



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 4

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

21 March 1986

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling Statements by Ministers, I have had an opportunity of looking at the two petitions that were presented yesterday and, in my opinion, neither one of them is satisfactory and do not conform to our rules. The one presented by the Leader of the Opposition is not really a petition to the House. In fact one would take strong exception, I think, to some of the remarks. It certainly is not a petition of any kind.

The second one presented by the member for LaPoile is a copy of a letter that was written to Mr. Tom Rideout and Mr. Ray Andrews. Certainly that does not conform to our rules. I would like to draw hon. members' attention to Beauchesne, Page 213, irregularity in petitions. It is section 693. "It is the duty of Members to read petitions which are sent to them before they are presented and, if they observe any irregularity, to return them to the petitioners."

Statements by Ministers

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, I want to make a partly verbal statement this morning and table some

information. I apologize to the Opposition but I just got here a moment ago. I will send over copies of these right away if they want to have them. I did not get here in time enough to give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, this deals with the designation of essential employees in the Maintenance and Operational Services bargaining unit and the General Services bargaining unit.

As hon. gentlemen will know, the labour legislation requires the designation of essential employees, and as well provides a mechanism whereby the government and the union can negotiate the list of essential employees as requested by the various departments of government. If we can agree on that, then they can be so designated. In failing to agree on the list of essential employees, the matter can be referred to an impartial tribunal, the Labour Relations Board, which is comprised of a representative of the employer, a representative of labour, and an impartial chairman.

Mr. Speaker, as you know this has not taken place. We have referred the list of employees we deemed essential in June of 1984 to NAPE in respect of both MOS and the General Services, and they, of course, to this point in time, as the House knows, have refused to negotiate.

I want to advise the House that this morning we will be resubmitting to the union an updated list of essential employees because a year and a half or twenty months have passed by and certain structural changes in the departments of government have taken place. So we have

updated these lists, but they are essentially the same. We will be submitting that to the union again this morning and requesting that, if they wish to negotiate them with us, we could sit down and do that. If there is a failure to do that, we will also be, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, submitting these lists to the Labour Relations Board and asking the Labour Relations Board to rule on the requested number of essential employees in each department. So we will be taking both actions very shortly this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I want to table for the information of the House the list of essential employees we have requested. I would point out that a large number of government departments have absolutely no essential employees designated or requested. In fact, as hon. gentlemen know, amendments to labour legislation in 1985 showed clearly that government did not consider certain departments as requiring essential employees. The legislation was even amended so that we do not now have the right, in fact, to request essential employees in those departments.

I want to just briefly outline the various departments that have essential employees designated. In the case of Maintenance and Operational Services there are, Mr. Speaker, out of the eighteen departments of government, only five departments that have essential employees requested in the Maintenance and Operational Services bargaining unit. Let me go down through some of them just very briefly, Mr. Speaker.

In the Department of Public Works and Services, we have requested 141 people in that department.

These are essentially people involved in the security of buildings, the operation of heating and the boiler systems and so forth.

In the case of the Department of Transportation, at this point in the year, 425 employees. As hon. gentlemen know, these are essentially snow clearing and ice control people and mechanics necessary to ensure the operation of the equipment during this point in time. These are considered essential only during the Winter months. During the Summer season, these people are not considered essential.

In the Department of Health there are three people considered essential. In the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth there are four, and again at the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth I think these are security people at the various recreational centers. At the Department of Justice, there are eight. Again, these people are required for the administration of justice under all circumstances. So we are requesting a total of 581 people as essential employees for a total of 24.9 per cent of the bargaining unit. I again emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that that is in the Winter months. During the Summer season, when the Transportation employees are not considered essential, that 24.9 per cent would be reduced to something in the order of 10 to 12 per cent. So there is a tremendous drop during the Summer months.

Mr. Speaker, in the General Services, again, there are only eight departments that we considered should have any essential employees. In the

Department of Public Works and Services, for example, there are four and these are essentially people involved in printing and photography for various government departments, primarily to insure that the House of Assembly can continue unimpeded.

In the Department of Forest Resources and Lands there is a figure here of 143. That seems to be extremely high but, Mr. Speaker, that relates to people involved in forest fire protection. Again, that is seasonal. Only during the summertime would there be 143 employees essential in the Department of Forest Resources and Lands. During other times of the year there would be far fewer people essential in the Department of Forestry, just a small number.

