



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 52

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Thursday

12 June 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to the observance of the week of June 15 - 21 as the first Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Week.

The first Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Week has been co-ordinated nationally by the Canadian Society of Safety Engineers, an organization committed to the furtherance of occupational health and safety objectives. At the local level, the Provincial Chapter of that organization has promoted a variety of activities which will increase the awareness of all of us to the benefits of occupational health and safety programmes.

In commenting on this special week, Mr. Speaker, I want to salute the workers, their unions and employers in this Province who have co-operated with government in improving health and safety conditions. These efforts have been complemented by safety associations and other interested groups who have also made an important contribution.

During the past decade or so there

has been a growing concern on the part of workers, employers and governments over health and safety problems in the workplace and all parties have responded in a co-operative manner to address these issues. Newfoundland was one of the first provinces, Mr. Speaker, to introduce progressive occupational health and safety legislation in 1978 and the other provinces, territories and the federal government have done likewise.

Mr. Speaker, my Department is dedicated to a course of action to alleviate, to the greatest extent possible, accidents and industrial diseases in the workplace. We pursue a course of action designed to eliminate the pain and suffering of not only the worker but also the families of those workers who are the unfortunate victims of work related accidents and industrial diseases. In addition to the human suffering, there is an increasing financial burden on the public as a result of such accidents and diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I view the observance of this first Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Week as another significant event which will help focus the attention of all Canadians on the importance of a healthy and safe working environment.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support all activities aimed at improving health and safety conditions in the workplace in this Province and throughout Canada.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I am proudly displaying the button which I hope to see all of my colleagues displaying during Occupational Health and Safety

Week.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, we concur with the minister in his statement and, if he would be good enough to send us over some pins, we will wear them, as well. There is no question that we want to salute the workers in the way that they have cooperated with government and have used their influence to make sure that occupational health and safety standards are maintained in the work place.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that this particular statement would come within a week, I think, of occupational health and safety in one of the most dangerous industries in Newfoundland right now, the offshore, being totally and very, very severely criticized by a safety supervisor, a supervisor who inspected the rig for safety hazards for the Newfoundland government and who found innumerable appalling safety hazards. Maybe the minister, by leave, would take a minute afterward to explain to us why it is, if he is so concerned and his government is so aware and he is working to maintain such a health and safety environment, how it is that we can have such appalling safety hazards existing on the rigs offshore, particularly in view of the lesson we learned in

February, 1982? Mr. Speaker, it looks like out of sight out of mind. Maybe we will go back to the unionization of the rigs, maybe that is where the answer is, that there be someone to bring to the minister's attention what is really happening out there.

I am sure my Caucus would give the minister leave to get up and explain to the House of Assembly, in light of this statement, exactly how it is that you can have health and safety hazards existing on oil rigs offshore which are still there, still existing, a week after an inspection was done by a government inspector and no comment has been forthcoming from the minister, to this point in time, on whether he accepts or does not accept the criticisms and the charges laid by Mr. Pumphrey. Maybe the minister would like to comment on that.

MR. BLANCHARD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BLANCHARD:

I would expect the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Blanchard) to take a negative attitude, even to some good work that is being done by groups such as we have with us today, Mr. Speaker. Any time is a good time, Mr. Speaker, to make an announcement about a futherance of the occupational health and safety programmes in this Province, and the hon. member should remember that.

MR. FLIGHT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. BRETT:  
Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear, as I indicated to the minister, that we concur with this statement and we are happy to support everything there. But I owe it to this House of Assembly and to the workers out there to bring to the minister's attention something that was brought to his attention so forcefully that he has not responded to it. There are safety hazards on those rigs. Now, what is the minister going to do about it?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You are the biggest safety hazard in Newfoundland.

MR. PEACH:  
You are a fire hazard, boy.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. BRETT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform the House that approval has been given to the Sisters of Mercy to operate a special foster home in the St. John's area for teenagers who are experiencing behaviour problems.

Over the years, the Department of Social Services has focused considerable attention upon the development of a continuum of services and facilities for the care and protection of children and young persons. The primary aim of this department has been, and continues to be, to establish, at the community level throughout this Province, a programme of family support services which will strengthen and preserve the family and enable children to remain with their parents. The regional personnel are comprised of young, qualified and dedicated social workers who possess appropriate counselling skills to work with families that are experiencing social difficulties and to assist them in resolving such problems. The homemaker services and the day care programmes continue to make a significant contribution towards family stability and unity. In the case of children with special needs, the child welfare allowance programmes provides much needed financial support to assist families in the purchase of services and equipment. There are also those programmes which involve direct home services, behaviour management and respite care, all of which emphasize family support.

Notwithstanding these efforts, Mr. Speaker, many situations continue to arise where, for various reasons, the family is unable to provide a suitable level of care for its children and, as a

consequence, they are placed into the care of this department. When this happens, the staff have a responsibility to provide the best possible placement for them in terms of care, guidance, nurturing and supervision. In order to obtain suitable living arrangements, the officials very often turn to community groups and organizations for assistance.

In the case of younger children who come from neglect situations, it has been found that the regular foster home programme, with its particular focus on the family setting, has provided most suitable placements.

However, with groups of children and young persons with special needs, including the troubled teenager with behaviour problems with which the family is unable to cope, the most appropriate placement very often becomes a more structured and controlled setting. While the family features are still important, a much greater emphasis is placed on guidance, supervision and behaviour management in the placement of those young persons.

It is with this group, teenagers, that the Sisters of Mercy have decided to concentrate their efforts in the development of a special foster home to accommodate six teenage girls. This joint undertaking between the sisters and the Department of Social Services is perceived as a very important step in developing a facility which will meet the needs of these teenagers as well as to assist them in preparing themselves for adulthood. The association of the Sisters with teenage girls is not a new experience for them, in that they operated Belevedere Orphanage

until it closed in the late 1960s.

This department has agreed to contribute towards the operational cost of this special facility in the amount of \$111,500. Hon. members will note that in the statement it says \$106,000, but that is incorrect. The total budget was adjusted to \$111,500, and that is for the coming year.

Also not in the statement is the fact that the congregation of Corpus Christi has contributed \$190,000 to renovate this home and make it suitable for this type of service.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), number one, for giving me a copy of his statement in advance so that I could take the opportunity of reading through it. I would also like, at this time, to take the opportunity to thank the Minister of Social Services for the kind favour he did a constituent of mine as early as yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in going along with the minister in his assistance to the Sisters of Mercy and to this special foster home. I know the demands on the Department of Social Service in this Province in which we live today must be tremendous and it is hard for the minister,

himself, to be aware of all the things that are happening in his particular department. We certainly go along with this particular move, we think it is a great thing. We certainly realize that there are a lot more requirements out there for things such as this to help the children who are being so greatly neglected in our Province.

I want to bring to the minister's attention the part of his statement where he talks about the experienced social workers, the respite care etc., which they are continually telling us are in the department and in the regional offices all across our Province.

Because Question Period has been tied up recently with something else, I want to take this opportunity to ask the minister to look into the problem in the district of Harbour Grace which I brought up in the Estimates Committee. We have several families, Mr. Speaker, out there, and this is relevant to this statement, who have disabled children at home, mentally retarded and handicapped children, with whom they are having some serious problems, as well a problem with one of the local offices. I have been continually working with the Department of Social Services trying to get these problems straightened out for these families. The minister makes reference in his statement to programmes which involve direct home services, behaviour management and respite care, and all emphasize family support.

The minister is aware of the problems we are having with the four particular families in Upper Island Cove and the problems they are having with the office in

Harbour Grace, and I would like to ask him if he, himself, would undertake, probably today - I know he cannot be on top of everything and he cannot be aware of everything they are doing - or after the House closes, to look into this problem to see if these families are getting some of the qualified care and experience that the department is supposed to be handing out in Harbour Grace. These four families, in particular, have had an awful lot of trouble in the past year or so, and in one particular family it is certainly causing a tremendous emotional strain on the parents. I am a bit concerned about it as, I am sure, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. minister if he would do that. We certainly congratulate him on the emphasis he has placed on this Sisters of Mercy foster home and he will have our support in any other ventures like this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add publicly my appreciation to the minister for the sensitivity that he has shown in a particular case on Bell Island, where he looked into a situation involving a young girl, where there had been an apparent error, I would submit, by the bureaucracy, and the minister in a very responsible fashion set up a special enquiry to look into

it and a result has been brought about which, I think, is proper and which will be of advantage to the child and to her relatives. I think the minister should be acknowledged, when good work is done, for doing such good work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries the Provincial Steering Committee Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Week, Mr. Dave Clarke, Chairman of the Department of Labour, Mr. John O'Brien, St. John Ambulance, Mr. Tom Murphy, Fishery Products International, Mr. Vince Ross, Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, Mr. Frank Taylor, Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour, and Mr. Bob Langdon, Division of Occupational Health and Safety.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I also have great pleasure in welcoming again our ex-Sergeant-at-Arms, Mr. Bert Hemmens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) in the absence of the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young).

First of all, I would like to ask the minister if he is prepared to table the memorandum, deleting the names of the public employees named therein? Is he prepared to table this memorandum?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Perhaps I am prepared to table it, Mr. Speaker, and offhand I see no reason why it should not be, with the names deleted, but I would like to take it under advisement. I will advise the hon. gentleman, perhaps tomorrow, with respect to that.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I thank the minister for that.

I would like to ask the Government House Leader is he aware that there have been a series of other departmental Selection Boards operating since November of 1985 and that, in fact, that is still the practice and the procedure that is being followed in the case of these high turnover positions?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly aware that the mechanism is there and I can say to the hon. gentleman that it would not surprise me that there are many of these Selection Boards operating. Yes.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Minister of Public Works and Services has stated that the reason he terminated the competition was because he believed that political scrutiny was such that he had decided to have these matters dealt with by the Public Service Commission, is that consistent with the minister's statement that these departmental Selection Boards are still continuing in his department?

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
The good night's rest the hon. gentleman had did not cure him from his really twisting and distorting of things. The explanation given to the hon. gentleman yesterday still stands, that what the Minister of Public Works and Services was doing with respect to this one particular Selection Committee was that he was not satisfied that it was discharging its duties appropriately, within the framework of the policies of this government, which is to appoint on the basis of merit and consequently he took steps to see that the selections were referred to the Public Service Commission

itself.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works did not restrict his answer to these four positions. He stated, and it was clearly done on television and less clearly in the House, but nevertheless a clear inference in the House - and I will try and see if we can make it clear - but definitely stated on television, outside this House, that it was his intent to change the procedure because of political scrutiny.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

This is the third question.

MR. BARRY:  
I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister how can that statement of the Public Works Minister be truthful if those departmental Selection Boards are still continuing?

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment to The Public Service Commission Act in the name of the minister that will be considered the first order of business today. I do not see any indication in that bill that there is any change at all from the way in which we operated in Section 14 of the act. I do not think the minister said that. I think what the minister was



doing, he was quite clearly addressing himself to that -

MR. FLIGHT:

Can you not do better than that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if they want an answer they will get it but if they do not want an answer, they will not. I think what the minister was doing at the time was addressing himself to that one instant case.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

On June 5, page 2751, I asked the Minister of Public Works the question: "Was this competition going through the Public Service Commission?" The answer of the minister: "No, Mr. Speaker, that is why it was cancelled."

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, is this a question?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I will ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying that the Minister of Public Works' statement there is consistent with the fact that these departmental Selection Boards are still continuing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the statement speaks for itself. You have to take these things within the context.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about consistency, look at the hon. gentleman, who went across this House on the basis that we could not get an agreement on the Atlantic Accord, spent two years savaging it and stood up in this House the other day to vote for it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, on page 2752, the minister was asked: 'Will the minister confirm whether there has been a subsequent competition to fill these jobs?' The answer of the minister: 'No, Mr. Speaker, but the process in the system is that the competitions'-competitions, plural - 'will be done by the Public Service Commission'. Is the minister saying that that statement of the minister is consistent with a truthful answer when the departmental Selection Boards are still operating?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, look, I mean how puerile! Does the hon. gentleman

think he is Melvin Belli or Clarence Darrow or somebody, getting up and examining what he said? When the hon. member said 'competitions', now how many? I would ask the hon. gentleman - perhaps we will switch it around, because the hon. gentleman always wanted to be Premeir - and ask him a few questions. Now, I will ask what was the Minister of Public Works referring to? He was referring to competitions.

MR. CALLAN:  
Now, Senator.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Thank you, but I like it here too much. I like my native land too much.

