



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 3

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

20 March 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I have some positive news today to pass on to members of the House of Assembly. I want to advise them that I was informed this morning, by telephone, by the Federal Forestry Minister, Mr. Merithew, that we have now reached an agreement on a new forestry subsidiary proposal, to replace the old one which will expire at the end of this month.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
I am not at liberty to disclose the details yet, that will be done in a few times when Mr. Merithew will come down and along with myself and my colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), will sign the agreement and announce the details. I want to give the assurance to members of this House and, indeed, the public, therefore, that we are satisfied with the agreement and I am pleased to inform the public and the House of this particular development today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I want to thank the minister for letting me know earlier that he was going to make a statement. I also want to thank him for bringing us some good news, as he said. It is great to see that we now have an agreement in place which is going to help benefit the forestry in this Province. It is long, long overdue. I can see now that the cups of tea in Ottawa have paid off, and you have an agreement. I look forward to working with the minister to improve forestry in this Province, and I hope that there are some great benefits for this Province in this agreement.

I also want to mention that my colleague for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) is very interested in the chemical pulp plant supposedly going to be negotiated, or built in the near future in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, and I would like to know if, in the near future, there is going to be some information coming from this agreement on that, or related information coming from the minister?

We welcome the news. We are waiting, also, for the forestry center to be announced for Corner Brook. We are looking forward to hearing that announcement in the near future. We welcome any good news. I pat you on the back for this, but we will be watching very closely to see what happens.

Thank you very much.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I have passed a copy of the injunction that was served on the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees over to the Premier and I would like to ask the Premier whether he was attempting to mislead the House yesterday when he raised the question of whether or not this injunction applied to members of the General Service. Would the Premier not agree that this injunction, in its plain terms, applies to all the members of NAPE?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of some happenings this morning the government takes the view that we wish not to comment on matters dealing with the dispute at this time in order to allow the exploratory talks that began this morning to continue and that anything we would say may be construed in some manner. So we would rather, because of the delicacy of the situation, refrain from making any comments that in any way are related to the present dispute to give the full chance of these exploratory talks being successful so that we could see the return to work of the employees.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

As of 1:30 Mr. March was saying

that there had been approaches made indirectly, that there were no talks underway, that he was prepared to return to the bargaining table without condition, but the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) is saying that there will be -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is this a supplementary question?

MR. BARRY:

No, it is a new question, Mr. Speaker. The President of Treasury Board is saying, Mr. Speaker, that there will be no negotiation until the employees return back to work. Now, which is it? Are the Premier and government speaking to NAPE? Are negotiations underway? Is government at the bargaining table, as the Premier said it was yesterday, or was that another attempt to mislead this House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have said what we are going to say on this matter right now. Obviously we are into a very delicate period and I think that any comment I would make or the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) or the President of Treasury Board, would not be opportune right now. We are eager to see the employees who are now on a work stoppage go back to work, and we want to allow the discussions that have been going on this morning, and hopefully will be going on this afternoon, to have the best possible chance of success. So I think the least said from our point of view to indicate anything the better in the hope that this will be taken

by the union as a sign that government is very serious to have this matter resolved.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Will the Premier answer the question I asked him directly: Are discussions underway with NAPE or is the Premier trying to avoid the heat in the House of Assembly by pretending that they are back at the bargaining table when in fact the President of Treasury Board is saying they will not return while the workers are out? Are you back or are you not?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to take whatever heat that the Leader of the Opposition wants to give, and that is no problem for me or for any member of this administration. The kind of heat that the Leader of the Opposition applies to this side of the House is so cold that we have to put our mitts on.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Your Honour recognized the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. SPEAKER:
As I understand it, the hon. member has yielded to the Leader of the Opposition.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
On a point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I was up at the same time as the member for Windsor - Buchans. If he is to yield to anyone he is obviously to yield to me since I was the next person to be recognized.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier to indicate, in light of the injunction that I have just passed over to him, which he may only have seen for the first time, whether he is now prepared to admit that this injunction was used as a method of intimidation rather than an instrument to maintain order? And whether he would indicate whether he is now prepared to ensure that the -

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, who should know better than any other member in this House, has indicated that an injunction has been given for that particular purpose. And, Mr. Speaker, what he is doing is he is impugning the integrity of the courts, he is calling into question an order of the Chief Justice of this Province, and he should be called upon to withdraw it. I mean, it is all right for the hon. gentleman to get on with political rhetoric and what have you, but certainly there have to be certain bounds.

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, in order to obtain that injunction the Chief Justice of Newfoundland had to receive certain facts from members opposite. There had to be the statement made, Mr. Speaker, that the public order and safety would be harmed if the workers were not ordered back to work - the members of NAPE, Mr. Speaker, not MOS or Health or any specific unit, the members of NAPE. We had the Premier stand up in this House yesterday and say of the General Service, members of NAPE, that he was not going to look to see whether the injunction applied to them, when the clear and plain reading of this is that it applies to all the members of NAPE.

Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning or impugning the Chief Justice of this Province or the laws of this Province, but they are being brought into disrepute by the evasive tactics of the Premier and members opposite and by the fact that they are treating one group of citizens one way under the laws of this Province and another group in another way. And the point is are they now going to keep charges laid against 120 citizens of this Province when they are not going to have charges laid against hundreds others on the picket lines?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the point of order which my colleague raised was the allegation by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that the injunctions were used for a political or some improper purpose. Now the fact is that an injunction is the order of a court, the injunction issues from the court. That injunction issued from the Trial Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, and in calling into question and in castigating and in satirizing and ridiculing the injunction, the hon. member is by necessity, not by implication, not by extension, not by the exercise of great powers of reasoning, but evidently and factually and automatically, calling into account the impartiality of the Supreme Court and it is clear in parliamentary law and parliamentary custom that no hon. member, on this side or on the other side, may call into question the impartiality of the court. The court is not elected, the court is not political, the

court is there as an impartial tribunal for the rule of law, and to call into question its partiality, its fairness is not permitted to any member, whether in Opposition or government, whether it be the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) or the Premier. And that is the question which is now before the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount states it very well, that the court has made an injunction. The implementation of that injunction is what my friend from Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) was talking about. We submit, and he submits and I submit, that the implementation has not been equitable, that it has been implemented on certain days and not on other days. Now nobody in this House will submit that the court had anything to do with that interpretation of the injunction. Somebody else interpreted the injunction and applied it accordingly, and we say with unfair discrimination. That is the point we are making. We are casting no aspersions on the court, but we are casting a lot of aspersions on whoever interpreted so conveniently that injunction after the fact.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order that was

raised, it does not appear to the Chair that there is a point of order. So I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to ask his question.

MR. BARRY:

The question is, in light of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier had decided that this injunction will now no longer be implemented with respect to the General Service members of NAPE who are covered under its clear terms, will the Premier now agree, and stand up like a man in this House and admit that he and the President of Treasury Board and members opposite were attempting to use this injunction as an instrument of intimidation rather than as a method of maintaining order in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me quite obvious, and I am sure it is to other members of the House and those who are within earshot of the Question Period, that the Leader of the Opposition and the members opposite are insistent on keeping this dispute going.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They hate to see any movement, any crack, any light at the end of the tunnel which may see the end to this dispute. For our part over here, Mr. Speaker, we are interested in seeing an end to it as quickly as is possible. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we continue to say to the Leader of the Opposition and anybody else who asks the question because, exploratory talks were held this

morning, some maybe ongoing right now, we do not wish to make any comments relative to the dispute, to signal to the union membership and to the union leadership that we are very eager to have this dispute solved. Any comments on the court injunction, or comments upon statements that have been made by the union leadership, I do not think would be appropriate. We want to demonstrate, by our silence, that we are putting our best foot forward and, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, we want to see an end to this dispute as soon as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor). The public of Newfoundland are stating concerns that if this strike continues welfare cheques may be held up, prisoners may not be able to be paroled because the staff are not there, drivers' licences will not be issued, and all kinds of government services to people suspended. So, would the minister tell us does he intend to stand by his threat to suspend people who are off on strike now, the members of MOS and the General Service? Does he intend to continue and follow through with suspensions, even though he knows that very act will further curtail services -

MR. WINDSOR:

Essential services?

MR. FLIGHT:

Essential services, if he wants to use 'essential', yes, to people in this Province, even though that one month suspension is going to further curtail and eliminate services to people of this Province? Will he follow through on his threat to issue suspensions which would now have to be issued to over 5,000 people?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the hon. gentleman is in the same camp as his leader in that he too will do anything possible to try to prolong this unfortunate dispute. The only thing that I will say to him, Mr. Speaker, is that various departments of government are doing what is necessary with management people to ensure that essential services to the public of this Province are provided.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, it does not matter what camp one is in. One has eyes to see and ears to hear and one can see what is happening in this Province. I ask the minister this, by what rationale did he decide to suspend all the workers that would dare come out on strike, and now it is 5,000, and in the same breath that he issued the suspension by what rationale did he say that you must stay

off? He is claiming they are essential one day, Mr. Speaker, that the day they went on strike they were breaking the law because they were essential in the better interests of the people of Newfoundland, but in the same breath he threatens to suspend 5,000 workers.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, I have addressed that question on numerous occasions in the past few days but, as the Premier has already said, we on this side of the House do not intend to do anything today which might jeopardize any possibility of finding an end to this dispute. The hon. gentleman will have to read the newspapers from last week.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, both the Premier and the minister have indicated the desire to get this strike settled, so would the minister tell this House of Assembly is he prepared to talk about, is he prepared to consider the lifting of that threat of suspensions in order to get the MOS and the General Service back to the bargaining

table? Will he lift the suspensions?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, what the government may be prepared to do is something the government will decide at the appropriate time and place. I can assure the hon. gentleman I am not going to negotiate with him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am afraid you are not going to get me complaining about not arresting any more people on picket lines, at least not in the foreseeable future. Mr. Speaker, my question has been partially answered but I may continue on with it. My question was to the Premier and essentially it was, since the MOS negotiating team was back at the bargaining table or was sitting at the bargaining table, would the government be willing to go back, but I understand from his comments, which I very much welcome, that indeed some sort of talks are going on right now. I wish them all the best of luck because I think that is important.

I would like to explore a secondary avenue.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member is making a speech.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, but I am just giving a preamble to the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please ask his question?

MR. FENWICK:

My question is this: Since the President of the Treasury Board has indicated that the ILO decision or the ILO report and the ramifications of Bill 59 are negotiatible or are at least discussionable, and since in the government advertisement today it repeated parts of the ILO committee report which also called for discussions -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

I am getting to it now.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have asked the hon. member to ask his question. He continues to make a speech. So I would ask him now to ask his question or I will recognize another member.

MR. FENWICK:

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier is: Is he willing to enter into the negotiations that the ILO has suggested in its committee report with NAPE and the other unions that are involved with the Public Service (Collective Bargaining) Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, may I thank the member for Menihék. He

was kind enough this morning to communicate to my office that he would be asking a number of questions in the House on this matter. I want to thank him sincerely for that. It shows that the hon. member is trying to be very responsible in a very difficult situation. I did not have a phone call from the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously some of the matters that the member has indicated are matters that quite possibly are under discussion right now. I do not know. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) has said on a number of occasions, and we have continued to say through the former Minister of Labour and now Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), that we would continue the review of all labour legislation with the new consultative committee that we had in place, which continues to be in place, on an ongoing basis, all legislation relative to the Ministry of Labour's jurisdiction. But I would not want to say anything more than that at the present moment. Obviously there are some talks now that are proceeding, and proceeded through the morning, and I imagine there are a number of topics that are being discussed and that could quite likely be one of them.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Notwithstanding anything that has been said so far in Question Period, as a first positive step towards ending the current labour dispute will the Premier take action to cancel the thirty day suspensions as a gesture of good faith?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, all matters that are relevant to the dispute I cannot negotiate, as the President of Treasury Board just said to a previous question, with the hon. member opposite. There are discussions underway right now and we will see how they get on. To bring up one or other of the issues that the labour leaders or that the government might want to raise and to do it here in the House while discussions are ongoing, would be irresponsible and preempting what is now taking place. I am not going to make any comment on any of the issues that are concerned. There are delicate talks going ahead and we hope they are successful. Various issues are going to be brought up by the parties at the table and we will just see how that works out.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the strategy the Premier is using. It may be construed by some as a method of getting off the hook in the House but I chose not to take that particular belief. It seems to me, when we talked about injunctions and so on, the Premier could not respond to similar

questions, and the Premier could not respond to similar questions yesterday because it related to the injunction.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is a supplementary. Could the hon. member ask his question?