In the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development we are asking for sixteen people. These are primarily veterinarians involved in the health of animals and of course if you have a major outbreak of disease in animals that can be quickly spread to humans as well.

In the Department of Transportation, in the General Services, we are requesting one employee. That person is a dispatcher for the air ambulance at Torbay, Mr. Speaker.

In the Department of the Environment there is one. In the Department of Social Services there is thirty-six. These are essentially people who are involved in dealing with the less fortunate in our society ensuring that emergency services and funding are provided to these people in various parts of our

Province.

In the Department of Health we have twenty. Again these are basically health inspectors and people involved in the health and safety of the Province.

In the Department of Labour fifty-one, again, these are inspectors involved in occupational health and safety inspections and so forth.

In the Department of Justice there are 156. Again, I think all of them, obviously, are people involved in the administration of justice.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is a total of 473 in General Services out of 4,020, 11.8 per cent and that even includes the 143 people in the Department of Forest Resources and Lands who are essential only during the summer season for fighting forest fires. So, Mr. Speaker, I submit these lists to the House of Assembly for your information.

It is the information that we will be submitting today to the Labour Relations Board for arbitration in view of the fact that NAPE, up until now, has refused to negotiate it with us. At the same time, we will be delivering them to NAPE as well with a request that they sit down immediately and negotiate them with us. Obviously, if we can negotiate it, then we will not be required to refer it to a Labour Relations Board.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there is something very funny going on here over the last couple of days in the statements that are coming from the other side.

Yesterday we heard the Premier get up and say that there were exploratory discussions underway and he refused to answer questions because he did not want to prejudice those discussions. If I am hearing the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) right, he is saying that there has been no discussion with NAPE leaders or the membership on this matter that he is now standing in the House to address.

When we get to Question Period we will be asking for clarification. Are discussions underway or are they not? If they are underway, why was this not discussed with NAPE before the President of Treasury Board came in here and presented it this morning. Is what is going on now an attempt by the President of Treasury Board to make out as though the reasonable requests by NAPE are unreasonable? Is that what the President of Treasury Board is attempting to do? Is he attempting to argue his case in public, to try and swing back public opinion which his heavy-handedness lost when he brought in those suspensions, when he refused to put a proposal for parity on the table, when he went and brought in the heavy hand of the law and saw the court injunction? He lost the tide of public opinion. Is he now standing up in this House and trying to reverse the flow of public opinion which is very clearly against him and against the Premier and against members opposite and in favour of those

people who have been out on the picket lines?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

That is it, you have got it, politics again.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the President of Treasury Board is, in this simple statement, standing up and saying that he wants NAPE to operate within Bill 59. He is rubbing Bill 59 in the noses of NAPE again this morning.

Mr. Speaker, our position on Bill 59, and we have asked government to take the same position, is purely and simply kill Bill 59! It has not worked and it has to go!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like to remind everybody that we cannot have any applause from the galleries. We will have to have silence. This is a rule of the House. If there is any disturbance, I will have to clear the galleries.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the President of Treasury Board and the Premier wanted to show good faith, they would lift the suspensions they have imposed, they would commit themselves to killing Bill 59, they would set up an industrial enquiry into collective bargaining in the public sector and they would agree to go back to the bargaining table with a proposal

leading to parity. Those are the proposals we have put forth as a resolution of this strike.

Mr. Speaker, our position on Bill 59 was first set out in January 12, 1985. It did not arise as a result of this labour dispute. When Bill 59 was introduced, there was an apparent deal made between labour leaders at the time and the then Minister of Justice and he committed himself to implementing Bill 59 in consultation with union leadership. He did not do that. He broke that agreement and that is why Bill 59 does not work. It will not work, Mr. Speaker, and it should be taken off the statute books of this Province.

I will say that the minister is coming on in a conciliatory fashion and has used a conciliatory tone in recent days. Even his remarks today are somewhat conciliatory. We take that as a positive step and we commend the minister to continue with that course of action, to get away from his arbitrary, intolerant, arrogant, dictatorial attitude which has been the attitude of the Premier in all labour relation disputes, get away from that and get down to a conciliatory reasonable tone. But, Mr. Speaker, do not think that you are fooling the people of this House, the people in the galleries or the people in this Province when the President of Treasury Board gets up yesterday and indicates that discussions are underway and this morning comes in and makes a statement where there has been no consultation and no discussion. Mr. Speaker, that is attempting to fool and mislead the people of this Province.