Mr. Speaker, there was more than one job being advertised, so I suppose the hon. gentleman, when talking about 'competitions', meant that there was more than one job. I do not know if the hon. gentleman sleeps well at night or not, but whatever happened he still has not learned his lesson. You cannot distort what he said. This is not a court of law. Look, the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services, I repeat again referred those positions to the Public Service Commission because he wanted to preserve the policy of this government to see that employment, be it temporary or be it on a permanent basis be done on the basis of merit. He was concerned that the criterion being used by the committee was not on the basis of merit, so he referred it to the Public Service Commission.

MR. BARRY:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon.

the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, on page 2754, the minister says: 'Knowing how the hon. gentleman was acting' - that was referring to myself, presumably. - 'and knowing the accusations he was making about me about political appointments, I said these jobs are to be filled through the Public Service Commission and put them into process, and that is where it is now, Mr. Speaker, in the process.'

MR. MATTHEWS:  
What is wrong with that?

MR. BARRY:  
Now I would like to ask the minister -

MR. BAIRD:  
You are in the process of elimination.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
- what is it, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMS:  
You are heading for destruction.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Let him go on.

MR. BARRY:  
Not until I can be heard, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:  
He is digging a hole for himself anyway.

MR. BARRY:  
Will the minister tell us what it was about these four appointments

that made them politically sensitive, but all subsequent appointments are not politically sensitive and can go through the departmental Selection Board?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Oh, my! Is he not some bright today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Is he not some bright today? Oh my, oh my, oh my! Is that not some good now? Poor little sooky baby! The poor little jealous Tory who scurried! Is he not some bright now today?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was politically sensitive is always politically sensitive to this government! If any appointment, be it permanently, forever and a day, or be it temporary, for a single day, beyond the basis of merit. So our good, honest Minister of Public Works, our competent Minister of Public Works, enforcing the policies of this government felt that the appointments were not being made by the Selection Committee on the basis of merit. So what did he do? He did not do what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition tried to do to the Premier, as the Premier recounted, to put his own names in - he did not make any representations that way - he said, they are to go over to the Public Service Commission to assure that they will be independently appointed on the basis of merit.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD:

Come on, Parky!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to Mr. Nielsen, the Government House Leader. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works, and the Government House Leader stated that he removed two members of the committee because they improperly carried out their duties in the selection of the four employees at Kelligrews. I would like to ask the minister if they have been reinstated, and when?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

What does he mean, reinstated.

MR. EFFORD:

Are they back on the committee?

MR. MARSHALL:

These gentlemen were never dismissed. Now let us not continue to distort things. These gentlemen were not dismissed from their positions. They are executing their functions in the Department of Public Works at the present time. The fact of the matter is that the Minister of Public Works did not believe that these two gentlemen were carrying out, as I repeat again, their duties on the Selection Committee in a way that was going to result in the appointments being made on the basis of merit. So he decided

that, whatever other capacities they have, and doubtless they have many, one of the uses to the Government of the Province of Newfoundland was not for these gentlemen to sit on Selection Committees. They are still employed but they are not sitting on Selection Committees - to my knowledge.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister is not aware of what is going on or he is not doing much reading up on exactly what the problem is because the Minister of Public Works stated very clearly that they were not to be on the Selection Committee any more.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, is it not a fact that these people were reinstated in January on the Committee, two months after they were told by the Minister of Public Works that they were incompetent and they will not be on a selection committee any more? Would the minister explain why this controversy is happening? How does he explain the statements made by the Minister of Public Works that they were not allowed on the Committee because they were incompetent, and now they are back on?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

An excellent question! You should be Leader of the Opposition!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Those are the kinds of real questions, incisive questions that we have.

MR. CALLAN:

Answer! Answer the question!

MR. BAIRD:

Watch your heard, billy goat!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

The Shah from Come By Chance.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, we cannot use pejorative language.

Really, you know, the answer given remains the answer. It is crystal-clear. The Minister of Public Works did not believe that these two gentlemen, in discharging their functions with respect to these particular appointments, were doing it on the basis of merit. The policy of this government is that all appointments be on the basis of merit. It was this party that brought in the Public Service Commission. You could not get a job, you could not get a liquor licence, you could not get a contract when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power unless you were a Liberal or a Liberal supporter, and it was this party that ended that particular regime of corruption in this Province. What the hon. the Minister of Public Works was doing was entirely and absolutely consistent with that policy.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what the minister is saying is a complete contradiction of what the Minister of Public Works has been saying. He has stated very clearly that they were dismissed because they were incompetent. Two months later, after the job were placed, they were reinstated.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works, by this indication, has certainly misled this hon. House of Assembly, and I would ask the minister, on the basis of that and of all that he has learned in the past five days, when is he going to ask the Minister of Public Works for his resignation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that question is not worthy of a response. I have already responded. We have the best Public Works Minister in this administration that this Province has ever seen and all the hon. gentleman has to do and all the investigative press has to do is just compare the Auditor General's report with respect to the Department of Public Works prior to 1979 and compare it from that period in time on since the minister has been there. He will see that we have a Minister of Public Works in this Province who is the best Minister of Public Works that this Province has ever seen and I hope he will remain there for a long period of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Acting Premier. The Minister of Public Works and Services said on four different occasions in the House that there was no memo instructing two officials to stay off these departmental hiring selection committees. Now, the hon. the House Leader produced yesterday a memo to this effect from the Minister of Public Works. Now, clearly the Minister of Public Works has misled this House. When can we expect the minister's resignation for misleading the members of this House?

MR. BAIRD:

What are you, judge and jury?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I wish they would quit it. I answered the question yesterday, I answered it today and I am getting bored with my answers. Particularly, when a politician gets boared with hearing his own voice -

MR. K. AYLWARD:

What about morality?

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, when we asked the

Minister of Public Works and Services on four separate occasions was there a memo, his answer was very clear, "No, Mr. Speaker." I would like to ask the Acting Premier who has been using the excuse that we have been taking the minister's words out of context, could he show us where, "No, Mr. Speaker, there was no memo," could have been taken out of context?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if they would just look a couple of columns back, they will see the question asked that they are now saying the minister said no to that was asked of the Minister of Public Works -

MR. FUREY:

Four times.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Do not be so ignorant! I know you cannot help yourself but just try to be a little bit genteel in the people's House.

MR. FLIGHT:

Come on! Answer!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen would look at the proceedings what they will see is that exactly the same question was asked of the minister two or three columns before this and the minister in his own colourful way said, 'Yes and No.'

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. House Leader can slither and duck and do all he wants, but the minister's words are very clear, 'No, there was no memorandum,' and yet this minister shows up with a memorandum. Now, why is the minister covering up for the Minister of Public Works and Services?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

This minister is not covering up for the Minister of Public Works.

MR. BARRY:

Be honest! Answer the question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked certain questions of the government and I gave the full facts yesterday. They are the facts. There is no need to cover up for the Minister of Public Works and Services because everything that the Minister of Public Works and Services in this government has done is completely, absolutely aboveboard. I cannot help it if that is the hon. gentleman's interpretation of what the Minister of Public Works and Services says, but I will say this, and I will just repeat it again, that what the Minister of Public Works and Services did, feeling that the Selection Committee was not appointing on

the basis of merit, what he did was he referred this to the Public Service Commission, the independent Public Service Commission, to be quite assured that the appointment would be on the basis of merit.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has said consistently -

MR. PEACH:  
Move that the House adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister has rose in his place on a number of occasions and has made the point that the board members were appointed on the basis of their qualifications and their merit. Would he explain to this House just how it was that the Minister of Public Works and Services gave them the flick in the first place, if it was not for his own political reasons, and just how it was that after the Minister of Public Works and Services had the done the deed that he wanted to do for his political buddies, they again poked back in place? I future ask the hon. gentleman the same question that everybody else in this Province is asking him, why, in view of the facts that have been given to him, he not ask or advise the Premier to ask for the Minister of Public Works and Services' resignation? Will he answer the first question and then do the honourable thing? There is

no explanation for it, and he knows it.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, there was a rumour around, you know, when the Leader of the Opposition first formed this present caucus, that he was going to revolve the positions of Opposition House Leader and Whip and what have you. The way that the Opposition House Leader is doing I think it is about time that he revolve those particular positions, although I understand he has half revolved them. I can only say to the hon. gentleman exactly what I have already said to him. The hon. gentleman can accept it or reject it - I could not care less. The fact of the matter is that the Minister of Public Works and Services was not satisfied that these appointments were on basis of merit so he referred it to the Public Service Commission to assure that the appointments would be on the basis of merit.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has now said, and the Minister of Public Works and Services said first, and he has now reinforced that -

MR. BARRY:  
No. The minister never said that but he is saying it for him.

MR. TULK:

He is saying it for him. In both cases it is coming out that what the government is saying is that those people that sat on that Selection Committee did not appoint on the basis of merit, that they did not appoint employees of the civil service on the basis of merit. I would ask him on what basis then did they make the appointments? What basis were the appointments made on if it was not on the basis of merit?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Public Works had the impression and had the feeling that the appointments were made on basis other than merit. Now it is immaterial what the other basis was because the only policy of this government warranting appointment is on the basis of merit. So he knew then that they were not operating in accordance with the policies of this government. That is why he wanted it referred to the independent Public Service Commission.

MR. FLIGHT:

What are you laughing at?

MR. MARSHALL:

I am laughing at you, with the rest of the people of Newfoundland who are laughing at all of you too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

It does not matter what the hon. gentleman, thought the basis was. He thought that they were not appointing on the basis of merit because of the way in which they discharged their duties.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I say to the gentleman opposite that it is not immaterial on what basis those people were appointed. Let me ask him again, what policies or regulations were those people who sat on the Selection Board breaking that the Minister of Public Works saw fit to give them the flick?

MR. BARRY:

He substituted his own ideas of merit.

MR. TULK:

Now he can use all of the Erik Neilsen charm that he likes. As a matter of fact he finds himself in the same position.

MR. PATTERSON:

Another Nunciata!

MR. TULK:

But I ask him, is it not a fact that at least one of those people worked on the hon. gentleman's campaign and that two of them worked on the Minister of Environment's (Mr. Butt) campaign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman said, the hon. gentlemen can use all the Nunciata and Copps' tactics that they want to but it is not really going to get them anywhere.



MR. TULK:  
What regulation?

MR. FUREY:  
You cannot cover up that dirt.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
That shows how right they were.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Now, I like the other box, you know. They appear to be more civilized. There is a division. There are the civil Liberals and the uncivilized Liberals. Mr. Speaker, he asked what regulation. Now, let me tell you something. The regulation, Mr. Speaker, is this: There is a policy that is engrained in the Public Service Commission Act that was enacted into the laws of this Province as a result of an act of the Progressive Conservative Party and government of Newfoundland. The basis of appointment to the Public Service is to be on the basis of merit, as contrasted with the basis that had adhered some three or four years before when you could not get a job, you could not get a liquor license, or you could not get a contract unless you were a friend of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the Liberal government.

The basic principle of that bill, the very principle of the bill is merit. So, because the hon. gentleman felt that this principle was not being adhered to, he referred it to the Public Service Commission.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews). It has to do with the Christopher Pratt retrospective at the Arts and Culture Center Art Gallery here in St. John's. It is my understanding, because of lack of space in the gallery and because one of the rooms is not available for this particular exhibit, even though the exhibit has been seen in Vancouver, Halifax and other Mainland parts, we will not get to see the entire works, specifically, that twelve works, six drawings and six prints, will not be exhibited. My question to the minister is this: What is the reason for denying the Memorial Art Gallery the use of the fourth room in order to exhibit the Christopher Pratt works?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Speaker, the situation is that there was a request in for space at the Arts and Culture Center, and that space is presently used for another purpose. We looked at relocating that particular exhibit and we had difficulty in finding space and, as well, that was further compounded with the cost of moving it out and then bringing it back. We offered the Upper Concourse which, for security reasons, was not found to be suitable to the exhibit that he refers to.

MR. FENWICK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary is that the sports exhibit that the minister talks about is now several years old and there have been very few people watching it and, as a matter of fact, has something like seven or eight of its permanent exhibits removed. My question to the minister is this: Since the exhibit -

MR. PEACH:

How would you know?

MR. FENWICK:

I went and looked at it.

Since the exhibit is clearly out of date, clearly is in need of upgrading, since there has been none of it done to it the last four or five years since it was put there, why did not the minister use this opportunity to move the exhibit, upgrade it, return the trophies that are missing from it, in other words, make it into a first-class sports exhibit we would all be proud of?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record in the House today as saying that I am very much in favour of culture in this Province and as well in favour of the sports fraternity of this Province. I am not anti-sport, like obviously the Leader of the NDP Party (Mr. Fenwick) is. For the last number of months, Mr. Speaker, he has been making statements in the media of this Province that have been very anti-sports.