MR. KELLAND:

Has the Premier given any indication to the representatives of NAPE that he is considering cancelling the thirty day suspensions as a gesture of good faith?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is just another way of asking the same question. I am not going to comment upon issues that are presently outstanding between the two parties.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and it concerns, of course, the present dispute and a statement that was made by the Minister of Labour last week in which he said if this strike were in the private sector rather than the public sector, then the general public would not be supporting the strikers. Now, Mr. Speaker, that leaves itself open to a number of interpretations. I would like for the minister, the author of Bill 59, to stand in his place and explain what exactly he meant by that statement. What did he mean when he said that if the strike was in the private sector rather than the public sector, then the public would not be supporting the strikers? Exactly

what did he mean by that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like for the hon. the member for Fogo to present to me in writing that I said that. I deny having made any such statement as what the member just stated. But try as they will, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody on this side of the House today going to make any statements on the very delicate situation as it stands right now. Many days I sat here bored waiting for good questions to answer, but today there is a very delicate situation and I have nothing to say about it.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I say to the hon. minister that he does not know half the time whether he is punched or bored over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, they are awful touchy about something over there today. What is going on? As 'the person responsible', and I use the minister's words, his exact words, his printed words in one of those full page ads that they take out from time to time on the other side, as 'the person responsible for harmonious labour relations' - those are his words, he is

responsible for harmonious labour relations in the Province - does the Minister of Labour condone everything that this government has done in the present dispute to its employees? Does he condone some of it or does he condone none of it? And if he does, would he please explain how he can justify his silence over their in his seat, and making the kind of statements that he has made? Does he condone everything, nothing, or some of it? Would he explain to us just what he does condone of what has gone on out there, the kind of provocation and harassment that has gone on?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have been proud of my record in dealing with labour over the years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

And I continue to be proud of my record, Mr. Speaker, and no insults that the hon. the member for Fogo will hurl will daunt my feelings about that. He knows where I stand on that. And if he does not know, his leader, who was minister for five months over there, ought to try to explain to him that you do not talk in public about very delicate situations such as we have at the moment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the great Deputy Minister of Labour who wrote Bill 49 happens now to be the Minister of Labour as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Bill 59.

MR. TULK:

Who wrote Bill 59, who wrote that infamous piece of legislation. He happens now to be the Minister of Labour, and I say to him that he cannot hide behind his past record.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is starting to make a speech.

MR. TULK:

No, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to quit hiding behind his past, because his past, I suspect, is not as good as he would have us believe, and to come out foursquare and stand behind labour in this Province rather than allowing the Premier of this Province to use the hobnail boots and the provocation and harrassment that has gone on with people in this Province. Come out, be a man, stand up and defend them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, just after the hon. gentleman's leader crossed to the other side of this House, he attempted to make a speech when the Federation of Labour was having a function and they closed off the microphone. They did not

want to hear from that party. What are they trying to do, make some brownie points today trying to create more furor?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We welcome the news from the government today that they now recognize the matter is delicate. It was delicate last week when they were seeking to provoke people, when they were harassing people, but we welcome the news that they have come lately to the realization that this is a delicate matter.

Now one of the more delicate aspects of it, Mr. Speaker, is the question of Bill 59. The federal minister, Mr. McKnight, has indicated he has been in touch with the provincial government to get them to change this bill. Will the Premier confirm that he has had such contact from Mr. McKnight or if not he, the Premier, then some other minister in his administration?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there are, unlike when the hon. member was a minister in the Federal Cabinet, ongoing communication between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland concerning issues which are of mutual concern to both governments, and they will continue. I am not only hopeful

but I am fairly confident that they are going to continue because people like the hon. member who just asked the question are not going to find themselves in positions of power in Ottawa for a long time.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

As always I enjoyed the Premier's answer. It had nothing to do with the question but that is beside the point. Now I put the question again. Has he heard from Mr. McKnight specifically the recommendation, the representation that the Bill 59 provisions be changed to fall in line with the ILO requirements? Has he had that representation? If he has, what is he going to do about the representation made by Mr. McKnight in this matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we are having ongoing talks with all the departments in Ottawa, including the Ministry of Labour and other departments, and they will continue.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Does the Premier share the view of Mr. McKnight that this Bill 59 requires changing to bring it in line with the ILO concerns?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on that at the present moment because to comment on it may jeopardize the delicate discussions that are ongoing right now.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I want to tell him that not only will we bring this transcript where he talked about the strike, we will bring verbatim the tape on which he said that if this were a strike in the public sector, the general public would not be supporting the strikers. He said it. It is on tape and we will bring it forward.

I have to ask, in light of the answer the minister gave my hon. colleague, how could he, as Minister of Labour, have stood quietly by for ten or twelve days and not said one word about this strike except that, which was an insult to the strikers and to the general public? Would the minister tell us how, as Minister of Labour, with the better interests of the working man at heart, he could have watched as those workers got screwed into the ground by this administration that he is part of? How could he have done that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member

for Buchans and all other members on the opposite side have had ample opportunity to ask any questions of me. I have sat here since the House opened and they choose a day when they are afraid something is going to take place, something positive. The parties are going to be brought to the table and we may get an agreement, and they will have nothing to talk about. They choose today to ask them. You have tomorrow and any other days to ask these nonsensical questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
In light of the minister's extensive experience in the labour relations field, I would like him to get up and tell this House how many times has he seen the imposition of a thirty day suspension being an inducement to the early settlement of a strike?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times we have to tell the hon. member that we are not making comments on this side today, me or anybody else as I understand it, and I think the Premier articulated that very well in the first question, Mr. Speaker. But I ducked no questions from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) or anybody else on the other side, but today we want a process to have whatever chance it

may have of success.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

At this stage I would like to welcome a group of students from Enright Memorial High School from St. Joseph's with their teachers Mr. Green and Mr. Reardon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

ooo

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
On a matter of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I took considerable encouragement yesterday from the statement from the Chair that it was the Chair's intention to enforce vigorously the rules of this House. I noted in particular your actions in the last day or so in insisting on short questions and answers for which I commend the Chair, if that is in order.

In the vein that you introduced here into this House yesterday when you made that statement, I would ask you to consider the following matter of privilege. Beauchesne, on page 104, paragraph 319 (3) provides in part: "a Member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any

reflections on the House," etc. and then I skip to the next line. This is the part I want to draw to the Speaker's attention: "or to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case." Mr. Speaker, repeatedly throughout this Question Period - and yesterdays and indeed throughout the last Session but I address myself now to this Question Period - repeatedly, and I give you two specific examples of ministers, in responding to questions, have attributed motives to members opposite. I submit that is unparliamentary and the two examples I give you are these, Sir. The Premier in responding to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said - I cannot quote him exactly - but part of what he said was, 'Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I want the strike settled.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if they want a more direct example, the next example requires no extrapolation or deductions at all. The President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) said in responding to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) that he, the member for Windsor - Buchans, 'would like to prolong the strike.' Mr. Speaker, that is in direct violation of the provision of paragraph of 319 (3) which prohibits members of this House from attributing unworthy motives to other members of this House and I say to you, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, could I have some silence?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, just as you, Sir, in your good wisdom has decided to see to it that questions and answers are brief, I would appeal to you on this matter to ensure that in future when members on any side of the House are attributing unworthy motives that immediately that member be interrupted by the Chair and asked to withdraw the allegation. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you ask these two persons, the Premier and the President of Treasury Board, to withdraw their attribution of unworthy motives to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) respectively.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, first of all, the hon. gentleman wants to so constrict the rules in this House to such an extent that the hon. the President of Treasury Board or any other person cannot express a matter of opinion or an obvious indication of what the hon. gentleman is doing because the hon. gentlemen there opposite, by and large, are so transparent that it does not even require an opinion to be expressed. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, with respect to raising a

point of privilege, I refer Your Honour to page 25 of Beauchesne, the hon. gentleman referred to the same edition, paragraph 82 which states: "A question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity."

If the hon. gentleman has a point of privilege or a point of order at any particular time, the time to bring it up is exactly at the time that he perceives that there has been a breach of privilege itself. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we can get into spending the whole time of this House on going over Hansards and going after what happened five minutes before, five days before, five months before, five years before and talking about points of privilege that occurred in their own mind and historically. A point of privilege has to be brought up immediately, number one, and secondly, what the hon. President of Treasury Board was saying was something was not a matter of imputing motives, as the hon. gentleman says, it was a matter of opinion. It was not even that, Mr. Speaker, it was axiomatic, it was something that was absolutely obvious.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, it does not appear to the Chair that there is a prime facie case for a number of reasons. I do not want to hide under the thing that it was not brought up immediately after it occurred. The comment that the hon. the President of Treasury Board made, as I recall it, was that an hon. member here was prolonging the strike.

I will look into the comments of the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) but, on

the face of it, it certainly did not seem to be a point of privilege.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of the Pooled Pension Fund, Province of Newfoundland, for the year ending December 31, 1984, the annual report of the Atlantic Lottery Corporation Incorporated 1984 - 1985, and the 1985 annual report of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation.

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 Ways and Means to consider the Raising of Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty and 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 Supply to Her Majesty.

Petitions

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to present a petition today to the hon. House on behalf of 548 residents of the district of LaPoile concerning the Southwest Coast Winter fishery. This petition has been signed, as I said, by 548 residents of the district of LaPoile. I would like to read the petition.

"Because of the importance of this fishery to this area, we feel that licences should be restricted to only plants which are operational at this time of the year, and that licences should not be issued to people who only pump fish. What has happened this year is that too many middlemen, pumpers and non-operational plants were involved in the winter fishery.

"It should also be noted that if licences are granted to operational plants that they are ready to process fish when the fishery opens and not come up with feeble excuses of why they cannot operate their plants and filter fish to plants all over Newfoundland and possibly the Gulf.

"We do not see any problem with fish going to the Northwest Coast because we will receive fish back from them in the Summer months but, we do not want to see large amounts going to the Northeast Coast without being processed in this area.

"The plants, the provincial government, the federal government, and the Fishermen's

Union should sit down and come up with a complete new system to eliminate loopholes which now exist allowing too much fish to leave this area without being processed."

Thank you.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for LaPoile for introducing the petition. I had a copy of that self same petition, although I counted 576 names, but that is a trifling matter. I also have another one which is very similar to it, which also has another couple of hundred names. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has it right now but will be willing to table it later on as part of the same submission since there are a few extra names on it, rather than introducing a separate petition.

The member for LaPoile brings up a very, very contentious issue in the Port aux Basques area, one I think that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), I am glad to hear, is going to speak too because it is a very, very important issue for them. For a number of reasons, the fishery this year was slightly shortened and the people who are working in the fish plants there are very much afraid that the large fishery they have this Winter will not last long enough to qualify them for unemployment insurance stamps.

The arrangement that has been made, which I think is a very logical and reasonable one, is

that the fish from the Southwest Coast is now trucked to the West Coast of the Province during the Winter fishery and processed in plants that are ice-bound now and normally would not have any fish to operate and that in the later Spring and Summer months, when the fish are on the West Coast of the Province, it is caught there and trucked back to the Southwest Coast to the Port aux Basques area so that it can be used there as well.

This seems to be an excellent system, working well and one which provides fish in both areas. Unfortunately, with the very high price of fish this year, there are a number of operators from other parts of the Province who are there now buying fish in a way which the residents of the Port aux Basques area feel very unhappy about in a sense that when the Spring and Summer comes they feel there will be no opportunity to get fish back from these individual communities themselves.

