



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 61

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

18 November 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I have a statement that I suppose could be styled as a statement of privilege if one wished to do it, but would I prefer to do it from the point of view of Statements by Ministers, and I wish to do it arising out of certain allegations, continuous allegations, the specific ones made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in my absence from the Province last week, as well as other matters, and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, because of the nature of this statement and because this statement relates to my past, present and future tenure in this House, that all hon. members in this House, including hon. members on my own side, would be kind enough to give me the latitude to be able to make this statement without interruption, and then afterwards there can be comment on it.

Mr. Speaker, last week I was absent from the House. I was in Calgary participating in an energy conference and meeting with government and industry personnel concerning the offshore and Hibernia's development.

On my return I find the Leader of the Opposition has levied another in his series of accusations against me. I regret he chose to

do so in my absence. I also regret, very genuinely, Mr. Speaker, that certain of the media chose to report these accusations without contacting me to determine my response. Hopefully those who did will give this statement equally prominent coverage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me first of all deal with the latest specific accusations - although I do so reluctantly since, as I shall point out later, I question whether my own private affairs and life which have no bearing upon my government duty should be publicly discussed by any member of this House. Certainly the privacy of those with whom I am related ought not to be.

Let me say there is no more substance to these allegations of the Leader of the Opposition than there were to the previous ones.

Vanguard Paper Box Company, Mr. Speaker, operates a box manufacturing business. Within the past few years the owners for their own legitimate reasons amalgamated their company with the Newfoundland Transportation Company, which owned the Bell Island Ferry.

Now, understand this, Mr. Speaker, neither myself nor any member of my firm have ever acted for the transportation division of the company in its relationship with the provincial government. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, another law firm has acted for the transportation division.

The involvement of my own firm has been confined to the box manufacturing business for which the company was originally incorporated, corporate financing and third party claims. It has had

absolutely no involvement in government's relation to the ferry business. Now get that, Mr. Speaker, and I would like that to be underlined because the impression was given in this House, and the headline in The Evening Telegram as a result of that reads, "Barry Tables Document Showing Marshall Firm Acts For Ferry Owner." Mr. Speaker, the obvious implication - not implication, direct accusation - was that in my own private affairs I was acting in relation to a ferry contract and at the same time acting for government which was completely untrue, a fabrication, and one that the hon. gentleman could have easily had determined if he had had the courtesy to have contacted me first. But he is not interested in that, as I shall say further on.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I can say here and now that I am not aware of what contract the company may have with government or indeed if it has one at all.

As to the rate hearing which the hon. gentleman mentioned, all I know is that at a political meeting on Bell Island during the last election, the opponent of the Leader of the Opposition announced the Premier had agreed to set up an inquiry into the rates and I wholeheartedly supported it. Some conflict!

As for these matters, Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge whether they came to Cabinet or if it was necessary for Cabinet's approval. Certainly I was not present. Furthermore, I would not have been.

Despite the fact that I had no relationship with that company in connection with its dealings with government concerning the ferry, I

would normally absent myself because my firm represented it in the ordinary commercial matters.

This has been the practice adopted by me on any matter of even indirect relationship during my tenure in government.

I suggest that any fair-minded person considering these facts - particularly that another lawyer has and is acting for the Transportation Division of that company, not in my firm - would realize how unfair these accusations and tactics of the Leader of the Opposition are. They could have been given to him had he the courtesy of informing me of the story he had constructed beforehand. As in the other cases, he choose not to. But this time he even hurls the accusation when I am out of the Legislature and out of the Province.

As to the appointment of Miss Gillian Butler to the Human Rights Commission, I had absolutely nothing to do with her being recommended for that position. I understand she is a chairperson and sits on the board with other members.

Neither would I have any connection with decisions of that Commission or any input one way or the other.

I am advised that Miss Butler was appointed on recommendation of the Department of Justice as a result of her qualifications. Even the Leader of the Opposition acknowledged her widely recognized competence. So why, therefore, raise the matter at all! He states it to be a matter of principle. It would seem the principle is that anyone having any connection with me cannot

participate in any form of public service no matter how competent.

As to remuneration, she has advised me she does not even know the amount yet. It has not been settled. Mr. Speaker, she could not care less about the amount. She assumed this position of public service out of interest. She is competent and able to do it. Her appointment ought not be publicly denigrated in the Opposition Leader's quest to discredit me.

Now, after I prepared this statement, I learned today, Mr. Speaker, as well, that the hon. gentleman was making enquiries of the Department of Justice on Friday concerning this person who is an associate of mine, having acted in some custody matter with respect to Labrador, and he was trying to construct something out of that. I mean this is so intolerable, Mr. Speaker. The situation is that this person has an expertise and a qualification. And I am not going in, and this is why it is so diabolical, I cannot talk about the private affairs of people, but I will say this because I have permission to say it: There occurred a situation where there was a contest over custody of a child - a man is talking now about eight year old children - between the grandparents and the parents. It went through the processes of court and it went to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland on appeal. And what happened was the judges sitting around thought that the interest of this child should be protected, of the child, of the eight year old child, that it would not be adequately protected by the solicitor representing the grandparents and the solicitor representing the parents, and they

thought she needed independent advice. So, Mr. Speaker, a judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland personally called Miss Butler and asked her to represent the youngster at the hearing and she did. That is the situation. Now, the hon. gentleman has gotten so diseased in his desire to discredit me that he even gets into child custody cases in Labrador. It is a shameful example.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ever since this House opened the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) - for reasons best known to him - has embarked upon a deliberate attempt to destroy my reputation and integrity. He has done this by drawing inferences from facts which are unfair and unwarranted and in many instances untrue.

He even went so far as to accuse me of untruthfulness and dishonesty by falsely giving the impression I had an undisclosed ownership interest in a company and thereby personally and secretly benefited from a land development company. This was widely reported inside and outside of the Province. He has now backed away from this but has yet to apologize for his act of character assassination. Nor, for that matter, Mr. Speaker, has anyone brought him to account for it?

Instead he has backed away by asking whether a Cabinet minister who practices law or is associated with a law firm should be a member of Cabinet. Let us for a moment permit him to remain unaccountable for those unfounded accusations of dishonesty against a member and I shall meet him on that question of a membership of a lawyer in a Cabinet.

Since he has posed his question in relation to myself let me say that the practice which I carry on is a private practice. Clients that I have represented over the years also carry on private businesses not dependent on government. When and if they have any relation with government - which happens on rare occasions since it is impossible in a small Province like ours to completely avoid it - I have scrupulously avoided any involvement.

As repeatedly stated over the past few days, since this session resumed, in the few cases involving Cabinet I absent myself, do not participate in the decision and never talk to any of my colleagues about the matter. Sometimes a decision will be made for the client and sometimes against it. But the point is any such decisions are made in effect as if I were not a member of Cabinet. Now, what more could be required?

For the Leader of the Opposition to contend that this renders a minister ineffective because of absence from Cabinet is arrant nonsense because these instances occur rarely.

Why then, Mr. Speaker, should a person who is carefully and honestly involved in a private law practice be prevented from membership in Cabinet if the Government Leader wishes him of her there? Has he to divest himself from all private interests? If so, everybody should. No one could have any interest in any kind of business. Anyone going into Cabinet would have to sell any shares he holds in companies. What about the Cabinet minister whose relatives have business interests which find

themselves dealing with government?

The point is, Mr. Speaker, everyone during his or her career and life in government either has some interest or a relationship with someone who does and to contend that one must divest oneself of every interest is both impossible and impractical. Government could not and would not work if the prerequisite to Cabinet membership was that a person must divest himself of everything. If you did that, you would get very few who would be willing to serve. It is a Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, it is not a convent or consistory. You cannot require that.

What you can require most certainly, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister or the person act honestly and not use his position to further any private interest. It also follows that one should not be presumed dishonest because one has a private interest. Is one entitled to assume that because one has an interest, one has dishonourably used one's position to enhance that interest? If so, if that is the rule, Mr. Speaker, there will also be very few people who would venture over the threshold of the Cabinet.

There is no doubt that anyone holding an interest of whatever type while a member of government is vulnerable to unfair accusations to anyone who wishes to do it. Anyone wishing to can imply through innuendoes and accusations that one is feathering one's own nest. There is all the difference in the world between the opportunity to be dishonest, Mr. Speaker, and actually being so. A potential conflict of interest does not mean there is

one. Yet having the potential leaves one open for accusations of those either heedlessly irresponsible or deliberately bent upon character aspersions.

This is what has happened in the present instance. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has deliberately set upon a course of taking certain facts and giving an interpretation that unfairly leads to a questioning of my integrity and my own personal security, that of the people of my family, and that of the people with whom I am associated.

Now I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman has done this. My colleagues know that in my seventeen years of government I have never used my position to advance my own or the interests of anyone with which I have been connected. What makes it even worse, Mr. Speaker, is that he as a former friend and colleague of mine in two Cabinets knows full well that he cannot point to a single instance of my being in an actual conflict of interest position. Yet he persists in weaving a web of innuendoes attacking my integrity without foundation.

It is surely not enough to say a person could be dishonest - I suppose one could say that about anybody - you must prove him to be so. Otherwise, it is grossly unfair to accuse by innuendo and attack a reputation. If he could establish dishonesty, Mr. Speaker, go to it, by all means do so. If not, it seems the height of irresponsibility to do the type of things that the hon. gentleman is doing in attacking me in my private life.

Now, why is the Leader of the

Opposition proceeding on this track? I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it is personal - despite the very deep and personal nature of the attack. I am sure it is not personal, although I do not know whether the hon. gentleman can differentiate between government success that he could not achieve as a person. I just say right now I do not think it is personal.

He is reported to have stated it is a matter of principle. Indeed it is, Mr. Speaker! The principle involved, as I interpret it, is whether a political opponent being unable to attack one on one's public record and achievements, should be able to attack one's private life. Let there be no mistake this is being done here by bandying about the names of people and companies whose only crime is to engage the services of my law firm for private legal services. Just think of the effect on family, friends and associates with charges such as those levied. Great stuff, Mr. Speaker! Great principle! Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is the power principle or the pining for it.

Let us recall the Leader of the Opposition resigned from the Cabinet of this government in 1981 claiming we were approaching the offshore wrongly. He staked his whole future on the premise we could not negotiate an offshore agreement which would optimize jobs, rights and revenues for Newfoundlanders.

Let us also recall, Mr. Speaker, that I happened to replace him. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador have today an agreement which gives more than the Leader of the Opposition ever dreamed we would achieve. It assures to

future generations every right they are entitled to expect as if they owned the resource and still be a part of Canada. British Columbia for one, as well as other provinces, are reported to want it. During my visit to Calgary, persons knowledgeable in Canadian history and affairs were kind enough to describe it as a most important federal/provincial agreement since the Western transfer of resources agreement of the 1930s. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), in fact, has told his caucus there is nothing he could find to criticize about it.

His hope, Mr. Speaker, having seen that, was that it would be an empty or a Pyrrhic victory - that Hibernia's development would occur through floating platforms which would provide minimal jobs. He based this on the initial environmental impact statement and, the record shows, pressed us to table it. Such pressure was irresponsible. Instead we quietly used our good offices, talked to all concerned, and today we have a gravity based system for development.

Now we are on the threshold, Mr. Speaker, of Hibernia's development, appointments have been made to the board, legislation is in the process of being drafted, new discoveries are being made and the future looks very bright for this Province as a result of it.

Now, I really believe the realization of this to be too much for the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). How else can one explain after seventeen years in government - during part of which he was a Cabinet colleague and can point to no improper conduct on my

part - he now chooses to take unfair advantage and attack my private life and security? A lawyer, namely me, in public life has attained a public success which touches his predecessor's public credibility. Not being able to denigrate the act, Mr. Speaker, he attacks the actor in a deeply personal, private and unjustifiable manner.

It seems of some significance as well, Mr. Speaker, that while I was away last week receiving very positive press at the Financial Post Conference - the type of event that my predecessor used to savor and relish - he chose to levy another attack in my absence.

Let it be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition has carefully steered away from asking any questions of me about energy matters. Being a former minister with some knowledge of the subject, I would have welcomed an examination by him on actions taken by me as his successor. Surely this Legislature would have been served well by his asking questions on the Atlantic Accord and its state of implementation, the gravity based system elected for Hibernia, the effect of the new energy programme announced by the federal government, the fiscal regime being negotiated for Hibernia, my meetings in Calgary last week, etc. etc. Indeed, I challenge him now to start asking these questions. At the same time, I invite him to cease justifying his own failures and inadequacies by attacking the private lives of myself, my clients, my associates and my family.

What has been done since this House reconvened, Mr. Speaker, is consummately unfair. If you

cannot attack a person's public record, it is not right to attack him personally by twisting facts and inviting unproven and unprovable inferences from those facts.