The situation is we looked very seriously at relocating the sports exhibit, we could not find a

suitable location for the sports exhibit, and that was compounded by cost. We are presently looking at relocating the sports exhibit, Mr. Speaker, and as soon as we can find a suitable location it will be moved. I do not agree with the hon. member that there are not very many people interested in or visiting the sports exhibit. The thing is I consider the sports exhibit to be just as important as any other exhibit in this Province. I treat culture equally with sport. I am not like the hon. member who obviously has a bias towards culture and is anti-sport.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Despite the minister's protestations, I have no bias against sport. As a matter of fact my question was why have you let that exhibition deteriorate to the extent it has, where about half a dozen of the trophies have been permanently removed and not returned and the exhibit itself is no credit whatsoever to the sports community? Why have you not put funds into it to make it a first class sports exhibition instead of letting it deteriorate the way it has?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member knows where the six trophies are, I do not know. But if he does I would like to have the information and maybe we could have them retrieved and returned

to the exhibit.

The situation is that we are very interested in relocating the sports exhibit. We are very interested in having a first class location for it. We presently have a committee in place that is looking around the city and looking at other buildings to see if another site is suitable and, as soon as one is found, then it will be put in place, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A question for the hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:  
A question for the hon. House Leader, Mr. Speaker. He said a number of times that all hiring is done on the basis of merit. We see the Minister of Public Works admitting on public television that the hiring is done on the basis of who worked on his campaign and he has also said this in other words in the House. I would like to ask the minister, does this indicate that there is a new definition of merit in play by members opposite? Is the merit we are talking about the Tory merit of working on Tory election campaigns? Is that what the minister means?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous. The answer is no. The only basis of appointment to a permanent job or a temporary job -

MR. SIMMONS:  
You know you cannot pork barrel like that.

MR. FLIGHT:  
There is a new morality around.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Really, now, I have you with the civilized crowd now so quit while you are ahead, 'Roger'. Quit while you are ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the only basis of appointment is merit, the capacity or ability of a person to be able to discharge the functions of the job or appointment which he seeks.

MR. FLIGHT:  
You are going down with him, 'Billy'.

MR. BAKER:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, since he says that people are hired on the basis of merit and he is not talking about political merit, if the Minister of Public Works readily admits that they are hired on the basis of working and his campaign, how can he expect the people of this Province to believe that there is no conflict here? How can he expect the people of this Province to believe that something wrong has not been done and how can he not ask for the minister's resignation on that basis?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

An excellent question! Because we have the best Minister of Public Works that this Province has ever seen, because, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works, his stewardship was his portfolio, as indicated in the area of public tendering and public contracts, and you just compare, I said, his record to other Minister of Public Works, his record with respect to the Public Service Commission and the hiring and what have you - that is the reason why. The hon. gentleman is saying what the Minister of Public Works said but the hon. gentleman knows, and I am sure fair-minded people around know that the statements attributed to the Minister of Public Works were statements that were dragged out of context.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. BAKER:

I would like to say to the minister that I can read Hansard and understand it. I would like to ask him: When is he going to stop misleading this House on the matter of a minister who has already misled this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. gentleman can read and I am glad the hon. gentleman can

understand. But obviously he does not understand the answers that he has been given. I will just repeat the answer once again, that the Minister of Public Works was not satisfied that these appointments were on the basis of merit. The policy of this government is to appoint both permanent and temporary positions on the basis of merit, and that is why he referred it to the Public Service Commission.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the minister is aware that he is now adopting the principle that with respect to 3,500 -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, that is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Ask it tomorrow.

MR. BARRY:

I am just counting, Mr. Speaker, to see how many words I got out that time to see whether that would clearly give Your Honour a complete grasp on -

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, oh! He is questioning the Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

On a matter of privilege, Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER:

I am dealing with three points of privilege already.

MR. TULK:

So?

MR. SPEAKER:

If you want to pose it, I will add it to them.

MR. BARRY:

I realize that, Your Honour. We would be happy to support extra staff and extra research on an emergency basis should Your Honour feel burdened by this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I will hear your point of privilege now.

MR. BARRY:

I am serious about this. As a matter of fact, we would like to see a public inquiry into this matter we raised yesterday so that His Honour would not be put in the difficult position of having to sift through the material that has been laid before him.

Your Honour, another matter of privilege which again goes to the same point, as to whether or not the Minister of Public Works is misleading this House, but it is with respect to another matter, a second or a third area I think it is now, where the minister has not been truthful in responding to questions on this matter. This

has to do, Your Honour, with the point as to why the Minister of Public Works cancelled the competition. The Minister of Public Works said he -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit him down, Mr. Speaker. How long is he going to keep this up. Sit him down!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am going to go into all the details about that, I am in the middle of it now. It looks to me as if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is just taking advantage of a point of privilege to expand on what he did yesterday instead of waiting for a ruling as to whether or not he has a prime facie case.

MR. BARRY:

I see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I thank Your Honour for those remarks. If Your Honour had given me a moment, I would have referred Your Honour to ten documented excerpts from Hansard, Mr. Speaker, that have been subsequently established in light of the responses made by the Government House Leader, information given by the Government House Leader. On another question, Your Honour.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, no question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question Period is over, boy.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Is that not scandalous?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
The issue raised with Your Honour yesterday had to do with whether the Minister of Public Works mislead the House when he said that 'he did not issue a memorandum.' I documented areas of Hansard, responses of the minister to that question. I would now like to refer Your Honour to the response of the Minister of Public Works when he was asked 'why the competition was cancelled?' There are ten places in Hansard where he gave answers that are completely inconsistent with the facts as confirmed by the Government House Leader in response to questions today, where he confirmed -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

That seems exactly the same point as the hon. -

MR. BARRY:  
It is not. It is not!

MR. FUREY:  
We have a brand new one here.

MR. TULK:  
This only happened today.

MR. FUREY:  
It is not the same one.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to please keep quiet.

It seems to me to be exactly the same point.

MR. BARRY:  
What is going on here? What is going on?

MR. SPEAKER:  
I am going to study that and -

MR. BARRY:  
You have not heard the remainder of my argument.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I do not want to hear the ten points. Because if there is one point there are ten, and if there are ten points there is one.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Another ten.

MR. BARRY:  
What? You do not have one, you do not have two or three or four.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Name him. Name him.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I am prepared to hear the hon. the Leader of the Opposition for a few moments.

MR. BARRY:  
Your Honour, I can understand with the yelling and the hollering that is going on on the other side that Your Honour may not have heard what I am saying. There was an answer given by the Government House Leader today that confirmed -

MR. PEACH:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no need to shout.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Would you mention that to the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), Your Honour?

MR. TULK:

And tell him to go back to his own seat.

MR. FUREY:

The child.

MR. SPEAKER:

Carry on.

MR. BARRY:

The Government House Leader confirmed today -

MR. BUTT:

(Inaudible) bite his tongue off.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) the way he talks to the magistrates.

MR. FUREY:

Grow up, 'Morgan'.

MR. BARRY:

The great file shredder strikes again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) answering service (inaudible) employees.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader got up today and confirmed that there were departmental selection boards operating after the Minister of Public Works stated that he would be letting the Public Service Commission

directly, rather than departmental selection boards, deal with these positions. I want to refer Your Honour to ten places in Hansard -

MR. PEACH:

Your Honour told him that he was going to rule on that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Name him, Mr. Speaker. Come on, boy! Name that child.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I want to refer Your Honour to ten places in Hansard where the Minister of Public Works, over two days, gave answers inconsistent with the continued operation of departmental selection boards. Now, surely, we are entitled, as a result of Question Period, to draw to the attention of Your Honour that there has been another case of the Minister of Public Works misleading this House. We did not have that information yesterday. It was only today that the Government House Leader confirmed that these internal selection boards were still operating.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would remind the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that I read Hansard, also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Two different Hansards.

MR. TULK:

That is not the point.

MR. BARRY:

Well, Your Honour, if Your Honour

wishes for us to sit and not raise matters in Hansard, that would be a somewhat extraordinary ruling and a new precedent for the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am just listening to the point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

On page 2751, Your Honour, the bottom right-hand corner and the top right-hand corner, he said 'it was cancelled because it was not going through the Public Service Commission.' Page 2752, Mr. Speaker, I have already referred Your Honour to, I referred Your Honour to page 2754 but only to one place. First of all, on page 2754 he says: "Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when I found out about the competition and the recommendations made by the officials in my department I said, 'No, no, boys, this is a thing that should go to the Public Service Commission', and that is what I did, Mr. Speaker."

It is already established that he did not do that, it is not yet to the Public Service Commission. He said he did it in November but it is not yet there. I then referred Your Honour to the other statement, a minute ago, where he talked about referring because of political accusations. The third place on -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am satisfied with two or three. The principle is the same, and I do not want to hear the ten.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to deal with this point of privilege first. I will take notice of that, also, and rule at a later date.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious point of privilege. First of all, when Your Honour was making a ruling, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was shouting at Your Honour. I do not think, really, that this House is to be subjected to the tantrums of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The fact of the matter is, this is not a classroom. He is rising on points of order and Your Honour is supposed to look into the proceedings to see if a member said something wrong or not. He was known, when he was on this side, as the schoolboy debater but, Mr. Speaker, this is not a classroom. Your Honour is the Speaker of this House and when Your Honour was making the ruling the hon. gentleman did not sit down. The hon. gentleman, quite clearly, was shouting at Your Honour when Your Honour was making a ruling and even making observations with respect to his point of privilege. As such, he violated the rules of this House and I think it is really incumbent upon him to withdraw and apologize to the Chair.

MR. TULK:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, like everybody on this



side, has no desire at all to question the Speaker's ruling, unlike we have seen the hon. gentleman do in recent days. But, let me say to Your Honour that it becomes very, very difficult when the Government House Leader is unable to control, or the whip, whoever that happens to be over there now, the din from the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), for example, who is not even sitting in his own seat, yapping across this House, and so on down the line. You can pick almost any member over there. As soon the Leader of the Opposition stands in this House to make a point, there is nothing but a steady yap and a yip from the other side. Now, I say to the hon. gentleman that he can try all he likes, and he can have his cronies on the other side try all they like to divert attention from what the Minister of Public Works and Services has done to the Leader of the Opposition. It will not succeed for them, it will still be there. He can practice all the charm he likes, he and Erik Nielsen, both. Canada knows Erik well, and Newfoundland is going to know Bill well, if he keeps it up. Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is, if hon. gentlemen on the other side would keep the noise down Your Honour could hear what is going on and hear what the Leader of the Opposition is pointing out, and there would be none of those problems at all in the House. It is a deliberate attempt by the Government House Leader and the other side to divert attention away from the Minister of Public Works with another issue, and he is not very good at it.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I must rule there is no point of privilege. I would like to assure

the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) I have no difficulty in hearing either himself or the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I will not heat it up too much. Mr. Speaker, in Beauchesne, page 11, paragraph 16, the definition of parliamentary privilege is spelled out in part and I quote, "Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions". I submit, Mr. Speaker, and it would be easy to document from Beauchesne, that one of the most basic rights of a member of any parliament is the right to be heard, obviously within reason, until such time as the Chair ascertains whether or not the member has a matter of privilege. One of the clearest, most basic rights of parliament is the right to stand in one's place and draw to the attention of the Chair that a member has a matter which he considers to be a matter of privilege.