There are I think a number of ways in which the problem can be addressed. One way hopefully would be that more and more of the fish can be stockpiled there in the Winter months so that it can elongate the season. I suggest something like a blast freezer facility in the area in one or two of the plants may be able to freeze some of the fish over a short period of time so it can be extended for a couple of weeks - maybe the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) would be able to talk more about that a little later on - or some sort of restriction on the places in which the fish can be shipped off to during this very short period of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition. I am very pleased to see that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) is also supporting it. I think it is an excellent way in which to bring the problem up and I look forward to the comments from the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition presented by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) and I am just a little bit surprised that it took these few brief comments in the course of the petition for the member to bring this matter to the concern of the House and I wonder why -

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I believe the practice in the Standing Orders on petitions is that a petition is presented on one side, can be supported by a member on the -

MR. BARRY:
Come on!

MR. FLIGHT:
Nobody stood.

MR. MARSHALL:
- and there is already somebody on the other side who has supported

the petition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. There was nobody standing, nobody stood up.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, actually the Chair was incorrect there in recognizing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. In our Standing Orders, one person presents a petition and it is supported by a member on one side and then by a member on the other side. I was incorrect in recognizing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Does the hon. the Leader of the Opposition have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No.

MR. BARRY:

Is this correct? The Government House Leader does not want to see support for the residents of LaPoile. Let it be noted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

There is plenty of support for the residents of LaPoile on this side of the House as evidenced by the Minister of Fisheries who got up and wanted to respond.

MR. SIMMONS:

To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To a point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have to express some concern for the ruling that was just made. I understand, Mr.

Speaker, and if you reflect you will realize that the expression 'on all sides of the House' is often used and it refers to the fact that while in terms of carpenter's terms there are only two sides to this House, in terms of political groupings, there are three sides to this House.

I submit the provision in the Standing Order relating to a 'side' of the House relates to a particular political grouping and nobody from this particular grouping, the official opposition, has spoken on this petition. I submit that that is the spirit in which the provision is made so we do not have a number of people from the official opposition responding to the same petition or a number of people from the government caucus responding.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, we have had nobody from the official opposition respond to the petition. We cannot be expected, since the gentleman for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) does not sit with this caucus, to make arrangements with him any more than we can with the government caucus as to who speaks from a particular side. We in this caucus constitute one side of the House. The gentleman who sits as an independent from Menihek sits as another side of the House and the members and the government caucus sit as a third side of the House I submit to you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to Standing Order 92 (1). The hon.

gentleman may see many sides to many situations but there are only two sides to this House. There is the government side and the opposition side. One of the problems we have had in this House, if I may say, is the mean spiritedness of the official opposition in not recognizing the member for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick) on various things which I will be dealing with shortly on committee. I refer you to Standing Order 92 (1). "In addition to the member presenting a petition," and I believe it was the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) presenting the petition, "only two other members, one each from both sides of the House, may speak to a petition and in so doing they shall not speak more than five minutes each." I do not know what the member for Fortune - Hermitage's (Mr. Simmons) perspective is but it seems to me, from where Your Honour is sitting, this is one side of the House and that is another side of the House. You can see off to the side, Mr. Speaker, and if the Speaker would like to sit down here you could sit and probably see two sides of the House. It seems to me that that is evident. There are two sides of the House. The hon. member for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick) was represented and he spoke eloquently to the petition. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) I know wants to speak to the petition and the Standing Orders preclude anybody else from speaking to it.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I was going to refer hon. members to our Standing Order. It is perfectly clear that in 92 (1) "in addition to the member presenting a petition only two other members, one each from both sides of the

House may speak to a petition." I must say there is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a few words in support of the prayer of this petition so ably presented by my colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) and supported as well, quite eloquently, by the gentleman for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick).

Mr. Speaker, the prayer, as outlined in this petition, is one that my colleague and I, the member for LaPoile, have spent, I suppose, numerous hours over the last several months trying to address in a meaningful way. I know his concerns and the concerns that he expresses so well for the people that he represents on the Southwest Coast of this Province. The problem that has been inherited in what is commonly referred as the Sou'west Coast fishery is not unique, nor is it new, but it has been one that has been escalating over the last three or four years. The big problem perhaps up until the last year or so was the great hue and cry, and rightly so, that vast amounts of this fish was not even processed in Newfoundland and Labrador, that it was going across the Gulf and processed in other parts of Atlantic Canada. That was brought home very clearly by events that took place last year and the year before and perhaps were about to take place again this year. What we tried to do this year was try to reach an understanding between the buyers and the sellers of the fish, between the fishermen, represented by their union, and by the processors who, for the first

time, tried to organize their own act and form themselves into a West Coast Producers Association, I believe they call themselves. Under the global umbrella of an agreement reached between those two groups, it was agreed that the first plants to have first access, the right of first refusal, to that fish would be plants located on the Southwest and West Coasts of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, we attempted to lend the support of government, the support that we have under the Fish Inspection Act, to that agreement to make it possible for that agreement to work for two reasons. One, in order to keep unprocessed fish from going out of the Province so that the workers in Newfoundland and Labrador would have the opportunity to process the fish and, secondly, so that the people living in the area contiguous to the resource would have the first opportunity, the right of first refusal, at processing the fish.

That was the arrangement that we all tried to strive towards. To some degree, Mr. Speaker, I think progress was made. It has not been perfect. There are still wrinkles to be worked out. There are still people out there who have tried to beat the system. We cannot try to balkanize Newfoundland and say -

MR. FLIGHT:

Are you supporting the petition?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes I am support the petition. If you will listen, you will find out.

The petition does not ask us to balkanize Newfoundland, to say that people from the East Coast cannot go to the West Coast to buy

fish or to say that people from the West Coast cannot come to the East. That is not what the petition says. The petition is saying that there are people out there buying fish who have no processing capacity, who ought to be out of the buying of fish. Mr. Speaker, that is something that we are presenting looking at in conjunction with the union, in conjunction with the processors, in conjunction with my colleague and the numerous representations he has made because the buyers' licenses expire at the end of March and we will not be renewing buyers' licenses next year under conditions similar to those under which they were renewed last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here from the residents of Isle aux Morts which says, "As people of Isle aux Morts, Newfoundland, a community on the Southwest Coast, we depend upon the Southwest Coast fishery for the survival of our community.

"We would like to serve notice that we will not tolerate the presence of any offloading systems coming into our area who have no intention of processing in our Southwest Coast area. We strictly stress and are determined to eliminate such offloading systems. We are seeking support from our governing party and members of the Opposition parties.

"Offloading systems which have no intention of processing in the area create a disastrous affect on our livelihood and is devastating to the economy of the area. If you fail to co-operate and see that our demands are reached then the people of Isle aux Morts and the surrounding area may have to move in and govern themselves."

Mr. Speaker, I assume that what they are saying here is that they have not seen the necessary representation from their member on this issue. As a matter of fact, this is the first time I have heard their member, the member for Lapoile (Mr. Mitchell), raise this as a problem for any part of his district. I am very much surprised to see that he is being so quiet on this issue if it has been such a serious problem for so long.

I would like the Minister of Fisheries to stand in his place and respond to the people of Isle aux Morts and indicate where he stands on this particular petition. We have people here who see their livelihood being taken away and they are very concerned that fish is being taken out of their community. They do not have the opportunity to see jobs stay in their community. The Minister of Fisheries is very quick to jump up and prevent me from speaking on the other petition. I welcome him to stand up and support this petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to anything related to the fisheries in this Province, the Leader of the Opposition was asleep again,

as usual. If he had listened to what my colleague for LaPoile had to say and had been less intent on trying to muzzle the hon. the member for Menihék, he would have learned that the hon. gentleman for Menihék presented the very same petition in response to the gentleman for LaPoile. I gave a response to both petitions at once, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is asleep as usual.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

There he goes, Mr. Speaker, he cannot stand the heat.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has been in this House long enough to know, Mr. Speaker, that a member does not present a petition in response to another petition, or is the Minister of Fisheries attempting to establish new rules in this House, new Standing Orders in this House?

MR. TULK:

No, he is just as stunned about that as he is as Minister of Fisheries.

MR. BARRY:

This is a separate petition from the people of Isle au Morts, Mr. Speaker, specifically.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To the point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. Again, if the Leader of the Opposition had listened, he would have heard me say that the member for Menihek said, 'I have a petition from the people of Isle au Morts that is so similar to the petition that was just presented by the gentleman for LaPoile that I will just include my remarks in the overall context. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BARRY:

Deal with the issue. Deal with the issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will deal with the issue. The issue, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. The Leader of the Opposition must be in a dream world. The fact of the matter is, there have been difficulties for the last number of years in trying to bring some degree of sanity and control and quality to the Southwest Coast fishery. The hon. the gentleman for LaPoile, Mr. Speaker, has spoken on numerous occasions about the problem related to the Winter fishery on the Southwest Coast of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

When? When?

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, the Opposition never hears anything, Mr. Speaker, because they are continuously asleep. That is what is wrong with the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Where was the Opposition last year when the former Minister of Fisheries tried to introduce a regulation to the buyer's licences to control fish going out of Newfoundland? I never heard them say anything about that. That worked to a degree, Mr. Speaker. That brought some degree of sanity to the operation. Where were they this year when the union and the processors and government tried to bring further sanity to the situation there by demanding bleeding and gutting at sea, and pricing and all of that? I never heard a word out of them, Mr. Speaker. They are there to criticize. They have nothing to offer that is positive. And the gentleman for LaPoile has been doing yeoman service for the people of his constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage, is he supporting the petition?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I am supporting the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. TOBIN:

A copy of a petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

My good friend -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour that the petition which is now before the House, which was presented by the Leader of the Opposition, is a copy of a petition. The member for LaPoile got up and he said, 'I present a petition on behalf of five hundred and some-odd residents of the district of LaPoile.' In that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, there are petitions from all over his district that he had compiled into one to present.

Mr. Speaker, the petitions he presented were from Rose Blanche, Burnt Islands, and Isle au Morts.

Mr. Speaker, I checked with the Clerk, and the Leader of the Opposition presented a copy of the petition. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not in order and the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) should not be permitted to continue to speak.

MR. SIMMONS:

How about the Minister of Fisheries?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. BARRY:

I would be very interested, Mr. Speaker, in establishing what scientific methods were employed by the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) to establish that this is a copy. I must say, Mr.

Speaker, I have great difficulty, from time to time, in establishing whether it is something written in black ink or it is something that is copied. But we on this side, Mr. Speaker, believe in getting up in this House and expressing the concerns of Newfoundlanders, rather than nit-picking on technicalities to keep the views of the people of LaPoile from being heard.

Mr. Speaker, we understand why members opposite want to keep the views of the people of LaPoile hidden, and keep it quiet, because the member for LaPoile is not doing his job. But we will fight, Mr. Speaker, to see that the concerns of the people of LaPoile are raised in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I assume that when a petition is read in the House it is an original and a genuine one and I have no reason to assume otherwise. I will have a look at the petition afterwards and if there is any irregularity, and I have no reason to think there is, I will have further comment to make. Now I would ask the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage to continue.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the petition was not the one presented by the gentleman from -

MR. YOUNG:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Can you just shut up for a minute?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Could he really, Mr. Speaker? Is

it physically possible for him to shut up for a minute? Just try it.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member has asked for silence. There should be no need for him to ask for silence, he should be accorded that courtesy.

MR. BAIRD:
It is the way he asked for silence.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, first of all, the petition I rise to support was not a copy of the petition presented by the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Mithcell), it was another petition. And I can affirm, because I was present when at least three persons signed it, that there is at least three original signatures on it. I cannot tell about the original signatures, because I was not there when they were signed. But the point is this, Mr. Speaker, that in all this charade -

MR. SIMMS:
Talk about misleading the House.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, if you are going to enforce the rules of this place, you are going to have to get to old leather lungs there from Grand Falls. You really are! Because every time you stand on your feet in this House, you get no protection from the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no need for the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) to make that comment.

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, there is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
I will name the hon. member if he continues on that tack.

Hon. members on the left are not giving this member a chance. I have gotten up before and asked for silence, and now I will ask for it again. I may have to name somebody on this side.

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. RIDEOUT:
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Hansard will clearly show that when the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage was resuming his seat he made a comment that was certainly a direct dispersion on the integrity of the Chair and the Chair -

MR. BARRY:
Aspersions. It is a good thing it was not an aspirin.

