



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 47

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Phil Wood*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Thursday

5 June 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I have recently come into and seen, and I have in my possession, some papers that were dropped to me in an unusual manner.

MR. PATTERSON:

The Dead Sea Scrolls.

MR. TULK:

No, they are not papers concerning the member for Placentia.

Mr. Speaker, they are obviously papers that are from the former Minister of Fisheries files, and I will be sending a copy to the Chairman of the Privileges and Elections Committee. They are papers that perhaps might be considered departmental papers. As a result of looking over them, I felt that I should bring to the attention of the House the fact that I have received them. They take a far different outlook on the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, for example, than we would take perhaps in this House when speaking of the mandate of the Saltfish Corporation. In view of the fact that there have been some questions asked to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) concerning Armazans - is it? - I think, that is the correct pronunciation. My pronunciation of Newfoundlandese is not too good, let alone Portuguese. But since they make some reference to that company,

and there were some questions asked, I understand, about some \$2 million -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I am wondering what the point of privilege is?

MR. TULK:

The point of privilege is that I want the House to be aware, and I do not want to impede the progress of the House, Mr. Speaker, in any way, and I want to table those reports so that the administration, perhaps the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries, and the former Minister of Fisheries, and, as well, the Chairman of the Privileges and Elections Committee can use this information. To be quite frank with you, I see very little evidence of anything damaging there, but I would want the administration to have those papers so that they can take a look at them to see, if indeed, there is anything there relating to Armazans or if there is anything indeed relating to Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker, I want to table this.

MR. PATTERSON:

How many on the other side have read the thing?

MR. TULK:

I do not know.

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, by virtue of the Newfoundland Fish Inspection Act, my department is responsible for the licencing of fish buyers and processors. The aims of this licencing programme are to support the processing sector of the industry by regulating processing capacity, and to establish standard practices for processing operations as well as for controlling the quality of finished products. Mr. Speaker, the Fish Inspection Act, with its various licencing and regulatory activities, is a reflection of government policy towards the maintenance of an appropriate environment that will allow fish processors to operate in an orderly manner.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, that this licencing programme continue to be effective in providing adequate regulatory support to the industry, support which will further strengthen the processing sector and thus have a positive effect on fishermen and others in the industry.

In this context, I have directed my department to review policies and regulations pertaining to licencing on a regular basis. These ongoing reviews will be carried out in consultation with the industry. Recently I discussed several proposed changes with both the processors associations and the Fishermen's Union, and I am pleased to announce today that the following policies are now in effect for 1986:

One, BUYERS' LICENCES: Buyers' licences for groundfish, pelagics, squid, crab and shrimp will be restricted to licenced processors. Licences for salmon, lobster and other species normally

marketed in an unprocessed state remain unrestricted. Also, a grandfather clause will be instituted to protect bona fide buyers with substantial industry investment. However, the licences of all non-processor/buyers will be thoroughly reviewed on an annual basis. Further to this action, industry has requested the introduction of a sunset clause to eventually reduce the number of non-processor/buyers and my department presently has this request under advisement.

Two, PLANT EXPANSION: (a) All expansion to existing processing plants will continue to require prior ministerial approval. (b) Plant expansion will mean any addition to a plant that will increase throughput capacity. (c) Expansions will only be considered for approval where any or all of the following criteria have been met: First, the use of new technology to better utilize the resource;

secondly, the development of new products - including secondary processing - or the processing of underutilized species; thirdly, the installation of basic necessities to improve overall quality or viability.

Proposed expansions not involving government funding or government facilities will be favoured.

Three, THE LICENCING BANK: The licencing bank concept will be discontinued and licences which are inactive for a two year period will be cancelled. The minister will have the option to reinstate the licence of a specific facility. However, no licence transfers will be made between plants. I guess the paper has gone around, has it?

Four, THE ASSIGNMENT OF A PROCESSING LICENCE: An operator will be licenced to process a designated species in a specified plant identified by a licence number corresponding to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans certification number.

Five, PROCESSING LICENCE CATEGORIES. To allow processors the opportunity to process a variety of species, my department will move towards issuing licences which give greater flexibility in this regard. At present, a groundfish licence allows a producer to buy and process all groundfish species. We intend to pursue the same concept with pelagic species rather than issuing licences for a particular species. This concept will be introduced over a period of time depending on individual plant current operations and requirements.

Six, DEFINING MINIMUM PROCESSING AS A CONDITION FOR GROUND FISH LICENCES: The following condition will apply to the issuing of groundfish processing licences: "All species must be processed prior to export. For this purpose, processing is defined as (a) filleting, (b) splitting and salting and (c) any other standardized process - acceptable to the department - required to accommodate final market specifications."

Seven, APPLICATION OF FISH INSPECTION ACT FOR LOCAL RETAIL TRADE The Department of Fisheries will further investigate the retail fish trade within the Province with a view to establishing appropriate regulations and guidelines to ensure acceptable and consistent levels of quality.

Eight, THE ISSUING OF PROCESSING PERMITS DURING THE GLUT FISHERY: Temporary glut permits will, subject to the following conditions, be issued to allow companies to process cod in facilities that are normally not licenced for groundfish: (a) salt fish process only; (b) the facility must be certified under D.F.O. regulations for saltfish operations; (c) the period of issuance will be for June and July with extensions only on the recommendation of the Cod Glut Trigger Committee.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I will be requesting government approval to amend applicable regulations so that:

(1) Licencing periods will be based on a calendar year rather than on a fiscal year to comply with all other fisheries management systems and statistics.

(2) A set fee structure will be implemented for licencing as opposed to the present system where fees are based on estimated production. On average, there will be little or no change in the actual fee paid.

Mr. Speaker, these measures are designed to provide a more streamlined and a more consistent licencing system.

I would also like to inform this hon. House that government intends to maintain a restrictive policy on processing capacity. I should not have to remind anyone about the considerable over-expansion of the fishing industry after the 200 mile limit was declared in the late 1970's. This over-capitalization and its associated heavy debt burden contributed largely to the severe

economic crisis from which we are only now emerging. That mistake, Mr. Speaker, must not be repeated. Since the number of plants is a major factor in the sharing of the resource, too many plants means too few fish for everyone. Also, a processing sector that is overcapitalized, is not capable of paying the best wages to its employees, or of paying top prices to the fishermen who supply the resource. If we are to have a strong fishing industry we must, therefore, align processing capacity with available resources. As well, we must increase both productivity and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, while it is necessary to maintain certain restrictions with regard to our licencing programme, we do want to ensure that all applicants receive fair and consistent treatment. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have established an appeals committee, removed from government, to which all applicants who are rejected by the licencing division can appeal. To date this committee has heard six appeals. In three of those cases the appeals were recommended for approval and licences were subsequently issued.

Over the past ten years, Mr. Speaker, we have learned that the fishery, like any other industry, must have the appropriate regulatory controls. Although it is desirable that such controls be developed jointly by both government and industry, it is government's responsibility to see that they are enforced adequately, consistently, and fairly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, while I thank the minister for having given me a copy of his statement a half-hour prior to House time, I think this is the sort of paper that in fact does represent some far-reaching changes in the licencing policies of the Department of Fisheries as it relates to processors, the sort of paper that should have been, maybe, presented in the form of a White Paper by the minister well in advance of the dates on which the policies would come into effect. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this is the sort of thing that maybe should have been referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries to enable members on that committee to study the implications of this policy paper.

So, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared at this time to commit the members of this side of the House to some of the policy changes recommended or at least, announced by the minister in this paper. We will be studying it over time, and afterwards, of course, making some comments on it.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, in the first page of the minister's statement, he talks about the ongoing review and the fact that it will be discussed with industry, and he goes on to say, 'Recently I discussed several proposed changes with both the processors and the Fishermen's Union,' - several changes. One of the questions I would like the minister to answer is, did he discuss all of these changes? - the minister indicates he did? Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said a moment ago, that the changes

recommended or at least stated in this paper would, to me, represent some far-reaching changes with some very serious implications on the processing sector and, for that reason, I believe that we should have been given more notice than we have been in terms of being able to react properly to it.

I would strongly suggest to the minister that before any further such recommendations or changes are made in the licencing policy of his department, that maybe a White Paper be prepared and presented to members of the House and to the people involved in the Province.

The minister, in the statement mentions the cancellation or at least a change in the buying licencing processes of his department. For example, fish buyers as we now know them, people who are non-processors, under this new regulation will be phased out. And while he does mention the fact that there is going to be a grandfather clause, I think, in the licencing process, it might well be, considering the fact that some of these people do have very substantial investments in their operations - while maybe they are not involved in processing, there are certain costs and certain monies involved in setting up to become a bona fide buyer of fish in this Province - it might well be that the government should contemplate or consider compensation to some of these fish buyers. It is not enough to just say that we are going to gradually phase them out with the grandfather clause and so on, and the sunset clause. Who knows what effect this policy statement will have on their operation even this year?

So, for that reason, if it can be shown that people are suffering financially or will be affected financially or will incur financial losses by virtue of this new policy, then certainly I think government has a responsibility to compensate those people.

I am happy to see in the statement, Mr. Speaker, that there is an Appeals Committee established, and having checked and gotten the names of that Committee I must say I have no quarrel with that committee or with the makeup of it; Mr. Hennessey, Mr. Cliff Russell, Mr. Gilbert Inkpen, Mary Lou Peters, secretary. These are people we have no quarrel with on this side of the House. They are all fine, reputable people. Certainly Mr. Russell and Mr. Hennessey and Mr. Inkpen - he, I think, was involved as the Executive Director of the Independent Fish Processors. I think he is retired now. Certainly we would have no quarrel with the makeup of that Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that these are some far-reaching policy changes, far-reaching in terms of the processing sector in the Province, and, for that reason, while we do not disagree with most of them, we recognize the need to tidy things up and to get things back on an even keel, Mr. Speaker, need I remind the minister that sometimes governments are inclined to become too restrictive in terms of licencing and that is one thing I think the minister should watch in terms of policy changes within his department. We will be studying this paper, Mr. Speaker, and going through it and considering how it will affect the processing sector, and no doubt we will be commenting on it to a greater extent some time in the

future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Before I make my statement, as Minister of Agriculture, I must strongly object to the partisan use of the hogs of this Province such as in the picture that was laid on my desk by the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). It is a nice picture, a very nice picture of the pig.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce to this House a further advance in the policy of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador as it pertains to the development of credit unions in this Province.

The Credit Union Council of Newfoundland and Labrador was incorporated in 1977 and is the umbrella organization for all credit unions in the Province. The council has developed a long-term credit union development plan to assist in extending financial services, through credit unions, to rural and remote areas of the Province. The council, through the project funding programme of the Rural Development Subsidiary Agreement II, received \$100,000 in 1985 to establish a credit union development fund.

I am pleased to announce that on May 16, 1986 a further amount of

\$120,000 was approved for this development fund. It is designed to be a revolving fund to help defray the initial start-up costs of new and emerging credit unions. Three rural credit unions are now successfully availing of the development fund and four new rural credit unions will come on stream this year with the invaluable assistance of this fund.

The Co-operative Development Division came to my department in 1980 and since then Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has shown a strong commitment to co-operative and credit union development in this Province, especially in rural areas. My announcement today, of the \$120,000 grant to the Credit Union Council of Newfoundland, is a prime example of government's support of locally owned and controlled financial institutions in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see this statement by the minister. I want to thank him for giving me a copy beforehand. We support this assistance to the credit unions of the Province. These credit unions are providing an important service in various parts of the Province. I think, for example, of the district of Eagle River where there was a bank pulled out from the Straits area, a couple of years ago, and the local residents

were deprived of any banking services. At that point in time, they decided to set up a credit union. I understand that it has apparently been successful to date and I would hope that it would continue to be, and they now have local banking services provided to that part of the Province which would otherwise not have been available.

Credit unions have been with us for a long time and perhaps at times we forget just how valuable and important they are because they have been around. They are not a new, innovative concept. I think they may be overlooked from time to time in the important work that they are doing. So I am pleased to see that the minister's department is recognizing the contributions made by credit unions to our Province and I hope we will see continued attention paid to these very valuable institutions which see that valuable services are provided in many parts of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

At this stage I would like to welcome to the visitors gallery twenty Grade IX students from St. Anne's Academy, Dunville, with their teacher, Doris Smith.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before calling Oral Questions there are a number of matters that I will try and deal with today. One was a point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons)

in connection with remarks made by the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). I must rule that there was no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

The second one was a further point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage. I have gone through it very carefully and, as far as I can see, he took the opportunity of getting up and making certain statements, but there was certainly no question of his privileges being breached.

The final one was a point of order raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). I must rule that there was no point of order but a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

### Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I have here in front of me a couple of papers and one is the editorial from today's Evening Telegram, "Jobs for the faithful", and I just want to quote the last line, "It's not what you know, it's who you know." And this is a result of the confession made public on TV by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) just recently, and I find it very disgraceful. But I would like to ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, if he would undertake to



investigate the Minister of Public Works' actions in appointments to jobs for a list of people that I hold here in my hand, Mr. Speaker, and especially in light of what he said yesterday, that if we give him some examples and he would look into it. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a list of names that I do not wish to make public but if the Premier would assure the House that some time before the house closes he would take this list of names and undertake to investigate if the Minister of Public Works gave these people jobs as political buddies or if they were given on their merits, or in what way did these people receive the jobs. If the Premier would guarantee us that he will report back after investigating the actions of the Minister of Public Works, I will hand over, Mr. Speaker, this list of names to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is getting to be a bit foolish. I suppose if we want to we could go back and investigate how the Executive Assistant to the Manager of the Marystown Shipyard was hired a few years ago when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was Minister of Development, and whether a competition was held, or how various other matters were handled by the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) when he was the Minister of Fisheries. I mean how far do you want to take this idea? I do not know.