We ask the President of Treasury Board to consider seriously these

recommendations we have made: Kill Bill 59, lift the suspensions, industrial enquiry and submit a proposal leading to parity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the Ministerial Statement. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent of the House to address the Ministerial Statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There will be ample opportunity for the hon. member to speak at a later time.

MR. FENWICK:

But, Mr. Speaker, in the past if leave of the House has been given I have been able to address Ministerial Statements. I ask for that leave now.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there are Oral Questions and there is debate on Interim Supply. The member will have lots of time to address the House.

MR. FENWICK:

I take it, Mr. Speaker, that is an objection— from the official Opposition, is it, for me to address the Ministerial Statement?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member may not address that statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member may address the House or leave of the House. Has he leave?

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Menihek has made a reasonable request. I would now, on behalf of each other member on this side, like to make the same request. All of us are here as individual members of this House. The Leader of the Opposition has spoken in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition in response to a Ministerial Statement and, if the member for Menihek would like to speak, and I understand that he would very much like to speak on this, I also would like to have the opportunity to make my views known on this issue and, therefore, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any member who wants to speak on this issue be given leave by the House to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The member who just spoke might want to consider that he is still a leader of a party but he is not. He has tried to be leader of

a party and he has been defeated. Now, it is only fair and we have done it before in this House. The Leader of the Opposition has the right to get up and respond, or some member opposite who is a critic to get up and respond to a Ministerial Statement. In this circumstance, and it was a like circumstance where it happened before, the House had agreed that the other leader of a party could speak, not every member, and there is only one other leader of a party on the opposite side and that is the member for Menihek. So what the member who just sat down is saying is that all members are leaders of parties here in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They are not. The member is not a leader. And all we are saying is for the sake of three or four minutes the other leader on the other side of the House should have the opportunity to respond too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour has ruled, at the request of the Premier and his Government House Leader earlier during this assembly, that there is more than one member required in this House in order to give the entitlement to speak as a member of a group in this House. Now,

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to waste time, we want to get down to the business that we came here for today which is to get some answers from members opposite. The member for Menihek will have lots of time to speak, Mr. Speaker, in Interim Supply, which will follow right after question period, and we will be happy to let him go first, Mr. Speaker, at that point in time, if he wishes. We want to get to questioning members opposite and we know they do not want to give the answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order. The hon. the member for Menihek may speak with leave of the House. If he has no leave he has opportunities at a later stage to speak. Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

AN HON. MEMBER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am making a ruling at the moment. Does the hon. member have leave?

MR. LUSH:

Am I allowed to get up now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed! Agreed!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

No.

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would agree to giving the hon. gentleman leave of the House to speak this morning, if again on other issues I as a member am allowed to respond to Ministerial Statements. Many times in this House there are Ministerial Statements that I would like to speak to and I do not get the opportunity. I am the member for a district as is the member for Menihek. Now if the government is so broad-minded, let they declare this man a leader of an official party in the House, and then it will be all over with.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not speaking to a point of order. This matter has been decided, leave has not been granted. Are there any further Statements By Ministers?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I have a very brief verbal statement to make. Our most recent survey of gasoline prices are showing a decline from 53.3 cents per litre to 49.55 cents per litre for gasoline and from 53.6 per litre to 52.88 cents per litre for diesel. This will have the effect of reducing the tax on gasoline from 11.7 cents per litre to 10.9 cents per litre and reducing the tax on diesel from 13.9 cents per litre to 13.7 cents per litre and this matter will be gazetted very shortly and will