I do not submit that he can go on forever and ever on that. We have some precedents in this House. I recall an occasion where the gentlemen from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in this parliament, in this Session, went on for about forty-five minutes on a matter of privilege without interruption. I recall the case of the gentleman

for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) who went on for some considerable time without any interruption from the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, in the exchange a few moments ago between the Chair and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) the Chair said, 'I have three points of privilege already.' Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no limit in Hansard on the number of points of privilege that can be put to Mr. Speaker. If we have a matter of privilege, we ought to be able to raise it, obviously.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Not the same one.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Well, that is another issue, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You cannot have more than one ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the retort to the Leader of the Opposition by the Chair, 'I read Hansard, also.' I submit, Mr. Speaker, that those two statements are statements that ought never to emanate from the Chair. Because what it does, it engages the Chair in a debate with a member and it makes it difficult for the member to make his point of privilege when the impartial authority that he is putting his point of privilege to, the arbiter, the person who must decide that point of privilege, has entered into an exchange at the emotional level. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that

kind of thing should not go on. I can understand that the Chair, like everybody else in this House, is human and we have our moments, but, by and large, Mr. Speaker, I would, as a member of this House -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:  
That is another point. I will not get into that, though.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that as a member of this House I am entitled to the assurance from the Chair that I will have the opportunity, as I am being given right now, unimpeded, to raise points of privilege and not be put through the exchange with the Chair such as we just witnessed in relation to the Leader of the Opposition. If the Leader of the Opposition is breaking some rules, and I am not suggesting he has, that is one matter but for the Chair to engage in repartee with a member during the course of raising a point of privilege, or at any other time, for that matter, is completely out of character with the role of the Chair. My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that my privileges and the privileges of every member of this House are breached if we get into a situation where a member in raising his point of privilege not only has to compete for the attention of the House over the heckling of people who do not agree with his view, but, if he has to compete with the Chair as well, then the most basic of parliamentary principles is very seriously undermined.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

The hon. gentleman is stepping on very dangerous ground in this House when he stands to debate with the Chair. He stood to debate with the Chair whether or not the Chair has the right to respond, in making rulings, by making comments, as were just made by the Chair in making the ruling that there was no point of privilege, and telling the person who raised the point of privilege that you also, Mr. Speaker, as Speaker of this House, as ruler of this House, read Hansard. The member who now stands is asking the question whether or not you, Sir, have the right to make these kinds of comments and he is now on very dangerous ground. I would say, if he is not going to directly question the rulings of the Chair he should not do it indirectly, which is the motive of the hon. gentleman who just stood up. I would also say, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to get involved with members debating with you, Sir, this place will be chaos. As hon. members, we have to have the firm understanding that we obey you, Sir, and your rules at all times. If we do not want to obey your rules, we have the right to challenge Your Honour's rulings directly, and not indirectly as was just done. It is a very serious matter, but I would say, at the same time, the hon. gentleman has not established any kind of prima facie case. He has not done that. He has raised the very serious matter of a member having the right to stand and debate with you, Sir, and question your rulings, and we cannot do that as members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, there is no prima facie case made.

Before getting on to the next item I would like to welcome to the galleries the Resource Technician Training Programme Committee of North West River, Labrador, Katherine Baikie-Pottle, Gerry Redmond and Olive Blake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Notices of Motion

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution:

WHEREAS Newfoundland and Labrador has over 50 per cent of Sea Cadets in the Atlantic Provinces; and

WHEREAS Stephenville is being considered as a site for a proposed Sea Cadet base for the Atlantic Provinces; and

WHEREAS officials of the Sea Cadet organization have recently visited Stephenville and are in the process of evaluating the area; and

WHEREAS the West Coast is in need of economic stimulus and has an opportunity to attract the Sea Cadet base for all of Newfoundland and Labrador;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House go on record as supporting Stephenville, Newfoundland and Labrador, as a site for the proposed Sea Cadet base and that a message be sent to the Minister of Defence in Ottawa supporting the choice of Stephenville as the site of the proposed Sea Cadet base for Atlantic Canada.

While I realize, Mr. Speaker, that it is a Private Members' motion and it would normally go to the bottom of the list, I have talked with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and most of the members of the House. I would ask that this given unanimous consent today to be sent off to Ottawa. We need to do it as soon as we can because the evaluation process is taking place. I think the benefits would accrue to all of Newfoundland and Labrador. I am sure that the Government House Leader will concur with that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, we give him consent in the spirit of co-operation. The hon. gentleman sits on the hard side, the chippy side of the Opposition, not in the civilized group, but he is a civilized person. We will agree, Mr. Speaker. We have agreed to accept it and we have agreed to for vote it.

I hope the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) will support it as well. We will just put it to a vote now

so that we can have it adopted unanimously. Remember how co-operative the government is.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:  
It is fortunate today I am wearing my Navy League tie. In that capacity, I cannot do anything but support it as well. I give consent as well.

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those in favour 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those against 'Nay'.

I declare the motion carried unanimously.

### Petitions

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the Red Bay Producers Co-op.

It states: "We, the Red Bay Producers Co-op Society Limited, hereby petition the House of Assembly to put pressure on the federal Minister of Employment and Immigration to release funds totalling \$56,740 that have been

approved under a Canada Works Strategy Programme. The funds are needed to construct a wet fish holding unit and an office space adjacent to the already existing drying facilities.

"We consider this just another step in accomplishing the goal that we set out four years ago to reach," that is, drying bulk salt fish on the Labrador.

This project, Mr. Speaker, was approved last Fall. It was approved by an advisory committee. It was approved by the minister of employment for our Province. It was approved by Ottawa, by the Minister of Immigration and Employment (Miss MacDonald) and it was approved by the MP. The money was in Goose Bay. It was ready to be released when the federal Minister of Fisheries put a hold on it. As a result, since February 7, I have been negotiating back and forth with the Premier's office, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) here in Newfoundland, the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon), and the federal Minister of Immigration and Employment (Miss MacDonald) to have the funds released.

I have several letters that I also want to table. It seems as if the federal Minister of Fisheries has decided, in his own good wisdom, that there will not be any drying of fish on the Labrador Coast, that they will continue to send the fish to Carbonear and to other areas of our Province.

It is interesting that the federal Minister of Fisheries is now in Carbonear today at a fund-raising event with the MP for that area, Mr. Johnson. I hope that the provincial Minister of Fisheries

(Mr. Rideout), now that he is here meeting with him, will point out the need to construct this building. The building itself is adjacent to a building that was already put there. I may point out also, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has put over \$20,000 into that building. They have put in other support. His own department has even helped. There are other departments and agencies of government that have put money into this.

The attitude taken by the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon) and some other people is that it is very unlikely that this operation will ever become viable, so they are making a value judgment even before various things are in place. I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, about fifteen years ago the people in Labrador were told that they could not get money to buy longliners from Loan Board because they would not pay for themselves. People went on and built longliners themselves and there are now forty or fifty longliners on the Labrador Coast.

The other thing is that almost \$250,000 has already been spent on it, and if this part does not go through, then we are going to see another example of government bureaucratic waste and one government going against the other. It is not a great sum. It is \$56,000. The Premier basically said that 'we do not want our people on Canada Works projects and long-term make work projects,' nor do the people in Red Bay. They do not want to continue to see the natural resources of Labrador always going to the Island part of the our Province, whether it be salt fish or crab

now going down to Bay Bulls or scallops going to another area of our Province, or hydro to Quebec or forestry to Stephenville, etc.

The people of Labrador are trying to take matters into their own hands to provide economic jobs for their area. But when they do, through political pressure from private businesses on the Island part of our Province, we find out that both levels of government cave in under these political pressures perhaps because of their political alliance. We find out that Labrador is delegated into this position of being hewers of wood and drawers of water, and not getting into processing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is an extremely serious matter. Here you have it approved by four different groups and then you have the Federal Minister of Fisheries come and intervene, saying, 'sorry, I am not approving that,' after it going through all of the process and even the money being in Goose Bay.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people on the Labrador Coast should be encouraged for their initiative of trying to get more permanent jobs in their area, of trying to get a building that will process and dry salt fish on the Labrador Coast. In regard to the economic viability of it, if they are not given a chance, one will never know if it is viable or not. I will go so far as to say that when the Fogo Co-op, Mr. Speaker, first got off the ground, everybody said that Fogo Co-op would not make it. The Fogo Co-op last year made a profit of \$750,000.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I ask that this petition, with related documents, be tabled and directed to the department to which it relates. I ask that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) personally intervene, speak with the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon) on this matter and have the funds released immediately. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is fair to say that the member and I have exchanged a number of pieces of correspondence on this particular matter. I do not remember all the detail of it now because some of it was some months ago. But, as I remember the situation, the petitioners in Red Bay are facing what is basically this: There was a drying facility built in Red Bay a couple of years ago. It was built in a part of the community that was a far distance away from the existing facility there. We must remember there was an existing salt fish operation in Red Bay. The local residents' intent in the beginning was to build a drying operation close by or within reasonable distance of the facility that was already in place so that it could use the fish from the salt fish operation for the drying operation. But it was constructed in another part of the community altogether. The operators of the salt fish

operation, because of the distance involved, indicated that they would not have anything to do with operating the drying facility. Now, that is where it started at first, Mr. Speaker. The drying facility was put in there but in a location that was not realistic for the present operator who already operates a facility up there. That is point number one.

Point number two, Mr. Speaker, is that I understand now the Red Bay people want to build another facility so that they themselves can process salt fish and then utilize this new facility that they built a couple of years ago.

MR. HISCOCK:  
That is not true.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says it is not true. I do not have the benefit of the letters in front of me. I could have checked it today if he had let me know. But from what I remember, the original building was built as a drying facility to dry fish processed at another facility in the community of Red Bay, but it was built so far away from the present facility, nobody wanted to utilize it. The Canadian Saltfish Corporation did not want to utilize it. The operator of the other facility, I believe, is H. B. Dawe and they did not want to utilize it. Now, the community is back looking for extra funds to build another shed adjacent to the drying facility so that they can do fish themselves. That is my recollection.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
It is only \$56,000 and its for office space.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:  
A point of clarification. It is for office space -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:  
- and also to take the wet fish -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:  
- and wash it.

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

The hon. member can make a point of clarification by leave.

MR. PEACH:  
No leave.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
So, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. HISCOCK:  
The member for Carbonear said 'no leave.'

MR. RIDEOUT:  
- I also want to say is that I believe we have supported this particular -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
- application, but I want to make sure that in saying we lent our

support to it, I want to confirm the history of how the facility came to be located where it is, with the people involved saying that because of where it is located, they cannot see any sense in making a go of it. Now, I do not know if that is true. I have never been there. I have never visited, but that is the advice and information that I received I believe when I was responding to correspondence from the hon. gentleman.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of the petition that was so ably presented by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). I want to also, in supporting it, to say that it seems to me that the minister and the people in the area, must have a different opinion of what is required. It seems to me that the minister must be taking the federal line from the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon) and, without getting political, I would advise the hon. gentleman that from what we have seen happening with the federal Minister of Fisheries in this Province, that would not be very advisable.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask him, in supporting this petition, if he is not clear and it is very obvious from his speech on this petition that he is not clear, I would ask him if he would immediately contact the Federal Minister of Fisheries and to clarify and get together with the federal officials, and perhaps the federal level of manpower as well, to see

that those funds that the Red Bay Producers Co-op are looking for are forthcoming.

Now I know full well, and I believe that is perhaps the reason the member for Eagle River has asked me to speak on this petition, I know full well, as well as anybody in this House, the problems that co-ops in this Province have in dealing with bureaucrats and with politicians in this country. There is absolutely no doubt and I fail to understand why it is that governments and bureaucrats cannot see why producers co-ops, such as in Red Bay and on Fogo Island, can be masters of their own faith. They always want to identify with them when they are successful, but when they have some problem, there seems to be all kinds of blockades put up in the way of people who are very creative people, otherwise we would not have this petition here.

Here we have seen either a Federal Minister of Fisheries, a Federal Minister of Manpower or the bureaucracy, say to the people of Red Bay, who are a co-operative, who make their own decisions, that, indeed, you are not fit to make the decision and we are going to refuse you the money. We are going to put it on hold. Now that is a very negative attitude to have towards co-ops. If the people who put together those co-ops had the same attitude, I would suggest to the minister that there would never be any successful co-op in this country. The truth of the matter is that the essence of a good co-op is to be co-operative. It is a different sort of business.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the minister that he should clear up



any situations as to where the building is located. I am sure that those people know what they want in Red Bay. I am sure they know why they applied for the money. I do not believe that the Red Bay Producers Co-operative, any more than my own co-operative on Fogo Island, would apply for funds just to waste money. Well, that must be the attitude that the federal Department of Manpower has, that it would be a waste of money to do this, otherwise why would they stop the funds? Why stop them?

I say to the minister that those people know what they want to do and, in many cases, their decisions will be much better than when made by any bureaucrat in Ottawa or in Halifax, Corner Brook, Goose Bay, or wherever it was. I say to him get the thing cleared up. Point out to his federal counterpart, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) and the federal Minister of Manpower and Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald) that she should encourage cooperatives.