MR. RIDEOUT:
I am making a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would submit to Your Honour that that cannot be allowed to stand unchallenged on the record of this House and that the hon. gentleman must be asked to withdraw, which he has not yet done.

MR. BARRY:
Are you saying (inaudible)?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am making a point of privilege. The hon. gentleman cannot infringe on the privileges of any of us in this House, especially on you, Sir, as the Speaker of this House, and he must be asked to withdraw that comment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard enough on that point of privilege. I dealt with that matter just as it cropped up, and I will deal with it more severely in the future if it should crop up from any quarter.

The hon. member has about a minute left to complete his comments on the petition.

MR. SIMMONS:

You see the circus I am trying to draw attention to. After all that, I get a minute to speak on a matter of substance, of concern to the people of the Southwest Coast. I heard, Sir, your admonition and if you must at the right time name me, Sir, you will have to name me. In the meantime, Sir, let me give notice that I am going to name some people. If I cannot stand in this Chamber and exercise my democratic right without being harassed by a bunch of hooligans and without your protection -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is completely out of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, the rules again! The good old rules! Hide behind the rules all of you, you bunch of gangsters. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that comment.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the comment and I would now like to say that the people of the Southwest Coast have not been very well served.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, the rules again. The good old rules again!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, at the request -

DR. COLLINS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Come by Chance -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is this a petition?

MR. BARRY:

Of course it is a petition.

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, as I recall, you requested the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage to withdraw a certain remark. I cannot remember

hearing him make a withdrawal. The withdrawal, of course, has to be made in unequivocal terms. It was an interference with the privilege of this House and it should be a matter that the members of this House can hear, and the withdrawal should be made in such a manner that members of this House, whose privileges have been impaired, are satisfied with the withdrawal.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have heard enough on that. The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage made a comment, I asked him to withdraw it, he withdrew it to my satisfaction and the matter is closed.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We saw in that situation, Mr. Speaker, the same thing that occurs when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is trying to project the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition at the request of the people of Come By Chance and at the request of the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), which myself and the member for Bellevue were given in a recent meeting with the Come By Chance hospital area Health Services Action Committee. This petition, Mr. Speaker, has 3,500 signatures, and I would say that it is one of the larger petitions that we have seen in this House. This petition reads as follows:

"The Come By Chance hospital will be closed in less than a year and

the building closed up, except for the out-patient clinic, which will be operated on a nine to five basis. We, the undersigned, request that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador take advantage of this building and turn it into a chronic care center and nursing home for senior citizens."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have that tabled and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates, obviously the Department of Health, but also the Premier's office.

Mr. Speaker, the petition just refers to the establishment of a chronic care center and senior citizens facility, but what the committee wants, as established from our discussions, is very clearly no reduction in the services now provided. That is their first request. But if, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health remains as hardhearted as he has been, and if the Premier refuses to intervene to help these people, then the minimum they ask for is the operation of a twenty-four hour clinic, twenty-four hour doctor services in that clinic, and not just a nine to five situation, which is what I understand the minister is now contemplating.

The reason they suggest a chronic care center is because the building will be there and, if you have a chronic care center, then you will need your medical staff, in any event, and the medical staff will be there on a twenty-four hour basis.

Mr. Speaker, there was a statistical study done by a Dr. Fowlow, who used to be at that hospital, who predicts that

between six and ten deaths will occur, I think it is, within the next twelve month period, or annually, as a result of heart attack victims or other sudden emergencies, whether asthma attacks, Trans-Canada Highway accidents and so forth, if that hospital is closed out. There will be over six deaths, Mr. Speaker, every twelve month period if this hospital is removed and people have to rely on either Come By Chance or St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, this is probably the real test of whether members opposite are serious when they talk about having concrete platforms constructed near Adam's Head. Because if that construction goes ahead, it will be absolutely essential to have doctors close by, within a mile or two of that large-scale construction site. The Minister of Health may not have considered this in the original decision. We ask him to reconsider it.

Also, when the refinery was in operation, Mr. Speaker, there were some, I think between ten and twenty, Workers' Compensation cases that went to that clinic every day that refinery was operating.

Now, if the construction of concrete platforms is going ahead at Adam's Head, again you are going to have your Workers' Compensation incidents, so again there will be a need for a service there which will not be available under the very limited service that the minister is now contemplating.

Mr. Speaker, the Action Committee has been communicating with the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) for a long time and they have been

kind enough to copy me, copy the Premier and others. We ask in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health look closely again. We know he is not a man who is stubborn and just digs in once he has made a decision, we know there are new circumstances, particularly with respect to concrete platform construction, that might not have been considered in the original survey, and we ask the minister to look at all the circumstances and to give the people of Come By Chance and surrounding areas the service they have become used to and so desperately want.

One final point: As I mentioned in reply to the Speech from the Throne, people were resettled from Placentia Bay and located in Southern Harbour and other areas around the Come By Chance area, Arnold's Cove and so forth, and they decided where they would move to on the basis of where the hospitals were. Now the rules of the game are being changed. That is not fair, Mr. Speaker, and we ask the minister to take that into consideration as well. We ask, Mr. Speaker, that full support be given to this petition by the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In replying to any petition, one has to cover all the facts that appertains to that petition. It has been decided by the Department of Health that we will close the in-patient department of the Come By Chance hospital as soon as the

hospital in Clarenville comes on stream. We have provided in the hospital in Clarenville to have consultants in internal medicine, in surgery, in anesthesia and in radiology, and hopefully to expand it in the future to have a modern hospital with all the modern facilities for a hospital of that size at this present time. It is going to be developed to the best of our ability, with the input of a very active board, and I hope an enthusiastic group of physicians. It has been determined by the Royal Commission on Health that we have an excess of acute beds in the Province of Newfoundland. It has also been determined by the Department of Health that small hospitals do not play the important role that they played to the health of a community in the past. Communications have opened up the availability of the more advanced acute care hospital, of the more advanced means of diagnosis, of the diversity of specialists who deal with the complicated or the severe cases that now have to be referred to secondary or tertiary care centers.

There is a movement alright in mileage; I believe it is about twenty miles. I am not going to argue on that particular point. Clarenville is going to be the center of excellence for secondary care treatment of all the people in that large catchment area.

At the moment, it has been decided that the clinic will be open from 9:00 to 5:00 and doctors will be on call thereafter. The clinic has all the facilities that Come By Chance hospital has at this moment to give care to acute cases that might be brought in. I do not think there is anything that can be done in the in-patient department of the hospital itself

that cannot be done in the out-patient facilities that are presently in that hospital.

With regard to converting it to chronic care, chronic care has changed a lot during the last thirty or forty years. That hospital was built thirty to forty years ago. It is more difficult to treat chronic care patients of level two and level three nursing levels, or illness, in an old building that has not been designed either for acute care, in this present day, or chronic care as we now see it in institutions.

There are many requests coming from all over the Island to put in new chronic care centers. I think there are thirty. The number of requests for licenced boarding homes has exceeded 300, I believe. We are doing our very best, and there are beds which have been opened in Central areas to cover large catchment areas of the population. As you look at the health care scheme in Canada, you will find that there is a decreasing utilization of the small hospitals. As in the report, as I am sure members of the Opposition found out recently as they went around our Province, they will find that many of the small hospitals in our Province have not got a waiting list at all. They would also find, if they went in and examined the records, and were told about the records, that there are very few serious acute cases treated in these hospitals. They are usually referred to secondary care hospitals; they are usually referred so that they can be treated by people who have specialized qualifications in these particular fields, also specialized means of diagnosis that cannot and will never be

available in the smaller hospitals any more, because with specialized investigations we also need specialist care. I cannot predict what will happen in the future, and I cannot look into the crystal ball of predicting any of the illnesses that has been mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in his excellent presentation, but as events arise, the Department of Health is always prepared to review any problem and to review any change that is absolutely necessary as these areas develop.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, in supporting that petition presented by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, and, I assume, supported by the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), I want to mention several facts. Number one, the Minister of Health, who just took his seat, said the hospital was built thirty or forty years ago. Actually, it will be fifty years in May. Unlike the Markland Hospital, Mr. Speaker, the hospital at Come By Chance, the building that is there now, is not the same one that was put there fifty years ago. Much of that hospital at Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker, is brand new. The Minister of Health will probably also know that the hospital at Come By Chance is always full. Today, last week, last month, next week, next month all of the beds

at the hospital at Come By Chance will be filled. That is one point, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday, and the Premier in responding to what was said - not yesterday, the day before yesterday. I read it in Hansard - talks about Come By Chance, he talks about the hospital, he talks about Clarendville being the area and that is true, Mr. Speaker. Clarendville is the area where the shopping centers and so on are located, but why is it, number one, that the Premier on at least two occasions, during two elections, stood up in Arnold's Cove and Come By Chance and said the hospital would never close because it was needed, and it would never close as long as he was Premier? Why did the Premier do that? Why did he mislead the people?

The second point, Mr. Speaker, is this: We talked about the construction of concrete platforms and the possibility of probably 1,500 people. As I indicated in a resolution that was put before this House of Assembly last Fall, Mr. Speaker - earlier this year I believe it was - there is the possibility that the oil refinery at Come By Chance may be reactivated. As I understand it, talks are ongoing, or I hope they are, between this government and Dor Chemicals with the possibility of setting up a petrochemical plant in that area. So, Mr. Speaker, even though the shopping centers and that sort of thing is in Clarendville, twenty-four hours a day, not from 9:00 to 5:00, people will be working on job sites where accidents happen and people get seriously hurt and Clarendville is too far away, Mr.

Speaker. Why close the facility? I mean, what is the Minister of Health going to do? Is he going to do what they did with the Whitbourne clinic, open it up from 9:00 to 5:00 and then after the first tragedy takes place, as happened at Whitbourne, then -

MR. REID:

What is wrong with what they did with Whitbourne? You put on the poor mouth then, did you not? What is wrong with what they have in Whitbourne now?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to accept interjections from the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde. He knows full well that Stan Dawe and all of the other Tories out there who were kissing cousins with the Premier condemned the Premier, and I used that in the last election very effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell this hon. House, I can tell the Minister of Health, and he knows it because he has received the same correspondence from the concerned citizens out there that I have, that what they are looking for now is a twenty-four hour clinic. They are prepared to accept the fact that they may not get chronic care. They are asking for it in their petition, and that is natural, but the people in Clarendville are asking for it, too, and they are not getting any more support from the Minister of Health than the people in Come By Chance are. It will be interesting to see what happens there over time.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that the people are asking for at least a twenty-four hour clinic, not a 9:00 to 5:00 clinic. Obviously, since the facilities

are there, a relatively new building is there, they would like to see the existing beds filled with chronically ill patients, and they are filled every day.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are they filled now?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer questions across the House when I am trying to stand in support of this petition.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and I hope that the minister has the generosity in his heart to grant the wishes of the people. The Come By Chance hospital cannot be compared with the Markland Cottage Hospital, the geography is different, everything is different. Some of these factors were brought to light by the Leader of the Opposition when he stood and presented the petition. The day before yesterday, when the Premier was talking about Come By Chance and the hospital, he talked about Come By Chance being twenty miles from Clarendville. Well, Southern Harbour is not twenty miles. I mean, Come By Chance and Southern Harbour cannot be the same distance from Clarendville if one is ten miles out the road from the other. The Premier, who was talking about the Leader of the Opposition not knowing his geography, talked about Norman's Cove, but Norman's Cove, of course, goes to Whitbourne. Even Southern Harbour, which is in 'Bill Patterson's' district, the member for Placentia, and Little Harbour -

MR. REID:

People from Norman's Cove can go to Whitbourne.

MR. CALLAN:

The Premier made that geographic mistake, I am just talking about the fact that the Premier did not know what he was talking about. When he talked about Norman's Cove, he obviously meant Arnold's Cove or Hodge's Cove, not Norman's Cove.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been patient, as Your Honour has. I have been awaiting the opportunity to rise and beg leave of the House to present this petition, all original signatures. Seven hundred students in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area of my district of Naskaupi signed this. The prayer of the petition reads as follows:

"Whereas Them Days magazine is helping to preserve our culture; two, Them Days magazine is a non-profit publication; three, Them Days magazine relies upon government and public support, Them Days magazine relies, to a very great extent, on volunteer help. We, the undersigned students of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, future leaders, concerned adults and voters, wish to express our strong desire that sustaining grants be made available and increased to Them Days magazine

to allow for the systematic preservation of our heritage in written, pictorial, and auditory form." I would like to table that petition.