A not insignificant number of people, Mr. Speaker, have urged me to retaliate against the Leader of the Opposition. There is no doubt if I choose to delve into his personal life and record, as he has done with mine, I could from the records construct a similar invitation to the public to question his integrity. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, the temptation was compelling. However, I have not and will not do it for two very good reasons:

Firstly, it would look vindictive and as if the allegations hurled at me were excusable only because the accuser's sins exceeded the accused. This is not the case - I have never used my position to enrich myself at the expense of others - nor shall I use my position, Mr. Speaker, after retirement from it, which will occur, by the way, Mr. Speaker, in my own time and likely many moons from now.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it would only compound the whole sick situation and discourage further people from seeking public office. Lawyers have been members of Cabinet and associated with firms throughout history. The Leader of the Opposition was one who was associated with a firm while he was a member of Cabinet. With that single exception, all have made considerable contributions. I hope that other lawyers in the future - as well as engineers, doctors, teachers, businessmen - will offer themselves for election and serve

in their Province in the Cabinet. However, they will hardly be enticed to do so if they feel there will be open house and an invitation to attack their integrity and honesty, and that of their family, friends and associates.

Finally, let me say that I do not dispute the right - and let us be sure you understand this - of any member who feels that a member of a government has used his position for personal gain to question him. Such questions, by the way, are usually first advanced in private communication between members, which has not been employed in any of these of cases. However, I contend that one should have reasonable grounds to base charges that a member is so using his position before hurling charges of conflict of interest and none have existed in any of these cases.

It is not unusual, Mr. Speaker, for people in public service to have direct and indirect interests. Such interests sometimes put them in situation of potential conflict of interest. However, in most civilized societies it is assumed that no actual conflict has occurred. This assumption prevails until it can be shown to the contrary - it has to do with, and is based upon, our basic premise of innocence of any person until proven guilty that is ingrained in the very roots of our civilization. Surely this is a rule of ordinary, common decency. One should not be permitted to invite conclusions that a person is committing a wrong by innuendo and suggestion which is unfounded, but, Mr. Speaker, that is what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I find, having to

make this statement, distasteful. These are matters relating to my private life and the private affairs of others. They should be allowed to remain private unless or until until someone can demonstrate some wrongdoing or has reasonable or probable grounds for suspecting improper use of influence and neither exists.

However, since my private affairs and my character have become a matter of public debate at the instigation of the Leader of the Opposition and his advisors - I do not believe the ones in this House, I absent them - let me inject another piece of information. After assuming responsibility for energy matters from the member for Mount Scio, I received a full ministerial salary. I am entitled as much to this salary, I think, as any other minister. While I do not contend to work harder than any of my colleagues, neither would any of them suggest I work less in my government duties than they. I have been able to hold the minister's position and continue my law practice by working long hours, usually extending far into the evenings and most weekends. The government, Mr. Speaker, has not been short-changed.

Nevertheless, because I wished to feel free myself to go to my law office during certain periods of normal working hours, I have not accepted a full salary although receiving one. Every year since I have received full salary, I have gone to the Comptroller's office and repaid one half of my salary. There has been absolutely no requirement for me to do so. I have done it voluntarily, Mr. Speaker, so that I could within myself - because these things are important - feel that no one was

being unfairly treated. I had never intended, Mr. Speaker, that this information be made public. It was private and personal to me, and I do not know if any of my colleagues, with the exception of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), had any knowledge of it. But since I am left to defend myself from these unfair charges, I feel I must mention it.

What I mentioned is not an attempt to get any accolades or medals for it - as stated it has been my intent never to have it known. But it is relevant here in the context of asking whether a person who freely and voluntarily returns to the Treasury in excess of \$15,000 each year to which he is entitled is likely to have the type of character to try to use his Cabinet position to directly or indirectly enrich himself.

Oh, sure, there will be some who will say, 'He is making so much in his law practice he can afford to do so.' There are always cynics in the world. To those I say my political involvement has resulted in considerably less returns in my own business than I would otherwise gain. How much less, Mr. Speaker, is a private matter that no one has a right to pry into. But you can be assured that the price of my public duty significantly reduces my private returns. One result of the unfair tactics of the Leader of the Opposition will be to reduce that further since not everyone wishes to engage legal services at the risk of having their names bandied about publicly. So what this amounts to, Mr. Speaker, is an attack upon a practice which I have worked hard and honestly to build up over the years.

Surely a person who wishes to make

a contribution to this Province through elected office and at the same time has the ability to carry on a purely private business should be able to do so without having his honour and integrity impugned. Surely he should be able to accomplish this without others causing unfair distress to his family, friends and associates. If dishonesty can be shown, Mr. Speaker, that is another case. But it is not legitimate or fair to infer dishonesty by innuendo and suggestion.

Enough is enough. If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) cannot attack me in my public conduct of duty, he ought not launch an unfair and unwarranted attack on my personal life.

If the Leader of the Opposition can point to a single dishonest or improper act in my seventeen years of government, or at anytime in the future, by all means bring it out. But he cannot and he will not be able to do this.

But just do not weave a web of fabrications by casting untrue and unwarranted innuendos from facts dragged from my private life.

Finally, may I say I shall not likely take the opportunity to respond any farther to these or other accusations. I shall just refer to this statement. I have done nothing improper. Let the Leader of the Opposition get off this bitter personal attack and ask me questions on public issues relating to the offshore and hydro, about which he has been so conspicuously silent. I welcome them but I have no desire to defend my personal honour against his fabrications.

When I sit down, Mr. Speaker, let him not equivocate and state in this House he was making no allegations of dishonesty. He most certainly was. Let him be man enough to apologize for the aspersions on my character and integrity arising from unwarranted conclusions he has invited the public to draw from those unfair innuendoes. Let him not slither away from that responsibility he has by saying it is a matter of principle - a question whether a lawyer can be a member of Cabinet. As I have said, throughout our history lawyers have served in Cabinet and have been connected with firms. It was on that basis and that precedent that I entered two Cabinets and have conducted myself honestly in public and private life for seventeen years.

If he cannot attack my public record and life, Mr. Speaker, let him stay out of my private life and cease casting aspersions on my character.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down and before ending, I want to address, if I may, from the floor of this House a few questions to the press. In doing so I want you to understand I am not attacking the press, so please do not let your headlines or leads read, "Marshall Attacks the Media" and let the import of what I have just said be less completely covered. But from these incidents there are facts and legitimate questions which I invite the media to consider and these are, number one, is it fair to allow attacks to be made on a person's integrity as was done last week without even contacting the person concerned? These stories were carried throughout the Province last week without a single call to me in

Calgary, or at my home where contact could have easily been made and has been. As all media know, it is very easy to get me at any time but not a single soul called, Mr. Speaker.

Was it good journalism to report the proceedings in the House last week without mentioning I was not even present? Anyone listening to the media or reading the papers would assume I was here and perhaps slunk away in my seat with no defence to make. Mr. Speaker, I think I have shown I have a defence to make. And the unfairness of it all is this is what occurred: "Barry Tables Documents Showing Marshall Acts For Ferry Owner". That is not true. I have indicated it is not true.

The next thing in the paper, "Marshall in conflict of interest." "Peckford concedes Barry has point worth checking." Not true, Mr. Speaker! Untrue!

Mr. Speaker, on CBC Morning Show the Leader of the Opposition is allowed to go on and make such a statement as 'Marshall has hundreds of clients whom he is bringing into government for benefits.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that might cause a certain amount of amusement and that might sound funny, but I would ask, Mr. Speaker, any members of the press or anybody here to picture what happens if you have two daughters, one fifteen and one twenty, who hear that on their way to the university and to school? Is that fair game to do that?

The third thing, Mr. Speaker, which I would ask the press to consider soberly is this: Is the treatment of this concerted attack on me really being carried by the

press in a balanced manner? By this I mean there have been accusations made against me which are obvious news. I mean, I do not dispute the fact that if anyone is irresponsible enough to make these accusations the press should report them, but the way it is reported in the news the public hears 'Barry Makes The Charge', then the next day they hear, 'Marshall Denies the Charge'. Now that is the context. The fact that such grave charges as my secret holding and gaining a profit from a share has proven completely false does not seem to have any effect. One would think an enquiring press would zero in upon the accuser and at least ask if he should not apologize and retract. Instead, it just takes the attitude, 'Okay, well, Leo was not correct there but let us see what more can be ferreted out of Marshall's life and his personal affairs.' By doing that, I just soberly ask the press is it not being part of this particular insidious process?

I will just give an example, Mr. Speaker, if I could, in the few more moments before I sit down. It is the process, it is the way in which the media in Newfoundland, I think, with all due respect to them - and it is not attacking the media, I am just making a suggestion - go about things. When the Leader of the Opposition made the first two charges - I will mention it - Here And Now, God bless them - they picture themselves as the hounds of heaven - came, and it was almost as if the Leader of the Opposition was taking their turf so they decided to do their own investigation. So they asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to the effect, 'Have Marshall or the people in his firm ever acted

in bond issues for the government?' That is gravy for lawyers, Mr. Speaker. You get a big fee for doing nothing but signing a simple little letter and it should be abolished. Anyway, the Minister of Finance said, 'I will look.' The Minister of Finance went and scrupulously looked at the bond issues of the Peckford Administration, came back and said, 'No, they have not.' I can ask CBC Here And Now, why do they not go back to 1971? They can go back to 1971 and they will find neither Marshall nor any of his firms acted. They will even find that when I was sitting over there in the backbenches the then Premier of the Province, who is now departed, the immediate Premier, wanted me back into the Cabinet and he would have given them out for me wholesale if I had gone after them. But I did not take them. I did not want them. But that is not news, Mr. Speaker. It would have been emblazoned all over Here And Now, I am quite sure, if they had found that any one of Marshall's partners had acted. That was the story they were after. They were not interested, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that 'No, he did not', that was not news.

Now, as I said, I question if our press has not inadvertently become a part of the process by doing it. The only way in this atmosphere that I can really turn the tables would be to take an initiative and start hurling accusations and then the headlines and the leads would read, "Marshall Charges." And the next day, "Barry Denies." That is the only atmosphere that we would have here. But I choose not to do this, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have already given.

Fourthly, after somebody has made

a charge about somebody's integrity, in these circumstances why could they not have asked, for example, 'Mr. Barry, you were in Cabinet with Mr. Marshall for a number of years, he has been in public life and private practice for seventeen years, why bring it up now? Why has this suddenly become a matter of great principle? Is that not irrelevant?' Or ask, 'Mr. Barry, it seems that Mr. Marshall has achieved what you vowed could not be achieved, you do not seem to want to ask him questions on what he has done publicly, do you feel his private life should be of interest as it is?' Or, 'Do you feel it acceptable to bring in the names of private persons and have their names and businesses bandied about?' Or perhaps, 'Mr. Barry, how desperate are you to see Mr. Marshall out of public life?' He can be as desperate as he likes, Mr. Speaker, I dare say I will be here a lot longer than the hon. member.

Number five. Mr. Speaker, why then the intense question to these issues? Why get so all concerned about it? Are not public questions of more concern? For instance, last week I was on a visit to Calgary. It was an imminently successful visit from the point of view of the Province not from the point of view of Marshall. So he need not get jealous over that. It was imminently successful.

I appeared at a Financial Post Conference and gave an address which was widely reported between Vancouver and Halifax. I met with the Federal Minister of Energy (Mrs. Carney) and discussed the further development of Hibernia. I met with Mr. Lougheed and I met with heads of industry. Would you

not think, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of information would be of more interest? Reading the papers coming down in the plane I read reports of the Financial Post Conference and the great height there is, even in Calgary, over the prospects and the future of this Province. What do I do when I pick up The Evening Telegram, which is usually good and reasonable, I see these. It is not fair.

The only reporter who went up from Newfoundland was Mr. Calver who gave a fair and a balanced report and showed the type of superior reporter he is and that he is interested in positive things rather than these negatives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say I have been abused, and I genuinely feel that the Press has been used in this matter. Perhaps its own penchants for its so-called interpretive or investigative reporting is part of the cause and is partly at fault. I do not know. But, as I say, enough is enough. I say, Mr. Speaker, to my good friend opposite, through you, you did not have the courage to stay in the Cabinet of the previous administration when it was negotiating the offshore, you thought it was going to be a failure. It was a success! Face up to it and stop trying to destroy the character and integrity of a former friend, a person who is only trying to do his best in public life. And keep away from my private life, my associates, and my friends. If you can show any element of dishonesty, you bring it up. But if you cannot bring up an element of dishonesty, do not disguise your own failures by trying to attack the life of a private

person.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

First of all, on a matter of procedure I would submit to Your Honour that that was not a Ministerial Statement, it is, as the minister indicated, a matter of privilege. I will also ask that you permit me the same latitude that was given the minister in asking members on both sides of the House to remain silent. Whereas on a Ministerial Statement I would only be entitled to half the time, I would submit it is a matter of privilege which has been raised and I am entitled to a reasonable amount of time to respond to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To the point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition I was going to bring up the matter that it was not a straightforward Ministerial Statement and that perhaps the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would be allowed more time than that.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to my way of thinking I do not care whether he treats it as a matter of privilege. Let him not get into technicalities, he can have all day if he wants.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to start off, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that it is unfortunate that the hon. minister appears to have a blind spot in this case. The minister stands up and says that I must prove dishonesty. Let me make it clear, first of all, and there has been some confusion in the press reports, Mr. Speaker, that I have not backed away from a single thing that I have said in this House. Anything I have said in this House I will say outside the House. I will repeat, I have backed away from nothing, but the minister is reversing the process.