Now it may very well be against the philosophy of that government but I say to him that co-ops in this Province can work, as the minister knows. He recently visited Fogo Island and he knows that last year the Fogo Island Co-op did make somewhere around \$750,000 profit. In the worst of years, in the last five, the Fogo Island Co-op in the Fishery practically broke even. It had a cash flow problem one year but was never in a situation where it should have to go bankrupt. I would say to the minister and I would encourage him to put the necessary pressure that needs to be put on the federal Minister of

Fisheries to support the Red Bay Producers Co-operative and see that the federal government releases the funds that are necessary to see this plant put in place.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition on behalf of the eighty-two citizens of the Community of McCallum, in the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. The prayer is very simple. "We, the undersigned, citizens of McCallum would like to protest the way in which we have again been ignored by the government. We have been trying for several years to receive funding for the construction of a new slip-way, the present one being in very bad condition. The communities all around us have received funding for different project but this year, once again, we were left out. Pretty soon we will not have a slip-way to pull our boats up on."

Mr. Speaker, the community of McCallum is a fishing community and its only reason for existing is the fact that people were independent and hard working and wanted to carry on the fishing industry as their ancestors have done since the community was established.

The only way that this community can exist is by the fishing boats that are used by them that are engaged in the fishing industry out of McCallum. Everybody that

lives in McCallum is a fisherman. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important that the community have a slip-way to enable the fishermen to take their boats from the water when the fishing season is over.

The storms of last Fall damaged the slip-way to the extent that right now there is grave concern in the community of McCallum that they will not be able to use this slip-way to get their boats out of the water when the current fishing season is over.

So for this reason it is vitally important that consideration be given to those people to provide funds.

I heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) in the House yesterday announce funds for a slipway in the St. Barbe district. I say that the situation in McCallum is equally as bad or worse than anywhere on the Island because of the simple reason that this slipway is the lifeblood of the community of McCallum. Without this slipway, the fishermen are unable to carry on with the fishing industry that they have carried on with for years.

McCallum is connected to the rest of Newfoundland by boats. The only way you can get there is by CN Marine or go in private boats owned by the people of McCallum. The road in McCallum is a three-quarter of a mile path around the community which is barely fit to walk over. The people of McCallum have now been reduced to the point that when a boat lands at their wharf - they, at one time, could bring their supplies in wheelbarrows, that is wheel it to their homes from the

wharf. Now they find that they cannot use wheelbarrows. The road has deteriorated to such an extent. Now they have to bring supplies from the wharf on their backs to their homes. We have let the road in McCallum deteriorate to the point that it is impossible to use anymore other than as a footpath around the community.

We now have the case where funding has been requested for repairs to this slipway over the last several years to no avail. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask this hon. House and members opposite to give very serious consideration to the providing of funds to support the people of McCallum by providing them with a slipway in order that they can carry on with their traditional way of life which is fishing on the Southcoast of Newfoundland.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in support of the petition so ably presented by my friend and colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert).

The community of McCallum is a community which in many respects, particularly in the economic respect, in the social aspect, in the sense of community that you find there and in the sense of industriousness that you find there, is a model for all of Newfoundland. Because, Mr. Speaker, the only people you find living on social assistance, first

of all, they are very few in number, but secondly, they are people who are doing so through no fault of their own. No lack of industriousness puts them on social assistance. It is a matter of physical circumstance or family circumstance, one or the other or both.

The overwhelming majority of the male adult population is involved directly in the fishery. It is a joy to be in McCallum, as I have been on many occasions, when the boats are coming in and to watch the activity, to watch the industry, to watch the commitment. It is a joy to be there almost any morning when the wind is blowing too much for the boats to go out. The men gather on the slip and use every minute available to them to make sure that everything is in readiness for the next time they can put out to sea.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point that McCallum pays it full share towards the public treasury of this country and this Province. Their wage earners pay income tax and pay other taxes in full measure and they do not get in return a lot of services in comparison to other communities, not only larger size, but of similar size. They do not get many services. There is no road there as my friend has said. What is there of a road, I may say, was put there through the old Canada Works Programme in the years when I was the member of Parliament and, before me, Mr. Jamieson. The road, such as it is, was build on those funds rather than by provincial funding. When you look for provincial grants you have something in the order of \$2,000 a year and that kind of thing.

The water system was promised by the Tory administration in 1973 when then Premier Moores was there campaigning in a by-election. It was never put in and it was eventually put in with \$280,000 in federal job creation money that I was able to arrange over three stints. The road has not directly cost the taxpayers of this Province hardly a whittle. The water system has cost them very little. In fairness, the Department of Municipal Affairs did put in some of the material costs, I think in the order of \$20,000 or \$30,000, if my memory serves me well.

The point I want to make to you, Mr. Speaker, is that here is a very legitimate request from a community that has not asked for much and got even less. They are asking for something, not for recreational purposes, not for social purposes, but something that will help them better do their work. Mr. Speaker, I, with great delight, support that petition.

No people anywhere in this Province are more deserving of the facility that they are asking for, no people have given more reason to the taxpayers who pay the bill, no reason which more justifies their request that comes forward today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support my colleague for Burgeo Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) and I want to support the people of McCallum on this very reasonable request. We may hear some argument about how much of it is federal and how much is provincial and that kind of thing. Surely, with the funds of the minister's department it may well be able to find a few dollars here to meet this very legitimate

request.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to stand today as well and support the prayer of the petition presented by the hon. gentleman on behalf of his constituents from McCallum.

As Minister of Fisheries for the Province, I am always pleased to support improved fishing facilities, whether it is off loading facilities, wharves or landing facilities. What we try to do in our department, Mr. Speaker, is use the few dollars that we have to compliment other funds that might be accessible, whether it is from CEIC or whether it is from small craft and harbours or whatever source it comes from. I think we have done that rather successfully over the last while in trying to top up and make possible the repairs to more and more fishing facilities in more and more places throughout the Province.

I can say to the hon. gentleman that we are quite prepared as a department to look at that same situation for his need and for his request for the people of McCallum. If we can do anything to assist in topping up the project to make it happen, to improve the facilities for fishermen in that community, then as a department and as a Province, we will be very pleased to do it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

A further petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of presenting a petition today signed by 133 residents of the community of Great Harbour Deep. The petition itself, I should say, I think, is unique. I believe members will understand the uniqueness of the request when I read the prayer of the petition.

The petition says, "We, the undersigned residents of Great Harbour Deep in the district of Baie Verte - White Bay, do here humbly request the support of our duly elected government through our elected representative, with input from other departments, to help us with our request for a big game licence, namely moose and caribou, to be issued during the month of February. Due to our isolation, we have no access to the hunt in the Fall, except by plane, which means that low income families who need the meat most to help reduce the high cost of living are unable to participate in the Fall hunt.

"We feel that should a licence be issued during the month of February, with proper supervision, there would be no long-term problems with regard to the big game population in the area. Also, we feel that our request is a reasonable one and expect a favourable reply in the near future."

Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of the petition, let me first of all reiterate the wisdom

of what the people of Harbour Deep are asking for. They are not asking to be slaughters of the wildlife population in the immediate surroundings of Harbour Deep. Anybody who knows that particular part of our Province know that as a local resident of Harbour Deep, unless you can afford to hire an aircraft, you cannot hunt in the Harbour Deep area in the Fall of the year. It is impossible, the sheer cliffs just rise up from the water and, other than the piece of land that the houses are located on, you would have to be a mountain climber to get up over the tops of the mountains and to the plateau and get back on the hills to carry out a hunt. If you were successful in doing that, then you would have very great difficulty in getting an animal back to the community.

So the geography as such that a Fall hunt for those residents, Mr. Speaker, is impractical. It cannot be done. When I was minister of wildlife I asked the officials in the department to look at the possibility of looking at isolated areas. It is not only Harbour Deep. There may be areas on the South Coast of the Province and other areas that are not easily accessible where we could have a properly controlled, very short, maybe a week or a ten-day hunt for males only, with proper control by departmental wildlife officials, so that people who live in those very, and they are very few, but very isolated geographic situations would have an access to wild meat for a food supply.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see anything wrong with it. I think with proper controls implemented by the department, it can be done properly. I can assure the

members of this House that the people of Harbour Deep are not out to chase down pregnant moose with snowmobiles or anything of that nature. That is not the kind of people they are. They are people who live off the land and they live off the sea. But, in order to supplement this part of their living by utilizing a resource, that I might add, Mr. Speaker, is eating them out of house and home - there are just too many animals in the area anyway. All the biologists will tell you that so it is not a biology problem as such. So I think it is a very unique request that bears looking into and bears looking at by the appropriate department and by the officials in that department.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in tabling this petition. I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates and I beg my colleague, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) to look on it with a most favourable eye.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I stand to support this petition.

There are a few conditions which the hon. minister did point out. It has to be insisted that this hunt be supervised and it has to be insisted that this hunt must be for males only because at that time in the year the breeding has already taken place. If you shoot

the female, you could be shooting two caribou or two moose, instead of the one. So it has to be stressed that this has to be clearly supervised and for the stag or the bull only, whether it is moose or caribou.

The other point is, Mr. Speaker, this is not new. There have been seasons open over the past years up there, although not in the immediate past years. About four or five years ago, maybe longer than that, I remember since I moved back to the area since 1971, the seasons were open. There was no great amount of abuse that I was aware of at the time, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly true that the herd is much more accessible in February by the local residents.

There is another point in this petition. I want to draw the House's attention to other areas in the Province to make sure that if this is made available for the residents of Harbour Deep, that there are other places in the Province which also find herds inaccessible. For example, a person in Roddickton can get a license to hunt in September but his license could be down in Taylor's Brook or his license could be in Harbour Deep and he too finds it inaccessible. So when that season is opened up, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it should be confined just to the resident of great Harbour Deep. The area is called 1 on the moose license. I do not know what it is called under the caribou license. When area 1 is opened up to the Harbour Deep residents, I think it also should be opened up to residents in the whole of the Strait of Belle Isle district and the St. Barbe district because that is also their hunting grounds for

caribou and moose as well, Mr. Speaker.

I support this petition. I think it is an excellent idea. I am surprised that it has not been happening because if the area can yield fifty moose, whether they are taken out in September or December or February does not matter as long as it is supervised, as long as stags only are taken. There is no great damage done to the stock, Mr. Speaker.

So I support the petition with the proviso that it would also include the Strait of Belle Isle, the St. Barbe district and other areas of the Province where the herds are also inaccessible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to that petition.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased indeed to speak to this petition which has been so ably presented by my colleague the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). As well, of course, some very interesting points have been made by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker).

Indeed, as the hon. minister has outlined, this is a unique request for a big game hunt in February, in the Wintertime. As the minister has said, this is presently being evaluated and assessed by the Wildlife Division of the department. As the hon.

minister said, there are no concerns that we have that the people would not be responsible when they get into a Winter hunt. Of course, the general wildlife concerns that one would have associated with the a Winter hunt is the assessability and accessibility to big game, particular in snow conditions which would slow the big game down. Of course, snow would act as, I guess, a vehicle for snowmobiles or whatever that would enhance the hunt or make the animals more susceptible, I guess, to abuse if the people were so inclined, of course, which we do not expect they would be.

So, these are the basic concerns that the wildlife Division has and, as I indicated, we will certainly assess it. As the member for the Strait of Belle Isle has said, the hunt will certainly have to be controlled so that it would be for males only because in that time of year you would have pregnant female moose or caribou and if you did shoot one you would take two.

The point that I have to disagree with with the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle is that we certainly could not open up the area to all the Northern Peninsula because if we did, we would probably have more hunters than moose or caribou and, consequently, we would be left without any resource in that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I would just like to say that the Wildlife Division will certainly fully evaluate the requests of the petition and let our points be known to hon. the Minister of Fisheries in due course.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the Curtoglen Parent/Teachers Association from Woody Point.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in addressing this petition, first of all, this same Parent/Teachers Association sent a petition to the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) some months ago. I have asked him about it a number of times and I do not know why he is ashamed or why he will not present it in the House, but I have asked him on a number of occasions to present that petition so that I could stand as their member and support it. I suppose they sent it, this particular Parent/Teachers Association, because they wanted it to go directly to the Minister of Finance who holds the purse strings.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member does not want to mislead the House but he is doing so. I received no such petition for presentation to this House. I have been in communication with certain people in the hon. member's district over this matter and they agree that I have not received a petition, although they

have written to government.

Therefore, for the hon. member to say that there is a petition for this House, it is inaccurate and misleading the House and I do not think it should stand on the record. Indeed, I do not think that the hon. member, now that it has been brought to his attention, I am sure it probably slipped his attention, that that is what he is doing, he should manfully admit that he was in error and withdraw the remark.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. It is a matter of clarification.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. If I thought that I saw the petition that the minister had from my riding, if I thought that, I apologize.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get right to the crux of this particular petition because it is very important. I want to read the prayer. It says: "We, the undersigned, hereby protest the elimination of four meters from the new elementary school reserved for the stage area in Woody Point. In 1986 we do not feel that we can accept the building which is not comparable to other facilities in the districts across this Island."