I am pleased, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) remained; I advised him just a short time ago that the petition would be presented. Over the period of time that Them Days magazine has been in existence, the last ten or eleven years, they have had a continuing problem, and that is one of funding. Of recent times and in past times, there has been a great deal of correspondence on the subject between myself and the Premier, the magazine, the various elected officials and so on.

I must thank the minister again for his prompt responses to the correspondence that I have originated to him on the subject, although I would have to say, at this stage of the game, I am not satisfied with the level of assistance, and I petition him, along with the 700 signatories, to give due consideration to that.

If I can briefly explain the financial situation that Them Days magazine is in, they have an annual budget of approximately \$100,000. Something less than half of that, \$40,000 to \$45,000, they can raise through the sale of the magazine and through their wholesale/retail outlet, the sale of souvenirs and things of this nature. Now that leaves more than half of their annual budget that they are required to raise. They, themselves, feel that they are continuously existing almost from hand to mouth, in that there have been so sustaining grants forthcoming. The people who

signed the petition, other people, the magazine, the Board of Directors of the magazine, feel that perhaps government has not attached the proper significance that Them Days magazine has to the preservation of the culture of Labrador. Labrador's culture has been recognized as being unique within our Province, and I think the minister and others have said that they agree with that particular description.

However, in 1985, for example, assistance has been in the form of \$10,000, but almost as a project grant, if I can use that word - in other words, \$10,000 now because this is all we have that we can give you to help you carry out the business of Them Days magazine for that year - but there has never been anything in the form of a sustaining grant.

Now, in the annual budget figures I mentioned briefly there, I would think that something in the line of \$25,000 to \$30,000 in a sustaining grant would be what government, perhaps, should be aiming at. You see, if the people connected with the magazine have to go out each year and try to raise \$55,000 of new money, basically, new money each year, they are almost begging for support. In that \$100,000 we are talking of a staff of three people to produce four quarterly editions of Them Days magazine. It is a very fine publication, there is no question about that. It is recognized the world over. The editor is now to be inducted into the Order of Canada. They have won many awards. It is used as part of the school curriculum and things of that nature, and they cannot understand why the political level cannot make a decision with that kind of

accreditation behind them, and that kind of record. And the very fine archival work they have done, which is a very powerful resource when we are talking about the Labrador culture and Labrador information, generates no revenue, unlike the magazine. The magazine does generate some revenue, the archives do not, but they are a valuable resource for anybody. They cannot understand why the political level cannot take their plight seriously enough, and this is not an aspersion on the minister or anyone else. I know he is trying. He indicated in the last piece of correspondence that recommendations or submissions have been made to government. I expect we will hear something on the 25th with reference to what level that will be. But I would like to impress upon the minister and members of government that what we are talking about is something of a much greater amount than \$10,000 on a hit-or-miss or project-type bases, that indeed what the magazine needs to survive is a sustaining grant of certainly not under \$20,000, hopefully something in the range of perhaps \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year in a sustaining form. So I obviously speak in support of the petition, Mr. Speaker, and hope and trust that I can see some support from both sides of the House to ensure that yes, indeed, there will be a sustaining grant for the very prestigious and very respected Them Days magazine in Labrador.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take

great pleasure in rising to respond to the petition so ably presented by the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). I would just like to say to him, as he well knows, and as do hon. members of the House, that during the Labrador games I had occasion to visit the headquarters of Them Days magazine and I was very, very impressed indeed with the operation and with the amount of material and so on that they have there. It was indeed a pleasure to have a chance to talk with Mrs. Saunders at that particular time and to discuss her operation and the financial problems that they are encountering with Them Days. I would just like to say that it was only about two months ago that I was really notified officially that Them Days were experiencing financial difficulties. I was somewhat surprised at that, because usually you know well in advance if someone has financial problems.

With regard to the member's comments on sustaining grants, of course it is very difficult for government to say that it is going to continue a grant to Them Days magazine for five, six or ten years. It has to be dealt with in each fiscal year and, of course, last year, as the hon. member has referred to, government did provide \$10,000 to Them Days. I am hoping that some form of assistance will be provided this year in the budget. The exact amount, of course, I will not know until the budget comes down. From a department point of view and as the Minister responsible for Culture in the Province, I have tried to lobby and acquire additional funding for Them Days because we fully realize the value of that publication to Labrador, particularly the coast of

Labrador. While I was there during the Games, of course, that came home to me fair square a number of times from people who expressed concern that Them Days just might fold. So I would just like to advise the hon. member that I am sincerely and seriously pursuing continuation of funding to Them Days. Until the budget comes down I really will not know what the end result will be, but I would just like to go on record in the House, Mr. Speaker, as officially supporting the petition put forward by the member for Naskaupi.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was a little bit surprised when the minister just said that he was not aware until a couple of months ago that Them Days magazine was in financial difficulty. I would say probably one of the reasons for this is that most of the officials in his department have too much contact with the sports element and there is nobody really

-

MR. MATTHEWS:

Be fair.

MR. HISCOCK:

No, no, I am being fair on this and I do not say this lightly, but there is nobody there, as such, who is really sort of in tune with the cultural aspect, and I would ask that the minister work on this. This is only a comment so the minister can brush it off very lightly, but the arts community

does not. I would like to be able to offer some suggestions to the minister. As was pointed out by the member for Naskaupi, they do not receive any money whatsoever from the archives. Now, the provincial government has archives here in St. John's for the Province. Cannot the minister look at the possibility of having the archives of the Province designate a sub-office or a sub-branch down in Goose Bay, get some money from the provincial archives and channel it into the Labrador archives of the Province? That is one thing the minister could possibly look at. We see in this Province the Symphony Orchestra getting money, museums getting money, Arts and Culture centres getting money, art galleries getting money.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Are you against that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

No, no! Will the minister listen to me? All of these are getting money. I wish the Minister of Environment would sit down and let me finish on this important issue. Mr. Speaker, the issue is that we spend a lot of money on the Island part of our Province. When you look at a sustaining grant of \$25,000, considering all the other grants we give to other parts of our Province, and when you consider that we do not give the Archives of Them Days magazine anything, it is quite possible the minister could go to one of the other branches in his department, or the Department of Education, and come up with some money and be able to do it that way. But I do think the sustaining grant should be

increased.

The other thing is, as mentioned by the member for Naskaupi, Them Days magazine is being used in some schools. I think they should be in all schools. Since too many of our text books are printed in the United States and not in Canada, we need to get more books into our classrooms.

MR. HEARN:

Not true. Not true.

MR. HISCOCK:

If the The Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) would listen, the point I am making is that Them Days magazine should be in all our schools. He took the advice of the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and put an Inuit book into the school curriculum, I ask why can he not do it for the white people of our Province? With regard to A Reflection of Labrador, it is the same thing.

That is all I am saying. I am only looking for ways of getting money.

The other thing, I have said it before and I wish the media would pay attention to this, I believe that the \$7.5 million that comes into this Province from the Lottery Corporation should go into the Department of Recreation, Culture and Youth and to help send people to the Labrador Games, to the Provincial Games, to the Olympics, and to fund museums, fund the symphony orchestra, and fund other groups. Instead, all these groups have to come cap in hand, or spend most of their energy going around trying to raise money each year. But that \$7.5 million goes into general revenue. I am not one who believes in buying tickets, but

more people would probably buy those tickets from the point of view that the profits were not going to the provincial government. I think the minister should continue to stress this.

As I said, I would like to compliment Them Days magazine for the work they have done, the volunteer work that they have done, and I ask the Minister of Education, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, the Premier and any other department, to find ways of getting money to Them Days magazines. Obviously the main way is a sustaining grant, but I also think that something could be done through the Archives of our Province. Maybe one of the people in the office of Them Days magazine could be designated as a permanent provincial employee, say the secretary, and have their salary paid out of the general revenue of the Province.

What I am saying is, we have people working in the Arts and Culture Centre being paid out of the public purse, as are people working in the Arts and Culture Centres in Corner Brook and Grand Falls and other areas, why can we not do the same for Them Days magazine, which is for all of Labrador? I think there are ways that the minister's department can bend rules - not break them - to be able to make up for the fact that Labrador is different. Because it is such a large geographical area with a small population, it is very expensive and very time consuming to go around collecting, and the minister needs to come up with innovative ideas. And I would say that if the minister had people within his department who were more attuned to the Labrador

culture, then they would have these ideas and we would not have to be expressing them.

In conclusion, I look forward to Them days magazine being included in the budget and I am sure the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Butt, commonly known as June in Goose Bay, will end up making sure that \$25,000 will go to Them Days magazine.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 1.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I have received a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER:
Please rise for a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

From Government House to the Honourable the Minister of Finance, dated March 20, 1986.

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the 31st. day of March 1987, by way of Interim Supply and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act of 1867 I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

(sgd)-----
W. Anthony Paddon,

Lieutenant-Governor."

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor together with the bill be referred to the Committee of Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor together with the bill, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):
Order, please!

Resolution

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st. day of March, 1987, the sum of seven hundred and fifteen million three hundred and thirty thousand nine hundred dollars (\$715, 330,900).

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Shall the resolution carry?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, if members opposite are insistent, I will sit down and let you carry the motion, if that is their wish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, as has been announced, the main supply bill, the budget, will be presented on Tuesday next. We do not anticipate that it will be immediately accepted, therefore there will be a period of time during which the current fiscal year will have ended and there will be no authorization from this House for the Comptroller General to permit funds to be taken out of the Consolidated Fund for the discharge of the functions of government, for the paying of bills, for the paying of salaries and so on and so forth, so we have to bring in an Interim Supply Bill.

We are intending to ask the House to accept an Interim Supply Bill for the period of three months, which would be April, May and June. We would expect that the Main Supply Bill will be passed before the end of June and, therefore, this three month interim supply should suffice. This is a routine measure, it is brought in every year. In the very unlikely event that the Main Supply Bill would be passed before the end of the fiscal year, obviously you would not need an Interim Supply Bill. But I do not think that has ever happened not only in this jurisdiction but in any province. An Interim Supply Bill is a necessary bill to be brought before the House, that is unless we want government to close up.

On this particular occasion, the amount of total allocation in the Interim Supply Bill is over \$700 million for the three month period. That is about 10 per cent greater than the Interim Supply

Bill last year, but it really covers the same proportion of the year.

The Interim Supply Bill is basically to allow the functions of government, the ongoing services of government and the ongoing obligations of government to continue until the Main Supply Bill is brought in. Almost 90 per cent of this Interim Supply Bill is for that purpose, to allow programmes currently being exhibited and that type of thing to be ongoing.

However, The Financial Administration Act also permits government to bring in supply for new projects, if these are brought to the attention of the House at the time the bill is introduced, and I now do so bring to the notice of the House that we have included in the allocation a total of just over \$81 million, and this is in addition to what is commonly referred to as the housekeeping expenditures, for new capital account and other matters.

Let me just briefly enumerate them: For the improvement and construction of roads \$17 million plus - I will just give the round figure if I may, it is all in the bill - road and bridge rehabilitation just over \$13 million; bridges and causeways \$3,600,000; highways, that is Transport Canada arrangements, \$22,700,000 plus; forest resource roads, this is in association with the federal government under DRIE, \$1,290,000; coastal Labrador water and sewerage projects, this is under the Native Peoples Agreement, \$2 million; airstrips in Labrador, which in actual fact are 100 per cent funded from the federal government, so we will put this in our Interim Supply Bill

but we will ultimately get reimbursed; \$1.5 million; the wood fuel conversion at the Wooddale Nursery, this is also part of a DRIE agreement, \$400,000. Then out of the Offshore Development Fund, which hon. members of Committee will remember, of course, is a federal/provincial fund, funded by both levels of government, the Centre of Earth Resources \$4.5 million; the survival centre \$2 million; the design facility in engineering to go into Memorial University \$1 million; and then there is an amount for block funding which would mainly will be used, likely, for smaller projects, for training activities, \$3 million. That is totalling \$72, 175,000.