If, Mr. Speaker, there were proof of dishonesty, it would not be this House that would deal with this matter, it would be the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) and her department. What we are talking about here and what we are dealing with is conflict of interest, actual or potential. Mr. Speaker, the minister will not get away with reversing the process. It is my obligation as Leader of the Opposition to put forth public documents and, for example, to ask the minister, what is this? What is behind these documents? - when he is shown as having a share in a land development company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the minister gets up and says, I do not receive a profit pursuant to that share, then, unless there is other evidence, that stands, as far as this House is concerned, that stands.

However, Mr. Speaker, that does

not deal with the question of whether the minister gets any benefit from that company and the minister has admitted getting benefit from that company through legal fees. And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the sum total of legal fees that can be gained - and I will go further - the number of transactions recorded in the registry indicate have been gained from that company, those legal fees and the size of those benefits go much further and are much larger than would probably be the case in just having one share in a land development company.

So it is not enough for the minister to get up and say, I do not get profits because I do not hold a share as an actual shareholder. He must explain, Mr. Speaker, how he can obtain legal fees from that company? How can he see a company have a piece of land excluded from a land freeze and opened for development, which will permit the sale of lots, for example, or the sale of buildings constructed on that land, from which the minister will receive legal fees, if his firm continues to act? If the government of which he is a part has taken the decision to confer that benefit to the minister, I will say directly to the minister - and it is sad to see it - the minister has a blind spot. Mr. Speaker, I will accept that the hon. member is being sincere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

I ask, Mr. Speaker, if you would ask all members, on both sides, to stay quite.

The minister, probably, actually does believe, Mr. Speaker, because

he has been the person who has taken it upon himself as a cause to reform the standards of political morality in this Province, to reform the public tendering laws, and to reform the laws relating to conflict of interest. Mr. Speaker, the minister, because his heart is pure, has let himself get into a situation where he can do no wrong in his opinion.

Now, let me refer the minister to this. I will table this and I will have copies distributed to the press. This is the first one I have gone to, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure we can go to many other sources. The first one I picked up, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Encyclopedia, the new encyclopedia that is out, published just recently by Mel Hurtig. Listen to this definition: "Conflict of Interest may be defined as a situation in which politicians and public servants have an actual or potential interest (usually financial) that may influence or appear to influence the conduct of their official duties." If we listen to the minister, there is no conflict of interest unless there is actual interest proven, unless there is actual influence, and the minister ignores totally that component to conflict of interest which goes to, 'how does it look?' Which goes to, Mr. Speaker, 'what do clients think? If they are hitting town from upalong, they are saying who am I going to retain as a lawyer and there are two firms?' One is a firm with a minister active in Cabinet and another is a firm, all other things being equal, with no minister in Cabinet. Which one are you going to go to, Mr. Speaker?

Let me table this first and let me

go on. The Premier and the minister were away from this House. Let me say to the minister that we held off for two days before raising matters. We have to get on, we have our business to do, as does the House and as does the minister. We held off for two days while the minister was away. He had made his speech, Mr. Speaker, and we assumed he would be back in the House. We had our questions prepared. We had our approach prepared. We held off for two days anyhow, Mr. Speaker. We want to get this dealt with and settled and over so that we can move on to matters such as the Atlantic Accord.

For the minister to get up and say we have not asked him any questions on the Atlantic Accord. Let me repeat, what is the cost of a barrel of oil from Hibernia? What international price will be needed to make Hibernia barely viable and how much revenue, under present conditions, will there be for both levels of government and for the company from Hibernia?

MR. FLIGHT:

Day after day, day after day.

MR. BARRY:

Day after day, day after day. That is the essence of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer the minister to a matter that has come in another jurisdiction. The Premier on Friday committed to this House that he would see at the standards of political morality in this Province will be as high as exist anywhere in Canada. "Yes," he said, "they are

higher already." Well, let me refer the minister and the Premier, I do not know why the Premier is not here today.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It is none of your business.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

It is too bad, but I hope he will read Hansard. I will be tabling this, Mr. Speaker, and there is a copy available for members of the media. This is a little thing I pulled up on the computer from Infoglobe over the weekend. I am just barely starting to look at these precedents, Mr. Speaker.

It is the case of Darcy McKeough in 1972 in Ontario. Mr. Speaker, Mr. McKeough's department took a decision which affected a piece of land in which his family had an interest. Mr. McKeough did not know about it. It was established that it was treated in a business as usual manner by the ministry. There was no question, Mr. Speaker, about any actual wrongdoing by Mr. McKeough. Mr. McKeough resigned.

The article, in reporting it, says, "at the very least," and this is referring to - now I will just quote Mr. McKeough, not to confuse the issue. "Mr. McKeough said, 'What is at issue here is confidence in the integrity of the system. To my mind this is paramount.' He said that when he resigned from Cabinet in August, 1972 after it was learned that his ministry - and not he personally - had approved a plan of subdivision in which a family corporate connection gave him a financial interest. He had played no part in the management of the company

proposing the subdivision and there was never any allegation that his ministry gave any special consideration to the approval. But," - listen to this - "he resigned because it looked like his actions had tainted the system."

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to go through matters. I do not know if it was an oversight or not, Mr. Speaker, but one of the matters that the minister did not refer to was the fact of his firm was appearing before the Landlord and Tenants Board, Mr. Speaker, where that board is appointed by Cabinet. Maybe the minister overlooked that. I would hope that he will set out his views on that as well as some of the other matters he referred to here.

Mr. Speaker, we agree with the minister that his private affairs are of no business to anybody in this House except insofar as they impact on his public duties or upon the integrity of the system, on the administration of government, and the administration of justice.

Mr. Speaker, for the minister to get up and say that the headline in The Evening Telegram is wrong because he has not acted for a particular division of Vanguard Paper Company is a supreme exercise in pettifogging. The minister acts for Vanguard Paper Company Limited. He obtains benefits from that company by way of legal fees. There is nothing untrue in that headline. That headline is absolutely accurate - "Minister Acts for Bell Island Ferry Owners." Vanguard Paper Company is the owner of that ferry. The minister acts for that company by his own admission, although he says not for the

particular transportation division.

He has admitted, Mr. Speaker, actively supporting a rate review. Mr. Speaker, we do not know how that rate review is going to go. For the minister to have taken a stand on that, to have supported that rate review, is a conflict of interest, actual, by his own admission.

On the Human Rights Commission, the minister ignored the point completely. The minister talked about he having nothing to do with the appointment and asked us why did we raise the matter at all. The point is how can the human rights commissioner be a watchdog over government, how can she exercise it statutory authorities, how can a commissioner decide whether or not to appoint a commission of enquiry or to recommend that Cabinet appoint an enquiry when it could be an enquiry into the commissioner's senior law partner, the hon. member, the minister?

MR. TOBIN:

You did the same thing.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I did not do the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

When the hon. the President of Council got up to speak he did ask for silence and he got it. Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not getting it. It is not just a courtesy, he has that by right.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister, again, by presumably wanting to blur the issues here, talked about my having an association with a law firm. Mr. Speaker, when I was in Cabinet I did a thing that has traditionally been done which is, you are not an active lawyer, you are not active practitioner, and you are not involved in obtaining legal benefits on the ongoing legal work of the firm. You are there as counsel. It means that you are no longer a partner in the firm, you are no longer acting but your name is there in the letterhead, you still have that connection. That was my involvement when I was in practice. I had my name on the letterhead for a time back in the period 1972 to 1975, I think. That was the only period when I did that. It was because I had come in from a law firm which I had started but, Mr. Speaker, I did not practice law. I resigned my files, passed over my files to other lawyers and I did not take the benefit of legal fees from other matters that went to the law firm.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the minister is referring to when he talks about my enquiries to the Department of Justice. Yes, I made enquiries to the Department of Justice, but Mr. Speaker, I did not even know about that case. I was not interested in Miss Butler's involvement with that case in Labrador and I do not know what he is talking about. Unless, Mr. Speaker, it is a case where the Crown was on one side and that firm was on the other side. That is what I would ask the minister.

I received a letter today, after making my enquiries, and I did not want to have it brought up like that. I wanted to have my facts before I brought it up, but since the minister has slung these charges across the House I have to respond. I got a letter from the minister's department today, from the Deputy Minister, saying, "Dear Mr. Barry, I have been directed by the minister to contact you with respect to information you have requested from the Department of Justice relating to wardship matters dealt with by the Unified Family Court.

"As you are no doubt aware, such matters are held in camera and are generally regarded as being private and not for public disclosure." That is wrong, by the way.

"As a result, I think it would not be appropriate for the department to release information concerning wardship cases and your enquiry should be directed to the Unified Family Court. The court will then have to determine if there is any relevant information which can be properly disclosed."

I am interested in ascertaining whether the minister's firm was involved on one side of a case in which the Crown was involved on the other. I do not know, and to be fair to the minister, I want it clearly reported, I do not know if that is the case, which is why I was making my enquiry so I could have the facts. But would the minister undertake, because it has been indicated to me by a number of individuals, including an official of the minister's department, that this may have occurred, and I stress the may. We will be asking questions of the minister to follow up on that

point.

That is all, Mr. Speaker. There were no enquiries about Miss Butler. There were no enquiries about anything other than that matter. I am going to - and I am not going to leave it, Mr. Speaker - want to know whether what I have been told is correct here or not. I do not know if it is at the present time. That was the enquiry I was making, an enquiry which I think has some bearing on the issue that we are talking about here.

As far as Fairview Investments is concerned, as I said, the minister got up and purported to deal with that by saying, "I do not get any profits." The minister has to go further and explain, if he is getting a benefit from the company through legal fees, and if the company is getting a benefit from government, either by being excluded from Pippy Park, or because of the location of the Outer Ring Road - and it is not just Fairview Investments, it is another company as well, Acharya and Ben Nevis, two other companies, from all of whom the minister has apparently received legal fees or his firm - if those companies have obtained a benefit from Cabinet and whether the minister was in Cabinet at that time. We want to know were the conflict of interest guidelines adhered to? That is a fair and legitimate question and I would hope that the media would not be scared off by the series of questions put to them at the end of the minister's statement.

I would like to say to the media that I would love to have them doing it. I would love to have these questions coming out in the Press. I am not blaming the Press

Gallery and I am not blaming the ordinary reporters but I have very real questions, Mr. Speaker, about the extent of resources devoted to investigative journalism in this Province today. I should not be the one to have to go out and carry on my own investigation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

You have a research assistant down there getting \$40,000 a year.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I would like to see resources devoted, as have been in the past, to following up on some of these matters and to other matters that are out there and will be raised in this House, some of them later on today.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of matters here. The minister talks about my making personal attacks when his language is regularly referring to either, I think he made references today to my diseased approach, my mental stability, and talking about my being unstable - all geared, obviously, to the issue and not to my person. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to say anything that I have said in this House, outside this House and I hope the minister is prepared to proceed on the same basis. If I make any personal attack of the minister which is not substantiated, the minister knows what he can do, he knows that he has remedies.

Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about it being the situation where he is innocent until proven guilty and therefore until we can bring in, presumably, a criminal inditement, we cannot raise

questions in this House. I would like to refer the minister to a Conservative colleague of his in Ottawa, Mr. Masse.

MR. PATTERSON:

Tell us about Fox in your Liberal Party - tell us about forger Fox.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Name him!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister: is that the standard that is applied in the House of Commons? The Premier has said we are going to have as high a standard in this House as is in the House of Commons.

MR. PATTERSON:

We will not while you are here.

MR. BARRY:

We see a Minister of the Crown in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, as soon as there has been a question relating to the matter of election spending by his association, I think, not even by himself, he does the honorable thing, he resigns until the matter is clarified. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Masse did not feel that he should stay in Cabinet and insist that until he was proven guilty, there was nothing of concern to be raised in the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, we have raised questions in this House which relate -

MR. PATTERSON:

You are blind! That is all you can talk about.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Relate to whether there was any actual wrongdoing.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going on much longer.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I will have to name an hon. member if he continues to interrupt. I have asked for silence and I expect everybody to respect that request.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have raised three questions in this House. One, I have put matters before this House which would indicate that the minister may have, and I say, may have been obtaining a benefit from companies while they were getting a benefit from government. The question of actual wrongdoing goes to whether the minister had any involvement in the decisions of government. It is not for us, it is for the Premier actually, and it is for government to explain the process. Mr. Speaker, we have seen a very sad series of answers to our questions. We have seen contradictory answers. We have seen the Premier get up in this House yesterday and say to my colleague from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) that, yes, the minister had told him about his involvement with the Bell Island ferry. The day before when the documents were tabled the Premier had said, 'I do not know about all the involvements of the minister,' and denied having any actual knowledge of the Bell Island ferry. We have seen the minister himself say, 'every time a matter of conflict or potential conflict has come up,

I have excused myself, I have tiptoed quietly out without telling anybody, on some occasions,' and at other times he says he told the Clerk. The Premier takes the position that he has had written letters of disqualification from the minister.