As I said to the Leader of the Opposition and other members opposite yesterday about permanent

employment as opposed to temporary employment, the case I just spoke of, down in the Marystown Shipyard when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Development, involved a permanent position which was filled without competition, over which he had some influence apparently, and insisted upon a certain person being hired down there without competition.

On permanent employees in the public service, which is 99 per cent or 99.5 per cent of the public service, it is done through the Public Service Commission and it is done totally aboveboard. When it comes to temporary employment, there is employment for two or three weeks or four or five weeks or five or six weeks, the department concerned hires people whom they consider to be competent, whom they consider to have experience, whose performance they consider - all factors are considered in it. I know of no instance where those factors have not come to play in it. So I am not going to get into a game of names here, Mr. Speaker, with the member for Port de Grave. All I can say to the member for Port de Grave is that the hiring of temporary employees by this government is done according to all of the factors which normally go into the hiring of anybody for any position. As it relates to permanent employees, that is done completely by the Public Service Commission anyway.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Premier of this Province that a lot of the names on the paper have been there for a number of years. If the Premier would like me to produce five times the quantity that is on that paper I will certainly do that.

Mr. Speaker, I have also here in my hand a document that I will table in this House. It was cut out of a recent local paper and read, 'Democracy, of the people, for the people, by the people' -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The question, please!

MR. EFFORD:  
The Minister of Public Works and Services was quoted as saying, 'According to Mr. Young, the Town of Upper Island Cove need not expect any consideration from him in the future because of the fact that the majority of people in the town voted against him in the last provincial election.' Will the Premier undertake to investigate to see if this is an accurate statement and was made by the Minister of Public Works and Services? Does he agree with this type of statement?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, tell the hon. the member for Port de Grave not to be so foolish.

MR. EFFORD:  
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, this is an ad taken out in the paper by the Minister of Public Works and Services and where it states, 'By a means of preventing patronage and a deterrent to Conflict of Interest amongst ministers.' Now, the minister has clearly stated and clearly confessed to using his position to get jobs. Will the Premier explain to the people of this Province that he either agrees with what the Minister of Public Works and Services is doing publicly or that he does not agree with it?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, the member for Port de Grave should ask his leader how he hired people at the Marystown Shipyard a few years ago.

People in glass houses should not throw stones.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier when he is standing in this House if he is prepared to tell the entire truth and acknowledge that the reference which is made to the person at the Marystown Shipyard was in fact an executive assistant to a retiring minister who was entitled to continued employment with government? So I suggest that the Premier go back to his files and keep looking if that is the only one that he find.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Premier correctly yesterday and again today to say that while he is prepared to accept political patronage and corrupt practices in the hiring of temporary employees, that interference by ministers in the hiring practices of the Public Service Commission would be treated more seriously by him? Is that what the Premier is saying?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the Leader of the Opposition, who can squirm all he likes over there and split hairs, if it involved a former executive assistant, jobs are usually found within the departments not in an agency where the minister responsible insisted to the manager of the Shipyard that he be hired without competition.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier did not answer my question. There representation was made -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I did not answer your question.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker. Well, then, does the Premier stand by his statement yesterday when he said, 'As it relates to permanent employment, as I have said that is done by the Public Service Commission

completely separate from government altogether.' Does he stand by that? And will he treat seriously interference by ministers with the Public Service Commission?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will answer that when the Leader of the Opposition answers this: Did he come to me back when he was a minister and try to insist that number two on a list get a job because he was a friend of the hon. member?

MR. BAIRD:

That shut him up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No more questions! No more questions!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier stated in this House yesterday that when it came to permanent employees, the Public Service Commission is master of its own fate. I would ask the Minister of Public Works would he confirm whether there was competition for four jobs at the Kelligrews Marine Centre for which there were some fifty to sixty applications? And did that competition include four temporary employees who had been previously employed by the minister himself?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public

Works.

MR. YOUNG:  
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
I would ask the minister is it a fact that there were two members of the Department of Public Works sitting on the Selection Committee of the Public Service Commission for that competition? And is it also correct that the minister refused to accept the recommendations of the Selection Committee because the four temporary employees that he wanted employed as permanent employees were not employed?

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

MR. YOUNG:  
No, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

MR. TULK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Would he confirm for this House whether or not it is correct that he was in such a rage that the four people had not been employed permanently, had not been selected by the Selection Committee, that he circulated a memo saying that those two public employees were never again to sit on a public

Selection Committee.

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

MR. YOUNG:  
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
Will the Minister of Public Works and Services confirm that he was in such a rage after receiving these recommendations concerning the Kelligrews Marine Center, which did not include his four temporary appointments for those permanent jobs, that he issued a memorandum barring two of his own departmental civil servants from ever sitting on a Public Service Selection Commission again? Was there a memo circulated from the minister respecting this matter?

MR. YOUNG:  
I have already answered that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Did the minister cancel, nullify or in any way interfere with the recommendations of the Public Service Commission for four jobs at the Kelligrews Marine Center? Did the minister interfere in any way whatsoever?

MR. PATTERSON:  
Sit down, boy! You were a nice

guy but now you are getting nasty like your leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Public Works and Services. It is sad to realize that in Newfoundland, with the youth unemployment rate the highest across the country, every one of them is not given the same opportunity to compete for the few thousand jobs that are available. That is the preamble but it is not my preamble but the preamble of The Evening Telegram, and I could not have put it better myself. I want to ask the Minister of Public Works and Services if he does not acknowledge that this is a great injustice to young people in this Province who are trying to find a job? Will he not acknowledge that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

No, I am not acknowledging anything, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

MR. BARRY:

What a shame! What a shame!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

If he will not acknowledge that, will he consider these jobs that he has at his whim being considered by the Canada Manpower Center for students around this Island? Would he consider sending them to the Center as a better way to allocate jobs fairer throughout the Province? Would he consider that maybe as a possibility to clean up his act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

In all probability, Mr. Speaker, I will consider the letter I had from the hon. member and the letter I had from Mr. Glen Tobin looking for a job - not Glen Tobin. What is the name of the fellow?

MR. BAIRD:

Brian Tobin.

MR. YOUNG:

Brian Tobin, looking for a job for a fellow in Stephenville. I will try to do all I can for the hon. member's constituents.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Public Works. In the defence -

MR. TOBIN:

Did you have a caucus first?

MR. PEACH:

You want to be an official party now, do you?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

My question is for the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker. It has to do with his defence of the hiring that has been going on of residents of his district for his department. His argument has been that permanent positions are not filled that way but filled by the Public Service Commission, but the temporary ones are filled that way.

I would like the minister to explain to us what are the durations of these jobs and what kinds of jobs are we talking about? Are they a couple of weeks duration? Are we talking a couple of years? Could you give us an indication of what kind of jobs you are filling in this manner?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

In most cases, Mr. Speaker, they are from four to six weeks.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

That is curious, Mr. Speaker. My information is that the Minister of Public Works is actually using the system in order to qualify people for unemployment insurance

by hiring them for ten weeks, laying them off and then hiring others. Could the minister confirm or deny that he is using that as a means of qualifying some of the constituents from his district for unemployment insurance?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

On the same topic, the Premier has indicated that 95 or 96 per cent of the positions are permanent and only 3 or 4 per cent are temporary. Could he explain to me why, then, 1300 positions in the General Service bargaining unit, which is about 3,000 to 4,000 as near as I can make out, are now temporary and contractual positions, which means you are talking about 25 per cent are in the range that can be done that way? Would you please explain to me in that particular example we have obviously a much higher percentage and why last Fall, when I put a question on the Order Paper asking all the ministers to give us a list of their temporary employees, only one particular department did and the other twenty-one did not? Could you explain that for me?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have some of the information, but each bargaining unit would differ, and the nature of the work that they have to do so, therefore, some bargaining units might be more susceptible for having temporary employment than others. It is like the departments. For example, the Department of Forestry. There is perhaps a higher demand for temporary work in that department. Mines and Energy is a really good example. The Department of Mines has a lot of temporary employment during the Summer, geophysicists, geologists and so on when they are going out to do their field work. So it will vary from bargaining unit to bargaining unit or from department to department, and that is the reason for it. There is a need.

For example, in the Summertime in the Department of Education, there is a demand for putting out school books and so on to the various schools around the Province. In some other departments there may not be a demand because of the nature of the work that that department does. So that is the reason for it.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether there was a Selection Board established to hire individuals for a Marine Service Centre, which passed recommendations in to the minister, whereupon the minister cancelled the competition?

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

MR. YOUNG:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Would the minister confirm whether this competition was to hire permanent employees?

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

MR. YOUNG:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Would the minister confirm whether he issued a memorandum, following receipt of the recommendations of this Selection Board, to the effect that the representatives of his department who had sat on the board should never again be allowed to sit on a Selection Board?

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

MR. YOUNG:  
Yes and no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:  
What do you mean, 'yes and no'?

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Would the minister explain to this House what he means by 'yes' and what he means by 'no'?

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

MR. YOUNG:  
I meant, Mr. Speaker, two words, yes and no:

MR. TULK:  
You are stonewalling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:  
Will the minister answer the question? Let us break it down. First of all did the minister issue a memorandum regarding who should or should not sit on future Selection Boards?

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

MR. YOUNG:  
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Will the minister explain to this

House why he cancelled a competition when recommendations were received from the board? Will he confirm it was because they did not select the individuals whom the minister wanted put in those permanent positions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, that is a twofold, threefold, fourfold question.

MR. BARRY:  
Answer it. Yes, yes, yes, no. Or no, no, no, yes. Or no, yes, yes, no.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, I am trying to answer the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's question. I said yes I cancelled a competition to fill permanent positions at the MED centre. I answered that.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Was this competition going through the Public Service Commission?

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

MR. YOUNG:  
No, Mr. Speaker, that is why it



was cancelled.

MR. TULK:

So it was for permanent jobs!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, did the minister authorize the holding of this competition in the first place?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Be very careful 'Haig.' Be very careful.

MR. YOUNG:

Never mind 'Haig'. I did not authorize this competition and that is why it was cancelled, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Will the minister confirm whether there has been a subsequent competition to fill these jobs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

No, Mr. Speaker, but the process in the system is that the competitions will be done by the Public Service Commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Will the minister indicate whether there were temporary employees selected by the minister in those positions and that those temporary employees continued since the board was initially set up?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

There again, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes and no. Be more specific about your question and I will give you an answer.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Were there temporary employees in these positions for which the competition was being held?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services..

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Were these temporary employees recommended by the minister and hired as a result of the minister's influence?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Have these temporary employees continued in those positions since the competition was cancelled?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and they will be until permanent employees are appointed by the Public Service Commission.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Will the minister indicate how long ago the competition was called for?

MR. SIMMS:

Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. BARRY:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I could not say. I would not like to mislead the House. Mr. Speaker, I could not say. Put it on the Order Paper and I will get the answer for you.

MR. BARRY:

I thank the minister for that very clear statement. Let us have a little shot. Would the minister indicate -

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the member for Menihek:

MR. FENWICK:

I am sorry, 'Leo.' I will give it back to you in a minute.

I would ask the Minister of Public Works have you been informed by your colleagues in the House here to stop saying anything because your stupid comments are putting them so far in a hole that you cannot possibly rise against?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services..

MR. YOUNG:

I presume, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked me a question and I could not hear it. Did the hon. gentleman ask me a question?

MR. MATTHEWS:

He does not have intelligence enough to ask a question.

MR. YOUNG:

It is too bad, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be able to answer

the hon. gentleman. If it is parliamentary, I would like to be given the definition of a mainlander. It would be a low blow.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Would the minister indicate whether that competition was called this year, last year or the year previously?

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

MR. YOUNG:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I could not say.

MR. BARRY:  
You do not know.

MR. YOUNG:  
It could have been in December when it was called or it could be in January when it was called. But 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.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You walked into that one, did you not?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
He sure did.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Did the minister request that this be immediately referred to the Public Service Commission? Did the minister request immediately upon receiving the recommendations that it be referred to the Public Service Commission?

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

MR. YOUNG:  
I do not know if it was immediately, Mr. Speaker. Knowing how the hon. gentleman was acting, 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 to now, Mr. Speaker, in the process.

MR. BARRY:  
Since yesterday.

MR. YOUNG:  
Not since yesterday. I know you do not know one day from the other, my boy. Mr. Speaker, it is being done by the Public Service Commission. Now I do not know how long it takes for the process to be done. They are permanent positions and they will be filled by the Public Service Commission. That is all I can say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

If I tell the minister that the Public Service Commission was contacted this morning and knows nothing about any such competition, could the minister explain that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I do know the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's flunkey phoned the Public Service Commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Leader of the Opposition this that if it is not there it is not my fault. The order was issued that this go through the Public Service Commission and I cannot do no more than that. If I did more I would be accused of interfering with the Public Service Commission. The person the hon. gentleman's flunkey phoned this morning probably did not know anything about it. It could be further down the line. Probably it is in the system to be called. I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Did the minister issue these instructions to his officials verbally or in writing?

MR. PATTERSON:

No, on a tape. He put them on a tape for them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know, but I guess, Mr. Speaker, I could find out. I will get up under oath because I am not allowed to lie to the House, Mr. Speaker. I would not dare do that. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman will give me time I am sure he will find the date that Haig Young wrote 'Go to PSC.'