In addition to that there is an amount of \$6 million put in for Baie Verte Mines. That was announced recently by government, that government will be funding certain operations at the Baie Verte Mines to allow that enterprise to continue operation. So there is \$6 million in for that, and then there is a further amount from the offshore fund for training equipment, which amounts to \$3 million, for a total of \$9 million. That brings it up to \$81,175,000 for those new capital accounts that I mentioned, in addition to the housekeeping.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a public service salary -

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, with all the hubbub I did not get all those figures of

extra spending that he was talking about there. Is it possible to have that tabled, or be able to get a copy of the actual detailed list? It is not in the list here. These are a special list. Is that possible, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. member asked a question and I think he will get an answer.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BARRY:

I just saw the newspaper and apparently the Minister of Mines made a statement with respect to Daniel's Harbour yesterday, a very serious statement, and did not see fit to inform this House.

The minister just referred to money now contained in Interim Supply for Baie Verte. We would like to know why is there not money contained in Interim Supply to ensure that Daniel's Harbour continues to operate? But more particularly, on a matter of privilege, we think it is an extreme discourtesy to this House, and improper practice, for the Minister of Mines to be issuing press releases on matters of this importance, affecting so many Newfoundlanders, without informing this House.

Now, the minister has said he did not have the statement in time for the opening of the House. We can understand that, but the normal practice would have been for the minister to stand in his place,

say he had an important statement and ask leave to present it.

We submit that practice was not followed. It is a precedent that we would not like to see set, that the most important matters are dealt with through press releases outside the House.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

It is not a point of privilege, but it is a good point. The fact of the matter is, last Thursday I was supposed to meet with Mr. Halbauer, who is the Vice-President of Teck Corporation, so that he could give me an update on Daniel's Harbour. Now, as the hon. member knows, there is an exploration programme going on there. I have been in contact with the union officials down there, and the members, and I promised them that when I got the information I would inform them immediately. Now, what happened was I had to leave Toronto before the meeting took place - the meeting took place about nine o'clock, and my flight took off early because I had business in the Province - so I did not meet with Mr. Halbauer myself but my officials did.

Now, the problem was that I had a statement from Toronto, over the phone, but it was not clear enough for me to be able to inform anybody, let alone members of this House. My deputy came back - I have been quite busy over the past few days - he informed the assistant deputy, Mr. Fleming, and

Mr. Fleming put together a press release yesterday and he called in to me to ask if it was okay to release it.

MR. BARRY:

Is there any chance of our getting a copy?

MR. DINN:

I will certainly get a copy for the hon. member today.

MR. BARRY:

We do not know if it is all detail or not.

MR. DINN:

Well, I can give the hon. member detail by leave of the House, if that is permissible.

MR. BARRY:

We will accept a copy if it is available.

MR. DINN:

Okay. I apologize to the House, but the fact of the matter is, I did not have a copy of the statement to make it. Possibly I could have come into the House and said what I understood to be transmitted to me, but I wanted to have a copy of that statement.

Now, in the meantime, the union leadership out there wanted to know on a fairly urgent basis exactly what was going on with that meeting. Since I had no communication from my deputy, I informed my assistant deputy to answer the telegram and put a copy of that release with the telegram to the union leadership, the people out there who are most concerned, and also to have a copy for me this morning. Well, I got a copy of it but the copy I have is not even the correct copy, so I could not use that today. But I can inform the hon. member of

exactly what the story is on Daniel's Harbour, maybe a little later on. But there is no point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, in light of the very reasonable and informative response of the Minister of Mines, something which should set a good example for other ministers on that side, I would withdraw that matter of privilege and I will accept the minister's undertaking to supply members of the House with the information contained in his release. I thank the minister for his information.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To the point of privilege, there is no point of privilege but rather a clarification of information.

Before I recognize the hon. the Minister of Finance, we have three questions for the Late Show and I would like to announce those now: One is from the Leader of the Opposition in relation to a response from the Premier during Question Period. The Leader of the Opposition was not satisfied with the answers.

Another one is from 'Beaton Tulk', the member for Fogo, who is not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Labour in Question Period. The third one is from the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), again to the Minister of Labour, who is not satisfied with the answers to the questions he raised.

So there are three questions for the Late Show.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. the member for Menihek wanted this tabled and I would like to table it. Perhaps we could get an odd copy made very shortly, if you wish it.

Just to finish off with a few brief remarks, Mr. Chairman. We do have a pay day for the public service, I think it is on the second of April, so it would be most unfortunate - I am sure all members of this Committee hope and expect the Public Service to be back in full strength at that time - if their pay was in any way delayed. So I would anticipate rapid passage of this bill.

Now, I know that the other day the Opposition put a caveat on their agreement to pass this bill before the end of the fiscal year, and that was that they would hope that the present work problem would be resolved by that time. I think there is every good expectation that that may be the case, and I think it would encourage the process if we now very quickly passed this Interim Supply Bill.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say how pleased I am to see you, Sir, occupy that particular position. I welcome you to the role.

MR. SIMMS:
I hope he does not -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

I would ask the Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) to restrain himself.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for that, because the first thing I wanted to say to the Committee, and indeed to the whole House, is in relation to something that I very inadvertently said during the course of the heat of debate earlier and I did withdraw immediately. I just want to expand on that to the degree that it was one of those comments that one never wants to make, and I never intended to make, and I want to say to all members of this House, those whom I consider my friends and those who may not consider themselves to be my friends, but all members of the House, that I regret having made that statement. Of course I have nothing but the utmost respect for every member of this House and I regret, without qualification, having made that statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:
Would the hon. member permit a question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
He will get one back ten times as bad, and he will never see his Interim Supply completed. You set the tone right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The Chair recognized the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. CARTER:
No, the member is yielding to me

for a moment.

MR. SIMMONS:

I say to the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), yes, I would permit a question if it is in the spirit of (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I understand the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) yields to the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) for a question?

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience that when a person withdraws an offensive remark they should do it humbly. I do not think the member has withdrawn that remark humbly enough. I call upon him to withdraw again.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BARRY:

I would like to say that unlike the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is a humble person and has a lot to be humble about.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Humility is a relative characteristic, and I suppose he and I have humility in relative terms.

Mr. Speaker, the second thing I

wanted to say on behalf of the official Opposition is to reiterate the commitment that we have made in writing to the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the Government House Leader, the commitment that we intend to give our co-operation to the passage of this Interim Supply Bill with a couple of caveats on a couple of conditions.

One, I think, is a fairly obvious condition, that we will get fairly forthright and full answers to the questions we put to the minister. We have no reason to doubt that, because in the past, in similar circumstances, he has been very forthcoming. So that is our first condition.

Our second one, of course, relates to an even more pressing matter, and that is the current labour dispute in the Province, the NAPE dispute, and from our standpoint we do not intend to co-operate in the passage of this bill until that dispute has been settled.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to a couple of points that I want to make in respect to the Interim Supply Bill. You will note that today is March 20, eleven days before the end of the fiscal year. Had there been an election in the past few weeks or some other intervening circumstance, one could understand the lateness in time at which the Minister of Finance has elected to bring in his budget. I am aware that he has set a date and it is next week but if you will check practice in this House over the years, when there has not been some intervening circumstances, such as an election, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the administration take it upon themselves to bring in the Budget

Speech reasonably early to allow its passage so that we do not have to go through this business of Interim Supply. Now, having said that, I recognize that Interim Supply is not exactly unique in this House. We have had it on many, many occasions since we became a Province but that alone should not be an excuse to do it year after year after year.

Mr. Chairman, the Bill itself has some interesting figures in it and I will come quickly to these. Perhaps the minister in his response can tell us why these particular figures are here. My understanding of Interim Supply is to get enough Supply for Her Majesty to pay the bills until the main Estimates have been passed by this House and, given that, I am wondering why in the Public Works Interim Supply vote the minister is asking for just over the full amount of the last fiscal year. It was \$39 million last year and he is asking for \$41 million now just for an interim period. There must be some reason for that relating to contract commitments or something but would he respond on that particular point.

Secondly, he is asking under Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development for an amount which represents about 90 per cent, about nine-tenths of the full expenditure for the 1985-86 year. An amount of \$15 million is being proposed.

Also, under Transportation the minister is asking the committee to approve an amount which represents about 95 per cent of the total budgetary expenditure on transportation matters during fiscal 1985-86 or the projected expenditure during that fiscal year.

Two others: In Social Services he is asking for about half the amount and in the case of Career Development and Advanced Studies about 40 per cent. So in those five cases but, particularly in the first three, where he is asking for essentially the full amount for the entire year I wonder why that is seen to be necessary given that he must anticipate that the main Estimates should pass this House sometime well before the end of the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues inform me that at about this time in the day it is Spring. Let us hope that the change of season connotes a change in attitude in this particular chamber, a change for the better I would sincerely hope.

Mr. Chairman, the other issue that I want to address because I think it is the overriding issue in this Province at this particular time and it obviously has budgetary or fiscal implications. It has other very serious ramifications for the Province as a whole. I refer, of course, to the current NAPE dispute. I have heard what I regard to be the sanctimony today about how delicate this issue is and my only wish at that particular time was that the whole NAPE membership could have been looking in.

There were two occasions in the past few days, Mr. Chairman, when it would have been most appropriate to have cameras in this House. One was during the Question Period today so that the whole NAPE membership could have seen that exercise here today, that exercise about what was delicate, etc., and the other time when the cameras actually were in the House. That was when the

Premier was responding in the Throne Speech to debate. We will be aware from the public airwaves, of course, that it was that performance by the Premier that triggered the walkout of the General Service. That is on the public record.

As I sat there on Tuesday night I found myself saying, to myself, there is the proof, there is the proof if anyone needed it that we should have cameras in the House all the time, to show the public of this Province exactly what is being said ostensibly on their behalf, particularly today, Mr. Chairman, during Question Period when there was that charade about the issue being delicate. Was it not delicate twenty-four hours before? Was it not delicate when the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) was provoking irresponsibly, rubbing their noses in it, telling them they were breaking the law, etc. Do you remember all those clips on television, Mr. Chairman, during the past few days? Where was the sensitivity about delicacy then, Mr. Chairman? Did this thing just become delicate now? I submit yes, Mr. Chairman. In one respect it just became delicate. It became politically delicate. The message got home in the last few hours that this is a politically delicate thing. That, Mr. Chairman, unwittingly, is what the Premier meant today, is what the gentleman, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), meant today and the others. That is what they meant by delicacy. Suddenly they had recognized that this is politically much more of a hot potato than we had thought. What they had thought before is they could ride this one out, they could intimidate those people and they could orchestrate and, Mr.

Chairman, I say to you they orchestrated.

Let us not hide behind any court injunction. Let us not hide behind any Chief of Police. They, the political bosses, Mr. Chairman, and the Premier and the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) and maybe the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), if so, unwittingly, because she admitted to us yesterday she did not know what was in the injunction - I find it hard to believe but I take her word. Now, Mr. Speaker, no innuendo, a straight statement up front.

The Premier of this Province, Mr. Chairman, and the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) have participated covertly in the orchestration of the intimidation of innocent people. Mr. Chairman, last week nobody in the law enforcement branch had any difficulty deciding that people such as Mr. Bill Parsons, by way of example, were included in the injunction. There was no dilemma then. There was no decision then behind closed doors that we will not look at this for fear we find the wrong thing, we will not look for an interpretation for fear we might find something we do not want to find. No fear then, Mr. Chairman.

Then they rushed out and arrested people, Mr. Chairman, arrested people who were not members of the NAPE unit at all. But yesterday, very conveniently, somehow not only did they need an interpretation to tell them whether NAPE were NAPE people - that is what they wanted an interpretation of, by the way, they wanted somebody to interpret for them whether NAPE people were NAPE people. That is what the

complicated matter was all about that the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) talked about yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

I would like to advise the hon. member he has two minutes left.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I think it needs to be put on the public record that this has been an absolute charade. I appeal to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) in the Chamber and I appeal to others involved in this to examine their actions in this particular matter because, Mr. Chairman, if we take the Minister of Justice at her word, and I do, yesterday in Question Period, then one of two things must be concluded from her statement. When she says that she had not had an opportunity, whether that was the term - the information to the House was that she had not cogitated on this matter of an interpretation of whether the General Service was included. That is the essence of what she told the House. It later emerged that this had been a deliberate act, at least on the behalf of the Premier, that it would not be done. The net result was that it had not been done. She told us that was the case.