Mr. Speaker, we hear the minister one day get up and say he has been scrupulously careful in making sure there is no conflict of interest and another day takes the position, 'how can I be expected to know everything that my law firm is acting on.' Mr. Speaker, if he is using conflict of interest in terms of actual conflict, even there he is wrong because, I would submit to Your Honour, if he is taking a decision with respect to a matter, say, excluding a company from Pippy Park, even if he does not know that his law firm is acting, if his law firm is acting and getting legal fees, and he is benefiting from those legal fees, that is an actual conflict, that is not just potential, Mr. Speaker. Under any definition, in any civilized, sane, and reasonable form, which I would hope we are, it is an abomination to start defining conflict of interest in terms of only those matters of which the minister consciously, deliberately, involves himself in order to rip off the government. That, Mr. Speaker, is a criminal offence. There is a section in the Criminal Code dealing with influence peddling for that.

Now, the minister has said 'I do not know how to deal with this other than to start hurling insults back.' Mr. Speaker, we have suggested to the minister how it should be dealt with. These matters can be dealt with by

setting up a Select Committee to look into each and every matter, to call witnesses, for example, from Pippy Park. Here is what I am getting from Pippy Park. I will give you a little clue as to what is going on here.

I wrote the Chairman of the Pippy Park Commission and asked him - because the minister told me that was the Pippy Park's business - he did not give us that information, I asked the Pippy Park Commission Chairman to give me the names of all individuals who had made representation on behalf of the owners of land who had had land excluded from Pippy Park. The Chairman wrote me back and said he considers that to be a matter of solicitor/client privilege. Now, can you picture that? The Commissioner is neither the solicitor nor the client. He is a third party who has gotten the information, and he is refusing to give that information.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter on my desk, drafted this morning, which will be going out today, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, to make a demand on the Chairman of that Commission to release that information. But, Mr. Speaker, that Chairman can wait for thirty days before responding to my letter. There can be a stonewall. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we are back in this House on a regular basis for the last several days, and we are going to be for several more days. As I have said before, if there is a stonewall going on here, the only way to get through a stonewall is to keep pounding, and we intend to keep pounding, because we are not getting information, whether it be from the Department of Justice or whether it be from the Pippy Park Commission. It appears, Mr.

Speaker, that the stone walls are being erected.

So I would again suggest to the minister that the way of dealing with this is for the minister and the Premier to agree to setting up of a Select Committee to look into this matter.

The minister talks about, Mr. Speaker, only receiving 50 per cent of his salary and saying it as though it was a big secret that he was not going to tell anybody. I think that was carried in the newspapers a year or a year-and-a-half ago. I am not sure but, I am fairly sure that he raised it in the House in response to questions. It has been public knowledge for a long time, Mr. Speaker.

I want to go back to my three questions: The first question we raised is was there an actual conflict of interest? Was there improper action by the minister? Was there improper influence being exercised by the minister? Those are questions that arose when we tabled the documents that we have tabled. They are not allegations that are being made, Mr. Speaker, they are questions that arise from the documents that are tabled, but they are questions that must be answered. That is taken as given in any legislature in this country, that when these types of documents, giving rise to those questions are tabled, answers must be given. The answers have not been satisfactorily given, they have been contradictory, Mr. Speaker, as to whether in fact the minister has been present when decisions were made affecting his clients.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is not true.

MR. BARRY:

It is true. Because the answers we have been getting, Mr. Speaker, are that the minister does not know - that is one set of answers - the minister does not know from day to day who his firm is acting for and what decisions that are taken in Cabinet might affect them. That is one answer that has been given and, if that is so, Mr. Speaker, we have not had a satisfactory response as to whether there has not in fact been actual conflict of interest.

The second question, Mr. Speaker, that we have been trying to deal with here, which is every bit as important, keeping in mind this definition is, is it possible that there has been potential interest involved when the minister makes a decision in Cabinet and he has an interest downtown? That is what we are talking about, two interests, Mr. Speaker, that conflict.

Conflict of interest is not a very complicated thing. You have an interest because you are getting money through a law firm from clients and you are involved in government and you have an interest in a decision that is being taken in government. If there is an involvement in a decision being taken in government, then there is the potential for conflict or there could be actual conflict, but there is definitely the potential for conflict because, Mr. Speaker, the question arises, how can anybody know what goes on in the mind of man? How can anybody know why the minister really decided a certain way in Cabinet if it is a client who is being dealt with, Mr. Speaker, or if it might be a client who is being dealt with and if he is turning a blind eye and

not looking as to who his law firm is acting for?

The third question goes to the effectiveness of the minister. The minister has said, "Well, I am only getting half salary and do you know something? I am working nights and weekends so I can carry on my law practice." Well, do you know something, Mr. Speaker, when I was a minister I worked nights and weekends on government work and I am sure there are ministers opposite there worked nights and weekends on government work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

So the question arises, Mr. Speaker, here we have probably the two most - well next to the fishery anyhow - the two most significant areas with potential impact on Newfoundland's future, the Petroleum Directorate and Newfoundland Hydro, responsibilities of the minister and we have him saying that, basically, he is a part-time minister. Even when he is here to act, when he is not downtown carrying out his practice, we have the minister saying he has to exclude himself. He says it is only infrequently. The Premier gets up and says, 'There are innumerable cases. How can he be expected to keep track of them all, how can the minister be expected to keep track of them all.' Who do we believe, Mr. Speaker? If the minister is excluding himself often because clients are involved, is that minister being effective, apart from his responsibilities for his portfolio, is he being responsible

and effective in terms of his greater responsibility to participating in the decisions affecting the Province at large?

Mr. Speaker, I am just about through. I do not think I have gone as long as the minister but I am just about to clue up. Mr. Speaker, the minister has asked why bring these matters up now? Some of them, Mr. Speaker, were public knowledge some time ago but not since. I do not think anything that has been raised - I just have to think back.

The Petro-Canada incident I only found about shortly before this House resumed sitting; Fairview Investments the same thing, Mr. Speaker; Universal Helicopters, I found out about that actually while the House was in session. I found out about it and within a matter of days when I raised it; Acharya Holdings and Ben Nevis, the same thing, I found out since the House sat, Mr. Speaker; the Landlord and Tenancy Board, the same thing, I found out when I was contacted by tenants who had concerns; and the Human Rights Commission, Miss Butler had been appointed during the Summer, since the House last sat, so this is our first session in which we can bring it up. There are a couple of matters that we will be bringing up, one matter today, another maybe tomorrow which have been there for sometime, Mr. Speaker. But they all go to the question of how far does the minister's influence extend?

I am just talking now about influence from his association with his law firm, influence into the areas of the public sphere. The minister says he carries on a private law firm. Well, when the minister's firm has an associate

that is Chairman of the Human Rights Commission, when the minister's firm has a partner who is Vice-Chairman of the Labour Relations Board - a matter I will be bringing up in question period today - when the minister's firm has a Chairman who is President of the Board of Regents - a matter that we will be raising probably tomorrow - Mr. Speaker, one has to ask how can the minister say that his is a private law firm? How can the minister say that there is no potential conflict between activities of his associates or partners in these areas and his own activities as a Cabinet minister?

Mr. Speaker, we have other matters that will be dealt with which relate to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), who is also, we understand, Deputy Premier, President of the Executive Council, Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, Minister responsible for Newfoundland Hydro and member for St. John's East. We have other questions, Mr. Speaker, that go, not to the minister's private affairs, nothing we have raised here is intended to delve into the minister's private affairs. What they do go to is whether the minister's private affairs have an impact upon his public duties? We will continue to ask questions. I would urge the press to continue to ask those questions.

I also urge the press to condemn me and to condemn me loudly and long if I, Mr. Speaker, say anything in this House that is unfair to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or attack the gentleman personally. Mr. Speaker, I have no concerns for attacking the gentleman personally. Like everybody else in this House, Mr. Speaker, we

have all gotten involved in government and gotten involved in politics because we want to make a contribution to this Province, Mr. Speaker. We have all tried to live up to certain standards. I repeat, again, that the Government House Leader has taken a leading role with respect to establishing higher standards of political morality for this Province, but, Mr. Speaker, those standards have to apply to all, including the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that the Government House Leader has been blinded, for whatever reason. He has been blinded by his own sense of personal honesty, by his own sense of purity, by his own high standards, which he believes he sets for himself, by whatever, Mr. Speaker, by his personal knowledge that he could never do anything consciously wrong.

I ask the minister, in all sincerity, if you are not satisfied with the definition given in the Canadian Encyclopedia, go anywhere else, Mr. Speaker, and for heavens sake, bring into this House a definition of conflict of interest which should be applied. Mr. Speaker, the one which we have set out here is "a situation in which politicians and public servants have an actual or potential interest (usually financial) that may influence or appear to influence the conduct of their official duties."

If there is another definition of conflict of interest that the minister is going by, would he please show us what it is and maybe we can have it enacted in law. Maybe we can have conflict

of interest defined, either in the Conflict of Interest Act or the Conflict of Interest Regulations because then, Mr. Speaker, we will be able to clearly see whether the Premier is correct when he says that this House, this administration and this Province will have as high a standard of political morality as anywhere else in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

At this stage I would like to welcome to the visitors' gallery nineteen Grade XI students from St. Michael's School in Arnold's Cove with their Principal, Harvey Jackman, and teacher, Frank Fram.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Marshall), or the President of the Council. Would the President of the Council confirm that the government, Premier or Cabinet has retained Mr. Cabot Martin, the ex-senior policy advisor to the Premier, in a consulting role?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have engaged Mr. Cabot Martin to be a consultant to the Government of Newfoundland, to the Department of Development in the Energy Division, to the Petroleum Directorate in relation to energy matters, particularly in relation to the development of Hibernia. I can tell this House that that decision of the government is one of the wisest decisions the government could make. Mr. Martin is a very highly respected and knowledgeable person in offshore matters and probably has greater knowledge than any other Newfoundland. He has already proven his worth many times over with his knowledge. I count ourselves very fortunate that we have a Newfoundlander like Mr. Cabot Martin whose advice and consultation we can avail of.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

There is no question about Mr. Martin being very knowledgeable. It may well turn out that Mr. Martin is very expensive. Would the President of the Council indicate the mode of remuneration for Mr. Martin? Will he be paid by the day, the week, the month or by the hour?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I want to check the actual specifics, but as I recall

the engagement is on an hourly basis for a consultant, in relation to the amount of time that Mr. Martin spends. In addition, there is reimbursement for expenses that have been validly incurred, such as travelling expenses, that one would expect in a situation like that. If the hon. gentleman wants me to, I can get the exact figures for him which I certainly will. But as I say I want to be accurate and I have not got them off the top of my head now.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I am not at this point interested in expenses, Mr. Speaker. I wonder would the minister confirm that Mr. Martin is being retained at \$150 per hour? Is that the hourly rate?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I believe that that is the rate of remuneration. I will have to check it, but that is the normal rate of remuneration that one would pay to a consultant and an advisor of Mr. Martin's experience and Mr. Martin's capacity.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister will confirm very quickly that \$150 per hour is \$1200 a day and \$6000 a week, \$312,000 a year. Now we only paid that senior advisor \$62,000 when he was working full time. I will tell the Deputy Premier that one hundred hours is two and a half weeks of eight hour days. Most of my constituents do not earn \$15,000 in a year, let alone two weeks. So would the Deputy Premier tell us if there are minimums or maximums in the number of hours per year that Mr. Martin will act as a consultant to this government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, obviously you cannot just take the amount that has been paid to a consultant on an hourly basis and project it over the year and say that the gentleman is going to earn that because he is not going to be working at that particular rate for that period of time. What was the latter part of the hon. gentleman's question?

MR. FLIGHT:

Is there a minimum or a maximum number of hours? How many hours will he work at \$150 per hour?

MR. MARSHALL:

That is something that I would like to check. To my knowledge I do not believe there is because of the fact that we want Mr. Martin's services for as long as the Province needs his services. I can assure the hon. gentleman that Mr. Martin's services to this Province are really totally invaluable, particularly at the present time, when we are in the very important and indeed very sensitive matter of negotiating

fiscal regimes and benefits for the Province of Newfoundland. I realize many of the hon. gentleman's constituents and many of ours are not being paid at that rate. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that the rate that has been applied in this case is the standard rate for somebody of Mr. Martin's expertise, but it would be totally incorrect to draw a projection to the effect that Mr. Martin is going to get \$300,000 in one year.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, that may well be but we have Mr. Martin's full-time service for \$62,000 a year. Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be a little ridiculous to suggest that he may be going to work enough hours to make \$312,000 per year but it is possible, and that is why I want to see the contract tabled. But the fact is, we had Mr. Martin's services for \$62,000 and we could have had him 24 hours a day. Now we have him at \$150 per hour and he only needs to work one fifth of the amount of time that he worked when he was earning \$62,000 a year. So Mr. Speaker, that to me is scandalous, and it is very topical and pertinent and we are asking this question today because it reeks of bald, blatant patronage, paying \$150 an hour to a man who we were paying \$62,000 per year, and that shortly after he resigned as the Premier's Senior Policy Advisor.