I can tell the hon. gentleman where he is going.

MR. BAIRD:

And he will not need an overcoat.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the Premier indicate whether he will investigate the evasive answers given by the minister in the course of his responses today? Will the Premier clearly, without attempting to avoid answering the question as he did yesterday, indicate is this what he got into politics for? Is he satisfied with the minister's approach to hiring temporary employees or permanent employees on the basis of political patronage? Does he support that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of allegations there about why I got involved in politics or why I did not get involved in politics and all the rest of it. Could the Leader of the Opposition answer this question? Did he come to me a number of years ago -

MR. BARRY:

That has nothing to do with this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Answer the question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It does because it is vile hypocrisy that the Leader of the Opposition is propagating upon the people of Newfoundland. Did the Leader of the Opposition not come to me and try to get a permanent person put in?

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. BARRY:

The Premier knows the rules, Mr. Speaker. 'Hypocrisy' is against the rules of this House. I let him get away with it yesterday. I ask that you order that he withdraw it today.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If 'hypocrisy' is out of order, I will withdraw automatically. I will not allow that to go ahead.

So if that is his point of order, fine.

MR. SPEAKER:

That has been withdrawn.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier answer the question as to whether he supports the principle of hiring young men and women, who may never have voted, on the basis of whether their parents supported the Minister of Public Works or did not support him?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, number one, temporary people are hired in the Department of Public Works, and in all departments, based upon experience

MR. BARRY:

No so!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- based upon merit, based upon performance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No! No!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is a range or criteria used. The Leader of the Opposition came to me when he was a minister about a permanent position and asked to put number two over number one, Mr. Speaker. That is what the Leader of the Opposition did. He tried to use his influence on me about a position in the Public Service which was permanent. I say people in glass houses should not throw stones.

MR. BARRY:

Will the Premier, Mr. Speaker,

answer the question?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Answer the question. You do not have the courage to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

You are a coward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, the point of order I rose on is not this one, but I think the Leader of the Opposition should be made to withdraw the word 'coward,' that is for sure, before I start my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will save Your Honour's time. I will withdraw 'coward' and say that the Premier has no courage. He does not have the courage to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition did not like the way I answered his

questions but, Mr. Speaker, I answered the question as the question was asked. They were all out, Mr. Speaker. Hansard will show they did not know what they were talking about when they got up asking questions.

MR. TULK:

What is your point of order?

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the Leader of the Opposition gave the impression that the four temporary employees out in the MED Centre are from my district. They are not. I do not know what district they are from. Their names were submitted to me and I okayed it, and that was it. I do not know who they are or where they come from, and I do not care, Mr. Speaker. They are doing a good job.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

We now have the minister stating that he okayed the hiring when he earlier told this House that they were not hired on the basis of his influence. He is now saying that he approved the hiring.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister cannot have it both ways.

MR. YOUNG:

What are you going on about?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Do you mind if I respond to your point of order?

Maybe the minister would explain to this House why he turned down eight requests from the press for interviews yesterday?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is none of your -

MR. TULK:

None of your what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Oh, I am sorry. I take it back. The Premier has given instructions for the minister not to go to the press. I am sorry. I take that back. I do not want to embarrass the minister. I apologize. The minister has been instructed by the Premier not to respond to eight requests by the press for interviews. So I am sorry about that. I am sorry that he is being muffled, Mr. Speaker.

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works has now, by his own mouth, indicated that he has not been truthful in his answers to the questions that were put to him today. I ask the Premier to do what should be done, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

I said that I approved the people to go into the MED Centre Mr. Speaker. They said, "Minister, we want four names of four people to go in," and I approved. I said, "Go ahead. Hire four people

temporary until we go to the Public Service Commission." That was when the building was being readied to be opened. I do not know who they were. I presume every minister here okays a position, and that is what I did. I okayed authorization.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard enough on that point of order to rule there is no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

This is a fairly serious point of order. The hon. gentleman said that the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services had not been truthful. I refer to Beauchesne, page 110. "It is not in order, it is unparliamentary to say a matter is untrue, to say an untrue statement. Debates, the House of Commons, 1961, '62, '67 "and on and on. "Not the complete truth June 19, 1964." Mr. Speaker, we have seen the hon. gentleman twist what the hon. minister has said. The hon. minister has said, and he has said quite clearly that nobody was hired with his influence, and the hon. member tries to twist that around in his point of order. We can accept twisting from the hon. gentleman, but we cannot accept, Mr. Speaker, in this House that a minister or any member is accused of saying something is untrue. The hon. gentleman has to withdraw that statement and has to be directed to withdraw it.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is, the hon. gentleman can do all he likes to try and cover up for what the minister has confessed. At one point this afternoon the Minister of Public Works and Services stood in this House and said he did not know the people who were hired, yet, in the next breath, he looked at us and said he okayed their appointments. The truth of the matter is the Minister of Public Works and Services has gone on public television in this Province and confessed to using his office for political patronage, and the truth of the matter is the Premier of this Province does not have the courage to put an investigation in place to see whether he has misused his office or not. The President of the Council can stand up all he wants and use up the time of Question Period with points of order that are not really points of order, trying to cover up for the hon. gentleman, but the truth of the matter is, the truth is out on the hon. gentleman regardless of whether the Premier or anybody else on that side likes it or not. He has made a public confession.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I did hear reference to 'untruth' and I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the word 'untruth' and substitute that the facts as related by the minister in his second statement are completely contradictory to the facts as stated in his first statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has withdrawn that statement.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have had an admission from the Minister of Public Works and Services today that he has had a communication from the Public Service Commission to inform the minister that 'my - he called him flunky - executive assistant' -

MR. MATTHEWS:

It is the same thing.

MR. TULK:

He does not sit in the gallery and grin.

MR. BARRY:

Well, there are a lot more of them over there, are there not? There are a few of them. Wave 'Alvin'. Give us a wave up here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:

How small can you be?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!



MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works has confirmed for this House that he has a pipeline out of the Public Service Commission which informed him with respect to a communication made by my executive assistant to the Public Service Commission making an enquiry with respect to a serious matter. The only way, Mr. Speaker, that the minister could have known that my executive assistant contacted the Public Service Commission was for an official of the Public Service Commission to communicate that information to the minister. That call was only made, Mr. Speaker, within two hours of this House sitting. Less than that. It was between two o'clock and two-thirty. By the time the minister came into this House, at three o'clock, the communication had gone from the Public Service Commission to the minister to inform him with respect to this.

DR. COLLINS:

Sure that is okay.

MR. BARRY:

No, no, no. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Premier has been saying that the Public Service Commission - he said it yesterday - is supposed to be separate and independent of government, will the Premier indicate how this is consistent with that independence from government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon.

the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

We have seen quite an exhibition. The hon. gentleman wants to get hot under the collar and, in effect, I think the hon. gentleman has been getting hotter under the collar ever since those polls have come out to show that he has sunk so low. One of the reasons he has sunk so low is the tactic he is trying to use today.

Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely no point of order. First of all, the hon. gentleman is giving his opinions of what the hon. gentleman's response was. That is the first point. The second point is, when a minister is responsible for a department, a division, a commission, I would think it would be very, very appropriate at any given time for a permanent employee of the department, a commission or a Crown corporation, or what have you, to be in dialogue with the minister responsible and to tell the minister responsible what has occurred during the day, during the week or during the month.

Now, the hon. gentleman is making a point of order that is not a valid one, it is a silly one, it has no substance at all and it is a stupid point of order. In fact, it is not a point of order. The fact of the matter is, the Public Service Commission in this Province is an independent Public Service Commission, and it has operated that way since 1972 or 1974, when it was appointed. The Minister of Public Works and Services or any minister has never interfered with its proceedings and it is operating very well, contrary to the type of appointments in the civil service when the hon. gentlemen were in

government; the only way anyone could get an appointment, a promotion, an increase in salary and everything else was to be a card-carrying member of the Liberal party.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about that. What the hon. gentleman is doing is raising a point of order which is not a point of order. He is exercised, he is angry, and the only thing I will say is he had no difficulty in identifying who was a flunky.

MR. BAKER:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, further to that point of order I would simply like to point out that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has now said that the Public Service Commission is supposed to be apolitical, is supposed to be at arms length and not dabble in the ongoing politics of government and so on. Now, if immediately an enquiry goes to the Public Service Commission the minister is contacted right away, that seems to me to indicate a very close relationship with the Public Service Commission and, in fact, would raise the suspicion in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that that connection is a lot closer than members opposite have been willing to admit. The thought goes through my mind, Mr. Speaker, how many other communications go to the minister with regards to job applications that come through that system?

MR. YOUNG:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Once again, the hon. the members of the Opposition are all wet. Mr. Speaker, I have not made a phone call or received a phone call from the Public Service Commission for over a month. The last correspondence I had was from the Chairman of the Public Service Commission asking me for authorization to go on vacation. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all the correspondence I have had. I did not say that I had a call. No way will Hansard show that I said I had a call from the Public Service Commission.

MR. MATTHEWS:

They have accused you, though.

MR. YOUNG:

But they got up and accused me, Mr. Speaker, of getting a phone call from some at the Public Service Commission.

MR. BARRY:

Your executive assistant took the call.

MR. YOUNG:

No, my executive assistant did not take the call, Mr. Speaker. How will that suit you? I got the information in this building, and not even in my own department. It was probably from one of your Liberal friends on that side. Do you know what I mean?

MR. BARRY:

Your word will not make that right.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader

of the Opposition wanted his office soundproofed and I think I will have to do it, because there are lots of leaks down there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I must rule that there is no point of order.

#### Notices of Motion

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of supplementary supply to Her Majesty.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is last year's, is it?

DR. COLLINS:

Yes.

ooo

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, Oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A point of order.

MR. TULK:

My friend for Stephenville in the hubbub that is going -

DR. COLLINS:

There is a point of order here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

There is a point of order.

MR. TULK:

A point of order that is what I am on.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

I am on a point of order.

MR. DAWE:

You were on your feet by you did not say anything.

MR. TULK:

Yes, I did. I said, 'A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is typical.

MR. FLIGHT:

What? What?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the comment of the hon. gentleman. When he used the phrase 'typical', he was obviously

referring to the Speaker. The truth of the matter is, I did rise on a point of order. I wanted to point out that in the din that is going on over there, the yapping that is going on over there my friend from Stephenville did not hear Your Honour call Petitions and I wonder if the House would revert to Petitions to allow him to present his Petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. TULK:

No?

MR. MATTHEWS:

If he is asleep, that is tough.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is not asleep, the Speaker did not call it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sorry, I missed the hon. member.

MR. TULK:

That is all right. There is another day.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if there was a bit of noise in the House, I think we can give way to the hon. gentleman to present a petition. But the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) was on his feet first in the proceedings. He did hear. It is who Your Honour wants to recognize. I think we should hear both petitions, to tell you the truth.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

No, no. The Speaker had called Orders of the Day and that was my point of order. Of course the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is doing the right thing and I am glad to see that he has brought his colleagues under control over there. Sure, go ahead and have the petitions presented.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman should exercise a little bit or a degree more of control and maturity so we can hear from the member for Port au Port.

MR. SPEAKER:

Which hon. member would like to speak first?

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, just before I introduce my petition, I would just like to say that I was trying to get on my feet but I could not hear what was going on; I could not hear Mr. Speaker because of members on the other side. When I tried to regain my feet, the hon. barbarian from Fogo was on his.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

That is not unparliamentary.

MR. TULK:

Sure I do not care whether it is parliamentary or not if it comes from that hon. gentleman. I wonder if we could have him speak to the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present this petition. The petition has 904 signatures on it. As well as the 904 signatures, there are 34 supporting letters with this petition. As well, Mr. Speaker, there is a brief with the petition and it is in French and English.

The petition, Mr. Speaker, is presented by the Fédération Des Francophones of Newfoundland and Labrador, which is comprised of Les Terre-Neuviens Français of Cap-St-Georges, l'Héritage de l'Ile Rouge à La Grand'Terre, L'Order du Bon Temps in Stephenville, and La Terre-Neuviens français, l'Anse-à-Canards, in Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, there are 904 signatures and most of those signatures are from French speaking individuals in the district.

The prayer of the petition reads this way: "The purpose of this petition is to point out to government officials that we, the undersigned, ask that action be taken to construct a road connecting the community of Cape St. George to Mainland. The function of this road for

educational reasons would be immense. The children would commute a distance of nine miles to a French school instead of commuting a distance of fifty miles. This road would also be used in promoting tourism, culture and, in turn, give a boost to the local economy."

Mr. Speaker, as members are aware, the Port au Port Peninsula is one of the French areas of Newfoundland. Most other areas where French reside in Newfoundland are where the French speaking people have come into the area but the French first settled on the Port au Port Peninsula in the 1800s. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, came from Brittany in Northern France and they settled on the Northern part of the Peninsula at l'Ile Rouge. When we hear the name Mainland now, well, they lived on the Island and saw the Mainland as La Grand Terre, which was the great land.

Mr. Speaker, the French on the Port au Port Peninsula have been trying to preserve their culture and language and it has been something that has been dying in the past ten years. However, there have been some very active organizations in that area. The first was in Cape St. George and now most areas where French people reside now have formal organizations that work very well.

I attended a meeting just a couple of weeks ago where all of the proceedings were conducted in French. There are still people who doubt the French fact on the Port au Port Peninsula but certainly, Mr. Speaker, these groups are very dedicated to their culture and, in particular, to the preservation of their language.