have an effect at the pumps thereafter.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, we welcome any reduction in taxes. They are not coming fast enough for us, the reductions, and I am sure they are not coming fast enough for the people of the Province in view of the way that the prices for oil are being reduced at this particular point in time. And we are glad to see that they have removed this responsibility now from the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) and given it to the unlikely gentleman, the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, on Interim Supply we will have another provision, Mr. Speaker, we will have another opportunity for the member to speak if government is willing to cooperate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a simple question. Are face to face talks underway with NAPE bargaining representatives or is the Premier attempting to communicate by ESP?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, over the last two days we have attempted to do two things. Number one, meetings have been held with a number of labour leaders, exploratory discussions to try to see what could be done to resolve the present dispute. Those talks were between a number of labour leaders, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and the Deputy Minister of Labour. I will not release the names of those people because we are hopeful that we will still be able to use their good offices over the next few days to assist in resolving the dispute, but exploratory discussions and talks have been held with labour leaders in the Province and with the Minister of Labour and the Deputy Minister of Labour. Secondly, for the last two days the Minister of Labour and the Deputy Minister of Labour have been trying to sit down with Mr. March as president of the union to begin exploratory discussions with him as the leader of the union to try to find a methodology to end the dispute and to begin meaningful collective bargaining. Unfortunately, to this point in time, up to this hour right now, Mr. March has not responded to our initiatives to sit down with the Minister of Labour or the Deputy Minister of Labour to talk. So we will continue during the next few hours

and during the weekend, through the offices of the Labour Department and the minister, to try to arrange a meeting face to face with Mr. March as we have been trying to do for the last two days because we think we need to sit down with the leader of the union in the first instance to see if we can work out a methodology to have people go back to work and have meaningful collective bargaining begin. So we will continue that initiative which we started a couple of days ago. And, we will continue to use the offices of the labour department to talk to the labour leaders that we have already initiated exploratory discussions with to see if they can also, as sort of another party in the matter, to assist us and to assist both parties to try to come together for the resolution of the problem.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, you would think that Fraser March was the March Hare and the Premier cannot pin him down. Hubert Sutton and the authorized representatives of NAPE have been over at the Department of Labour sitting down waiting for government representatives to come to the bargaining table. They have caught out the Premier in his deceit and his falsehood when he said that he was back at the bargaining table or still at the bargaining table.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is beginning to

make a speech.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier will he explain, since he said a couple of days ago he was still at the bargaining table, where are his bargaining representatives when Hubert Sutton and the other representatives of NAPE are in the room waiting to bargain, waiting to talk? They are the ones who decide who represents the union, not the Premier. Is the Premier now saying that government will only deal with the president of a trade union? Mr. Speaker, is it still a precondition to bargaining that the workers return to work?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, we are trying to work our way out of a very difficult situation. We believe that the best way to do that is to sit down with the head of the union, in the first instance, to work out an agreement whereby two things would happen simultaneously. One, that meaningful collective bargaining would begin, and that the people would be back at their jobs. That is what we are trying to work out.

So there are two steps here. One is an agreement whereby the workers go back to work and then the second step would be, as they go back to work, meaningful collective bargaining would begin. We are prepared, as a government, to sit down with Mr. March or other labour leaders to work out an agreement which would allow that to happen. What that agreement would contain obviously would be the subject of negotiations with the union, so that is the way we would like to

proceed. We would like to proceed by not going directly into trying to get a collective agreement. There comes a step before that, as most labour leaders know, and that is, when you are into this situation of an illegal walkout and you have a dispute on your hands, almost in every instance the first thing done is that the parties try to work out an agreement under which they both would agree on two things: one, for the workers to go back to work and, secondly, for meaningful collective bargaining to start.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I did ask the last day that we would have short questions and try to have short answers and, if answers cannot be short, to have them as a written statement. So I am not criticizing what has gone on but I am just suggesting that if we are to get as many questions and answers as we can that we would adopt that attitude.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It was noted that I had about three words out when you said that I was making a speech. However, the Premier was given a lot of opportunity to reply. Let us hear a reply on this one. Would the Premier explain how he is going to get workers back to work if they are going to be suspended as soon as they go back to work?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, obviously I cannot address that, because if we are behind closed doors going to try to get an agreement with the union for them to go back to work and for meaningful collective bargaining to exist, that may be one of the items which will be in that agreement, for them to go back to work.

MR. TULK:
You should be nominated for an Academy Award, boy.

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

I am very pleased to see a large lot of people in the gallery today and they are always very welcome. They must realize, though, and some may not, that they are not allowed to take any part whatever in the deliberations, either by applause or laughing or any other way. And if they do I will just have the galleries cleared.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Premier and his government talk about restraint and they are only able to allow 4 per cent increases and freezes and stuff like that and I wonder, in line with this, will the Premier table Treasury Board Minute 616 for 1985 in the amount of \$785,600 for redecoration of the eighth floor? And will he indicate whether the \$150,000 spent to redecorate his inner throne room is included in that \$785,000?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I find the member's question

rather hypocritical when that party over there supported the Select Committee recommendations to spend \$4 million to \$5 million on members of this House.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Menihek.