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a question, if the Speaker will

permit. Did Mr. Martin accompany the Minister of Finance to Japan recently? And if he did accompany the Finance Minister, were the expenses for that trip paid and was he on that consulting rate of \$150 an hour on that particular trip?

MR. MARSHALL:

If I may, Mr. Speaker, before my colleague replies, could I just answer the first part of the hon. gentleman's question?

MR. FLIGHT:

Sure.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I would like to point out that the hon. gentleman should understand Mr. Martin's engagement is of an ad hoc nature. There will be some months he will be quite busy, there will be other months he may work very few hours. And as to the fact that he was employed for \$62,000 annually, this is not Soviet Russia and you cannot keep a person employed in the government by government directing that he must. Mr. Martin of his own volition, for his own purposes, wished to go out in private business. And, as I say, I know the Province will benefit greatly from the fact that we are going to be able to avail of the services of a man of the quality of Mr. Martin, particularly the expertise that he has in these sensitive times.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, recently the Province issue a debenture in Japan and on

that occasion I took the opportunity, as I did when we did the same thing last year, of seeing certain things that I thought were in the best interest of the Province, and subsequently went on to China for the same purpose, to undertake certain visitations and consultations and studies that I thought were in the best interest of the Province.

Those particular interests involved the offshore in relation to the fiscal regime. The hon. member opposite thinks that the offshore is a very narrow affair but the offshore question is a very involved affairs. One of the most involved aspects of it is the fiscal regime that we have put into place and that fiscal regime has to bear on the world situation in regard to offshore oil development. So I was anxious, in my position as Finance Minister, to get as much information as I could on this particular trip I had to make to Japan in that regard, but also in China where there is very active offshore developing going on.

At the same time there was another matter which was of very current interest in this Province and that is the development of aquaculture. Both Japan and China, and the latter for centuries, I suppose, have very great expertise in aquaculture and Mr. Martin had taken a very keen interest in this when he was the Chief Adviser to the Premier. Mr. Martin has interested himself in great detail in the fishing industry, particularly in the leading edge of the fishing industry at the present time, which is aquaculture. So I arranged to have Mr. Martin come with me because he had expertise in these two areas, the offshore

oil situation particularly in regard to fiscal regime that we were putting in place, and secondly the development of aquaculture, which, of course, is a matter that we would have to look at very closely in this Province in terms of encouragement and funding and development. He did accompany me for those two purposes.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister obviously avoided answering the question. I want to know how much it cost to have Cabot Martin go to Japan and, by the minister's admission, China, and whether or not he was remunerated on that trip at \$150 an hour as per his new contract with the government. Was he paid \$150 an hour on that trip? What was the total cost of taking Mr. Martin to Japan and China? Was the cost based on the contract that Mr. Martin has with the provincial government as a consultant, \$150 an hour plus expenses? I have one more questions on the expenses.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

No, Mr. Speaker, he was not remunerated on the basis, during that period, at the rate of \$150 an hour. His contract for that brief period was not on an hourly basis in any case.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Will the minister table - and we will be watching for it - the cost of the trip, how much it cost this Province to have Mr. Martin accompany the minister on the trip to Japan and China?

I would want to ask my final supplementary to the President of the Council. It has been established that we are paying Mr. Martin now \$150 an hour on a consulting basis with no maximums. Would the minister tell the House whether or not we are also paying his expenses? Are there expenses included for Mr. Martin in his present contract with government over and above the \$150 per hour?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, not expenses in the sense of paying rental or anything like that, but expenses certainly. If, for instance, Mr. Martin had to accompany me to Calgary, or something like that, which he did not last week but he could have, a consultant would normally expect that expense to be reimbursed. I can also say that while Mr. Martin excels in many areas, he is invaluable on the phone. He calls all over the place between here and Vancouver and Britian, and amasses a tremendous amount of information. So his phone bill sometimes is a little bit more than the hon. member's or my household bill, but consequently that is paid. But those are the two expenses.

MR. FLIGHT:

Do not laugh. It is not funny, 'Bill.'

MR. MARSHALL:

Certainly, I am not saying it is funny.

MR. FLIGHT:

One hundred and fifty dollars an hour is not funny in this Province today.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman can make a lot of that, if he wants to, like the hon. gentleman wanted to when Mr. Lougheed was appointed. He can equate that to people in his own district and I can equate it to people in mine, but the fact of the matter is we need expert advise and direction and help from every quarter we can get it in the very important negotiation of the fiscal regime. What we are paying are reasonable rates to both of these people within that context.

Now, the hon. gentleman says, "No joke!" No, it is no joke. Neither, Mr. Speaker, do I think it appropriate when the hon. gentleman - I do not think the hon. gentleman is really honed in on things - starts complaining about paying rates of that nature to people who can benefit the Province. They are reasonable rates and certainly Newfoundland will get more than a fair share of return from them.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, would the minister attempt to tell the House, since they have given the

former Senior Policy Advisor, Mr. Martin, a contract and we are going to pay him \$150 an hour for his service and we are going to pay his expenses, how much is that package going to cost the Province of Newfoundland this coming year, one year's work from Mr. Martin? Was any estimate done? Has the minister got any idea how much this is going to cost us? Now it is the Martin package. How much will the Martin package cost this Province based on \$150 an hour for every hour he works for the Province, plus expenses.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, he calls it the Martin Package.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Golden Parachute.

MR. MARSHALL:

The Golden Parachute.' If we could get the Flight Package, if the gentleman had anything to contribute, we would be delighted to have an input from the hon. gentleman.

MR. FLIGHT:

Just wait long enough.

MR. MARSHALL:

Unfortunately, the hon. gentleman, even though he is the Energy critic, every day shows he has absolutely nothing to contribute. Now do you have an outer limit? Mr. Speaker, the only limit is that we will use Mr. Martin's services to the degree that is necessary in order to assist us. He will not be paid one cent above the number of hours he works. I can tell the hon. gentleman that this government is getting and

will get full value for each and every second of time that Mr. Martin expends on government business.

The hon. gentleman can talk all he wants to. You see, it is beyond the perception of the hon. gentlemen there opposite. You know, they want to talk about the Loughheed retainer. Now they want to talk about Martin. But how about, Mr. Speaker, talking about Hibernia and the fiscal regime, and the Board, and the success and the promise and the hope for the future of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, \$150 an hour is beyond anyone's imagination and justification in this day and age. Announcement of a salary such as that being made today, \$150 an hour, possibly \$312,000 a year, when we get another announcement today that fuel adjustment charges are going to be increased this month 1.4 cents per kilowatt hour, which is three times to what it was in October month, based on 1000 kilowatt hours that would equal about -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Would the hon. member pose a question?

MR. EFFORD:
-that would equal about \$9.00 per 1000 kilowatt hours and the average household is 5,000 a month, so the approximate increase

this month is \$45.00.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. EFFORD:
My question is to the minister: How does the minister justify the increase in the fuel adjustment charge pertaining to this amount \$45.00 per month increase, three times what it was in October month? How can the minister justify that in the low income bracket that those people are in?

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I have a little bit of difficulty mastering the hon. gentleman's masterful mathematics. I could not follow him. But I understand his question is how can we justify it? Now the fact of the matter is that everybody pays for their electrical bill throughout the year on the basis of cost. There is very little profit. I am very happy to say that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, that much maligned corporation, that if you look at that circle that is usually drawn by accountants and you look at the attribution of expenses, you will see an infinitely small amount. It is the most economical corporation that has ever been run. I know the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) fully agrees with me on it. It is about, I think, 7 per cent or something like that.

So what the hon. gentleman is talking about is the fuel

adjustment charge. We had a full and complete hearing before the Board of Commission of Public Utilities. The Commission has provided we are going to spread in effect the fuel adjustment charge, which would normally be imposed on people in the Winter months when it is harder to beat, over a period of time, which is much more logical. That is what is being done. People are not paying any more, Mr. Speaker, at all. They are paying no more in the long run. All we are doing is just making it normal.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
In PEI this Winter, according to the news report we are getting, they are getting a decrease of 25 per cent. We right here in Newfoundland now, I suppose, have the lowest job rate we ever had in the last number of years, the lowest income in Canada per person, and yet we are paying the highest per capita rate for electricity in all of Canada. The average income right now is about \$6000 a year.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

This is a supplementary question, would the hon. member pose his question.

MR. EFFORD:
The question, Mr. Speaker, is to the minister. He is saying that people must pay their bills. What I would like to ask him is, with the increase, how can the people be expected to pay these high

electricity costs when they have absolutely no income to pay them? Now, that is a very sensible question to ask him.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
For people who cannot pay their electrical costs, who cannot meet their expenses, there are social programmes in place to assist them.

MR. BAKER:
Which will not cover it.

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman there opposite mentions the PEI rate, he keeps referring to it from time to time. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that they receive money from the federal government with respect to it. We have a much longer range view than the hon. gentlemen there opposite. We look forward, in the very near future, to being able to renegotiate some sensible position with respect to Labrador power and in that case we expect that we will get considerably more than \$50 million from the federal government. It is the first time, by the way, there has been any federal government that has been anyway interested at all in changing this problem up in Labrador. The hon. gentleman talks about power rates, and we realize power rates are high. We are very sorry they are high. We do as much as we can by providing an efficiently run Hydro Corporation, by providing a Public Utilities Board to enquire into applications for rates. What we will do, Mr. Speaker, some day, I hope in the not too distant future, is we will be able to recapture and try to eradicate the

mistake made by the hon. gentlemen's party there opposite when they gave away the Upper Churchill where we would have now been enjoying infinitely lower rates.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Port de Grave, a final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:
I am glad you mentioned the part of Social Services because the average income for a family of four on Social Services is \$6000. Very simply, does he think that the people with an income of \$6000 a year can afford a \$40.00 a month increase?

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is very concerned about people on social assistance, as we all are, and I say the hon. gentleman has no monopoly of concern on that. As far as we are concerned we are extremely concerned about the unemployment rate in Newfoundland, we are extremely concerned about the high cost of living, and we are extremely concerned and very sympathetic to the people in this Province who have low incomes. What we have done in the Peckford administration is we have attempted to take steps to eradicate this. We have restructured the fishery, for instance, so that there are stronger jobs there. We have redone the Corner Brook mill so that there are good, sound jobs

out there, and we are involved now in the offshore, which brings a great deal of promise to the people of this Province. The hon. gentlemen are going to be very, very depressed over the coming months and the coming years with respect to the offshore. The best thing that they can do is face up to the fact, ask certain questions, and try to make something positive of it rather than the way they have been conducting themselves in the House.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). When the Labour Relations Board is asked to deal with certain matters which have come before Cabinet, whether it be the designation of essential employees or some other issue relating to a union dispute with NAPE or other government union, does the minister see any potential for conflict with the Vice-Chairman of the Labour Relations Board being a law partner of the Government House Leader, (Mr. Marshall) Deputy Premier, President of the Executive Council? I wonder if the minister could answer that?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister for Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any potential for conflict of interest there. The gentleman in question has been a member and Vice-Chairman of the Board for quite a number of years. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition is well aware, there

is provision in the Labour Relations Act for any member of the Board who has a conflict of interest to absent himself. Members of the Board, not just the Vice-Chairman, regularly do that.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Would the minister be aware, and if not could the minister check, whether the Vice-Chairman has a practice of excluding himself from all matters relating to government employees or disputes in which government has taken a position?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister for Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take that question under advisement and I will check it.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Would the minister indicate whether the Government House Leader excludes himself, when it comes to Cabinet discussion, from all matters relating to labour issues that might go to the Labour Relations Board eventually for resolution?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon.

Leader of the Opposition was referring to the Vice-Chairman of the Board. He said the Government House Leader.

MR. BARRY:
No, I was referring to the Government House Leader.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Well, perhaps you should ask that question of the Government House Leader. Were you asking it of me?

MR. BARRY:
Yes, you are the Minister for Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
I am not clear on the question, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
I do not mind if the Government House Leader wishes to answer. But as Minister of Labour, with responsibility for the operation of the Labour Relations Board and governments relations with labour generally, is the minister aware whether or not the Government House Leader excludes himself from Cabinet discussion on issues, whether relating to government employees or others, which might eventually go to the Labour Relations Board for resolution?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. I do not recall, as a matter of fact since I have been in Cabinet, whether there has been an issue where the Vice-Chairman of the Labour Relations Board has been involved and whether in fact the

Government House Leader was in Cabinet at the time to absent himself. But if the Leader of the Opposition so requests, I will check the matter out.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, if I could just follow up, it is not a matter of knowing after the fact. It is a matter of does the minister exclude himself from matters which might end up before the Labour Relations Board. For example, the matters relating to the recent brewery strike, is the minister saying there was no Cabinet discussion with relation to the brewery strike?

Mr. Speaker, government takes a position on these disputes, for example, the legitimacy of bringing beer into the Province. Does the minister make it a practice of excluding himself, disqualifying himself from Cabinet when issues come up which could go to the Labour Relations Board eventually?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I regard that, again, as a hypothetical question. I mean, the brewery strike was a matter in the private sector. Whether the matter was discussed or not, I would not see any conflict of interest there, Mr. Speaker. Again, I think it is just a hypothetical question.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). Last evening the Chairman of the Royal Commission on Unemployment, in response to a question in Stephenville, I think it was, raised concerning what he thought should be done respecting youth unemployment in the Province, suggested that he did not know what could be done other than the young people, the youth, causing a revolt or having a revolution. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, is this what we are paying this Commission \$1 million for? Is this what they are going to come up with for an answer to youth unemployment? Or is it a matter of the Chairman becoming frustrated now that he has seen the situation, seen the futility of this Commission?