Mr. Speaker, what brought this petition about is the fact that the road between La Grand'Terre, Mainland that is, and Cap-St-Georges are some fifty miles apart but the actual distance, over the hill, is only about nine miles. Mr. Speaker, each year on St. Jean Baptiste Day - and I would let hon. members know now that I will be collecting for this as I did last year - there is a walk between the French community of La Grand'Terre, Mainland, and Cape St. George. Mr. Speaker, what really brought this about is the fact that there is going to be a French school in Mainland. This has caused some question about the distance between the two communities.

As well, Mr. Speaker, there have been some studies done. One being the Ubel study of Bay St. George back about eight or nine years ago and another study was done by La Terre-Neuviens Francais, the French group themselves, and another by Campbell Engineering. Those studies felt that, outside of the French fact itself and the togetherness of the French communities, that there was a great deal of economic benefit to be gained by a road across the Cape.

Mr. Speaker, if one were to look at the map of the Port au Port Peninsula, with a short road link, you could rationalize services on the Port au Port Peninsula, whether it be fire or school services, as we are talking about in this particular case. In particular, Mr. Speaker, this road is a road which would help greatly in the development of tourism in the area.

I have walked along it on a couple of occasions. The area is one of

the most beautiful areas in the Province. It is impossible to see the true beauty of the Port au Port Peninsula unless one walks over the Port au Port Peninsula. This road would link the two French speaking communities but would also give the area a situation where a person could drive around the Peninsula, rather than back and forth to the various communities. As well as linking up the communities, it would aid in fish pickups, oil deliveries, tourists visiting the area and, basically result in a rationalization of municipal services. As well, Mr. Speaker, it would open up one of the most beautiful parts of the Peninsula and one of the most beautiful parts of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to belittle the prayer of the petition by talking about economics but, it seems that with this petition everything comes together. The French speaking people of Port au Port and the English speaking people of Port au Port would all benefit by this petition, certainly the French culturally, but the district as a whole.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support this petition and refer it to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in my place to support the prayer

of this particular petition from Port au Port. It is interesting that the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) invited members to walk over Port au Port, because for the last fifteen years, this administration has certainly been walking over Port au Port. With the unemployment rate there, I believe, hovering around the higher end of 70 per cent, we need to bring as many dollars as possible into the Port au Port region because -

MR. HODDER:

What is the unemployment rate again?

MR. FUREY:

May I have a little protection, Mr. Speaker? I did not open my mouth when the member for Port au Port spoke.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

I just want to ask the member a question. What is the unemployment rate?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome this petition, signed by some 900 people from La Terre-Neuvriens francais and other French groups in that particular region, as well as the English groups who now live side by side in harmony.

I was surprised the member did not mention other communities that would be directly impacted and affected by this petition, such as Three Rock Cove, such as Lourdes, such as Ship Cove on the other end.

This has been, Mr. Speaker, a

dream of the people of Port au Port for many, many years. In fact, the hon. member, when I was his campaign manager in 1982 when we survived the Peckford juggernaut which swept across this Province, led by the great leader who was supposed to bring us all to the Promised Land. We put our heads down, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and myself, and went door to door, I, as his senior campaign chairman, I, as his media consultant, I, as the private citizen who wrote his ads, coached him, told him not to be nervous in front of a microphone and on radio, taught him how to stand before a television camera, wrote his speeches, in fact, Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell, gave what little confidence he had a super injection so that he was partially proud of what he was trying to say at that time. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. We improved in 1982. Despite the tidal wave of blue Toryism sweeping across the Province, Port au Port, I am proud to say, elected Mr. Jim Hodder, with the help of this particular member, by a plurality of some 400 votes in that Peckford wave.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the petition, let me say this: Now, we see the member as a parliamentary secretary, collecting \$15,000 above and beyond his salary.

MR. SIMMS:

What has this to do with the petition?

MR. FUREY:

From Port au Port, he is a Parliamentary Secretary to the Resource Policy Committee, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

What better chance for him to have this road connected between mainland and -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

- Cape St. George?

MR. HODDER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening. The member for St. Barbe has not said a word, as far as I can see, in any way in support of the petition. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that our Standing Orders say you must support the petition when you rise. Mr. Speaker, comments about my position as a parliamentary secretary and comments of that sort are certainly not in support of that petition and are an insult to the francophones of Port au Port. As well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the member over there could not even hold his own job as party Whip for more than a month and a half.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, there is -

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point -

MR. FUREY:

There is no point of order. Now, Mr. -

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the point is well taken.

MR. FUREY:

It is well taken.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member was straying very much from the petition.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, what I was saying, to be very relevant, is that this is a very isolated pocket of people.

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have to rise on this point because it has happened time and time and time again. The hon. member continually offends. He keeps interrupting Your Honour. Your Honour is up making a ruling and before Your Honour has completed a sentence, the hon. member is breaking in and making remarks. Secondly, when Your Honour calls for order, the hon. member persistently turns his back on Your Honour and pretends he does not hear Your Honour. The hon. the member for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick), I am sure, can often hear him. I have personally observed this many, many times in the last number of weeks and have let it go by because I did not really feel that I was particularly involved myself. I think it is a disgrace to the Chair and I now feel that I am involved because I am a member of this House and I do not like our



Speaker and our Chair disgraced the way hon. member is doing it through his abjectly, unparliamentary procedure and attitudes. I would say that Your Honour should call him to order.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

I apologize to the Chair if I did not hear you. If I turn my back on you sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it is because I am trying to raise my voice over the jackals and jackasses and whatnot on the other side. Mr. Speaker, I apologize if that is the case and I would like to get on with the few minutes that I have left.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FUREY:

To a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the point of order I am trying to make is in direct relation to this petition which is very important to La Terre-Neuviens francis and to the Port au Port Peninsula generally. I wanted to say to the hon. member, I think it is only fair, and my point of order is this: I do support that petition and he is now in a position, being in the government, to do what is right -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order!

MR. FUREY:

- and to go and have that road built. Stop sulking, get off his rear end and do it!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague who has done such a good job this past X number of years. That is why, despite whichever colour the hon. member was wearing when he last campaigned, was elected. The people of the district realized -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

The point of order is this, Mr. Speaker. I clearly heard the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), when he rose in his seat to support the petition, say, 'I support the petition.' I heard the hon. gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) make the statement that he had not heard the member for St. Barbe support the petition. Now, that should not be allowed to go by. The truth of the matter is that the hon. gentleman would like for him not to support the petition so then he could go out and play a little bit of politics with the people of Bay St. George and in

the Port au Port Peninsula. That is what he would really like to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:

Who sold his soul?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is getting the hon. gentlemen so exercised today. There is something that has happened to the hon. gentlemen.

MR. PATTERSON:

They are sitting too close.

MR. MARSHALL:

The fact of the matter is the hon. member for St. Barbe got up and there was a point of order that he was not supporting the petition. The Speaker drew him to order with respect to it and why the hon. gentleman is now getting so hot under the collar I do not know.

MR. FUREY:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. House Leader was even here. He is always wandering around through the corridors and I do not even know if he was here when I rose in my place, but my opening words were - Hansard will support

me on this - 'I rise in my place to support this petition.' Those were my opening words. Now, you cannot get any clearer than that. I do not know why the hon. member for Port au Port, in his mischievous and devious little way, wanted to twist and convolute and turn around words that are very clear and very obvious. Then he was supported by somebody who should know better. I can understand it coming from the cavity between those ears from Port au Port, but from a man with your intelligence, with your know-how, with your experience, with your savvy, with your little ears, you should have been able to hear. Mr. Speaker, I feel insulted as a member that the hon. House Leader would stand here and tell me that I did not support the prayer of that petition.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, how dramatic. You know, I am not being nice to the hon. gentleman because of his nice words or anything, but I am just saying let us get on with a certain amount of business. You know, all of the hon. gentlemen there opposite seem like they need an overdose of tranquillizers today to keep them down. The fact of the matter is, let us get on with the business of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. gentleman brought in his petition in the usual way in which he brings in a petition. The hon. gentleman had been called to order for some reason. The hon. Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk)

gets mad, you know, and blows a gasket. The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) blows a gasket. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) blew a gasket earlier. You know, let us calm it down so we can get on with some business.

MR. TULK:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The truth of the matter is that there was a gentleman who rose in this House, the member for St. Barbe, and his opening remarks were 'I support the petition'. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), either out of ignorance or otherwise, rose in his place and said that the hon. gentleman had not supported the petition. Now as I said before, the truth of the matter is that they would love for the member for St. Barbe -

AN HON. MEMBER:

This is not a point of privilege.

MR. FUREY:

This is a point of privilege.

MR. TULK:

A point of privilege, boy. Sit down and learn the rules of the House.

MR. FUREY:

Sit down, you should know better.

MR. TULK:

Wait until your turn comes!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, tell him to wait until his turn comes! The truth of the matter is the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) would love for him not to support the petition, but that will in no way come true. The hon. gentleman has made certain campaign promises down there to learn how to speak French, now that he has not done it, he is trying to lay something on the member for St. Barbe.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have heard enough on that point of privilege to rule on it now. There is no point of privilege. There is a difference of opinion, obviously, between two hon. men.

I would also like to rule on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Fogo. I think the point was when the hon. the Minister of Education was speaking that he was not speaking to the petition.

MR. TULK:

No, no, no. I was just saying what he has tried to (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

All right. Okay. Well, I rule it is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. the Minister of Education has about a minute left.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I fully support the petition. The establishment of a road across from Mainland to the Cape will not only have tremendous advantages in the field of education, it will bring together the nucleus of the people on the Port au Port Peninsula, many of whom are French

or are closely affiliated with French, generally speaking. Also, not only in the field of education, but certainly in the field of tourism, an area that is perhaps economically deprived to some extent, the road will help. Tourism has tremendous potential for that area. The road across the mountains in that area will tremendously increase the benefit to the people generally.

So I, and I know government generally, certainly support the petition presented by my colleague and he and I have been doing a fair amount of work this past few months to make sure that the school in Mainland and certainly the road generally will become a reality for the people who live in that part of the Province.

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a very serious point of order. This afternoon in the debate during Question Period, when the Premier mentioned to the Leader of the Opposition about the hiring practices of an executive assistant in the Marystown Shipyard when the leader was the Minister of Development, responsible for the shipyard, the response from that debate from the Leader of the Opposition stated, Mr. Speaker, that as a minister he had a responsibility to an executive assistant. The Act or the Minute of Council or whatever it was, stated that the executive assistant had to be placed, that that was part of the law, Mr. Speaker, in the public service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER:

I do not get the hon. member's point of order.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, this is the point, I am getting to it now. He stated that and the Minute of Council, Mr. Speaker, quite clearly states that an executive assistant who has been in the position for three years has the right to be placed in the public service.

The point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that the statement by the Leader today was not fact. The Marystown Shipyard is not, and I stress this, Mr. Speaker, part of the public service. It is a Crown corporation. Mr. Speaker, they can laugh all they want, but the fact of the matter is if we are going to be here, Mr. Speaker, the statements that are made have to be factual, have to be true.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I hope I get a chance to explain.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes. Mr. Speaker, my point of order is, and it is a very serious point of order, Mr. Speaker, because what was said in this debate today, and you have got to understand the context that it was said in and understand the issue, Mr. Speaker, that was in debate at the time, when the Leader of the Opposition stood in this House and tried to defend his actions by saying that the act stated that what he did was right because an executive assistant had to be placed in the public service. Mr. Speaker, he did not place the executive assistant in the public service but, rather, in a Crown Corporation. Now, Mr. Speaker,

that is a very significant difference.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has nothing to do with order in this House.

MR. TOBIN:

I asked Your Honour, Mr. Speaker, to make that quite clear, that the statement today by the leader was not factual, Mr. Speaker, and he should be made to at least clarify it, if not withdraw it.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Burin - Placentia West for having given me the opportunity to deal with this issue. It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, what they are trying to scrape up from my past. Mr. Speaker, apparently it does not matter whether it is in caucus, in Cabinet, or in my ministerial files. There is no such thing as a thirty year rule or a twenty year rule. It is obviously a five minute rule, five minutes after you asked him a hard question, then the Cabinet secrecy, caucus secrecy, all goes out the window.

Mr. Speaker, do I care? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Not on your life! Throw the windows open, throw the doors open, throw the files open and let it all hang out, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Let the public see and let us see what the fact is here now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I do not intend to delay, Mr. Speaker, on this point. If the member would stay quiet a minute, I will explain. We had, Mr. Speaker, a young man who had a family living in Grand Bank who was the executive assistant to a minister of the Crown. Not to me. No relation to me. Never worked on my political campaign. Never did anything other than, Mr. Speaker, ask for fairness and consideration. Now, as an executive assistant, his minister has resigned and was no longer in government. Mr. Speaker, the individual was entitled - now we have to understand this, it is not a competition for the general public - by an Order in Council to be hired in another position once his minister is no longer in government.

MR. TOBIN:

That is not true.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, let me finish that. The member and the Premier apparently had decided to split this hair and it seems that what I did grievously wrong was make representation to have this individual employed by a Crown Corporation, rather than by the public service.

MR. TOBIN:

Which the Minute of Council states.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I plead with this House, I plead with the member opposite, I plead with the Premier, do not make me resign my seat for having done that, please, please, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, am I to be condemned forever, do I go now out of this House with a scarlet letter on my forehead because I have helped an individual who is entitled to a job in the public service, instead of doing that, I helped them get a job in a Crown Corporation because that would permit him to be employed near where his home was and where his family was. Mr. Speaker, to that vile and hideous crime, I confess! I confess, Mr. Speaker, I confess and I plead and I beg! I beg, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and the Premier not make me resign for such a vile and hideous crime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BAIRD:

He has gone off his head again.