Mr. Speaker, the couple of hundred people who sent this petition, perhaps the House is aware that these people did, in a way, strike against the construction of this school and they stopped construction for a number of days in Woody Point because, Mr. Speaker, they were absolutely frustrated by being treated as

second class citizens in this Province when it comes to education in rural Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, why do you suppose they stopped the construction of this particular building? After struggling, Mr. Speaker, for fifteen years to get this building constructed in Woody Point, it was their understanding that they would not only get a gymnasium but that they would get a facility whereby they could teach their children theatre arts, dramatic arts, public speaking and have a suitable facility in that gymnasium. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, these gymnasiums are so small that when you host tournaments and what not, such as in the school in Stephenville Crossing, represented by the member for St. George's, where I taught at Assumption High School, the stage becomes very important in high schools and schools of this nature in rural Newfoundland when you are hosting tournaments. Where else can you put spectators? Where else could I, as an English teacher there, have taught theatre arts and drama and public speaking?

So, Mr. Speaker, what we saw here was a new elementary school being built after fifteen years of struggling in the community of Woody Point, which services Woody Point, Shoal Brook, and these areas in Glenburnie on the South side of the Bonne Bay area, \$760,000 was allocated for this new school. Mr. Speaker, I talked to the Chairman of the Integrated Education Committee and he tells me that they have already put in an additional \$50,000. He tells me he sent a letter to the school board saying, "It is up to you now, if you want to come up with the extra \$26,000," because we all



know when the footings are poured and the building is up, you cannot add a stage after that. It would be an incredible cost, it would cost way too much. So, Mr. Speaker, what they did is they said to the school board, "You come up with the money to build the additional shell," just the outside structure, and the Parent/Teachers Association, Mr. Speaker, get this, they would come up with the money to build the internal structure, to build a staging area, to find the money for the curtains, to find the money for the wood and the nails and the supplies to build this properly within this structure.

It must be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the \$26,000 that they think they need, they do not need \$26,000, because the \$26,000 would look after the exterior and the interior. They do not want that. They said, "Just give us the \$18,000 to build this gym, the extra thirteen feet, so our children can have their rightful place in terms of education in this Province."

I mean look, it all boils down to one simple Orwellian commandment, Mr. Speaker: all children in this Province are equal. But, Mr. Speaker, all children in this Province are equal but some children in this Province are more equal than other children under this administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
And that is sad.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

What we are saying Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:  
- in conclusion, is that we need this \$18,000 to construct this extra thirteen feet to give our children in rural Newfoundland the dignity, the right - and it is a moral right, Mr. Speaker - to have a decent and satisfactory education for the rest of their lives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in supporting the petition so ably presented by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), mainly because of some concerns that he has mentioned that, I think, are relevant to many other areas throughout the Province.

It seems that if there is a shortage of money when you go to construct a school, if there is a place to be cut, it is always the gym, and that sort of perturbs me. I have been in several gyms throughout the Province. I have played basketball in a number of them and I find that if you are sitting on a bench, your feet extend over the playing area. In many areas the travel and so on that teams have to do is supported by the money that you can raise from exhibition games. I have seen gyms in new schools where there is no room at all for spectators. It does not make very

much sense to me at all.

So I thought that perhaps we had reached the stage and I have seen some great schools built this year with some great facilities inside, the gymnasium, in particular, I noted in each school. I thought we were back again to building good schools without cutting and including full gyms. It is unfortunate to hear the story we have just heard.

Also there is another matter that perturbs me a bit and I just throw it in here, it is not only inside the school facilities, but the outside school facilities. We are perhaps seeing too many schools built on a piece of land the size of the school where the children have to walk through the door and immediately either on to the street or onto the surrounding rocks. Hopefully we will get to the point very soon where there will be a requirement as to the size of land on which you can build a school.

There are, I know, in England regulations which state that you have to have X number of acres of land before you can build a school to provide for play areas and playing fields. So I think we are a bit behind in that regard and hopefully we can make some regulation changes soon that will bring us up to date.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, now I have seen about everything. The government, building as they are, a school

that is going to cost \$760,000 in Woody Point with the interior being done by the local people, refusing now to go all the way and provide an extra \$18,000 which it is estimated to cost to put this extra thirteen feet on the stage in the school. Mr. Speaker, it is almost unbelievable. You would have to read the petition to fully appreciate the situation.

I am sure the minister being rural Newfoundlander must understand this. In most rural Newfoundland outports, the school is the centre of pretty well all of the cultural and social activity in that community, especially during the Christmas season when you have school concerts and other social activities taking place in the school. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely ridiculous to think that people in one part of Newfoundland can have so much and people in another part of Newfoundland can have so little. As my friend and colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Fury) says, 'It is equal treatment of unequals'. You have people in one part of Newfoundland who are being very unfairly treated and then you have people living in another part who are being well treated. In my view, that is not good enough.

I can certainly support this petition, Mr. Speaker, having come from a small Newfoundland outport and appreciating the importance of this sort of thing in an outport where there are so few facilities for youngsters to enjoy themselves and to have plays and other social activities. I am at a loss to understand how the government can be so cheap, how they can be so miserable to discriminate against these youngsters just for the sake of \$18,000.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that so many people in Woody Point and the surrounding areas took the trouble to circulate this petition and the fact that there was a strike in the area, a demonstration, and that Reverend Fowler, the Anglican Priest in the area took part in that demonstration, surely, Mr. Speaker, that must speak for itself. People just do not, for the fun of it, go out in the bad weather that we have on that coast at times, go around from door to door circulating petitions, demonstrating and a man of the cloth demonstrating with them. It is not being done lightly and it certainly should not be taken lightly by the minister and by his government.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly suggest to the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) that it is not enough to get up in the House and give lip service to this problem. I would suggest to him that he has got it within his authority to correct the problem. Today he can give the order that will make the money available to the people in this community to construct the school properly and to provide that little amenity, a very small amenity, Mr. Speaker, compared to the money being spent in other parts of Newfoundland for gymnasiums and other such facilities. So the minister today should listen to what I am saying. He should give the order to have this problem corrected.

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I commend my colleague for raising it in the House.

MR. HEARN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

For the record, I cannot let it stand to have the member for Twillingate say that the government is building the school and cutting. The decision to build that school and the funding for the school is not provided directly by government at all. The decision as to the size of the gym is not a government decision. The hon. member has been around long enough to know that. It is strictly a decision of the school board. The funding for the school is allocated to the school board by the Denominational Education Committee, whichever one it is, and the board decides what will be done.

If the board found out there is not enough funding there, the request is made to the Denominational Education Committee and to these Committees each year we give \$20 million. Ten per cent is put in by the local board. So you are looking at \$22 million being spent in construction. They are the ones who decide, not government. We give them the funding but the decision is ultimately theirs and I, as minister, or the government generally, has absolutely no say in what size the gym is in any school. That is a decision made, as it should be, at the local level where they know what is needed. Unfortunately, if a bad decision is made, well, then they are the ones who will have to accept the blame for that.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

All of which gives rise, Mr. Speaker, to the very raison d'etre of why we have a Ministry of Education, which was raised during the Estimates Committee.

Why do we have a Minister of Education? We really do not understand why. When you approach the minister about problems dealing with specific issues, it is the school board. When you approach the minister dealing with taxation through the back door dealing with education, it is the School Tax Authority. When you approach the minister with a problem dealing with student aid, or whatever, it is out of his hands. When you approach the minister dealing with the removal of the TV station from Memorial, it is the Board of Regents at Memorial. When you approach the minister and ask him about the removal of the Extension Service of Memorial from rural Newfoundland, it is an administrative decision by Memorial.

Mr. Speaker, all of this gives rise to that point of order, why a Minister of Education, why a salary carved out for a Minister of Education when there is no power, when there is no raison d'etre, when there is no reason to be?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Before recognizing the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) I would like to read out the three questions for the Late Show. The

first one: 'I am dissatisfied with an answer given to me by the Government House Leader concerning a question put to him in today's Question Period concerning the Minister of Public Works and Service's behaviour,' from the hon member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). The second question; 'we are unsatisfied with the answers given today and would like to go on the Late Show' from the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey). That was is addressed to the President of the Council. The third question; 'I am completely dissatisfied with an answer given to me today by the Government House Leader concerning the Minister of Public Work's behaviour' and it is from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, by leave I would like to speak in support of that petition. I am going to have my three minutes regardless so, I would like for leave to be granted. I am going to have three minutes regardless so, I would like for someone on the other side to grant leave.

Mr. Speaker, by leave?

MR. SPEAKER:

Is leave granted?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Two and a half minutes.

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, two and a half minutes. All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is the bottom line in this petition is that instead of a gymnasium, the people down in Woody Point want a gymnasium. That is what they are looking for, just like the one that myself and the minister visited in St. George's High in New Harbour, Dildo a month or two ago.

In most high schools, and in most elementary schools most of the gymnasiums that you see around this Province in recent years, of course, are what people commonly refer to as gymnasiums because they are a combination of both.

Mr. Speaker, who is responsible for the loss of this thirteen feet to me is not really the question here. The question is, how can the problem be solved? Mr. Speaker, if I can take just thirty seconds to draw an analogy. The people in Arnold's Cove, which is a big town in my district and a very progressive town. There is a big new fish plant there, National Sea Products, and they for years and years, Mr. Speaker, not only did not have a gymnasium thirteen feet to short but, they had nothing. They could not seem to get the money out of the school board in Clarendville. What happened, Mr. Speaker? Here is a suggestion and if it is too late for Woody Point -

MR. FUREY:

No, it is not.

MR. CALLAN:

- perhaps it is a suggestion for some other areas of the Province. What the good people in Arnold's Cove did was, since they could not get adequate funding on a timely basis from the school board, they

applied for the maximum at that time of what the Premier refers to as foolish LIP programmes, the ones where you put two fences around the same graveyard and all that. They applied for and received a maximum of \$150,000. Of course, that \$150,000, which was used mostly for labour because it was labour intensive, went a long way, Mr. Speaker, towards preparing at least a shell for the proper gymnasium. I have been in that gymnasium and, as I said, most buildings that are built today, as the member for Woody Point has suggested - you know, just for the sake of another thirteen feet, to leave it out would be terrible. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but stand and support the petition. I thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been waiting very patiently to get this petition presented. I did not think my chance would come this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to see the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell) in his seat, but I do not think he is in the building this afternoon.

MR. TULK:

The hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will take it to him.

MR. EFFORD:

The prayer of the petition states

very clearly to the hon. House of Assembly: "We, the concerned citizens of Country Road, protest the proposed closing of the post office at Country Road, Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of points I want to make here. Point number one is that just last Fall, the people who are presently operating this small post office got a contract renegotiated with the federal government to rebuild a post office at some considerable expense, not having any idea whatsoever what was going to happen in the very near future and that their post office would be closed. I find this, Mr. Speaker, very confusing. The the people in postal services here in Newfoundland would not consider the great expense to build this particular post office, small though it may be, and then a few short months later, inform the people of this small community that they propose to close the post office.

Mr. Speaker, the post office in this particular community serves some 240 people and, to me, it is a serious situation, but it goes to prove one thing: We here in the Province of Newfoundland are continually facing cutbacks. The Tory administration provincially and federally are subjecting the people of the Province to cutbacks, cutbacks, cutbacks, saving money with absolutely no consideration for the hardship that is going to be put on the people in a community, no idea whatsoever of what they are doing to people of the surrounding area and especially, as I said earlier - and I want to make this quite clear - of the financial strain being placed on people who have already gone to the expense of

building this particular building.

Now, if the government of the day, provincially and/or federally, have any consideration whatsoever for the people of this Province, they must realize that if they are going to impose cutbacks and restraints, the people who are going to be most generally affected are the average consumers of any province. Unfortunately, it seems the most restraints are felt by the people of this Province of Newfoundland.

On this petition, there are quite a number of names 'X'ed. All of those people are senior citizens. A great number of them do not own their own vehicles and have no transportation and, if this post office is closed, the nearest post office to that community is about three or four miles away, which means a tremendous expense and inconvenience is going to be placed by the federal department on those people. It is very, very unfair.