Mr. Chairman, that means one of two things. Either the minister is clearly something less than competent in that she is dealing with an act that is two or three years old to start with and she is dealing also with an injunction that is several days old, a couple of weeks old. She is dealing with some basic common sense matters, i.e. if Bill Parsons is included in the injunction, not being a

member, how can it be construed that the direct membership through the General Service unit are not covered by the injunction. So, Mr. Chairman, it is clearly a matter of either a lack of competence or some wilful blindness on her part. Either, Mr. Chairman, I submit to her, is not good enough for the chief law enforcement office of this Province. It is just not good enough.

Now one final point, Mr. Chairman, and I will have a time to come back at this, this nonsense that we hear from the Premier in this matter that somehow they washed their hands and that they are the government and all that kind of thing but they have nothing to do with law enforcement, of course, just does not jibe with parliamentary reality. It does not jibe. We all know that the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General in her dual capacity is, among other things, the chief law enforcement officer of the Province. We know that she takes that mandate, Mr. Chairman, from the Premier who appointed her to the administration.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, his time is over. He has spoken for much more than ten minutes. I submit that he should sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! There is no point of order. I thank the hon. member for bringing the time to my

attention. I informed the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage he had a couple of minutes left, and I assumed he was wrapping up his speech. I would ask him to draw it to a conclusion.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that what I am saying is not terribly palatable for people who have come so lately to the issue of delicacy. Who did not realize a few hours ago that this was a delicate matter. That households were being disrupted, that education was being disrupted and that school buses could not operate. They did not realize all of that, and suddenly, lo and behold, eureka, Damascus Road and all, they discover delicacy. They discovered it in the last few hours. What an insult, Mr. Chairman, to those poor youngsters out there who are having their education interrupted! How can they, Mr. Chairman, identify with that kind of a charade? I submit, Mr. Chairman, and I will submit it again and again until everybody hears it, that this whole business of arrest was orchestrated for political purposes, to intimidate people, and once the intimidation could not be achieved, they decided to get politically smart and lay off. That is what happened, Mr. Chairman, as sure as I stand here.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, first of all I would

like to take this opportunity to table what I believe to be a correct copy of the news release that went out yesterday with my permission, with respect to the Daniel's Harbour mine. Just to go through briefly what the release says, officials of the department met with Tech Corporation last week on Thursday morning and that meeting basically outlined what they were planning to do with respect to Daniel's Harbour or Newfoundland Zinc.

The story is this, Mr. Chairman: In Daniel's Harbour there is an ongoing exploration programme. That exploration programme will continue until its conclusion so that they can identify the ore reserves they have in Daniel's Harbour. That is number one. So the exploration will continue. Number two, on the 15th of April, I believe, or thereabouts, Daniel's Harbour, which has already been given notice of closure, will be laying off the miners. The reasons for the layoff are as follows: (1) there is not the grade of ore there, and (2) there is not the quantity of ore required to get the grade that they need to make any kind of a profit at all.

The hon. the member for the area pointed out several times over the past few months the fact that Daniel's Harbour would probably close, and possibly close on account of the fact that Cyprus Anvil was opening. Well, that really does not have any bearing on the situation in Daniel's Harbour at this point in time.

There were discussions with respect to, is there anything that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador could do to allow the mine to continue? I mean, what,

if anything, could the government do to allow the mine to continue?

Mr. Chairman, they had requested workers' compensation fees be reduced over the past few years. They have gone from, I think the rate was \$6.50 down to something like \$3.25 or a 50 per cent reduction from what they were. That is based on their good record. Daniel's Harbour had a very good occupational health and safety record out there, and it was deemed over the past few years they were paying excessive amounts of workers' compensation and, as a result of that, the rates went down. So that was done, and they were very pleased with that.

They also requested a subsidy on electricity rates. It was decided that the commercial or industrial electricity rates that were in the Province would continue to be the same for Daniel's Harbour as well as anywhere else.

But over and above that, Mr. Hallbauer indicated to us that if we, as a government, were to pay the salaries of the 160 or 165 people for the year, if we were to pay their complete salaries for the year, the company would still lose money. So I said, what is their plan of attack? Is Daniel's Harbour finished forever and so on? Basically, their plan is this. They are going to identify the ore reserves at Daniel's Harbour.

There was a requirement by Occupation Health and Safety to put in a air flow through system. That system is no longer required. It would have been required if they were down in, I believe it is called, the T zone because there was no end, we will say, to the tunnel and air had to

come out or people could be adversely affected. That area is just about mined out now and so the company will not need that system any more.

The plan of attack that the company has is to leave fifteen or twenty people in place out there so that they can preserve the mine as it is. They will be doing some flooding but the flooding will not occur in areas where they have potential to recover ore. He indicates to me that if the price of zinc goes up, and it would have to go up substantially because it is down now somewhere in the order of thirty cents per pound, but if it goes up over the next year or so, they will have the ores identified and they will be reopening. However, I would not want to lay that out to the people of Daniel's Harbour as a carrot because the price of zinc may not go up for two years or three years. Basically that is the situation that they are in right now.

Mr. Hallbauer indicated that there is no subsidy that the government of Newfoundland can really give so that that mine could stay open beyond April 15. It is just totally impractical at this point in time. They have lost in the order of \$300,000 per month for the time they have been operating since. They lost about \$125,000 I believe in September and then \$300,000, \$300,000 and then nearly \$400,000 as those few months went by. They are in such a loss position with what they have there now, the quality and the grade and so on, that it is just impossible to keep the thing open. It is just not practical, nor is it practical for the government to subsidize at this point in time, he said. He will be completing

the exploration programme and he will then have identified the ores that they do have there so that if the price of zinc does go up, then they could reopen. They will have the mine preserved for that eventuality.

I would just like to point out to hon. members that it certainly was not my intent to not inform the House of Assembly. I sent the press release as was relayed to me yesterday to Mr. Sooley, the President of the local down there, basically the words that hon. members have received right now. I also informed him that I would be getting together with the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) to make sure that everything that is possible to put in place with respect to the Futures Programme, the training programme or anything else, any programmes that are available we will be putting that in place over the next few days with respect to setting up committees and so on and making sure that any and all programmes that are available are made available to the people of Daniel's Harbour. That is basically what has transpired up to this point in time but I would be only too happy to answer any questions hon. members may have.

I certainly apologize to the House because it has never been my practice to not inform the House of Assembly but I thought yesterday afternoon that it could be released and that these people should be certainly informed as quickly as anybody should be informed.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, we accept the minister's explanation. Our main concern, as is, I am sure, the concern of the minister, is not to have this issue debated, it is to make sure the workers at that mine are dealt with fairly and properly and that everything possible is done to see that jobs are available on the Great Northern Peninsula and at Daniel's Harbour, however many jobs for as long a period of time as possible.

I think the minister may be overstating the case to some extent when he says that it does not matter what degree of subsidy is supplied, the mine cannot be kept open. Really what the minister is saying is that it is a question of how much money might be needed because if the operating costs, for example, were covered by a subsidy, there is no question the mine would continue to operate and make the profit that would be available, even at a lower price.

However, one of the points that the minister is going to have to deal with - I might note that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Fury) has recently, as of a couple of days ago, been appointed the new Mines spokesman for the very reason that he has a great concern in this area and he will be - although he is unavoidably absent from the House on business today, he is aware of the minister's statement - communicating with his constituents who are affected by this decision on Daniel's Harbour and in his capacity as Mines spokesman. I am sure that this matter will be raised probably

before the House closes on Tuesday, if it happens. In any event, the member for St. Barbe will be following up on this point.

The point that has not been dealt with, and we do not have time because we only have a few minutes left in debate today to deal with it, but the point the minister is going to have to deal with at some point in time is whether this federal subsidy to the Yukon mine will not mean that this mine at Daniel's Harbour will have to stay closed for an even longer period of time because of the ability of that mine in the Yukon to undercut, not just Daniel's Harbour but probably other mines in Canada producing zinc, because they will be able to keep their costs down by virtue of this federal subsidy.

As the competition of cheaper ore, which will now happen as a result of the subsidy, is seen in the market place, it is going to keep prices depressed for a longer period of time than would otherwise be the case. The federal subsidy, in other words, will permit the Yukon mine to produce zinc at a lower cost and therefore they can sell it at a lower price.

It is much the same as the Saudis are able to do in the oil industry. Because the cost of production of the Saudis is down, they are able to make money at prices for oil where other producers cannot make money because their cost of production is so much lower.

It is the same way in the Yukon. Because the cost of production in the Yukon will now be so much lower as a result of this large federal subsidy, they will be able

to pour zinc ore into the market place at a lower price and this will have the effect, I fear - I will be interested in hearing further later from the minister on this point - of keeping Daniel's Harbour closed for a longer period of time.

If the minister is not sure whether or not this is the case, I would ask the minister to seek some information from the Daniel's Harbour management, from the gentleman, the Vice-president of Teck that he was speaking with. Just get his views with respect to whether their ability to compete will not be hurt by this federal subsidy.

The point that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Fury) has made in the House and the point I make again is that if the federal government is going to subsidize a zinc mine in the Yukon, then should there not have been a subsidy considered for Daniel's Harbour as well. It was known that the mine was in difficulty. Why is it it is being done on an individual mine basis rather than on an industry basis?

It would seem to me if the Government of Canada was going to deal fairly with the people of Daniel's Harbour they should have brought in a policy for zinc mines rather than for a mine in the constituency of the minister who introduced the subsidy, Mr. Neilsen. It is not just a coincidence.

It is an indication of where the clout exists now in Ottawa. It is an indicate that the real clout does not exist with our representative in the federal cabinet. Our representative in the federal cabinet is unfortunately rapidly losing clout

and the clout has shifted to Western Canada and other parts of Canada where they have stronger ministers, and this is regrettable. The people of Daniel's Harbour and the people of this Province are being hurt by this.

I see that we have run out of time and we are now into the Late Show period, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There are three questions for debate on the late show. There is one by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to the Premier. He is not satisfied with the answer to his questions on the NAPE strike.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, since Question Period finished we have had certain

discussions with union representatives of NAPE and we have been informed by a NAPE representative, in fact, the NAPE bargaining team came over into the Confederation Building, informed the administration that they were there to continue bargaining, that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) poked his head in, heard what was said - I am told it was the Minister of Labour, it might have been the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) - but in any event the point is that there was no discussion on the part of the administration. The union came, as Mr. March indicated today, as he was prepared to do, said we are here at the bargaining table, where is government? As of approximately an hour ago, they are still looking to find the government negotiators.

Mr. Speaker, it would be very unfortunate if the Premier is just trying to skate around Question Period and avoid giving answers to this House, and hope that the House will close before this strike escalates further. We hope that the Premier is not trying to mislead this House by indicating that there are discussions underway, when this sort of thing is happening.

We have seen in this labour dispute, Mr. Speaker, what can only be labelled raw provocation, blatant provocation on the part of the employer, on a part of the Premier, the President of Treasury Board, and the Administration, provocation which takes a number of forms. It takes the form of providing for back-door salary increases for management and hidden salary increases for certain members of this House, for the political flunkies that are giving service to the Premier, Mr.

Speaker. That was a raw blatant provocation, at the same time that members of the union were being arrested and hauled away and thrown into jail, the Order in Council the same day was being signed to increase the salaries of members of this House. Mr. Speaker, that is not right.

We see the Premier talking about restraint and, at the same time, engaging in extensive renovations to the Premier's Office. Again, we are informed by the Premier that these renovations were something in the area of half a million dollars. We have information, maybe the Premier would care to deal with it, and we have the Treasury Board Minute Number that, in fact, Treasury Board approved I think \$786,000, in excess of \$700,000 for renovations to the Premier's Office. We have been informed recently that for the room in which the Premier's desk is contained, there was another \$150,000 expended in the last few days. We would like to hear whether the Premier could confirm if this is the case because, Mr. Speaker, this is the sort of provocation that is designed to keep the strike ongoing. Then, of course, we have the imposition of the suspension.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:
Your time is up.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, there was more than a minute passed by the time this started.