MR. FUREY:

Back in your hole gofer.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have heard enough from both sides. There is obviously no point of order.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A petition, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to present a petition concerning the MUN Extension office. This is the latest one that I have received and it contains 200 to 300 names. I am very proud to stand here today and present it to this House.

I feel very strongly that we should keep pressing the university administration to reconsider the decision they have made and also press the government to provide the proper funding for the university, which is in dire financial straits. I want to go through a list of the number of things that the Extension office out in that area has provided, just some of the things they have done over the last year or so. I want to go through a list of the accomplishments, if you want to say, or some of the things that they have been working on. It is very impressive and it is a wide-ranging contribution made to the whole economy of the whole area, the Southwest Coast.

They have been providing counselling services to a number of groups out there concerning financial or government agencies on how to apply for grants. They have been involved heavily in community development, involved with ninety-odd communities on the Southwest Coast, which is quite a wide range of communities to be handling. They organized and prepared the Futures Conference that was held last year and where

there is now ongoing consultations with the economic development groups of the area and also with the government departments as they are trying to improve the economy. There was also, for the first time, an economic development organization. It was the first time they had come together and this was done on initiatives of the MUN Extension office. They have also been working on out there, as an extra service, aquaculture activities, trying to get people involved in aquaculture out there to get into the industry and to provide some work in that area. They have also been involved with organizing The Troubadour magazine, which is now the youth magazine for Newfoundland and Newfoundland. As a matter of fact, Mr. Neil Tilley is on the Youth Advisory Council as a member and so has made a wide ranging contribution on that end.

They have also been involved on the white -

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, the hon. member is apparently trying to present a petition. He is not doing a very good job of it, but he is doing his best and his colleagues over there are making so much noise it is difficult to follow the hon. member. He is difficult to follow anyway, but, I mean, with all the noise over there, it is almost impossible to follow him. So could his colleagues be told to be silent as the House rules require

and let the hon. member try to make the point he is trying to make in the petition?

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

He is absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker, and now that the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is out of the House, it will be absolutely quiet.

MR. FUREY:

You can go back to sleep now 'John.'

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member can have silence for his petition.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for the compliment on the job I am doing in presenting the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I got a list about an arm long here of the contributions that they have made out there. The petition is presented to me by over 250 people, students at the college, workers in the area, and people who are concerned about education on the Southwest Coast region.

So I think it is a very serious matter that the dismantling of this office and the one in

Marystown is going ahead without really any fuss being kicked up by the administration here and without taking the responsibilities which are theirs.

The university is in dire financial straits and I have to emphasize that fact. They are going to be forced probably in the Fall of this year to institute more cutbacks and students are going to suffer. Rural Newfoundland is now going to suffer because of this development, because of the lack of monies that have been given to the university.

We hear about the big contributions that were made but over the next four to five years we are going to have over \$187 million withdrawn by the federal government that should come to Newfoundland. That we are not even looking at, we are not facing it yet, but that is going to make it even tougher on our system down here.

I rise and I want to present this petition. I am very happy to present it. I hope that something comes of it. I hope that we keep pushing and pushing until we have a realization at the university and in government that rural Newfoundland has to be served by such a service. I feel very proud to present it today and I urge the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) and the President of the University, whom I have been meeting with and discussing this with, to take it into very careful consideration as we do need this service out in rural Newfoundland.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for Gander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the petition presented by the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). I have been sitting and listening to a few of those petitions that have been presented having to do with MUN Extension and what is happening to the university as a result of the policies of this government.

First of all let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it seems as if all I have been hearing over the last number of years, particularly since this administration came into office, is eliminate, eliminate, eliminate. Mr. Speaker, they have a great struggle, and do you know what their struggle is? The great struggle of this government is to try to keep things going that were put in place before they came in office. Mr. Speaker, they cannot even keep the things going that were there when they came in office! What kind of a government is that, Mr. Speaker?

For quite some time we have seen the deterioration of the Trans-Canada Highway. We have seen suggestions from the federal government to eliminate all kinds of programmes dealing with Newfoundland, and now we see this government standing up and announcing tremendous increases to Memorial University. One of the big points in the Minister of



Finance's budget was the tremendous increase that was going to be granted to Memorial University. But in fact, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is this: We have seen an enrolment that has been increasing by 10 or 15 per cent at Memorial and compared to the actual usable money to the university, it has been increasing at a much lower percentage. By usable money I am not talking in terms of the capital money that was used to build the extensions to the university and so on, but the usable money having to do with the teaching of courses, which is the main function of the university. We have seen that increase at a far slower rate than the enrolment increases at the university.

The net result is that the university has had to consolidate and they have been squeezed year after year, squeezed, until now they have taken this step that I am certain they do not want to take. That is the problem. They do not want to close down the Extension Service. This is their link to rural Newfoundland; this is their link to every thing that exists outside of the Avalon Peninsula; this is the thing that brings the university closer to the areas of the Province that are far removed from St. John's.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, the university is not particularly interested in cutting those ties. The Extension Service provided an invaluable service, instigated community projects, instigated various kinds of community development, provided opportunities for individuals to further their personal development and Mr. Speaker, that is an important aspect of this. The university does not want to cut it

back. However, they have been squeezed so much by this government, who has taken a hands-off approach - and I can still hear the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) now, Mr. Speaker, talking about how, 'we cannot interfere with the integrity of the university. We cannot give them money and tell them where to spend it'. I agree. We cannot do that. The university stands on its own.

However, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the university is being very responsible in this way, that they have retained these services for so long, after so many years of being squeezed financially by this government, and not wanting to raise tuition fees too high to drive people out of the university. They have resisted doing this for so long but they are at the point now where something has to be cut. This particular service, compared with some of the other things the university is doing, had to be cut.

The solution is not, Mr. Speaker, for the government to give the university money and then say 'you have to spend it here, here, here and here.' That is not the solution. The solution is, first of all to agree that the university is acting responsibly, and if the position of the government is the university is not acting responsibly, then that is a different case. If their position is that the university is acting responsibly, then, Mr. Speaker, the only solution is to provide the extra money to make sure that that contact with rural Newfoundland remains intact. As I pointed out earlier it is a very valuable contact.

Now I would like to hear some

comment at this point from one of the heavyweights on the other side. A couple of them there on the front benches are not heavyweights, that is for sure. But I would like to hear some comment from some of the heavyweights on the other side as to whether they are saying -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

About ten seconds. As to whether they are saying, Mr. Speaker, that the university is being irresponsible or are they, in fact, admitting that they are the ones who are cutting off this service by the reduction of funds.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise. When the hon. member mentioned the word 'heavyweight' - I am much too modest - I almost did not rise. But I intended to speak on this so I am going to overcome my modesty and rise anyway.

I support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

I think the hon. the member for Stephenville is clearly concerned about his area, as he should be. I am quite sure he is concerned about the young people in this Province and I am quite sure he is concerned about the progress of education in this Province.

However, Mr. Speaker, whilst

supporting the petition, one has to bring out certain realities and that is that universities throughout Canada, throughout the world, are under difficulties at this point in time because the 1980s is a less affluent area throughout the world than the 1970s. We have just gone through a recession. The effects of the recession are not yet over. So the universities throughout the world have not been able to draw as easily on the funds available to them as in the past.

Now despite that, Mr. Speaker, and despite the fact that we are the least affluent Province in Canada, I think we should realize that last year over \$88 million was given to the university for its operating budget.

MR. MARSHALL:

How much?

DR. COLLINS:

Eighty-eight point three million dollars was given to the university for its operating budget. That works out at something over \$160 for every man, woman, child, baby and infant in this Province that was given to the university for its operating fund. Now, I am sure the university could have done with more money, I am sure the university wanted more money, I am sure it would have used it in its best discretion, but for every man, woman, and child in this Province to donate to the university \$160, every person, every single resident in this Province, I think is a pretty fair contribution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the university is a very responsible organization when it has this amount of money generously given by the people of

this Province through the government. The government does not give it, it is given by the people of this Province through the government. When the university gets this money, it has to decide how best to expend it. I am sure it would like to have many more programmes than it has, but it has to realize that certain programmes that were put in at one point in time, which were desirable, can now fall in priority as certain other things are put in place.

Now, MUN Extension was put in place when there were almost no other organizations outside St. John's to help with economic development, to help with community development. That is no longer the case. There are many organizations that have been put in place by this government outside St. John's for that purpose now. Similarly, the Extension was put in place when the university presence in Corner Brook, close to where the hon. member's district is, was very small. That is no longer the case. The university's presence on the West Coast now is much, much expanded and this government, only this year, has decided to fund a Fine Arts Division for the university on the West Coast.

So the university authorities have decided, even though they are getting generous funding, and they have many demands on it, they say, 'Which priorities must we service and which ones of somewhat lesser priority must we let go?' and they have decided they would have to let go the branch office for MUN Extension in the hon. member's district. I sympathize with the hon. member, but these are the facts of life.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) -

MR. FUREY:

The most powerful man in the Province.

MR. TULK:

No, he is not the most powerful man in the Province.

MR. FUREY:

Yes, he is the most powerful man.

MR. TULK:

The most powerful man in the Province is right there. The Minister of Finance is the second most powerful man in this Province, he is the man who controls the purse strings in this Province. I understood him to say that he supported the petition. I would ask the hon. gentleman to not use the 14 per cent which is really 8 per cent that Memorial got in terms of spending, which is hardly above inflation over the last couple of years. It is only catch-up. I would ask him, then, if his support means that he is now going to find the little amount of money that is required to keep the MUN Extension facility open in Stephenville? Because it is not much point in the hon. gentleman standing up and saying, 'Well, I support' and then say 'but'. He has the cash, now come on with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is disrupting the proceedings of the House here. Look, here we are, near to five o'clock, and we have not even gotten the business of the day. I do not know what is wrong with the hon. gentleman. I do not know whether there is news in the Liberal Party that they have deferred their local leadership convention and he is upset about that today or what the reason for it is, but he is very cranky and canterkerous today. I suggest that when he gets up get up on legitimate points of order, but let us get to the business of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

On a new point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

I want to correct something that the hon. gentleman said.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

On a new point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A new point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I just want to correct just a

couple of things that the hon. gentleman has said. First of all, there will not be a leadership convention in this party, I can assure him, for the next twelve to fifteen years. Secondly, -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

- what is really getting me upset is that the hon. gentleman has been looking over here for the past couple of days smiling and I cannot stand the sweetness and light.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

I would like at this stage to welcome to the Visitor's Gallery 58 Grade IV, V and VI students from St. Peter's and St. Paul's Schools, King's Cove, and also their teachers, Tom Maddox, Morris Lewis, Leo Furlong, Jerome Ricketts and Carol Ryan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to announce three questions for the adjournment. The first is by the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) who is not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Public Works and Services. The second is from the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who is not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Public Works and Services. The third is from the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) who is not satisfied with the answer given by the Premier.

#### Orders of the Day

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act," carried. (Bill No. 43)

On motion, Bill No. 43 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, the following bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper.

A bill, "An Act To Revise And Reform The Law Respecting Corporations." (Bill No. 20)

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Farm Development Loan act." (Bill No. 15)

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 5, Bill No. 25. "A Bill, An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act To Provide For The Establishment Of The Real Estate Foundation." (Bill No. 25).

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I just want to ask a brief question on this Bill. We submitted an amendment to this Bill. I do not know whether the government made a final decision on that, whether they said they were going to accept this amendment or whether they were not. I wonder if the hon. the House Leader can clarify that?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind responding to the question, but the hon. gentleman's question is not in order on Third Reading. I

will say that the decision was made. We debated it, I do not know if the member was in the House at the time, in committee and the government decided at the time it was not inclined to accept the amendment. It considered it and the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russel), I believe - he is indicating by nodding - indicated that we would try it as it presently is, and if there are any amendments needed, we would be prepared to present them.

On motion, the following bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper:

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act To Provide For The Establishment Of The Real Estate Foundation". (Bill No. 25).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Embalmers And Funeral Directors Act, 1975". (Bill No. 22).

A bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase of Certain Pensions". (Bill No. 24).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Land Development Act". (Bill No. 5).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Labrador Linerboard Limited Agreement Act, 1979 In Order To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Amending Agreement Entered Into Between Her Majesty The Queen In Right Of The Province Represented By The Honourable The Minister Of Forest Resources And Lands And Abitibi-Price Inc.". (Bill No. 6).

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 14, Bill No. 1.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order 14. Second reading of a

bill, An Act To Implement An Agreement Between The Government Of Canada And The Government Of Newfoundland And Labrador On Offshore Petroleum Resource Management And Revenue Sharing. (Bill No. 1). The debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure to speak to this bill today to let my comments and opinions go forth on what I think of the legislation, how we got where we are today and where we are going in the future. As this bill is supposed to be a development bill in the sense that we have planned our future, we have something that is a solid foundation for the future of this Province when it comes to the petroleum industry offshore. I watched the battles this government had with the Liberal government in Ottawa over the years, when they were saying they could not do this and they could not get that.