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

My question is for the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) and it is to eliminate a bit of confusion in my mind. Over the last couple of days I am getting a distinct impression that the government over there is attempting to find some sort of way out of the impasse that we are in and, initially looking at the essential list, I was wondering if we had turned around and gone in the other direction. The first part of the question I have for the President of Treasury Board is that in his statement, which I did not get a chance to reply to, he indicated that if the union was not willing to negotiate these two lists he would be going straight to the Labour Relations Board. Does that now mean that that option was available all the way back from the beginning of the bargaining process, perhaps as far back as 1983?

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

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, the provision in the legislation provides that in the event of failure to reach an agreement on the requested list of designated employees it can be

referred to the Labour Relations Board by the union, which is a protection to them to ensure that government does not unduly delay the process of negotiating essential employees. So they have the right in that circumstance to refer to the Labour Relations Board and the Board's decision is binding. Similarly, government can refer it as well. As the hon. gentlemen knows from statements I have made over the past couple of weeks, the union has objected to the Labour Relations Board dealing with any issues of essential employees relating to NAPE and the Board has complied with that request in view of the fact that the union has challenged Bill 59 in court. The court has ruled it a valid piece of legislation but the union has appealed it and the board has said that they will not hear any appeals or any arbitrations on that issue while it is still in dispute by NAPE. What we are doing today, in view of the failure of the union to negotiate, is once again requesting the union to sit down and negotiate this revised list, and, secondly, referring it directly to the Labour Relations Board with a request that they do hear it in spite of the union's objections.

MR. FENWICK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
My supplementary is an I now hearing from the President of Treasury Board with this request that this now becomes a package that the government is now going to the union with, if you negotiate these essential employees we will then work some

way out of this impasse? Is that essentially what we have here, one part of a package that is being presented to the union?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, there has always been a list there. We have requested the union to negotiate with us, they have failed to respond and all that we are doing is going to them once more with a list that has been updated, because almost two years has passed since our original list was submitted, requesting them once again to negotiate, but in anticipation of continued refusal to negotiate we are also going to the Labour Relations Board and asking them to arbitrate.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

Referring back to your comments in the Ministerial Statement where you indicated that you will discuss with the union the list, the impression that I received from that was that this was an initiative that you were taking. Is it correct now to assume that you are willing to sit down and discuss this list with the union and if, along the way, something about the MOS contract or other parts of Bill 59 come up, that you would be willing to talk about it this time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the negotiation or the discussion on the list of essential employees is not part of the collective bargaining process. It has been a request that has been before the union for a long period of time, since June of 1984. We would very much like to sit down and negotiate this list of essential employees with them. If that helps in any way to resolve this impasse, we would be delighted.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

I wish to address my question to the hon. the Premier. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the Tory administration deliberately provoked NAPE into going on strike. The logical line of questioning would be why. I ask the Premier, did the Premier provoke this strike in order to save money to offset the cost of repairs to the Eighth Floor which, I understand, was close to \$1 million?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is so low down a question, I mean, it does not deserve an answer from me. Obviously anybody who knows me at all knows that I would not attempt to do that, to provoke a strike or to provoke people to go out and lose pay in a legitimate job that they had. I would not allege that of any member of this House on either side. I would never say that about the hon. member in any

of the dealings that he has had over the years, either in private business or as a public person of this House. I do not think that he should stoop so low as to accuse any other member.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

In view of the fact that this was done to the teachers, is the Premier prolonging this strike in order to save money to offset the cost of his recent trip to China, which I understand was about \$300,000?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that anybody appreciates those lines of questioning that the hon. member is involved in right now. We have been trying over the last few days, the Minister of Labour constantly hour by hour, the Deputy Minister of Labour, to get this dispute over. We are not at all interested in saving money on the backs of the workers of this Province. We have no intention and never did do anything for that reason. We have tried to conduct ourselves as reasonable people under the laws of the Province. That is what we have done, we have tried to conduct ourselves as reasonable people under the laws of this Province and will continue to do so. And to suggest some kind of devious motives on behalf of the administration I think is not becoming of the hon. member and not becoming of any citizen of

this Province.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Will the Premier, who saved money by keeping the teachers out, who saved money by keeping the brewery out, tell this hon. House where he plans to get the money that he has been wasting on patronage appointments, where he plans to get the money that he used to redecorate the eighth floor, if he is not going to take it from the NAPE people whom he has thrown out on strike?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

One way we are doing it is we are saving money by rejecting the salary increases that the hon. member wanted in the Select Committee Report to the House of Assembly.