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any statement made by the Chairman of that Commission. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that we count ourselves, again, very fortunate that we have somebody like Mr. House conducting it. I think this Commission has all the promise of being probably one of the best Commissions that has ever been struck by the Government of the Province of Newfoundland.

The hon. gentleman gets up and takes statements out of context. I do not think it is really fair for the hon. gentleman to denigrate the Chairman of the

Commission or the Commission itself. The Commission is a very, very highly qualified one which is going to do good and I suggest he wait until the report comes in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No more questions? No more questions?

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

A question for the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Over the weekend through the news media we heard the Premier and the Minister of Labour comment on the implications of the situation whereby the ILO condemned the Province for having unjust, unfair and discriminatory labour laws. The Premier indicated that he thought everything was okay, that this was a leftist organization and he was making laws for Newfoundland and what this leftist organization said had no effect on legislation for this Province. The minister himself indicated that he was going to do something about it, that he was going to look into -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. the member pose his question?

MR. LUSH:

In view of these apparent conflicting statements, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering where the minister sits, whether he is going to be like the Premier and do nothing about it but accuse this group of being a leftist group or

whether the minister is going to follow his line of action when he said he was going to look into the allegations and accusations made by the ILO and to ensure that the laws were changed if they were unfair and unjust. Now, who is correct? Who are we going to listen to, the Premier of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard)?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the short answer is, yes, of course we are going to look into the recommendations of the report of the mission that came here. But I think the hon. the member for Bonavista North should examine what the Premier said. The Premier did not say we were going to do nothing about it. He referred to the fact that it was a body outside of Canada and that we make Newfoundland laws here in Newfoundland and we administer them. But he did say that we would be examining the report, and we are right now, Mr. Speaker, in the process of examining the report.

The member did hear correctly on the weekend. I did say we were examining the report departmentally and would be making some pronouncements on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 26 of The Financial Administration Act, I have six copies of Minutes of Council to table. These relate to pre-commitments.

Orders of the Day

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

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to see that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is still in his seat because I want to ask him a hypothetical question, I suppose, what would he do if I were to throw a few accolades at him?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

This hon. House, Mr. Chairman, does not make provisions for the throwing of things back and forth across the floor. I understand the reason that the distance is such is so that members cannot reach across with their swords and inflict mortal damage upon each other. I understand it is two

sword lengths across. But there is no provision for the throwing of accolades, Mr. Chairman.

Now I must confess that when I first came upon the word 'accolade' I was a little bit fuzzy about its meaning, so I had to refer to a dictionary to find out what it was all about. Let me take hon. members back in time about a little more than nine months ago. A little more than nine months ago a love-in had just begun in this great nation of ours, which reaches from sea to sea. Mr. Chairman, there were a lot of happy people in this great nation of ours. The love-in started when the hon. Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Mulroney, took office and Stewart MacLoed in The Evening Telegram make reference to this love-in. He tells about the comments that came from the various premiers across the nation when they saw this new era, which was ushered in, this new era of good relations between Ottawa and the Province.

MR. PATTERSON:

At least to men of good will.

MR. DECKER:

One comment came, Mr. Chairman, from the Premier of Saskatchewan, Premier Grant Devine. He was pleased to see that co-operative federalism is alive and well again in our great nation.

Then, Mr. Chairman, Prince Edward Island's Jim Lee came on. Mr. Lee says "today we are launching a new era in co-operation."

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are not allowed to read from a newspaper unless you table it.

MR. DECKER:

I will table it.

But the clincher, the crown came when our hon. Premier rose to his feet and looked upon Mr. Mulroney and he said, "I can only throw accolades your way, Mr. Mulroney." So overwhelmed was our Premier at the new era was being ushered in, he lost all control of himself and he could only throw accolades at the new Prime Minister of Canada who swept out all of the disagreements, who swept away all misunderstanding, and who ushered in a new age, a day when we would be living in Utopia, when we would be living in Camelot, Mr. Chairman.

When I read this in The Evening Telegram, I said, 'What in the world is an accolade?' There was something they discovered out there in Port aux Basques which came off a 17th century vessel, but that was not an accolade. It was a 'lade', anyway, some sort of a 'lade', Mr. Chairman. I thought it might have been an astrolabe, and I could not see the Premier, for the life of me, throwing an astrolabe at Mr. Mulroney. So I will confess, Mr. Chairman, to this hon. House that I had to go and bring out my trusty Concise Oxford Dictionary and I discovered what it was that our hon. Premier was talking about. To throw an accolade or to confer an accolade, Mr. Chairman, is to take the tip of your sword and touch it upon the shoulder of your hon. comrade and to knight him, to make him Sir Brian Mulroney.

But an accolade, Mr. Chairman, is more than that. An accolade could also be a kiss. Our hon. Premier was so overwhelmed and so beside himself with this new spirit of co-operation that he was impelled to throw kisses at Mr. Mulroney, tap him on the shoulder with his sword and 'I knight thee, Sir

Mulroney,' or to throw kisses at this hon. gentleman! What is an accolade that I would throw at the hon. the Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman? It would probably be symbolic of this new era of co-operation that Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Premier have ushered in to Canada.

But, in the spirit of tossing those accolades around, Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of this new co-operation between Ottawa and Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, I just witnessed the complete devastation of our fishing industry in this Province. The hon. the Premier who, a nine months and a few days ago, was throwing accolades at Mr. Mulroney, could not even convince Mr. Mulroney that FFTs would devastate the inshore fishery, especially as it applies to the Northern Peninsula.

Mr. Chairman, our hon. Premier, who nine months and a few days ago was throwing accolades at the hon. the Prime Minister, can not even negotiate his way into a secondary roads agreement. This Province, Mr. Chairman, is in desperate need of road building in every nook and cranny of our Province and we acknowledge that we do not have the money to do it ourselves. We need a secondary roads agreement, we need federal money to make it possible for us to build our roads. The Premier, who, a few months ago, was throwing accolades, is not, obviously, getting any accolades thrown back at him because he cannot even nail down a secondary roads agreement.

Mr. Chairman, this Province is badly in need of a forestry agreement and the Premier, who, a little more than nine months ago, was throwing those kisses at the

Prime Minister, cannot get the Prime Minister to throw a forestry agreement back our way. So when you talk about the use of the sword to tap that hon. gentleman on the shoulder, I am wondering if we are not entering into a completely different age like we saw in the late 1970s and the early 1980s, Mr. Chairman, when the sword was being used in a completely different way by our Premier.

It is ironic that when he used the word 'accolade', he was speaking of a weapon which could be used to confer honour or a weapon which can be used to confer pain. It is ironic that that same instrument can confer honour and knight the Sir Brian Mulroney, or it can be a jab into the solar plexus and can make it rather difficult for Sir Brian to get his breath, Mr. Chairman.

So, what I see, Mr. Chairman, a mere nine months and so many days later, the same sword that the Premier took to tap Sir Brian on the shoulder, he is now taking to revert to where he was, to a day of fighting all over again, Mr. Chairman. We know what that cost Newfoundland. We had a Premier who liked to hear himself bark. We had a Premier who made political points by getting up and fighting, always fighting and never winning. Mr. Chairman, we are seeing it happen all over again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. DECKER:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Chairman, when speaking to this bill a couple of days ago, I wanted to get into the desperate unemployment situation in this Province. I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, when we heard that we were coming back here for a Fall session, that the Premier and the government were going to bring in new initiatives, were going to bring in new policies, to deal with the outrageous, the disgraceful, the atrocious high level of unemployment in this Province, the high level of unemployment in every sector of society, young and old.

I think the response by the Chairman of the Royal Commission over this weekend to a question that I raised here in the House just moments ago, I think the answer that the gentleman gave was a clear indication of the gentleman's frustration after going around this Province and seeing first-hand the frustration and the anxiety and the hopelessness that has been experienced by our people. When he saw this first-hand I believe his answer demonstrated his frustration and possibly indicated to him the futility of the task that he is involved in.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that that is not the case. I eagerly await the report of that Commission, but not, Mr. Chairman, to put a face on unemployment, not simply to come back to this House and tell us how bad the situation is, not to tell us how horrendous the situation is, because we know all

about that, Mr. Chairman. We did not need a Commission to point out the gravity and the seriousness of the unemployment problem in this Province. What we needed and what we now need is new initiatives from the government. What we need now are new job strategy policies and programs to wrestle with that problem and to solve the problem. That is what we need. We know the gravity, we know the seriousness of the problem. We know all about that, Mr. Chairman. The unemployment problem in this Province has been studied to death. What we want now are solutions. What we want now are programmes and policies that will put our people to work. That is what we want. Policies that are geared to all segments of society, the young and the old, Mr. Chairman, to give our people some hope and some optimism for the future. That is what we need at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, this House has now been in session for several weeks and we have not heard of one initiative by this government to deal with that, our number one problem in this Province. We have not heard of one initiative, not one iota, Mr. Chairman, of an activity geared towards solving that problem.

We did hear the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) getting up and giving us a post-mortem, telling us about how many young people were employed this Summer but nothing for the young people for this Winter, nothing, Mr. Chairman, of substance for the older people, for our experienced workers. I wonder why it was that the government of this Province so willingly accepted the new federal programme for this Province, the Jobs Strategy development

programme. Was the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a part of that, accepting that programme in total for this Province, a programme that is not geared nor tailored to the needs of the people of this Province?

I think this has been raised in this House before by some of my colleagues. Quebec did not accept the programme. They did not accept it because they realized that this programme, with its new emphasis and its new direction, did not fit into the economy of that Province. But we, Mr. Chairman, accepted it. We accepted a program that is geared to private enterprise, to go along, I suppose, with the philosophy of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) that private enterprise is the engine that is going to get our economy going. Well, I say that engine, Mr. Chairman, has quickly run out of gas. There is no gas in that engine. We see not evidence of that engine doing anything to the economy of this Province.

So Mr. Chairman, we have got a program that is basically geared to private enterprise, a program that is geared to training. I have said before, nobody on this side of the House or on any side of the House, or nobody in the country disagrees with a program that has got a training component. Nobody disagrees with that, a program that gives emphasis to people. The government has tried to give the perception that this is a program that is going to be of immense benefit in the future because they changed its emphasis. Whereas other programs were project oriented, this program is people oriented. It is going to train people.

Mr. Chairman, one thing is to have a training component but let's look at the value and practically of that program. A program that is going to last sixteen weeks. What kind of training is a person going to receive in sixteen weeks? We have people going to trades schools and taking training for three or four years. We have people in the Fisheries College, three, four, five years. We have people in other institutions training for five, six years. All of a sudden, we are going to come up with a training program, Mr. Chairman, that is going to fit people, suit people and train people to work in the future. How naive! How assenine! To think that in sixteen weeks we are going to train people to work in the future.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, what are we going to train them for? Or what are they going to do once they are trained? Once they get a person trained to be a carpenter, once a person receives on the job training as a plumber, once a person receives on the job training as an electrician, where are the jobs after that job is finished? Where are they? The person is going to be no more prepared on two basis: the person is not going to be trained and there is going to be no job after he or she is finished and they are going to be looking for Canada Works next year in the same way that they have done in years previous. They are going to be waiting for that next federal job training program and hoping that they will be able to get on that job. That is how it is going to be, Mr. Chairman, it is just a rose by any other name.

The program, Mr. Chairman, is not suited for this Province. It is

not geared nor tailored for the needs of this Province. I am not condemning the program, as members opposite have been doing for years and years. It is a godsend, Mr. Chairman, that we have them. People in this Province would have starved if we had not had these projects. There are communities that would not have little recreational areas, they would not have town halls, they would have public buildings if it were not for these projects. Let's get honest, Mr. Chairman, let's call a spade a spade, it is still a make-work program; that and nothing else.

What about the other component of that program which says that in order to be hired on one of these jobs a person must not have been employed anymore than twenty-four weeks out of the previous thirty. What does that mean, Mr. Chairman? Sometimes we do not get the significance of those statements and we do not get the impact of them. What it means is that a person who has got six or more UI contributions does not qualify to get on one of these programs. What is the reason for that? Can the Minister of Finance tell me whether that component is dropped?

What it means is that a person who has got six, seven, eight or nine contributions cannot get on that job because the rational is that is a person got six weeks work, then he can find the other four, if he has got seven weeks work he can find the other three. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is as difficult to find four weeks as it is to find ten when there is none. There is no work in this Province. It would just be a tantalizing experience for any person in this Province to know

that they were lucky enough to find work for six or seven weeks, but now we have got a federal programme in the community and they have disqualified themselves because they had the initiative, because they had the industry, to find themselves six or seven weeks work. Now they are discriminated against and possibly will have to go on the welfare role for the rest of the Winter. That is the programme we have accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. LUSH:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. LUSH:
That is the great programme, Mr. Chairman, that hon. members opposite have perpetrated upon the people of Newfoundland, that is the great programme, that is the great Jobs Strategy Programme, that is the great programme that they perpetrated on the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, when they start the hiring, maybe the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) can respond and tell me whether he has asked the federal government to change that rule with respect to hiring? The minister is not listening. I do not know whether he has made any representation, whether the minister has made representation to Ottawa to change that component. Maybe the minister can tell the House whether he has been concerned enough to ask his federal counterparts to change that component with respect to who is

qualified to work on these jobs.