But we had to and sign an agreement with the present government in Ottawa even before they were elected. But we finally got it, they finally brought it in, and it is about time, it is nice to say it. There are some good things in this agreement, but there was something there, as I was reading but there was something there, as I was reading through it, which I could not believe. I said to myself, the

Premier of this Province and his administration have always fought to have participation in the offshore industry; to have a say in what goes on, and while there are some good things in this bill, and I will talk about them also, but the big thing that I am really surprised with is this 40 per cent back-in that has now been thrown out the window.

I am amazed that this Province has signed an agreement, wants to put it through both Houses, the House of Commons and the House of Assembly here in Newfoundland, and we do not have any say in the development. I am amazed, I am disappointed and I think that it is a major flaw of this agreement.

I would like to quote Mr. Douglas House who is the head of the Royal Commission on Unemployment and Employment. He has been travelling around this Island and he wrote a book in 1985 *The Challenge of Oil*. In that, I just want to take a quote as he is quite a noted source on this.

"By far the most important weakness is state participation. The 1977 regulations provided for the Newfoundland Petroleum Board to take an undivided 40 per cent interest in every lease. This participation was to provide both a major source of revenue and, more importantly a direct say for the Province of Newfoundland through 40 per cent representation on any management or operating committee relating to the lease area.

"Although radical for North America such a participation agreement is now standard practice in the offshore industry internationally" - and everywhere

else. "Participation has been all but abandoned in the Atlantic Accord."

I had to read that about three or four times. I had to go look and read the agreement. I had to go look and talk to people who are in the industry and see if that is a fact. I had to see if exactly if that is what they did, if they had just threw it out the window in their negotiations and signed away a say that you would have had in any of the developments in this Province when it comes to offshore oil.

I cannot believe that they went ahead and did it. I think it is a major flaw. It is something that supposedly this administration had been fighting for and I think that they should reassess exactly what they have and see if they can get that back, but I doubt very much if Mr. Mulroney and his troop up there are going to do anything of that nature as they love taking things away. It appears that they are going to take away a lot more before they are finished. But, their mandate is running out very fast.

I have to express my disappointment that we do not have that 40 per cent ownership level and the resulting participation. As a matter of fact, the oil companies even agreed previously in '77 to the regulations that, for example, in the Hibernia development, would have meant a 40 per cent say. We would get 40 per cent of the revenues, we would get all of the things that have to do with the decision-making process, we would be totally involved as part owner of the resource.

I thought that this administration had always fought for that and

many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians supported them on that. I thought they had fought for this participation, for ownership, that we have to have. It is our resource. It is ours and we have to have a say over it. Now they have an agreement which I believe is flawed, it has good points but this is a major flaw which I cannot believe that they have let go and let them in.

MR. MARSHALL:

Would the hon. member permit a question? Are you going to vote for it or against it?

MR. EFFORD:

We will let you know that later.

MR. MARSHALL:

Surely there is no hesitation since all of your criticisms are (inaudible) -

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The minister does not have to worry about my vote.

MR. MARSHALL:

You cannot be two-faced all the time.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am not like some characters.

MR. HISCOCK:

Listen to who is talking.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am not like some characters, but I do believe in expressing my opinion and I do not believe I am an anti-Newfoundlander because I am not a Tory, obviously. That seems to be the case around here in this Province.

As a matter of fact we are going to be forced actually. It is unfortunate you know, I mean you think about it, you can say 'how

are you going to vote for it or against it whatever.' They make the people believe that everything they do is for the people and that they could not get it any better. They could not get it any better. You know, it is amazing. This is the administration that says, 'We are always thinking about the people, our interests are undivided. We would tell the Ottawa crew exactly what we think of them, if they were trying to do us in in any fashion or any manner.'

We seen that evident in the fisheries restructuring agreement of FFTs. That was exceptional work done by this Province on putting our interests forward. There is no doubt about it that they held Ottawa to its agreement and held them to their word. So while we have an agreement, that supposedly is good, that supposedly has all the interest of Newfoundland and Labrador in it, we have major people in this Province who have said there are some flaws.

Of course, we are going to point out those flaws and hope that the renowned Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), is going to correct those flaws. As a good Opposition should do, we should point out those flaws and we should bring forward some points so that they can be corrected so that the future of Newfoundland's offshore petroleum industry is taken care of and is put in a better manner for the future.

It is not a problem whether or not you support it or support this amendment or you support this section of it, there are some flaws in this agreement that you would think that this

administration would say, 'There is no problem with it, boy, just go ahead and pass it through and it has nothing to do with it.' But I tell you there are some things there that I think should be pointed out and I am going to do that. Hopefully, the administration will listen. Again, that is hopefully, and I suppose that hope has dwindled lately because they have not listened to too much. I have some major concerns. There are some good things in it. It is better than what you had in Nova Scotia and that is fine and it is good to see, we got that, that is great, that is wonderful, but there are some definite problems that we have it and I would like to go through a few things.

The recall clause, re the Atlantic Accord, as far as I am concerned, when it comes to the offshore, fails. When you talk about the Come By Chance Oil Refinery, for example, and you talk about how we are supposed to have refining capacity and that we are going to have first crack at that and that it will provide jobs here, there are questions as to whether or not that is going to come into existence. There are some questions related to whether or not the resource is not treated the same as if it were on land and it is a major question. If it was on land as in Alberta, and whether or not we have the control over the rate of production that we are supposed to have, there are some questions about that. Those are questions that I have about this legislation. I think they are very serious questions about this legislation that I have and I think the minister should take heed and should reassert or at least look at these concerns because we have got some major



problems.

There is a lot of information, Mr. Speaker, that is not out. While we have the bill here, there was a lot of information that is not out as related to the royalties scheme. They are supposedly negotiating that. They are supposedly negotiating everything you can think of that is related to this. So, while we have the bill and it is supposed to be their flagship, I suppose, of this total administration in the last number of years, I have many concerns as to some of the flaws that exist. I think the minister and his government should take heed.

Our leader is a fellow who has participated in the offshore oil process over the years, has put the regulations together and knows very well what things are wrong with it and what things are good with it. It is, I think, a shame in a lot of ways, that if the Liberal party, for example, is to suggest that there are some flaws, that there are some things that could be helped, that some things could be improved, that this administration would get on with, 'Well, we are not going to bother thinking about that or listening to it because it is not our idea.' I think they should be very careful as to how they handle it. We want to see offshore industries developed in this Province and we hopefully are going to see that in the near future. Of course, when you look at this administration and how successful they have been with negotiating so far with Mulroney, we definitely have some doubts. It is a good thing they got the Atlantic Accord memorandum signed before the election because I wonder now if they would have such

an agreement, but we have it and we have some good things in it. It is better than the one that Nova Scotia had in many respects. That is good. I have read over the comparisons put together on the Nova Scotia agreement and the Newfoundland agreement and there are some things in our agreement that are better. That is fine.

But I must impress upon the administration that there are some major flaws and while we will have this Atlantic Accord put in and put through this House, there are many questions still left to be answered as to the future of offshore oil industries in Newfoundland and Labrador, as to the training of workers, the employment, the employment numbers, the plight of the industry and what kind of petroleum scheme we are going to have as they negotiate with the administration.

Also we are very concerned with getting the offshore going because at the present time Newfoundland is suffering because of the downturn in the oil industry. They are suffering badly and we want to push this administration and impress upon them that people want to see some developments moving; they want to see this Atlantic Accord implemented; they want to see the jobs that were promised, that were supposed to be created; they want to see this happen.

A lot of people have built dreams on this oil industry and a lot of them are being shattered at the present time. I feel that a lot of that blame and a lot of that has to go to this administration which has made many people feel in the past like they were an anti-Newfoundlander if they did

not agree with their sentiments as to offshore oil ownership and so on. It is finally hitting home to a lot of people that they are not the super warriors that they thought they were and that there are things that they could get a little bit better, things that they could patch up and make a better agreement.

That is pretty well the crux of the whole thing. I have great doubts as to this administration's ability to carry on a mandate to govern the people in a lot of ways and to govern and to negotiate with the Mulroney Government our future in offshore oil.

We see PIP grants not being replaced. We see attempts to negotiate some type of a replacement for that as oil industry people would like to see so that the offshore can be further developed or further wells can be drilled. We see this replacement requested and we see it falling on deaf ears in Ottawa.

I have a kind of bad sense of what faith is between the Ottawa and provincial governments over how they are negotiating and what they are putting forward in negotiations. I think that they have damaged their respectability a great deal, especially since the restructuring agreement was broken. I think they have damaged their respectability in a lot of ways as to their negotiating abilities. We have just seen an agreement signed in forestry, for example, which is 70/30 and it used to be 90/10. If this type of negotiating is carried on, I have to wonder about how much money we are going to have from the offshore when the hon. Minister of the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) gets finished with his

negotiations. I hope he does not carry that lead. We will end up with less money. People want to see this thing get moving and you cannot go saying the Liberals and the NDP do not want it and they do not want to see prosperity. It is a silly way, that is the only word to say, for the minister and for his government to get on. He knows there are many concerns out there. This Opposition is very effective, it is constructive and it is bringing forward good suggestions on the Atlantic Accord. It is bringing in good suggestions on a lot of legislation and it is going to continue to do so. The concerns should be addressed, they are very constructive and they could see better legislation in this House of Assembly. We look forward to the day in the very near future when we will have the chance to fix the things that have been done badly over the last number of years. That will be a good day and the people of Newfoundland will smile a little easier when we attempt to try to clean up the mess that has been created by this administration.

One of the things you have to question is this consultation and co-operation that supposedly this mandate of the Premier and his administration is built on and supposedly what the Atlantic Accord is built on. It is built on harmony; it is built on federal and provincial negotiations getting along in a greater era of harmony, a greater era of co-operation, of being able to see each other's point of view, of being able to see what Newfoundland's real concerns are, of being able to provide us with the proper funding to get out of the hole we are in and to get moving.

A lot of people in Newfoundland and Labrador have a lot of doubts about these negotiations at the present time. We have seen nothing but a stripping away of the monies that have been coming in to Newfoundland and Labrador and the Atlantic Provinces in general. They have a lot of concerns as to how the Minister of the Petroleum Directorate is going to negotiate with his federal counterparts. They have many concerns as to what the fiscal arrangement is going to be. They have great concerns when they see that the Atlantic Accord does not include the back-in rights to 40 per cent, which is a very important thing. To me it is very important. I do not know if it is to anybody else but I want to express that concern.

MR. MARSHALL:

What is a back-in?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

What is the back-in? That is the back-in, look. That is back-in, see. To explain it to you is a simple matter.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, what is a back-in?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

State participation I will give that to you anyway. If the minister would like lunch next week, on him, I would gladly tell him what I think of the back-in, 40 per cent clause.

I think that the shinning armour is coming off the administration. They bring in their Atlantic Accord in February, they bring it in for a few days and then they put it away. They bring it out again just as the Summer session is getting ready to close. I have to wonder about their total

support of what the Atlantic Accord means to them.

I have not seen, as a matter of fact, many of them get up over there. I am surprised at that, to tell you the truth because I would have thought that with all the knowledgeable people on the other side they would have had hard-hitting comments as to how good the agreement is and that there are no flaws. They could have assured me. I would want to be assured that there were no flaws in this agreement at all. I would want to be assured that there are no problems whatsoever because I want to see positive things happen in this Province. I do not want to see negative things happen in this Province.

I invite the minister, when he clues up the debate in the future, to take care of my concerns, as they are very legitimate concerns, as to the future of the petroleum industry in this Province. I have to emphasize that fact that I have not seen anybody else over there, maybe one or two people, get up, and I am somewhat surprised. If I had this bold and great agreement, the Atlantic Accord I would be up jumping out off my chair. I would have thirty-six people over there rushing to get up and talk about this wonderful agreement.

I think it shows a little bit about how much a lot of them know about what is going on with it actually. They talk about how we do not know too much about this or too much about that but I do my reading, I must say, and I am trying to learn and understand, as we all are. I would like to see people on the other side get up and tell me how good this agreement really is, how positive it really is and what the details

are for people like me who do not know too much. You could tell us exactly what is good about it and what is not good about it. We are only trying in the Opposition. Myself, I am trying to point out some things which I think are legitimate concerns. I would like the minister to treat them as that, whether or not I am going to vote for it or not, he will see when I stand up on this matter. Believe me, he will see that. I will be here in living colour. I know he does not like that.

The Atlantic Accord is supposed to be their flagship, but I just want to express the concern, I want to tell him to get the rest of his people up and have a chat about it, at least say a few words about it because, if it was me over there, I think I would be up yallyhooing about it, to tell you the truth. This thing is suppose to be the best thing since sliced bread. As a matter of fact, the way it is going we might not see any negotiations, we may not see any monies coming in, we may see industries going under over the next year or so, ones that are set up supposedly because the minister said to set up since the offshore was going to go and 'we are going to make it go and Mr. Mulroney now, we are getting along so well, we have it going now, I tell you.' We have only lost about \$500 million this year because of Mr. Mulroney. That is all. Next year I say we will do about \$1 billion, and it is going to keep going up.