Why would any government, whether it be federal or provincial or any party whatsoever, not take into consideration, for a measly few thousand dollars that it costs to operate this post office, the strain on our senior citizens, along with all the other people in this particular community. I cannot see where any government would get any satisfaction or any points to prove where they are going to tell me that they are saving any money. If it would cost the federal government - and I would not expect it to cost any more than \$12,000 or \$15,000 to operate this small post office for one year. Take into consideration the hundreds of thousands of dollars, the millions of dollars, that are being put in large

corporations, and it all comes from the taxpayers or all the provinces and the Province of Newfoundland included, to keep those large corporations going.

So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the government and especially the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell) - it is certainly within his department - to make a special effort to put forth to the federal department and some members in the federal government, to make representation on behalf of the people of the community of Country Road and the people who just built this building at great expense for protection, to see that this does not happen just because the federal government and the post office is going to save a few thousand dollars. We can put millions of dollars into subsidizing Air Canada and it just indicated a few short months ago \$300 million a year to subsidize the farmers of Quebec. Now, if all these millions of dollars can be wasted, surely a mere \$15,000 would not affect the federal treasury by keeping this post office open in Country Road.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

I do not know if anybody on the government benches wants to speak to this petition. If they do, Mr. Speaker, I can go last.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The House Leader wants to speak.

MR. CALLAN:

Okay. The House Leader is going to speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the hon. gentleman spoke and there are two people who have spoken on the other side.

MR. CALLAN:

No, no. This is a new petition.

MR. MARSHALL:

Oh well, you speak and then I will speak.

MR. CALLAN:

I hope that did not use up any of my time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to stand and speak in support of the petition just presented by my hon. colleague. Mr. Speaker, there are two things that we have to look for here. It is common knowledge, of course, how dense some of the people in Newfoundland are that they keep voting Tory. It is beyond me. Because it is a common thread that runs through provincial Tory governments and federal Tory governments that they are off on this big kick of shutdowns and close ups and putting locks on doors, like the Come By Chance Hospital and the Markland Hospital, and the list goes on and on and on.

Here we have, Mr. Speaker, a post office being closed. The human factor is forgotten about, Mr.

Speaker, in a bureaucracy that exists way up in Ottawa. For example, my mother-in-law used to be a post mistress. She was a post mistress for thirty-odd years. The member who just presented that petition, Mr. Speaker, talked about his petition being signed by a lot of people who just had their names signed with an X. They cannot write obviously. I remember when my mother-in-law was the post mistress in Norman's Cove for thirty years or whatever it was. The people who could not read and write, who were often senior citizens, and wanted to come and buy a money order for whatever purpose, either to make an installment or a payment on their car, bank loan or whatever, the post mistress was not required to do it but she, being the kind of woman that she is, went through the trouble of making out the actual money orders and doing all of the paper work and all of the writing that had to be done for these senior citizens. But all of this, as I said, is lost. It is lost in the bureaucracy that exists. Here is a post office, wherever it happens to be, let us shut it down because the people can go three or four miles down the road and use that post office.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that we see here and it must be remembered - and why the message is not getting out and being filtered out I do not know - the thing is that you would expect as the population - we have not had a World War in the last five or ten years, we have not had an earthquake or a flood that has destroyed the population of Canada or of Newfoundland communities - the communities are growing. This is not a community that has been resettled to some other part of Conception Bay. The

population is growing and what we see happening here, Mr. Speaker, is the things that were built up by successive Liberal Governments in Ottawa and this Province, the things that were built up over the last twenty or thirty years are being gradually eroded and destroyed. It does not make any sense to try and reason with members opposite to try and convince them otherwise.

For example, the present government in Ottawa not only are they closing post offices but they are also tampering, Mr. Speaker, with family allowance, the baby bonus, and with old age pensions. They are destroying the things and we have seen it happen with Medicare as well. The things that successive Liberal Governments in Ottawa have given to the people of this country year after year, the things that they need and deserve, like Medicare, MCP, and community post offices, and the baby bonus, and the old age pension, all of these things are gradually being eroded in Ottawa by this government that has only been there for two years.

God help us, Mr. Speaker, God help us if they are in power in Ottawa as long as this crowd have been in power in this Province. After fifteen years, we have seen nothing only a gradual erosion of services and the human touch, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:  
This government, and the government in Ottawa, knows nothing about it. They destroy rather than build up. And God



help us when the time comes for the next election.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

DR. COLLINS:

I defer to the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to have too much to say but in speaking to the petition, that all I can say when I observe and listen to the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is that he was, when he was elected to this House and he is still, a walking inconsistency. He was after all elected as a Reform Liberal, and Mr. Speaker, that in itself is an inconsistency.

All they are doing is just wasting the time of the House. What is the point of getting up and talking about a matter that relates to a federal government responsibility?

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the whole secret of the matter is that I really got up on my feet to foreclose the Minister of Finance from getting up and speaking, so I foreclosed him from speaking now and I will sit down.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, by leave.

MR. MARSHALL:

No.

MR. TULK:

You mean you are a dog without a

lap?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

No, give the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) that.

MR. EFFORD:

You would not support that petition?

DR. COLLINS:

Do I have leave, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. MARSHALL:

No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

No leave.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 19, Bill No. 27. That is a very interesting one, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Public Service Commission Act, 1973".

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that should not really have to take much of the time of the House. I very proudly introduce it on behalf of the illustrious Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the best Minister of

Public Works and Services that this Province has ever seen, and it is An Act To Amend The Public Service Commission Act. What it very, very simply does is it extends the application of the Public Service Commission, that independent body that was set up by the Progressive Conservative successive governments, and is protected and nurtured by this government, in particular the Minister of Public Works and Services.

We have already seen in the past few days, Mr. Speaker, how the Minister of Public Works and Services used his position to refer matters to the Public Service Commission to assure that the merit principle adopted by this government and enshrined in legislation, the Public Service Commission Act, how he did this and how he protected the principle. All this bill does, Mr. Speaker, is enable the powers of the Commission to be extended to agencies as well as bodies. Also, there is a schedule there which is a schedule detailing the departments and the divisions where appointments are made by the Public Service Commission. Mr. Speaker, pretty well every position is done by the Public Service Commission and we want to assure it is done, because it is an independent body and it is executing the policy of this government and the preceding government to appoint on the basis of merit.

So I move second reading.

DR. COLLINS:

Question! Question! It is a housekeeping matter. Question!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, obviously anything relating to the Public Service Commission is a non-controversial item today in this Province. Everything, everything relating to the Public Service Commission has been dealt with, naturally, in a completely up-front, aboveboard, unblemished fashion.

MR. TULK:

No politics.

MR. BARRY:

Like ducks!

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a new incident brought forward in this past two weeks that has left the Public Service Commission Act in tatters. The minister, who with pride points to the fact that he brought in that act, that he drafted the act, in the same way got up in this House and with pride talked about how he had drafted the conflict of interest regulations. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the minister, when those acts were brought in, actually had the principles in his soul, in his heart, in his head that were enshrined in those acts, but, Mr. Speaker, we have had a certain affair, I think we should call it the rotten Haig affair. Something smells, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

In the Department of Public Works and Services.

MR. BARRY:

Something has just been cracked, a story has just been cracked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
The rotten 'aig affair.

MR. BARRY:  
Now, is the member dropping his H's or is he putting them in?

MR. TULK:  
That does not matter with me, you know that.

MR. BARRY:  
Is he dropping them at 'olyrood and picking them up at H'avondale? Mr. Speaker, I think it was the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) who quite properly pointed out -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
I think members elected to this House really are defenders of the people. That is our primary task.

MR. TULK:  
That is what we are trying to do.

DR. COLLINS:  
I think the hon. member is offending against that basic principle. Mr. Speaker, we have dialects in this House from many parts of the Province, and it goes back to olde English days, where some people will drop an H off one word and add it onto another. It is an honourable, well-known dialect in this Province and it should not be made fun of. The people of this Province have every right to be proud of their heritage and proud of their dialect. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition is making fun of this historic and this noteworthy ethnic and, as defenders of the

people, I think we should rise up in anger against him, and, Your Honour, I am sure, will want to rule him out of order.

MR. BAIRD:  
Shame! Shame!

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

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

MR. TULK:  
In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minister of Finance for defending me to the Leader of the Opposition. I have that terrible problem of putting on h's and taking them off. And, do you know something? The Leader of the Opposition and myself we joke about it continuously because, of course, he knows that I am not going to change that and he has no desire to see me change it. So I want to thank him for defending me, but I have to tell him that it is totally unnecessary. The Leader of the Opposition understands.

MR. BARRY:  
And to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I think it should be pointed out that the minister seems to feel that he has to apologize for those people who do that. Now, I should point out to the minister that if you are talking about good English, if you are talking about English the way it was supposed to be spoken, that is the way it was.

MR. TULK:

That is my argument:

MR. BARRY:

It has been documented, Mr. Speaker, by Dr. Story at the University, Professor Kerwin and others at the University, that in Newfoundland we have pockets of dialect that come straight and unblemished from sixteenth century England, from the sixteenth century. The way the English of Shakespeare was spoken is right here in this Province today, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

But I will leave it to the Minister of Finance to decide whether I am putting an 'h' in or not putting an 'h' into the rotten haig affair - all right? Now, I will let the Minister of Finance decide that.

MR. DECKER:

He should be studying his mathematics.

MR. BARRY:

Because an awful stench came through this hon. Chamber, Mr. Speaker, a few days ago -

MR. BAIRD:

That was when the Opposition walked out.

MR. BARRY:

There was the stench, Mr. Speaker,

-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I think I should rule that there is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, I am sorry about that.

But there is still the stench, and it was, Mr. Speaker, when this story broke, when it cracked. Mr. Speaker, when the 'haig' issue broke, there was one terrible odour.

MR. TULK:

There is a chicken sitting on that 'aig, too.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a very valid point. There is a chicken sitting on that cracked 'haig'. It is the first time I have seen a chicken attempt to build a breakwater around a 'haig'. Not a stonewall, Mr. Speaker. It is not a case of stonewalling. We have the case of a Newfoundland chicken trying to build a breakwater around a 'haig'.

MR. TULK:

Around a rotten 'aig.

MR. BARRY:

You know, it is like when you get up early in the morning and you are looking forward to a great breakfast, it is bright and early, the sun is shining, you go and you put on the frying pan, you put some nice butter in the bottom of the pan -

MR. TULK:

The day is young.

MR. BARRY:

- the day is young, you are feeling on top of the world and you say, 'Look, the world is my oyster, I had better have a couple of 'haigs' to keep me going'. You go to the refrigerator, Mr. Speaker, you open up the door, you reach in - you forget that the 'haigs' have been lying around for a while - you go out, you bend over your frying pan, your butter is coming along nicely, the sun is still shining, you have your bacon

there - actually, you have your bacon in the pan, you do not need butter - you have a nice little bit of bacon fat there, you crack your first 'haig' and what do you find? Lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, the 'haig' has been around too long. It has been around too long.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the present Minister of Public Patronage went public with his patronage and this was reported last week, we saw Haig get cracking and there was in this House just one terrible odour.

MR. BAIRD:

That was when you should have gone to roost.

MR. BARRY:

And however much members opposite get up and try to wave, the odour does not disappear. Do you know something, Mr. Speaker, I think it might be a case -

MR. SIMMS:

A point of odour.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, it is a good point of odour. I think it may be a case where there is more than one bad 'aig' in the refrigerator.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

There is more than one bad 'aig' in the refrigerator.

MR. SIMMONS:

They should throw out at least one of them right now.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we had the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) indicate that he, also, was a Minister of Public Patronage

earlier.

MR. TULK:

Pork barrelling.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, we have one Minister of Public Patronage and one Minister of Public Pork Barrelling. I am sorry, I get them mixed up.

MR. FUREY:

That is all part of the job now, is it not?

MR. BARRY:

Now, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), that has been raised. Well, I have to say with that minister I have a number of municipal matters presently pending. We had better be nice to that particular 'haig'.

MR. SIMMONS:

He might be a ham but he is no 'aig'.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, he hams it up a little bit. The municipalities do not see very much bacon from him. He has not delivered the bacon yet. Maybe tomorrow we will find him deliver the bacon for all those municipalities. He should have delivered it a few days ago, a few weeks ago. Maybe tomorrow we will see him deliver the bacon to those municipalities that are waiting for the approval for their works projects.

MR. TULK:

Would that have anything to do with Friday being 'the' Friday.

MR. BARRY:

Friday is a good day for the minister to get his publicity.

MR. TULK:

I wonder, does he believe the

House is closing?

MR. SIMMS:

'Leo', we were just assessing you and we think you are cracking up.