MR. TOBIN:

You asked for a 25 per cent increase.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that the Premier was not so concerned last week, before this strike

started as he appears to be this morning, and we would not be in the mess in this Province that we are in today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

I would like to ask the Premier is it a fact that through his concern for the safety of the people of this Province that management personnel in the Department of Transportation, who have absolutely no training for driving and no training for repairs, are forced to drive these heavy equipment trucks and ploughs on the highways?

MR. FLIGHT:

And not licenced for the job.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the people whom the hon. member refers to have the appropriate licences to operate the machinery that they are now operating. Just let me say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member what would happen tonight if suddenly there was a major snow storm, for example, in Conche or Croque or Westport or some rural part of this Province, and about two o'clock tomorrow morning, in the middle of that snow storm, there was a child who got sick and had to go directly to Baie Verte Hospital or Springdale Hospital or Grand Falls Hospital right in the middle of it, and we did not have somebody to make sure that that road was ploughed so that that child or that person could get to hospital? You know,

what would happen, Mr. Speaker? So we have a responsibility. After something happened, tomorrow morning the first thing you would hear on Open Line would be, where is the government? They are suppose to be keeping the roads ploughed because we have a right to hospital services.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

If the Premier was so concerned over the safety of the people of this Province, he would make sure that this strike was over now and the proper people could drive those vehicles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Actually what is happening -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. EFFORD:

Does the Premier know that the people who are driving those ploughs and trucks have in the process had accidents with pick-ups and pushed them out in the woods and also drove ploughs off the roads and seriously affected the safety of the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

MR. REID:

Pushed them off the road?

MR. EFFORD:
Yes, off the road.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, may I answer the question?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I am not aware of the incidents that the hon. member mentions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Check with the department.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, could I have the courtesy to be heard in silence? I did not say anything when the hon. member asked his question. I kept quiet. Can I have the same courtesy?

MR. BARRY:
You have nothing to say.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Fine. If you do not want an answer it is fine with me.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the Premier makes a good point when he asks what would happen 'if'. I ask what would happen 'if' these emergencies occurred during that thirty day suspension the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) has

provided for? What would happen then?

Mr. Speaker, talking about suspensions, I want to put a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), a man who has got good credentials in the labour field, his credentials are good - whether he is adding to those credentials these days is another aspect - up to now. My question is, given that suspensions of any kind have not been used very regularly as a bargaining tool, it seems to me, would the minister confirm the widely held story in this town that he was not consulted on the question of suspensions and heard it first when most people in this Province heard it first, on television? Would he confirm that?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
No, Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm that. I am part of the Cabinet and when decisions are made I have to be part of those decisions.

MR. SIMMONS:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Would the minister tell the House that he agreed, he concurred in that particular decision to threaten thirty day suspensions on all persons who had walked out? Would he tell the House what his position is on that issue?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, my position with respect to those suspensions and all matters in the dispute is for the last two days my office has been trying to reach the office of the president of the organization, of NAPE, to try to get back to the table to discuss the question of suspensions, to discuss anything relative to getting back to work. The hon. gentlemen on the opposite side ought to know that in every major dispute this is a mechanism that is engaged in.

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister is no longer the man from Glad.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Premier to clear up some confusion for me. He said he wants to negotiate with Fraser March on this dispute. Fraser March is going back and forth to two different charges in court. He spends half of his day going back and forth addressing charges to him -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

It is a slight preamble.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman is attempting to make a speech.

The hon. the member for

Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

If you want to negotiate with Fraser March, as a sign of good faith will the Premier direct the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) to withdraw the charges placed against Fraser March under this confused injunction, which the Minister of Justice does not know to whom it applies drop the charges against Fraser March and against the other people who have been arrested, and then we will see maybe some movement towards the end of the strike?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to intervene in the court process of this Province, number one. Number two, what we are attempting to do, though, is what all reasonable people do when two parties find themselves in a dispute of this nature, to try to get both sides together to work out an agreement whereby the workers will go back to work and meaningful collective bargaining will begin. That is what we are trying to do, that is what we will continue to try to do to bring an end to this dispute.