A person who has six, seven, eight or nine weeks is not allowed to be hired on these jobs, or not allowed according to the rules and regulations. Has the minister made representation to the appropriate minister to have that rule wiped out and to have it rescinded for Newfoundland? As I said, and all hon. members will appreciate - we have all become cognizant of the unemployment situation in Newfoundland - it is just as difficult for a person to get four weeks work, three weeks work, as it is to get ten weeks work when there is none. When there is no work, there is no work! That is the desperate situation that we find ourselves in at this particular point in time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to again re-emphasize the frustration, the financial anxiety that has been experienced by thousands of Newfoundlanders right now as I speak, by thousands of Newfoundlanders, as the Minister of Career Development reads the newspaper. Mr. Chairman, he is probably not going to read there about the hungry people that are in hundreds of Newfoundland communities right now. He is probably not going to read there right now about the children who are going to school not clothed properly, about the people living in inadequate housing facilities, people with their lights cut or senior citizens who now have to bear the brunt of this recent increase by the hydro company. Those are the people that is going to hurt, Mr. Chairman, those people on fixed incomes, the senior citizens who are each day seeing the value of their dollar eroded by increases in the cost of

living, like this one that has just recently been approved by the Public Utilities Board.

Mr. Chairman, it would curdle your blood when you realize the absolute frustration and the absolute anxiety and the conditions under which people in this Province have to live. Mr. Chairman, I did not realize until recently the tremendous need for housing in this Province. I did not realize it and I suppose the reason I did not realize it is because we had many programmes in place and things were being done and people were being satisfied because they made various applications and they were trying to get their homes renovated, repaired and insulated and made more comfortable to live in. All of a sudden, everything is pulled away. The federal government have cancelled out, closed down every housing programme there is. Now, Mr. Chairman, people are crying out. I get call after call from people complaining about the conditions of their homes and the desperation that they are in to try and have them renovated and upgraded. There is only one programme now, Mr. Chairman, and that is RRAP. There is such pressure on that programme now, because the federal government have scuttled every other programme, that that programme has almost become absolutely useless. The people working trying to administer these programmes, Mr. Chairman are driven ragged, they are driven crazy with the number of applications that they are getting, not being able to process them. They are not even able to respond to them, they are getting that many. What was a good programme has now become useless and futile because RRAP is not able to take care of the demands

that have been put upon it in rural Newfoundland. We may as well scrap that one for what good it is doing right now because there are no many demands on it.

Mr. Chairman, wherever you look there is nothing but a picture of gloom. There is nothing but desperation. Wherever one looks, there is no employment, there are no programmes to assist people in housing, to build new houses or to repair the old ones. On top of that, the cost of living is just escalating with energy prices going up all the time.

Mr. Chairman, one group of people that is bearing the brunt of this is our senior citizens, a group about which we must be very much concerned. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to use the time of the House. I just want to make this point about the tremendous need for housing in this Province and here we are without one housing programme. The provincial government has absolutely nothing at all to assist rural Newfoundlanders in terms of building a new home or in terms of renovating their present one.

I want to again emphasis the desperate situation with respect to unemployment. I want to underline and emphasis and reiterate and point out the gravity and the seriousness of that situation. We have been here now, Mr. Chairman, for several weeks and there has not been one initiative announced by this provincial government to deal with that problem, not one initiative, not one policy. The Premier is very excited about the levels of unemployment that we have. He is very excited about it.

Just last week when there was a

little mercurial shift in the unemployment, when there was just a little mercurial irritant that pushed the statistics down by 1 percentage point or something, the Premier was absolutely ecstatic. He was beating his breast and saying how happy he was that they were doing something with unemployment when, as I have said before, it was just a little mercurial irritant, a little mercurial idiosyncrasy that caused the unemployment to go down by 1 percentage point.

Mr. Chairman, if this Province is going to do anything dealing with unemployment, if this government has any strategies, it is time to announce them now and tell the people of this Province by how many percentage points they intend to reduce unemployment over the next twelve to fifteen months or are they just going adrift. When the Premier hears that it is gone down 1 percentage point he is going to get on the media talking about what a great job he does. Next month, when it goes up 2 percentage points, he will say nothing about it.

Do they have a plan or do they not? Let the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) get up and tell this hon. House today and tell the people of Newfoundland, who are out there waiting desperately for jobs for this Winter, by what percentage point his government plans to reduce unemployment in this year, in the next year, in the next twelve to fifteen months? What is their target? How much do they plan to reduce unemployment in the next three years - two per cent a year, three per cent a year? In three years time can the people of Newfoundland expect to see unemployment reduced by 10 per

cent? Let the member get up and tell us. Is the minister going to answer the questions?

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is a good point of not. I will certainly take guidance from Your Honour. The hon. member has got leave to speak and I think he is making a marvellous speech and I could listen to him for hours and hours and hours, but he seems to be gearing himself up and up and up. I wonder is he ever going to stop? Is there any way that the hon. member could indicate to us how long he wants this leave that was given to him to extend. If it is going to go on and on and on, perhaps we better send out for some sandwiches or something.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, it is just a matter of recapitulating what I said, re-emphasizing and reiterating to make sure that members opposite knew the impact of what I was talking about. Mr. Chairman, I am just going to finish by recapitulating the very vital significant important points I was raising.

I was talking about the Jobs Strategy programme that is not tailored to the needs of this Province and what the provincial

government have done with it to ensure that our workers are not going to be discriminated against, that they are going to be able to put bread and butter on the table this Winter.

I was talking about the great need for housing in Newfoundland, in rural Newfoundland, in particular, in the absence of any programme to assist them in this matter of building -

MR. TOBIN:

Is this still to a point of order Mr. Chairman?

MR. LUSH:

- new homes and renovating their existing homes. Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to know what the government was going to do to attack this vicious and cancerous problem of unemployment. Specifically, I wanted the minister to tell us by how many percentage points his government plans to reduce unemployment over the next year or over the next two or three years? Does he have any good news? Does he have any optimistic news to tell the people of Newfoundland? Let him do it now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I am sad that you ruled against that point of order because I thought the hon. member

opposite made a spirited effort to have the point of order validated. However, your ruled against it.

Mr. Chairman, just a few remarks. Firstly, to the hon. member who wanted to throw accolades across the floor. He wondered what would happen if he threw an accolade across the floor? Well, he defined an accolade. I do not know what I would do if he threw an accolade across the floor. I would like to ask him a question, suppose I threw an acolyte across the floor, what would he do?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who just took his seat now said that nothing has been done about unemployment. That is not quite fair. He knows that. He was getting on in a rhetorical fashion. In actual fact, if we look around at what has been done in this Province, the offshore fishery has been put on a solid footing for the first time in I do not know how many years.

Admittedly, the inshore fishery this year has been a bit of a disaster. It is not a total disaster, but that was more due to natural events rather than any lack of attention on the part of this government. We have tried our best to do for the inshore fishery what we succeeded in doing for the offshore fishery.

I mentioned earlier in the day our efforts in aquaculture. I do not believe that there is much appreciation opposite and, indeed, perhaps in the Province of what is going on in the field of aquaculture. In this Province

alone, we have a salmon hatchery. We have started aquaculture in terms of muscle farming. We have started and we have for some years trout farming. It is not doing too well, but the potentiality is there. We are starting, and this is perhaps the most exciting thing, we are starting at a very early stage sea ranching or sea farming, whatever you want to call it, in terms of codfish. This is a very, very exciting area. We have this year alone put very large amounts of money into various aspects of aquaculture in this Province. Even though it is now giving rise to quite a small amount of employment, I predict that over the next few years there will be very significant employment come from the development of aquaculture in this Province. So I do not think the hon. member is being quite fair when he says, we have not done anything in that regard.

Then he is forgetting the mining industry. We have promoted mining. The hon. Minister for Mines (Mr. Dinn) a little while ago showed how much exploration there is going on now and pointed out there are some new mines coming in, gold mines and other mines. So there is going to be, and there is now, some employment there. And so on and so forth. So there are things being done.

But, however, the hon. member was quite correct in saying it is an extremely difficult problem. We have had in this Province, in particular, and going back long before we were a province, a serious, serious unemployment problem. The fact that they persisted for so long means that it is extremely difficult to cure. I do not downgrade the efforts of the Royal Commission on

Employment and Unemployment as the hon member does. Even though we have had many, many studies on various aspects of unemployment in this Province, I think it is such a difficult problem to cure in an non-industrialized, narrowly-based economy such as ours. We do have to keep looking at it recurrently, we have look at it in the light of present day circumstances. We just cannot dig out old studies that were done fifty years ago and try to get the answer out of that. We have to look at it under present-day circumstances, realizing that it is going to be very, very difficult to cure on a permanent basis but, I think, that we have got things going for us now that perhaps previous generations did not have.

Now, I just want to ask hon. members opposite one other question, are we ever going to pass this bill? Are we every going to accept this resolution? I would just like to point out that there are other money bills coming up so if hon. members opposite feel that if they pass this they will lose their opportunity to have wide-ranging debate, I would like to assure them they will have all sorts of opportunity for it. I am getting fed up with this bill. I do not know if the hon. members are. I would encourage them to accept the resolution and pass the bill so that at least we can bet on to something new.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman, we on this side

fully appreciate the minister's anxiety, both in terms of this bill and other matters, but insofar as this bill is concerned he must understand that he marches to a different drummer than we and his objectives are different than ours. One of our objectives in this matter is to get some answers to questions and to use the debate, frankly, to air some views which have financial indications. Certainly that is within the latitude of debate allowed under the bill.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I would like to direct a question to the Opposition and to the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). Is this motion ever going to pass or they going to talk it out forever? They have a right to speak to it, there is no question about that, but is it their intention ever to pass it or to just talk on incessantly? They have been raising the same points day after day and they are making no sense at all, or just repeating the same things over and over again. I would like to ask him outright if it is his intention ever to let it pass or does he wish to filibuster?

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The hon. member who has just spoken really is in no hurry to get this thing over because if I

remember correctly a few days ago he asked me if I would give a discourse on a couple of topics that I have not yet gotten around to doing. I assure him that before this is over I will take advantage of the opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). The last on the list of items he raised was the question of the history of unemployment in this Province. I would be the first to agree with the minister that unemployment has been high in this Province for a number of years and, indeed, has been climbing. My surprise today, in this committee, is that he is the one that should draw attention to it.

If I were he I would not draw attention to that particular matter because he, having a penchant for figures, will realize that when the Tory administration took office in 1972 the rate was not 20 or 21 per cent but 9 per cent when his administration, when his colleagues, which he subsequently joined, took office. When the Tory administration took over in February 1972 the rate then, a legacy of several years of Liberal government, was 9 per cent. When the administration of which the gentleman for Green Bay (Premier Peckford) is the leader took over in 1979, the rate was 15 per cent. It had climbed in those seven years from 9 per cent, Mr. Chairman, to 15 per cent.

MR. SIMMS:

How was it when 'Joey' took over?

MR. SIMMONS:

It was higher than 9 per cent, if the gentleman for Grand Falls would reflect.

DR. COLLINS:

When did 'Joey' say, "Burn your boats?"

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, there is another example of how myth, repeated often enough, can take on the perception of being a reality. I refer the gentleman who raised the question about "Burn your boats" to some writing by the late Ted Russell, who resigned from Cabinet for reasons of different philosophy with relation to development and so on. He made a pronouncement on this very point and the point he made is that the gentleman, who was supposed to have made that statement, never did make it, but the myth is repeated often and often and often enough until it becomes a reality you see, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

When an hon. member misleads the House it is incumbent upon any member who knows the difference to get up and object. The previous, previous, previous - I do not know how many times previous Premier, did say many times, "Burn your boats. There will be two jobs for every man". Those two statements were juxtaposed. He said it over the radio. He was reported in the press. It is a well known fact

that that is exactly what he said. He was talking about the industrialization of this Province. He thought that by bringing in his nutty schemes that he could industrialize this Province and that the fishermen might as well burn their boats because there would be two jobs for every man and they would not have to do this degrading work of fishing any more. And that is the bone I have to pick with you. That point should be set straight.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Of course what the former Premier did not realize when he was making that statement was that the Tories would come to power in '72 and drive the employment rate not down from 9 per cent but up to 20 per cent or 21 per cent. You can excuse the man if he did not count on being overtaken by the Tories when he made those kinds of statements.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a bit unfair to go back and slap statements up to people, especially people who are not here, but even people who are here. For example, I could have fun every day. I just saw my good friend from Waterford-Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) the gentleman who handles quite competently the Intergovernmental Affairs portfolio. We could be ramming it down his throat every day of the week how he gets personally attacked by the man who sits next to him, gets attacked every day of the week. We heard it again today

from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) about how unwise people were back in 1966 to vote for this Churchill Falls fiasco. One of the people who voted for it sits next to him. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs was one of the people who voted for that fiasco. We could ram that down his throat every day of the week if we wanted. Two on that side voted for it. Nobody on this side voted for it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who was the other one?