MR. MATTHEWS:
You are not the only one who knows the time.

MR. SPEAKER:
I am able to look at the clock. The hon. member has spoken for five minutes.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I am sorry Your Honour, it has been four minutes exactly, four minutes. I understand Your Honour might not have seen the clock but a minute had elapsed before -

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

MR. BARRY:
You know this is not fair and it is not right, Mr. Speaker. It is not fair and it is not right.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we can put any more faith or any more credibility or validity in what the Leader of the Opposition has just said when the Leader of the Opposition yesterday or today accused me of somehow trying to gain sympathy because there were threats upon my life. I do not know if we can trust anything that the Leader of the Opposition says as being very honest.

I was able sometime this afternoon to find out from the police who contacted my office as it relates to that, to show the lack of credibility that the Leader of the Opposition is going to have on this whole matter. How can you take seriously anything that he says when there was a threat on my life which was made through a call which came to the Leader of the

Opposition's law firm's office this morning or last night on tape. Yet, the Leader of the Opposition is out publicly questioning whether in fact these things are actually happening, to show the irresponsibility of it all.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter and nobody wants any risk to the Premier or any other member of this House or any member of the Newfoundland community for that matter. I was informed this morning, Mr. Speaker, by a member of my law firm that when the secretary came in this morning there was a drunken voice on the tape uttering a threat against the Premier. I instructed the member of my law firm to immediately contact the police and pass this on.

My statements, Mr. Speaker, to the media were delivered yesterday afternoon. I stand by them. They were delivered yesterday afternoon and they are to the effect that there is nobody on that picket line, Mr. Speaker, that I have seen or anybody else has seen, that is engaged in anything but very reasonable and responsible conduct. What I have said is that I do not want to see the Premier start playing games with those honest people on that picket line -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You raised it.

MR. BARRY:

No, I was not the one who raised it. I was questioned by the media, Mr. Speaker. Let me just say this: the Premier, Mr. Speaker, must make the decisions as to the protection that is needed to permit him to perform his function and we will support him in those decisions but we say to the Premier, do not, Mr. Speaker, attempt to make life difficult for those people on that picket line who have engaged in very reasonable and responsible action on that picket line and that is what we are talking about here today.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Leader of the Opposition never got in his place today on a point of privilege to bring the headlines of The Telegram which alleged that the Leader of the Opposition called it a ruse and a whole bunch of other things which, if the Leader of the Opposition was really legitimate in what he is saying, he would have done immediately this afternoon at the first opportunity. He did not do that so I can only assume that he condones the kind of headlines that were in the paper today accusing me of attempting a ruse on this whole matter. I have been plagued by some of the members of the press, because they apparently, from somewhere or other, had information which we would not confirm on the question of threats to my life. We tried as hard as we could not to have this matter become public. I can only say that honestly to the

Leader of the Opposition. All I am saying now, Mr. Speaker, is that I find some of the comments by the Leader of the Opposition when he gets up to speak in the Late Show to question again something that I answered in Question Period today somehow less than credible when I think of the way he handled the other matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. It is just a difference of opinion between two hon. members. The Premier's time has now elapsed.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

For the Leader of the Opposition's benefit I have made arrangements that if the Leader of the Opposition wants to go to the police and listen to the other tapes that have been recorded with the threats on my life, then there is no problem with me. I would authorized that.

MR. J. CARTER:

He would probably recognize the voices.

MR. BARRY:

If you want me to do that I would be happy to do it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not want you to do it. You were questioning my credibility and I am just saying to you, if you want to know the truth of the matter, it is there for you to find out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I now call on the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) a question. I simply tried to point out in the limited time one has in this House to ask a question that there is something that has been inconceivable to the general public and to the labour movement in this Province happen over this past two weeks. Here is the author of all the labour legislation in this Province this past ten years, whether progressive or not, good or bad, the man that the labour movement saw as their own private Mr. Glad, the man that was going to come into this cabinet, in this House of Assembly and straighten out the mess that labour has found itself in as a result of the kind of policies re labour that we have seen this past ten years from this administration. What they found unbelievable was that a strike had gone on for almost two weeks and not one word, Mr. Speaker, not one word from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), one way or the other.

When the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) chose to break his silence he made a statement, Mr. Speaker, and he recorded it and denied in this House today that he made the statement but his mistake was in denying the fact that was a voice clip. He is on tape saying, and he knows that he is on tape saying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

Could I have silence, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
Stating that the only reason that this strike -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I do not want to take up the time of the hon. member but I ask members on my left if they would give this member the courtesy of silence.

MR. FLIGHT:
He is on tape stating that if this were a strike against the private sector, the general public would not be supporting that strike the way they are supporting it. Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of Labour who is the protector of the workers in this Province say this while he was Deputy Minister and since he has been minister he has tried to have himself portrayed as the champion of the working man. He knows full well that if this were a private strike, he would be taking on management. This government has done things to these strikers where if this were a private strike that minister would have had no choice but to take on management.

He would not have permitted management to threaten thirty day suspensions. He would not have permitted management to suggest that the strikers would be replaced by the unemployed Newfoundlanders in this Province. He would not have permitted that, Mr. Speaker. He would not permit the owners of a company in the private sector to give management raises while they kept strikers on the picket lines. Now, Mr. Speaker, where is he? He cannot

have it both ways. He cannot allow himself or hold himself up as the champion of the workmen in this Province and sit quietly.

It was disgraceful last night to see a press conference with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) sitting like a lump behind the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) who was doing the talking both for and against the workers in this Province. It was disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, and I would suspect there has been a great disservice done.

I am very much concerned about the credibility that this minister will carry as of this strike in this Province. Mr. Speaker, the people on the picket line, the MOS people and the General Service, are supported one hundred percent by every labour movement in this Province. By every unit of NAPE, by every private sector union, by every public sector union, they are supported one hundred per cent. Those labour unions, Mr. Speaker, and the leaders are looking at that Minister of Labour and they are saying, 'My God, where is the faith? Where is the trust that we put in that minister?'

Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned, as he should be, that he will come out of this with any credibility. It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, to me and to the people on the picket lines, that the Minister of Labour sits quietly by.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:
The minister will undoubtedly get

up and give an accounting for his performance in this strike, a strike, Mr. Speaker, where he, the Minister of Labour, is allowing the workers in this Province to be abused.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely appalled at the members opposite. They have a fine, articulate gentleman in the person of the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

- who has the ability to articulate, not only on questions of labour matters, articulates them very well, always asks fine, sensible questions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

- and we hear this rubbish, nonsense, untruths coming from the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). From time to time, Mr. Speaker, we hear these hon. gentlemen opposite talking about credibility and about somebody endeavouring to mislead the House. The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans just rose and said that in two weeks I never uttered a word about this strike. In the next sentence then, he describes my saying something in a tape that he is unable to find, that he cannot produce.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

The only one you made.

MR. BLANCHARD:

What are you talking about? Did I say something or did I not? Make up your mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, in the short period I have been in this House, I have heard the hon. the Leader of the Opposition accuse several members of attempting to mislead the House. When he rose in his place, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the Late Show, he made a statement that I poked my head into a room today where some labour leaders had gathered. Mr. Speaker, that is the thing that brings into real question the credibility of the leader.

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible) the deputy minister (inaudible)?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Ask the deputy minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are rather frustrated today. They made every endeavour to have this side of the House talk about a labour dispute that is in a very, very critical stage right now. By any methodology that we can find, we are seeking to get people back in a meaningful manner to the bargaining table to try to end

this conflict but like we have seen in many other cases, Mr. Speaker, the last thing that hon. members opposite want to see is this conflict ended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the House has been opened now for several days and there is has been ample time for members over there to have asked intelligent questions. They could have had their labour critic ask very intelligent questions. He is the only one over there capable of doing it. Yet, they wait for a very critical day in a labour dispute, today, to have the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) get up and get off with a load of utter nonsense. The member for Windsor - Buchans could not even articulate what we were trying to do in the background trying to have his constituents avail of a programme called MILAP. He kept going behind the curtains, Mr. Speaker, last Fall when the House was opened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the minister's time has now elapsed.

I would ask hon. members on each side of the House for silence.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, what a pious, sanctimonious attempt to try to cover up for his own incompetence. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has completely destroyed his

credibility and the leader is now moving him on to what he considers to be bigger fish, the Minister of Finance. He has destroyed you, you are gone, he has left us nothing only the ashes. That is all that is left of the hon. gentleman. Let me say to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) we have just seen him stand up and in a sanctimonious way to try to hide behind a statement that he did make. We have just seen him stand up and try to in some way slither around the actions of the Premier and of the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor). I believe that the hon. gentleman was so ashamed of it that that is the reason why he was quiet. He must be the most uncomfortable minister on that side.

I asked him a question today, Mr. Speaker, and did I get an answer? He said he knows where I stand on that. I want to tell him that the people out there on that picket line also want to know where the Minister of Labour stands on the issues that are before him. What was the delicate situation we were looking at today? I will tell you. The Premier of this Province yesterday came into the House and he said that they were at the bargaining table, government was at the bargaining table, they are waiting for somebody to come back and sit down and talk to them. NAPE today went and sat down at the table and was waiting for the hon. gentleman to send in his negotiators. The deputy minister, which he should be, I do not blame the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) because he should still be the Deputy Minister of Labour since he wrote that Bill 59 for the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn). He should still be the Deputy Minister of Labour. The Deputy Minister of Labour came in

and the NAPE people said to him we are here at the bargaining table and they left. That was the end of it. That was the delicate situation that the Minister of Labour was in that he could not answer a question in this House.

MR. BARRY:

He did not even know the deputy was in there I do not think.

MR. TULK:

No. He did not know the deputy was in there. He just took his cue from the Premier. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has a responsibility to people in the labour movement in the Province. Do not take any coaching from those two. That would be terrible. He has to stand in this House and answer for his actions or inactions, the things that he has not done. He has to tell us where he stands. He is responsible for the labour component. Let Treasury Board President look after Treasury Board. Let the Premier look after the Province. He is responsible for the labour component. He is the person NAPE out there are saying is supposed to represent them in the Cabinet. What is he saying? Where does he stand?

Does he believe that the Premier should have used the courts and the Newfoundland Constabulary in the way that he used them to put pressure on those people? Does he believe that? Does he believe that you should have bully boy from Mount Pearl on television saying, "Get back or we will issue thirty day suspensions?" Does he believe that? What has he done to try to ease the situation? The great conciliator! There he is, the man who has the reputation of being able to settle everything, the man from Glad. Now, stand up,

do not go hiding behind your desk, behind little platitudes, behind things that you say are sensitive that are not sensitive, stand up and tell us how you feel about what that man has been doing to ordinary decent people in this Province. I challenge the hon. gentleman to stand up in his place.

Never mind standing up and talking about the time the Leader of the Opposition was working with labour. Never mind talking about MILAP in Buchans. Stand up and talk about your portfolio and tell us where you stand so that the people on that picket line will know that at least they have one friend in that arrogant government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to detect a note of jealousy from the other side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

We have a Premier, Mr. Speaker, who is very capable of handling the affairs of this Province. Thankfully, we have a President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) who is doing an excellent job and we have a Minister of Labour who has a high degree of credibility with the labour movement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr.

Tulk), who did not have enough knowledge about fisheries to be the fisheries critic, is now trying to make pronouncements about labour. I told him this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I will give him a seminar when this is all over and let him know so he can ask some intelligent questions about this.

They have short term programmes but I do not know if your programmes are long enough for that. Yours are a maximum of a year I think. I was going to suggest that you enroll with the new Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies and take a seminar on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a group of people who like to talk over there but they do not like to listen. I listened attentively when both members got off with a load of nonsense over there about labour matters when they do not even know what they are talking about.

They are quoting me on tapes on matters that were never uttered and in the next voice they are saying that I have not opened my mouth on the thing. They should get their act together, Mr. Speaker, before they start making these nonsensical statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

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