MR. BARRY:

Why did you not do it a week ago?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I will ask again. I want to ask

the Minister of Justice this question, will she consider it? Would she just tell us does she know now who is covered under this injunction that is now so confusing to the public?

MR. BARRY:

That is against all NAPE members.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne prohibits questions soliciting opinions on matters before the court or on legal questions. And as the Premier has already said, the efforts of this government are now concentrated on getting the parties to the dispute back to the bargaining table to bring about an end to the dispute. I have no comment to make about separate matters which are before the court and which must be adjudicated by the courts.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate why two days ago she was prepared to make a comment on the matter before the court, and say that she was not clear whether the General Service was included, why two days ago she was prepared to comment on a matter before the court but she is not prepared to comment today?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I would not comment

on any matter before the court. I was asked a couple of questions by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) about the court injunction and about some relevant legislation. I took those questions as notice. I said I would consider whether or not it would be appropriate for me to get into discussion of legal opinions in the House of Assembly and I have concluded that indeed it would not be appropriate. As a matter of fact, Beauchesne clearly states that it is out of order for a question along that line to even be posed in the House of Assembly. Certain matters are now before the courts of our Province. Independently the judiciary will adjudicate those matters. In the meantime, the efforts of the government are being directed towards resuming bargaining and bringing an end to this dispute.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a follow-up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying now that she is criticizing the Premier for stating that he has decided that the minister and others would not clarify this very clear injunction? Is she saying that the Premier did something wrong in making that comment two days ago in commenting on something before the courts? Is that what the minister is now saying?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, no member on this

side has commented on matters before the court. I think the Leader of the Opposition is simply rehashing his question and I have answered as fully as I can the original question. There is really no need for me to comment any more. I will not now, and have not in the past, commented on matters before the court.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Would the minister indicate whether or not the members of government, the representatives of government, applying for this injunction had to give an undertaking to the Chief Justice to see that the injunction was enforced? Has the minister done anything to ensure that this undertaking, given to the Chief Justice, is being lived up to?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, how often do I have to say that I will not comment on matters before the court? These matters are ongoing and will be dealt with in the proper way, independently, by the Chief Justice of the Trial Division of the Newfoundland Supreme Court.

MR. BARRY:
They may be calling you in to answer too.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
My question is to the President of Treasury Board. The minister, in his statement this morning, indicated that there are exactly, apparently, 425 essential people with MOS out of the 1200. Now, Mr. Speaker, the whole 1200 transportation workers are off the job right now. What happens if we get an agreement, and hopefully we will in the next few days; will that 425 that he deems essential be then exempt from his suspensions?

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

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, we have indicated that we are doing everything possible to try and find a resolution to this dispute, to get back to the bargaining table, and I think to get involved in that particular question, to try and answer it would not be in the best interests of our efforts to solve this present dispute.

MR. FLIGHT:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Would the minister now indicate, in keeping with what he would want us to perceive as a conciliatory attitude, would he consider lifting the suspensions in order to get negotiations started? Is that one of the things he is prepared to do?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. President of Treasury

Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think that sounds very much like the same question and I think the answer would have to be the same as the one I gave just a moment ago.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I have one more question for the Premier. He has said he will negotiate with Fraser March to bring this thing to an end. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) has said he wants to negotiate with the committee. If he will accept it, I will make the phone call to get you all together so you can solve this thing, because it seems as if there is not a serious attempt here to end this dispute. It seems that one committee is going one way and one committee is going the other, so just tell us who is going to negotiate with whom and then maybe all this confusion can be cleared up?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I can just say over and over again there are two steps. The first step, we think, is to have an agreement with the union, and preferably with the leader of the union. Now what that agreement would contain as we are saying here this morning - as the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) said - what that first agreement would contain would be a number of elements