I think he should sit down, get the good fighter image back again into the administration, get the good fighter image back because you are losing it. You are losing it, I tell you. I will give you some good advice, you are losing

it over there. You are losing it very badly, as a matter of fact. While this agreement may be very good in a lot of respects, there are some flaws. I would like to ask the minister and his Caucus Committee and so on, to -

MR. MARSHALL:

What are the flaws?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Believe me we have pointed them out very ably, as a matter of fact. This state participation, by the way, whatever that means, I do not know what that means now, but whatever that is, when you get up in your last comments I would like to hear you tell us that the 40 per cent back-in that is not there -

MR. MARSHALL:

What is a back-in?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am asking you, Mr. Minister, I am expressing legitimate concerns about this Atlantic Accord. That is the major one that I wanted to concentrate on.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, can I have protection from that wicked minister over there who is trying to disturb me.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. member for Stephenville is debating.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Please, I cannot take the heat, Mr. Speaker. It is very difficult for me to speak here.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

Ah, I knew he would be up.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, just a point of observation, really. The hon. gentleman is a very nice guy and he has a reputation as a very nice guy, but he has also acquired very quickly the Liberal art of emoting words without any meaning or without any sense or anything. He is soon going to be mixing up his verbs and his adjectives and his nouns if he keeps going.

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:

I am not sure that the minister understood what the member for Stephenville was saying, but what he was saying quite clearly was that when the Liberal administration in Ottawa was looking after this, when there was an incentive to come to the shores of Newfoundland to drill, when all of this was there under the Liberal administration, we owned, all of us, every citizen of this Province, no matter what their age was, we owned a piece of that action, we owned a percentage of it. Well, Mr. Speaker, what the member for Stephenville is saying is that has been wiped out by concurrent agreements by two Tory administrations. We no longer own it. We have no piece of the

action. We have nothing! We have no incentives to go drill and we have no percentage of the chunk of the real estate offshore that we own as a birthright given to us by the Liberal Party of Canada. It has been wiped out by the Tory Party of Newfoundland and the Tory Party of Canada. That is what the member for Stephenville was lecturing the House Leader about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank my colleague for St. Barbe for his protection from the minister. I appreciate that very much.

While I am not be the most knowledgeable individual in Newfoundland and Labrador - I will never say I am, second most probably, but I will never admit that I am - I have legitimate concerns about this accord and I state them. I get up in this House at the risk of being done in by the most knowledgeable leader, the leader of the House on the government side. I do not mind that at all as long as I can be reassured that we have not negotiated away this clause which we could have had which would have meant some great revenues for us and a greater say in the offshore. Now, if that is wrong, I am sure the minister will tell me and I have no problem with that. I am not saying that I a right, I have questions about it. I am sure the minister is going to

tell me exactly from right or wrong and he will do it in his good typical fashion and be right nice to me since he thinks I am a nice guy.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Who is this?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
The Minister Responsible for the Petroleum Directorate. I want to go through a couple of comments here. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is a very knowledgeable individual on the offshore, I must say, especially concerning the back-in clause. Not only that but, Douglas House, who wrote a book and in the book talked about this state participation. He says, "Although radical in North America, such a participation agreement is now standard practice in the offshore industry internationally. Participation," he says, "has all been but abandoned in the Atlantic Accord".

So you know, I get concerned -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Who is it?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Douglas House, you know the guy who is the head of the Royal Commission on Unemployment and Employment.

MR. TULK:  
Is that the fellow who is going to solve the unemployment problem in Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Yes, the gentleman who is suggesting solutions. Now, when a gentleman of that renown says something like that, I am concerned. I want to bring those concerns to the minister in this

historic debate because I think that they have to be addressed. I am sure that he will address them when he gets up and I look forward to that. He may help me make my decision as to what I am going to do about this vote on the Atlantic Accord.

He says, "Through direct participation in the resource development process, the corporation, that is the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation, was designed to help the Province achieve a fair share of revenues, jobs in industry benefits, while operating in a manner which is sensitive to local needs."

So this is the type of thing that we had and that we do not have now. I thought that the thing we had before was not too bad. I thought it was pretty good, actually. I thought that the minister would have fought to have it kept in the Atlantic Accord. He seems to think that it was not that good. So I am sure that he will clarify that.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Clarify what?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
State participation. You seem to think that it is not there or whatever. I do not know.

MR. MARSHALL:  
What is that?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
I just explained it. Now, if you are not listening I am sorry. But I am not going to repeat it.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Clarify what?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, can you keep the minister quiet so I can continue my remarks. I am trying my best to -

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Order, please!

Can we have silence while the hon. member is debating.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order please, on both sides of the House.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
To me that is the big concern I have. There are a lot more and maybe what I could do is write them down and send them to the minister in writing so that he can answer them. But that is the big concern I have with this. The participation for Newfoundland and Labrador is somewhat limited. We could have had more with this state participation that we have with the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation.

So that is the concern that I would like to express and I think it is a legitimate one. I would like the minister and his colleagues to address that concern. I have others, like I said, and I think that it is a major concern for many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who have seen this administration base their politics on the offshore and the marbles in that basket saying, "We are the fighters for Newfoundland and we will have for you what is required, what is needed, what we have never had before, an

agreement that will give us all of the benefits that could accrue to us in the maximum fashion." If that is such, I have concerns that it is not and I think that there are some things that could be improved. I am sure the minister will tell us the difference and give us this great knowledge that he has so we can decide what we think of this Atlantic Accord. I am just about to finish my comments on the whole thing.

I hope the minister could take those comments in serious vein. I have great concerns about this bill. It is an historic bill; it is a bill that is very important to Newfoundland's future.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
If it is alright, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has a few remarks he wants to make. Since he is not here, I adjourn the debate, if it is permissible, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
That is quite permissible. I want to say that the Leader of the Opposition, I understand, is going to be out of town tomorrow so what we have agreed to do is we will bring this Second Reading debate back on Monday. Hopefully we

might be able to conclude it then, because I am anxious to hear what the Leader of the Opposition has to say. I am also anxious, I can tell the hon. gentlemen there opposite, in making sure that the Leader of the Opposition is going to be in this Chamber when this bill is voted on with a standing vote.

Tomorrow we will be dealing with the following order of business, as it appears on today's Order Paper. We will be doing: Order 15, Bill No. 12; Order 16, Bill No. 4; Order 17, Bill No. 26; Order 31, Bill No. 48; and then we will be coming back to Order 19, Bill No. 27 - we will skip An Act To Amend The Petroleum And Natural Gas Act because that will go after the Atlantic Accord - and then we will have 'An Act Respecting The Power To Approve By-laws And Regulations Passed By Various Associations Of Professionals', etc.

Now, having said that I would adjourn, Mr. Speaker. I will not be in the Chamber on Monday myself so perhaps we will have the vote when -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame!

MR. MARSHALL:

I know you will all miss me.

MR. TULK:

We will, we will!

MR. MARSHALL:

One other thing, since we are in such an affable mood, Mr. Speaker, I want to put on the Order Paper what will be the last piece of business, there will be other business. With leave, if I could give a Notice of Motion.

MR. TULK:

Sure.

MR. MARSHALL:

On behalf of the Premier, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that this House hereby recommends to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the appointment of Ambrose Hubert Peddle to be the Parliamentary Commissioner pursuant to the Parliamentary Commissioner's Ombudsman Act.

It is a renewal.

MR. TULK:

This happens regularly.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes. I am just giving a Notice of Motion to get it on the Order Paper.

We could call it 5:30 p.m. and get on with the Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed to call it 5:30 p.m.?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### Debate on the Adjournment

[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

We have three questions for the Late Show. The first question is from the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) and it is addressed to the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young): 'I am dissatisfied with an answer given to me by the Minister of Public Works and Services and wish to debate the issue on the Late Show.'



AN HON. MEMBER:

Is that the only one?

MR. SPEAKER:

No.

The other two questions are: Number two question is posed by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) addressed to the Minister of Public Works and Services. He is dissatisfied with an answer given by the Minister of Public Works and Services concerning the hiring of public employees and he wishes to debate it on the Late Show. Number three, posed by the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), is addressed to the Premier. He is dissatisfied with an answer to a question.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad the hon. the House Leader is not going to be here on Monday to hear my Leader speak with reference to the Offshore Accord. It certainly will not be an attack upon his person as was the reverse. Let me get to the question, Mr. Speaker. This whole question that rises out of the Department of Public Works and Services rises because there is a very obvious, blatant and perceived problem, and the problem arises from what we see in an ad from the Minister of Public Works and Services and what we see the Minister of Public Works saying on public television across this Province.

Let me deal with it one at a time. The ad, and I will table it - it is the Public Tendering Act, and there is a section here that says, 'What does the Act mean? The Act means that government will do the following:' Now, what does it say? It says, 'Government will

- a means of preventing patronage and a deterrent to a conflict of interest amongst ministers and public servants alike.' In other words, this Act will protect ministers from putting their hands into the pork barrel, like other ministers, and it will protect minister's bureaucrats from doing the same thing. So what we have is the minister spending taxpayer's dollars advertising the fact -

MR. DOYLE:

Only permanent positions.

MR. FUREY:

Is the Minister of Municipal Affairs saying this is only for permanent positions?

MR. DOYLE:

All permanent positions.

MR. FUREY:

All permanent positions. I will come back to that and I am glad you said it and not me. We see the minister say this on the one hand and what do we hear the minister say on television on the other hand? On the other hand we hear the minister saying, on public television across this Province, 'I will favour those people who worked for me and I will not favour those people who worked against me. Now, clearly that is what the minister said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. YOUNG:

That is not correct.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Let me just ask the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:

Are we ever hitting a nerve over there. The Minister of Sewers is upset, the gofer is upset, they are all upset. We must have hit a nerve. I hope the Minister of Public Works and Services can hear over all the hoopla from the jackals, this very important question. I am glad that the Minister of Municipal Affairs said this ad dealt with permanent positions. That is what he said. Well, let us see what the Premier said today in response to my Leader dealing with temporary positions. He asked, 'Will the Premier answer the question as to whether he supports the principle of hiring young men and women who may never have voted on the basis of whether their parents supported the Minister of Public Works and Services or not?' Now, that is dealing with temporary positions. Here is what the Premier said, "Mr. Speaker, number one, people are hired in the Department of Public Works and Services and in all departments, the temporary people, based upon experience, based upon merit, based upon performance and there is the range of criteria.' Now, the Premier's criteria is one thing and the Minister of Public Works and Services' criteria is quite another. The Premier's criteria is on merit, is on experience and is on performance. The minister, on public television the other night gave us his criteria, 'If they worked for me, I will be kinder to them, if they worked against me, I will not be kinder to them.' And here is what this minister also said in this House, 'The student in my district has a better chance of getting a job if his father supported me than the

person whose father supported the other party.' Now, that is directly in contradiction to what the Premier said. The Premier's remarks are clear: Experience, merit, performance. And this minister had the gall to stand in this House and say, 'In my district, they will get a job if their fathers supported me and not any other party.' Clearly, what he said in the House, what he said on public television -

MR. BAIRD:

Why do you not go back to the (inaudible) in 1985.

MR. FUREY:

Can you quiet down that jackass on the backbench, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BAIRD:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

I would just like to advise the hon. the member for St. Barbe that I am no jackass! If he were to say that outside this Assembly, I think he would wish he had not. I ask him to withdraw.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

The hon. member is absolutely correct, he is not a jackass. I apologize and I would ask him to respect my privilege and my right to speak in this House, rather than yap like a jackass. So I say, Mr. Speaker, he is not a

jackass and I ask him not to behave like a jackass. That is fair. He is a good and honourable member, so I respect that he is not a jackass; therefore, he should not behave like a jackass.

My question to the minister is this - you cannot say in the House one thing, that 'I will hire in my district and they have a better chance if the father supported me,' and you cannot say on public television, 'I will support you if you will support my party and I will hire people who support my party,' because it is in contravention of what the Premier said. I would ask the minister to explain the difference.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, yesterday I answered that question and the hon. member was not satisfied. I am sure his question and my answer had nothing to do with the ad in the paper. The ad does not deal in any way whatsoever with employment or the hiring of people, it deals with the Public Tendering Act.

Mr. Speaker, I also agree with the statements of the Premier, that the criteria of hiring in government is merit, performance and ability to do the job, but probably the other criteria is what I said on television.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The second question, posed by the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. SIMMS:  
See if you can outdo 'Chuck'

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, let me say to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), you do not have to outdo, as he calls him, 'Chuck', and neither do you have to outdo the member for St. Barbe, when you have the Minister of Public Works and Services standing in his place on one of the most serious issues to have come before this House and, in answer to a question on the Late Show, he spends thirty seconds out of the five minutes he has, answering the question. Now, I can understand why the hon. gentleman does not want to stand in this House, Mr. Speaker, and speak. Because what he did on public television in this Province, he knows it, the Premier knows it, every member on that side of the House knows it, that what -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Now, boy!

MR. TULK:  
Be careful of him, Mr. Speaker, he is a violent man sometimes.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Who, me?

MR. TULK:  
No, not you, the man with the red tie down there who is trying to get his image up for the leadership.

Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman did the other night was confess to everything that people on that side know that is

happening. He confessed to what is a common practice on that side of the House.

MR. FUREY:  
Corruption.

MR. TULK:  
It is called corruption. Maybe the hon. gentleman is not as fast on his feet in front of a television camera as the Premier and some of his other colleagues, and for that he can be forgiven. But the fact of the matter is, he told the truth.

MR. BAIRD:  
That is something a Liberal never does.

MR. TULK:  
He told the truth by saying to the people of this Province -

MR. MITCHELL:  
It is something the Liberals do not know how to do.

MR. TULK:  
Ah, ha!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Foot and Mouth has spoken again.