MR. TULK:

No, he is not the 'aig'. The chicken is in.

MR. BARRY:

Some chicken! Mr. Speaker, this Public Works Commission Act, we cannot let the minister sneak this in when he looks up in the press gallery and sees nobody there. He thinks the press have gone home for the day. The rotten 'haig' affair is going to be around for a while, Mr. Speaker, and I think that it should be discussed in the context of the adequacy of the Newfoundland Public Service Commission Act.

Before I close I would just like to say that perhaps the minister should consider, and maybe the Government House Leader should listen to this, an additional amendment, and maybe we should propose one, that all temporary employees as well as permanent employees go to the Public Service Commission and be dealt with directly by the Public Service Commission.

MR. TULK:

There is an amendment coming up.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! It is now 5:30.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, it is 5:30 and it is Late Show time. If I could just close with this note.

MR. SIMMS:

The yoke is on you.

MR. BARRY:

This is one 'haig' that is not young, Mr. Speaker. To put it another way, it is the first young 'haig' that I have ever seen that smells.

MR. BAIRD:

And you sound like a turkey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I adjourn the debate.

### Debate on the Adjournment

#### [Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:

A motion to adjourn is deemed to be on the floor. I would call on the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, we were pointing out to the hon. House Leader, the President of the Council, the Acting Premier and, of course, the resident chicken that there are a number of cases here that have been established in and outside of Hansard, on public television, on the radio waves of this Province, and inside of this House, whereby the Minister of Public Works has stated clearly, unequivocally, and in a very synoptic manner to the point, on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, that there was no memorandum sent by him to departmental officials stating that two of these officials should not appear on a departmental Selection Committee again.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me take you through this, and I want the hon. House Leader to show us today, and in the Late Show this afternoon, where it is that this minister's words have been taken out of

context. Now, he has slithered, he has slid, he has ducked, he has connived, he has played with the language, he had toyed, deflected, distracted, done it all, but the facts of the matter are, Mr. Speaker, that we are talking about three words and here they are in quotes, "No, Mr. Speaker."

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. FUREY:

What is his problem anyway?

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. member is clearly out of order in what he is saying. He is discussing a matter that Your Honour has taken under advisement, to bring in a ruling on, and he is now debating this issue. He is really showing tremendous disrespect to Your Honor by engaging in this sort of around the backdoor remark after Your Honour has clearly said, 'I have heard enough on this issue now. I am going to make a ruling on it at a future date.' So to bring it up now in debate I think it is very disrespectful to the Chair and I think the hon. member should clue up his remarks. Perhaps we could give him thirty seconds to clue up his remarks.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, that is just a display of the chicken and the

Care Bear waltzing to Let Us Waste Time. Mr. Speaker, what I was pointing out very clearly-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, I find it difficult, during this half hour which is for answers for members who were dissatisfied with answers given earlier in the week, to pinpoint that. I think the hon. member is in order.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what we are pointing out very clearly is that we are asking the Acting Premier, the hon. House Leader who loves to act as though he were Premier, to come clean with this House of Assembly and to deal with the facts as they are laid out in Hansard. There is no confusion here. There is no twisting of words. There is nothing taken out of context. How can one take, 'No, Mr. Speaker,' out of context? Now the questions were very clear as well, Mr. Speaker. We asked the Minister of Public Works did he have a memo instructing two officials to stay off these selection committees. The answer, "No, Mr. Speaker." The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) asked the same question to the Minister of Public Works: Answer, "No, Mr. Speaker." This member for St. Barbe asked the same question, "Was there a memo?" Answer: "No, Mr. Speaker." The hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked: "Was there a memo?" Answer: "No, Mr. Speaker." On four occasions -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:  
You heard, 'Order!' Sit down.

MR. FUREY:  
- the Acting Premier -

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

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
My point of order is, was that minister misleading the House -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:  
- and is this minister misleading this House?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is abusing the rules of the House.

MR. BAIRD:  
He should be named.

MR. SPEAKER:  
He is getting up on a spurious point of order. It is completely out of order.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, all I can say is this, it really is a shame, you know, it really is a shame. All the Fureys in Harbour Main - all of them Tories - would be rolling over in their graves to hear the hon. gentleman! The hon.

gentleman got away somewhere, and the hon. gentleman, when he got away, lost all common sense - he had to lose all common sense when he became a Liberal.

Look, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak for five minutes, all I will just say once again, and will repeat once again, the actions taken by the Minister of Public Works were actions that were taken in order to preserve the principle of merit, that has been adopted by this government and practiced by this government. What he did, and he very properly did, was that the did not feel that the interdepartmental committee were proceeding on a basis that would result in appointments being made by merit, so what the hon. gentleman did was he referred it to the Public Service Commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Far from the point of the hon. the Minister of Public Works having to explain himself or to resign or misleading the House, the Minister of Public Works is due the commendation of this House for the actions that he took, because what he did was he wanted to preserve appointments by merit in the public service. That is it.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
I asked a question today of the minister. Of course, it was in relation to the 'aig affair, and



after hearing the answers of the hon. gentleman today and seeing how chicken he is, like he has behaved over this matter, and seeing that there is a rotten 'aig, we are beginning to wonder on this side which came first in this misleading thing, was it the chicken or was it the 'aig? Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman came into this House and I think he says that he resigned from Moores' Cabinet over certain issues, the former Premier's Cabinet, over certain issues. But in actual fact, I have a letter here now I think would indicate why the hon. gentleman got flicked out of that Cabinet. Really it was Premier Moores who gave him the flick. But in any case, he came into this House as the champion of the public service - no more wrong in government. He brought in an act, which we were debating a few minutes ago, that he claims to be the sole author of. His soul was in it. Everything that he could find, his whole political being was in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to put an act in the Legislature and to have it passed but it is another thing not to be chicken enough to see 'aig' all over it. That is what we have seen. I think in this particular case the chicken came first.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can stand over there all he likes, he can stand over there from now until eternity and deny that the Minister of Public Works misled this House. He can deny it forever. Black and white, in Hansard, which I understand the gentleman reads regularly, and he does not leave out a period when he is looking at it. As a matter of fact, I understand he will probably go up to Hansard and have

everything changed to look a certain way if he said something, to have it edited properly. The hon. gentleman yesterday evening missed something. Under the pressure of the Opposition he was forced to bring in and read from - which he refuses to table but I can tell him that it is soon coming out, and give him a warning, it will be out - a memo in which it was clearly shown that the Minister of Public Works had said one thing in this House and that the memo said another thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he might stand up and claim - this has to be remembered - that the Minister of Public Works was acting in ignorance, but he cannot do that. He knows he cannot do that. Because in Parliament, in this Legislature; there is a process that ministers have used quite often on the other side when they do not know the answer to a question, and quite rightly so, so they have taken certain questions under advisement. But the Minister of Public Works did not do that. He replied to one question in particular, 'No, Mr. Speaker', four times. By doing so he put his head on the political chopping block.

I want to say to the chicken who is sitting on the 'aig' that the hon. gentleman would do well to get off the 'aig' and to see that justice is done in this Province because while he may smile nervously at the cameras, CBC and NTV, while he may look at them as much as if to say, 'I know this is all out of context', well I would ask him what the context was. When a minister is asked a question four times and he replies, 'No, Mr. Speaker', when that is contrary to the facts, when that is untrue, as the

President of the Council knows -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:

He knows full well that he should act and I call upon him to get up now and say that, 'Yes, the Minister of Public Works should tender his resignation', or 'Cluck, cluck, cluck'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what is the point? They are beating it to death. I mean they want to talk about 'aigs now but I tell you now where the shells are on the other side: the shells represent the heads of the hon. members because they are soft in the head and you can tell that they are because of the way in which they are reacting to this. It is ridiculous.

The fact of the matter is, the Minister of Public Works and Services called a competition to fill certain temporary jobs in the Department of Public Works and Services. It is the policy of this government to appoint on the basis of merit. The Minister of Public Works and Services had reasonable and probable grounds to believe that the appointments, through this particular committee, would not be on the basis of merit. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, he wrote to his deputy minister and said, 'Because of this I am inclined' - now mark this, he did not say appoint

somebody else, he did not say, as has been alleged appoint four people from Harbour Grace or four from Upper Island Cove, and he did not wish to appoint anybody of his own volition, but what he wanted to do was preserve the policy of this government - which is the appointment, on temporary or permanent basis on the basis of merit. So what he did, having reasonable and probable grounds to believe that it would not result in appointment on merit, was refer it to the Public Service Commission. Once again I say, instead of being criticized, I think the hon. minister is due the commendation of this House and the people of the Province for preserving this principle of merit, just as the Minister of Public Works and Services is due, as well, the commendation of the Province and the Opposition for the way in which he has seen The Public Tender Act in this Province administered. There are no more problems with respect to the contracts, just as the Minister of Public Works and Services is entitled to commendation in this particular case because he wanted to preserve appointments in the public service on the point of merit. That is the answer, the whole and complete answer.

As to the hon. gentleman quoting from Hansard, they can quote from Hansard all they like, but if anyone fair-minded wants to read the entire proceedings of Hansard, they will see that what I am saying is entirely consistent with what the Minister of Public Works and Services did in the series of questions. They are picking paragraphs and statements out of context, and that is all that they are doing. It is not getting them anywhere, and I do not know why they do not want to debate the

affairs that really are of interest to the people of this Province rather than dragging a matter to death.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader on this issue reminds me of the little grey hen that was becoming a little broody and was strolling down the road just after an ostrich had passed. And the little gray hen saw this enormous object on the road. Her eyes widened, Mr. Speaker, and all she could do was flap her wings and take a run at it. It was all she could do to get up on top of this oval object, Mr. Speaker, this ostrich egg.

MR. BAIRD:

'Leo', I think you are quacking up!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

This was the situation, Mr. Speaker - you had this little gray hen up on top of that ostrich egg. And she flapped her wings and moved her feathers this way and that, you know how they do it, Mr. Speaker, trying to cover that egg.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to point out to the Government House Leader who has been put in the position of Erik Nielsen, that all the stonewalling of Erik Nielsen could not save Mr. Sinclair Stevens. And I would like to suggest that the Prime Minister of Canada did a

very wise thing when he called for the resignation of Mr. Stevens until a public inquiry had determined whether in fact, Mr. Speaker, there was anything to the allegations.

Now, here, it is not a matter of allegations. Here we have the minister coming in and confessing he is the minister of public patronage. He has confessed publicly. And I would just recommend to the Government House Leader that he consider his own image, consider the image of this administration, consider the Premier's image when he decides to stay up on top of that ostrich 'aig', and perhaps he should keep in mind that maybe he should not put all his 'aigs in one casket!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Because, Mr. Speaker, he is going to find that putting all his 'aigs' into that casket, that casket, Mr. Speaker, of political corruption, is going to see the burial, the interment, Mr. Speaker, of all members on that side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

And there is room for you, 'Matthews'..

MR. BARRY:

He was gone before the rotten 'aig affair. He was gone long ago.

MR. SIMMONS:

Who better to do it than the undertaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing worse than having a rotten 'aig smeared over you. There is nothing worse, Mr. Speaker, than having a rotten 'aig smeared over you. It is hard, it takes years and years, Mr. Speaker, to get rid of the stench.

MR. BAIRD:

You should know.

MR. BARRY:

Well, I have had to duck a few from the other side periodically, but I think we have managed so far.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we have an admission of abuse of position. But worse than that - that issue was bad enough, the public patronage issue - we now have a situation where a minister has come in, Mr. Speaker, and not spoken truthfully in response to questions from the Opposition or from the press. And precedent requires, if there is going to be respect maintained for the legislative process, if the principle of government and ministerial accountability is to be upheld, that minister must go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what can happen is that the minister is shuffled away after the House closes. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. We know the minister will not be back here after this Summer. We know that. But, Mr. Speaker, I

tell the Government House Leader, and I tell the Premier, that if it were done, it be good that it were done quickly. Because, Mr. Speaker, doing it privately, after the House of Assembly closes, quietly, is not going to disassociate members opposite from that abuse of office and from that breach with parliamentary tradition which we have seen over the last week in this House.

So let the Government House Leader get up and admit, as the Premier has said, that he disagrees with what the Minister of Public Patronage has said - presumably what he has done, too, although he has not said that. If there is that disagreement, let the Government House Leader respect the principle of Cabinet solidarity and pass on the message now to this House that the Premier has asked for that minister's resignation if the minister has not had the honour to already pass it in to the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

It is moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn.

All those in favour 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'Nay'.

Carried.

The House stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.