MR. SIMMONS:

My good friend from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey).

So you see, Mr. Chairman, only two of the people in the present Chamber voted for that nefarious arrangement, only two -

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow this to stand, another point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The information was kept from this House by that gentleman he is referring to. The contract was not made sufficiently clear and a lot of stuff was glossed over. It is not fair to raise that kind of issue.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

It is just like the information on

the Atlantic Accord is being glossed over at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I have some points I want to make.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, make him sit down.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have some points I want to make -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Could we have silence please while the hon. member is debating?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, the man who wants to get this through quickly is the Minister of Finance. If his colleagues have lots of time I have lots of time. We are here all week.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could we have silence please while the hon. member is debating?

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I have some things I want to say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) but just in passing. I find it intriguing -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Once again could we have order please?

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman, a word of advice, Sir, if you name him, do not call him by his proper name because it is unparliamentary.

Mr. Chairman, just in passing I find it fascinating that those who chose the fascinating term Atlantic Accord used that particular term 'accord.' The only other accord I know of is the Honda Accord and I find some similarity. In the case of both accords, we the consumers will pay, we the livyers here will get the crumbs, it is the foreign multi-nationals that will really benefit, just as they benefit from the Honda Accord, so from the Atlantic Accord. Okay? And the most shameful thing of all, Mr. Chairman -

MR. TOBIN:
What kind of car do you drive?

MR. SIMMONS:
I drive a good Canadian car, Sir.

MR. PATTERSON:
Do you?

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, indeed I do. What do you drive?

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing against either Atlantic Accords or Honda Accords as long as we call spades spades and realize in the case of both Accords the real benefits are going elsewhere. They are not going to the Newfoundland Treasury or the Newfoundland people because clause

(54) took care of that forever and a day. You talk about sellouts, Mr. Chairman, that is the ultimate sellout. You talk about selling a birthright for a mess materialistic potage, you talk about selling a birthright, the ultimate, bargain basement birthright sale was Clause 54.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
I never said I own a Canadian car, I said I drive a Canadian car. I also own a French car, if that is what you are getting at.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:
I think they missed the entire point, Mr. Chairman, which is not surprising. Surely we invest where we can, where the dollars come from and where the products come from are not the relevant issues. The relevant issue or the point that I was making is that where is the real benefit going to go in terms of the Atlantic Accord or the Honda Accord, which is the analogy I made. In both cases, they go to foreign multi-nationals. That is where they are going to go.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:
I have got all the time in the world.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
I ask members on both sides of the House to be silent, please.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Minister of Finance makes particularly good sense when he talks about aquaculture. I agree with him. Perhaps the Minister of Fisheries, when he is looking for an excuse to make a statement, should draw attention to aquaculture in this Province. It is an issue that I was involved in many years ago down in Bay d'Espoir and the thing is taking off. We put a lot of federal dollars in there and I believe there is some provincial money in there now, but the thing is taking off in other areas of this Province. It is an issue that we have come late to as a jurisdiction. I do not mean only Newfoundland, but Canada as a whole has come late to the wisdom of getting into aquaculture. Of the hundreds of millions of people who live in Asia, I am told and this figure would be three or four years old now, that fully two-thirds of the fish products consumed in Asia are produced on fish farms or in aquaculture situations. So I commend what the government is doing in this particular area. I support what the Minister of Finance has said. It is an area that we should be doing-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

You see how difficult it is, Mr. Chairman to even make a few nonpartisan statements around here.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. members time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:

You have got a poor beknighted buffoon. Will you tell me what a

great speech I am making so I can continue.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, after listening to the remarks of the hon. gentleman for Fortune - Hermitage, I thought that the Bill was going to carry after he stood up and spent ten minutes complimenting the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Fisheries as well as other people for the excellent work that they have been doing.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have more compliments.

MR. TOBIN:

The fact of the matter is, we have been here now for the past week dealing with this Bill that is before the House. Motion 1, Mr. Chairman, is before the House and there has been a lot of debate and discussion back and forth and the member for Fortune - Hermitage, I would give him full marks because it is the first time that we have heard any comments coming across this House.

We heard the member for the Strait of Belle Isle and you would almost believe, Mr. Chairman, like his colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), that they have been out of touch with reality for the past twenty-five years.

The fact of the matter is that in the past four or five years, Mr. Chairman, all one has to do is make an assessment of what has taken place in this Province. We can look at the fishing problems,

which my colleague from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), as well as other people in this House, is very familiar with. We can look at the restructuring agreement, we can go back to the days, Mr. Chairman, when the Leader of the Opposition acted for the Bank of Nova Scotia and put them in receivership which resulted in the closing down of several towns in this Province. We can go back to when the other companies had financial problems. The whole thing was in disarray. Nobody knew what was going to happen, including the member from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), who represented Burin - St. George's at the time. Nobody knew what was going to happen in the fishing industry.

MR. FLIGHT:

But Crosbie knew on the FFT issue.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, nobody knew what was going to happen in this fishing industry, and it was only the people who are members of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Peckford administration, who really cared what was going to happen in the fishing industry in this Province.

MR. FLIGHT:

Crosbie knew.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, we do not need the member for Windsor - Buchans to tell us anything about fishing. Because if his knowledge of the fishing industry is as limited as his knowledge of everything else in the Province, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. SIMMS:

Energy, in particular.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, energy, in particular - I can

assure him that we do not need any of his advice. And I do not even deign to entertain any of his advice as it relates to fishing matters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, when you mention the fishery, do you hear them going on the defensive?

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes.

MR. TOBIN:

Why, Mr. Chairman? Why? Because they are the ones who supported the Government of Canada and every other government in Atlantic Canada in putting factory freezer trawlers on the Northern cod in the next number of months. That is the reason why, Mr. Chairman. And all one has to do is go out into rural Newfoundland and listen to the comments of the people.

MR. BARRY:

You are insulting the intelligence of the voters.

MR. TOBIN:

Insulting the intelligence of the voters! Mr. Chairman, that is the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), when you talk about fish. 'Do not insult the intelligence of the voters!' Well, Mr. Chairman, I can tell him that the people on the Burin Peninsula are not multimillionaires sitting down in a Duckworth Street law office, they are fishermen. And I tell you, Mr. Chairman, if by talking about fish I have to insult the intelligence of the Leader of the Opposition, then so be it. It is too bad!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

When did you last land a fish cross-handed.

MR. TOBIN:

Oh, listen, now, Mr. Chairman. Now he has another one! He is fishing cross-handed now! He has some knowledge now, Mr. Chairman, he is fishing cross-handed!

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that that is the problem in this Province, and that is why the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is on that side of the House today and not on this side, because of his lack of knowledge of the fishing industry. When he was in Burin - Placentia West, Mr. Chairman, if he had represented the best interests of the fishermen, he would probably be still there.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell hon. members that I am proud to say that I come from a fishing background, and everybody belonging to me, including my brothers and cousins who are still on the trawlers. We do not need any lessons from anyone over there as to what the fishing industry in this Province is all about. I, too, have been there, by the way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we talk about the fishery and we talk about what this government has done for the fishing industry in this Province. Mr. Chairman, just the other day the Premier of this Province and his government showed the leadership that was necessary by standing up for Newfoundlanders, by letting the Government of Canada know that we were not in favour of factory freezer trawlers. This government

took the same action that we have seen in this House for the past four or five years, or longer than that. When there was a Liberal government in Ottawa which would not give this Province a fishing agreement, when there was a Liberal government in Ottawa which would not give this Province an offshore agreement, when there was a Liberal government in Ottawa which would not sign a roads agreement or any other agreement, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland supported them.

What happened the other day, Mr. Chairman, when the Premier of this Province brought in a resolution dealing with the factory freezer trawlers? What happened? Was it the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party that again supported Ottawa and sent the message loud and clear that there was not unanimity in this House, that the House of Assembly was divided as it related to the factory freezer trawlers and, Mr. Chairman, to a large extent contributed to the decision that permitted factory freezer trawlers? Mr. Chairman, that is the interest they have in the fishing industry.

What happened to the resolution that came before the House dealing with unemployment insurance for fishermen? They got up like a bunch of trained parrots - 'I will table the policy paper of the Liberal Party' - and took their seats. Now, Mr. Chairman, that was a lot of good to the fishermen in Twillingate, or the fishermen in Fogo, or the fishermen in Bonavista North.

MR. SIMMS:

Labrador in particular.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Labrador in particular.

There was no sign of the members from Labrador at that particular point in time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He did supported it, though.

MR. TOBIN:

No. He stood up in the House and threw the paper on the floor the same as the rest of them, Mr. Chairman. The former Leader of the Opposition used to talk about, 'Trained Seals'. Well, Mr. Chairman, he certainly left the trained seals behind him.

MR. BUTT:

Did you see the results of the poll? There is going to be another one very soon.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, when I spoke about the fishery the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said that I was insulting the intelligence of the people. The other day we heard the Leader of the Opposition say something to the effect that it was beyond his professional ability to work as a lawyer for the federal government because they did not pay enough. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are insulting his intelligence because we mention fish.

MR. FLIGHT:

The press have all gone home, 'Glenn'.

MR. TOBIN:

There you go. The member for Windsor - Buchans, that is exactly what he said in this House, 'It is plain to the press.' When I stand in this House I stand to represent the people who sent me here and I could not care less if the press or anyone else are here. We were sent here, by the way, by our constituents, regardless if what

we say is going to be carried in the press. That is like today, Mr. Chairman, they ran out of questions before the half hour of Question Period was over. Why were they short of questions?

MR. MATTHEWS:

They were not prepared.

MR. TOBIN:

They have never been prepared.

MR. J. CARTER:

Rex was off.

MR. TOBIN:

No, they thought it was five o'clock and they figured the press were gone. Now, that is what happens. Then they went on to talk about the Atlantic Accord which my good friend and colleague, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), was able to negotiate, unlike some other people who could not negotiate it.

MR. J. CARTER:

Who are you talking about? Name names.

MR. TOBIN:

As a result of that, Mr. Chairman, he decided to become a very jealous Tory in this hon. House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. members time is up. Shall the resolution carry?

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Time is running out for the afternoon, but I would like to get

a couple of remarks in here. Initially I would like to say that in reading through Hansard for Friday I would like to clarify one little point, because it disturbs me when false information is presented in the House of Assembly.

I would like to make reference to some comments made by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and make a point that will be in the record of the House. The hon. member was inquiring, based on some allegations made by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) - 'Old Curly' they call him in Labrador - and he wondered about my attendance in the House of Assembly and he said, "I understand he has not been very punctual in his attendance in the House of Assembly in the past." Now, that is the sentence I find a little objectionable and it will be, of course, in the record. The Speaker of the House will confirm that whenever the House of Assembly is in session and I leave the House of Assembly to go out of St. John's, the Speaker is always informed in writing - whether other members on either side of the House do it or not is of no concern to me - of the dates I go and the types of activities I will be involved with, which are constituency matters. I would just like to have that read into the record for clarification purposes.

I do not mind criticism - I suppose when you are in public life you are going to get it - if it is fair and constructive and truthful, but when it appears to be some sort of a deliberate attempt to have something recorded in Hansard, I do object to that and I just wanted to make that point.

To get on to some points of concern to me, and I will make one comment in reference to the remarks, or the presentation by the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), whom I have known for quite a long time. In fact, we are friends, I would like to say, and I am speaking in a nonpolitical sense. Although I am not and never have been a fisherman myself -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Chairman, let me make one point. I sat here all day and listened to everybody and I did not make any comments, or make any heckling noises or things of that nature.

MR. BAIRD:

That is because you were asleep.

MR. KELLAND:

Well, I would have offered a heckler for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to ensure if everyone was awake, but I thought, perhaps, that would be out of order. However, I did not do any heckling. I believe that when you are sitting you should listen, and when you are standing you should speak. It is too bad that what the people of Grand Falls call the 'Town Clown' could not do the same thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Nevertheless, I would like to say that I find some of the remarks extremely interesting. I am not being critical of the member at all in this sense, in that I am not a fisherman myself. However, most of us in this Province have

roots, I suppose, which are, of course, in the fishing industry and that is not anything in particular to orate on. But even though we perhaps never jigged a fish or hauled a trap or whatever, we do have some knowledge of the fishing industry. I think members on the opposite side continually try to cloud the particular issue with respect to factory freezer trawlers and things of this nature, when the general population of the Province really know the actual facts of what happened. We stick with the position we took. That is our position, it is as simple as that, and there is no backing away from it.

But in more of an era of co-operation, Mr. Chairman, there are many areas in which I think both sides of the House can work in a co-operative effort.

MR. MARSHALL:

Would the hon. member like to adjourn the debate?

MR. KELLAND:

I will adjourn the debate and take it up at another time.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 19, 1985 at 3:00 p.m.