By saying to the people of this Province that if you do not vote Tory - we have seen the Premier do this in political campaigns in the Province - in this Province, you are not considered equal to those people who do. That is exactly what the hon. gentleman said. That is the principle upon which we have seen the Premier of this Province campaign in election after election. The Tory candidates, what have they done in Newfoundland? Day after day, after day, for twenty-one days

they will trounce around their districts and they will say, vote for me. The member for Port au Port knows what I am talking about, we have discussed it many times. They will trounce around their districts day after day for twenty-one days and say, vote Tory or else. Now that is what the Minister of Public Works and Services said the other night on public television.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of districts, and I am glad to see the Minister of Municipal Affairs over there giving his piece of advice, because I know what he told him. I know what he told the Minister of Public Works and Services, 'tell about all the money he got down in his district for water and sewer.' I bet you that is what he told him. Is that what you told him 'Norm', tell him about the money he got down in his district for water and sewer? So stand up 'Haig' and tell us. Would the Minister of Public Works and Services stand up and tell us that the Premier has finally realized that you cannot blackmail the people of Fogo, you cannot bribe them and you cannot buy them, that they will vote the way they want to vote? I would tell the hon. gentleman that he stood in his place in this House and made the statement that the people of Harbour Grace will elect him forever. I think he said that yesterday. But I want to tell him that if he thinks, and this is perhaps the bigger sin that he has committed as a member, that he can buy the people of Harbour Grace district, then he had better start thinking again. I would love to be the candidate against him in the next election and take him on on that issue, because I tell him that he cannot buy the people of Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
- try as you like.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Are you looking for somewhere to run?

MR. TULK:  
Well, if you were looking for somewhere to run you would run in Carbonear, because that is probably the easiest district to take from the Tories.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here a beautiful picture of the Minister of Public Works and Services, it is one of his better pictures, in the ad which says, 'What it is, and what it mean', talking about the Public Tendering Act that the President of the Council, the Government House Leader is so proud of. 'It is a means of preventing patronage.' How noble! How noble do those words sound!

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
The hon. gentleman was on television the other night saying, 'I used the taxpayers' money for patronage.'

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I have listened

to this debate and these questions for the last two days. I mean, there are more Tories in Newfoundland than there are Liberals. That is a fact. There are thirty-six seats on this side and there are fifteen Liberals on the other side, so it stands to reason that more Tories would get jobs. As far as I am concerned -

MR. FUREY:  
What is your point of order?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Speaker, I am about ready to get to my point of order - the hon. gentlemen have struck bottom on this issue, because they are trying to make it sound like there are no Liberals in this Province getting jobs from this Administration.

Now, I just want to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as refuting that. Because as Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, I have given jobs to Liberals in the last three or four weeks, and I can name them. I can tell them right now, Mr. Speaker. And some of them who got jobs, are relatives of some of them over there.

My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is this:

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You gave jobs to Liberals?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Yes, I did. Is that not terrible?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Shame! Shame!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
My point of order is simply this, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. House Leader (Mr. Tulk) over there is trying to taint this administration as giving jobs to

Tories only and I want to stand on record in this House as saying that we treat everyone equally in this administration and if the hon. gentleman continues to pursue this, I am going to submit names, table names, and it is going to embarrass some of his colleagues over there. If you keep it up you are going to be embarrassed.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman has succeeded in wasting my time, but I would ask him one simple question. He just made the same confession as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) made the other night. How do you know they are Liberals? How do you know they are Liberals? Do you check them? Do you have to be checked to see whether you are Liberal or Tory in this Province to get a job? You have just made the second confession.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

A new point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

You have made the second confession. Table your list.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is a point of order on the floor.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

The new point of order, Mr. Speaker, is simply this, that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Public Works and Services, is being accused because he gave jobs to people, that because he gave them to them, they were all Tories. They are all Tories they say, right? And because their relatives get jobs, they are all Tories.

MR. FUREY:

He did not say that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You are accusing him of it. He did not say it, you accused him of it.

The situation is, to use the same logic and the same reason, if there are people who are related to members opposite, then I take it for granted that they are Liberals. So I am only using the same logic. If such is the case, we are then equal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let what he has just said go down in Hansard as confession number

two from the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He will table it.

MR. TULK:

Table it! And will you tell us who are Liberals and who are not? And let me ask this House this question, did the Minister of Public Works make the statement that, "The sons and daughters of people who work for me have a better chance of getting a job than the sons and daughters of those people who did not." He said, "I am only human. After all, I am only human." Well I say to him that he may be human but he has made a botch of the Ministry of Public Works.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, we saw again this afternoon in the Late Show the nonsense and the foolishness hon. members on the opposite side are going on with. In his remarks the House Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tulk) accuses me for telling the truth. Is there anything wrong with telling the truth, Mr. Speaker? That is what I would like to know. Is there anything wrong with telling the truth? You know, should I not tell the truth?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know a little bit more about the Liberal Party probably than the hon. gentleman does, and how you could get a job

by calling up the former Liberal Premier. I can tell you you never had to go through no Public Service Commission to get a job then, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG:

I ask the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, who brought in the Public Service Commission Act?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Who did?

MR. YOUNG:

We had to bring it in, Mr. Speaker, because the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was going crazy over-appointing people.

MR. TULK:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman may be right. Maybe under a former administration in this Province you could, but let me tell him here is his ad, where he was so proud that he had an act to prevent patronage. You made the commitment. Your administration, the Premier's administration made the commitment to the people of this Province that there would be no more patronage, and the other night you confessed to still doing it. As a man, you should resign.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

The last time I got up and said very few words the hon. member accused me of not saying enough. I just asked this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, who brought in the Public Service Commission Act? Who brought in the Tendering Act? We had to bring in the Public Service Commission Act because of the actions of the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you what is happening on the other side. Apparently, they did a little poll and they got the results of what is happening in the district of Harbour Grace. I challenge anyone on the other side, including the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), to come out and I will show you what is going to happen in the next election. If they were only as sure of winning the fifteen or sixteen seats they have in the next election as I am sure of winning the district of Harbour Grace, they would have no trouble keeping their seats warm.

MR. MATTHEWS:

They sewed it up for you.

MR. YOUNG:

I would not be going around kissing pigs, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You will use the pork barrel, though.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say one thing before I get on to the question. Concerning kissing the pig, Mr. Speaker, if ever I had something in my hand that I was proud of, it is this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

When I walk into the Janeway Hospital and I see the sick children down there and I can do something -

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that what we are debating right now is questions on the Late Show. I have not heard a question today or any other time this week -

MR. EFFORD:

Well, then, keep your mouth shut when I am talking.

MR. TOBIN:

- as it relates to the member for Port de Grave, Mr. Speaker. We do not care if he kissed a pig, we do not care if the pig is a sow or a boar, that is not important to us. This is the Late Show, Mr. Speaker, and he should put his



question now and forget about the pigs.

MR. EFFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

The member for Burin - Placentia West just stood in his place and said that I am wasting time and they do not care about what I did out in my district. They cared enough this afternoon to take the time and the opportunity to photocopy the picture and send it all around the House, so he is wrong on that point. What I did here was for the sick children at the Janeway. And I would kiss a pig again next year, because I am the most popular gentleman in the district. I would even consider kissing some of the members opposite if it would help the children at the Janeway Hospital, Mr. Speaker, but it would be very serious.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I make my contribution and I do it gladly for the Janeway. I do not have to brag about my donations to charity, do not worry about that.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I would like to bring to your attention is

that the person who printed this did not know which was the hon. member for Port de Grave. They had to say 'Port de Grave MHA, John Efford.' They had to distinguish between the pig and 'John'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I cannot see a point of order. The hon. member was not satisfied with an answer he got from the Premier and I presume he is developing his point at the present time.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

For the hon. gentleman's information, Mr. Speaker, I can tell him that this Caucus here donated, I think it was, \$1,000 to the Janeway. How much did your Caucus donate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I commend the PC Caucus for doing that. I have nothing against

that, it is the same as what I did out in my district and I commend you for that.

Mr. Speaker, my question this afternoon to the hon. the Premier was concerning the confession that the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) made recently in a news statement. I am not condemning - I want this very clear - I am not condemning or making the same accusations against other ministers in that particular government. The issue we are talking is the way in which the Minister of Public Works and Services has - and still is - abused his position by the way in which he carries out hiring practices for people from his district. He has on numerous occasions in his district, publicly in the town council hall of Upper Island Cover, time and time again, told people very clearly, 'You are Liberal, do not talk to me. You are Liberal, I am not doing anything for you.'

Now, I am sure that the Premier of this Province does not condone that type of action from the Minister of Public Works and Services. I am sure that the Premier has a responsibility and he realizes his responsibility to the people of this Province. The polls very clearly show how the Minister of Public Works and Services has been abusing his position. I presented, this afternoon, a number of names - I think it was twenty-one names - to the Premier of the Province and I asked him to check it out. If the accusations that we have been making are false, then I will accept the blame. But I ask the Premier to check out these names, and there were very, very few names. They were appointed -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:  
It is only ten minutes to six, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member has spoken for five minutes.

MR. EFFORD:  
That is ridiculous!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I listened to some of the debate outside the House, the great presumption on behalf of the member for Port de Grave that he would want to embrace him in some form of kissing operation next year. I do not know if we can forge a deal with the Opposition to enter into this kind of an embrace next year. Perhaps we will on behalf of the sick children at the Janeway.

Mr. Speaker, from all of this, it seems to me the issue has more to do with CBC than it has to do with the Opposition or anybody else. I think there is a penchant on behalf of some of the members of the media, particularly CBC, to try to prove some kind of wrong doing by this government. They have been at it for two or three years. I have been harassed personally in the last year, on several occasions, sometimes over a number of days, by reporters over completely unfounded allegations, and they always come to me or come to other ministers, and the way the whole thing is concocted, there is the presumption of guilt right from

day one. If they can get the Minister of Public Works under the lights for thirty-five minutes and have their questions all designed - and do not ask them to give the questions ahead of time because that is awfully insulting. You are not supposed to do that. If they can get some minister or some member, and it could be on the other side just as easily as it could be on this side, they can try to portray or depict, and they are sure not to have it in context. I have done interviews which have been ten or fifteen minutes long, and they will pick some part out. The worst part they possibly can is what they will put out, Mr. Speaker, on the news. And that is what they did with the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young). They conspired and it was done. It was done by a CBC reporter who is a good socialist.

MR. TOBIN:  
Defeated.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
A defeated socialist. And they conspired to try to catch the Minister of Public Works and Services.

It has been said by some of the members in the media at cocktail parties and so on, 'The Premier, myself here, 'must have some skeletons in his closet and we are going to find them.' It has been said by them. They have done interviews with ministers and, I am sure, members opposite, where they have tried their darndest, and they will not play anything positive that the minister said, they will conspire to get it around as negative as can be, because negativism is news as far as they are concerned.

We have made statements here in this House from time to time about job creation or about some other thing, or even when the Opposition and the government get together on something, and now we have done it on three or four motions, and they will still lead in their article with, you know, 'A miracle happened in the House, the two sides got together,' even though perhaps we have gotten together as much on resolutions over the last two or three years as any Legislature anywhere.

Last evening, Mr. Speaker, was a good example on this very subject. How did CBC play, for example? - 'I rushed out of the House.' It just so happened yesterday, I did not rush out, I went more slowly than I normally go out of the House. After I got out of the House and went downstairs I rushed, because I had to catch the plane and get to Corner Brook. But you know what the press said. And you take anybody watching it - it could happen to any of us in this House - 'He rushed out of the House and was unavailable for comment.' As I understand it, the press knew where I was gone. If they were going to play, 'unavailable for comment,' the first thing they should have done was call my press secretary anyway asking, 'Is the Premier available for comment? We want one on the Question Period.' So, you know, it is all part of it, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
On a point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
The purpose of the Late Show, Mr.

Speaker, as was clearly pointed out to me, was to get to the issue that we were not satisfied with the answers to the questions we were asking. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has very clearly for the last three or four minutes, wasted time and not referred to the list. I did not make any false accusations. I presented a list to the Premier and I asked him very clearly, Mr. Speaker, to have it investigated to see whether the accusations we are making are false or true.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I said in the House yesterday and I say it again today, on temporary employment we hire on the basis of merit, on performance. There have been students hired one year who were not rehired the next year - they might have been recommended by a member opposite or a member on this side - because their performance was not up to par. It goes on all the time. There is merit, there is their performance, there is seniority and all the rest that go into all of the hiring that occurs on temporary employment.

The Minister of Public Works and Services is right when he says that this government has hired through the Public Service Commission. You can go and check all the information. Now and then number one is not picked because the department puts up arguments for it, but then there is a grievance procedure. If the department or the minister does not pick number one and picks two

and three, they have to defend that before an independent tribunal which has nothing to do with government. That is the way the Public Service Commission works in the hiring of permanent staff.

On temporary staff the various departments have the discretion, because it is only practical to do it that way. Because Summer employment is not very long, you do not want to take three weeks to go out and do ads and all the rest of it, because it is not practical to do it. Sometimes the minister might have to come up, because of forest fires or something, for more temporary employment right on the spur of the moment and has to hire them right away. That is the whole point of temporary employment.

I just heard from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, for example, who told me that a CBC reporter told him, 'Get back to my previous point.' From CBC's point they have to be the Opposition in Newfoundland, they are not going to leave it to the Liberal Party. Now, you know, that is the way the press act, and he said that.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

There cannot be a point of order now, the motion adjourn is deemed to have been put.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier still has not answered the question. There is no debate going on here about CBC. The question was not about

CBC, it was about the action that he was going to take as to what that minister said. Obviously, he does not have the courage to take any.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is out of order. There is a motion on the floor now to adjourn.

MR. TULK:  
Well, you have not put it yet, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
"Aye".

MR. SPEAKER:  
Those against 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Carried.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 a.m.