which would be sufficient for the president of the union to recommend to his membership that they go back to work so that then his negotiating team that is in place can negotiate with Treasury Board. That is the way most of these kinds of disputes are handled. You need some kind of a mechanism to trigger good feelings on both sides, respect on both sides, so that then, when the two negotiating teams get together, there is a high chance of success. So you need those steps. What we are saying is, in the first instance, let us get together with labour leaders as well as people in NAPE to try to work out some kind of an agreement which will then see two things happen; the workers going back to work so that they will not lose any more time, so that they will not lose any more money; and, at the same time then, that first agreement would trigger the meaningful negotiations on the collective agreement.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the total unacceptability of the controversial and contentious Bill 59, and in view of the minister's own statements, on the heels of the condemnation by the International Labour Organization, to look into Bill 59 - the minister said in this House that he was going to look into Bill 59 - can the minister tell the House what now has been the result of that looking into, that checking into Bill 59? Has he found it acceptable? Have they found it

totally unacceptable? Is it the recommendation of the people who looked into it to scrape it, to cancel it or to fine tune it? Just what has been the action with respect to Bill 59?

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Bonavista North for a very good, intelligent question. The result of looking into Bill 59 resulted last June in some amendments being brought into this House, and a bill being passed which exempted nine whole, complete bargaining units from the essential services part of the bill. Certainly other changes were made to the bill, very beneficial changes at that time. If he wants to go back to Hansard and have a look at what I stated at that time, I said that there would be ongoing dialogue with Public Service Unions to determine other aspects of the bill which we would be prepared to change. We are still committed to that, Mr. Speaker. All I am looking for is the opportunity to sit down and talk with them. We had a committee in place, Mr. Speaker, it did not get an opportunity to operate up to this time. I am personally committed to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:
That is a pity, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
I would like, at this stage, to welcome to the gallery Mayor Elaine Williams, Pool's Cove; Mayor Russell Blagdon, St. Jacques-Coombs Cove; Mr. Cyril Brown, Co-ordinator, Fortune Bay North Development Association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome Bill Dixon, President of the Federation of Mayor and Municipalities and Doug Smith, the Executive Director.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

o o o

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
I rise to seek leave under Standing Order 23 to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of debating a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the dangerous labour situation existing in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier was so eager to give the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) an opportunity to debate this issue in the House, now is the time for the Premier to show his stuff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now is the time for him to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that a debate under Standing Order 23 will give every member, including the member for Menihek, a chance to debate this face to face with the Premier and his cohorts.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wishes to give me his motion in writing, I will consider the matter.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I just refer, Mr. Speaker, to Beauchesne, Page 91, dealing with this particular motion. At paragraph 283 it states, "There must be no other reasonable opportunity for debate," which is one of the criterion. We have just had Question Period. If this motion is not in order, the government business will be Interim Supply. There is plenty of opportunity to discuss this matter then.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite obvious, as well, that what the hon. gentleman is doing, has been doing throughout Question Period and he has been doing at every opportunity, is try to inflame things rather than bring about a rational resolution of the question that he brings before the House.

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

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, we see again in the Government House Leader the attempt to divert things from the real issue. A few minutes ago we had the Premier stand in this House, challenge everybody on this side to give leave to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to reply to a Ministerial Statement. Well, right now, if the Speaker rules this in order, I would ask the Government House Leader to put his money where his mouth is, to put up or shut up, to get up and say, yes this is a matter of urgent and public importance and indeed the member for Menihek and every other member in this House should have a chance to debate it. Mr. Speaker, I challenge him. I emphasize again that they are playing games.

We saw the Premier this morning stand up and he should have got one of the Genies from last night. We should have one left for him for the kind of act that he put on in this House, the comedy hour. Mr. Speaker, I would challenge him now, the Government House Leader. Come on, put up or shut up, let us see where your money is. Come on, let us have a debate.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, could I speak further to the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member was not speaking very much to the point of order. If the hon. member has a few more observations to make I will certainly hear them.

MR. TULK:

Let me address the point of whether there is any urgency in this debate.

We have a situation in the Province where highways are not being ploughed, where people are operating equipment in a manner unsafe for the public. We have a situation where people are out on picket lines when they want to be back in their jobs. We have a situation where this Province is practically shut down and it has to do with the government's provocation of people, their confrontationalist attitude that is going on, and we have people who are doing without in this Province because of the government. So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the urgency is there and that there should be a debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am going to rule this motion out of order because there is plenty of opportunity today under Interim Supply and also in the Address in Reply to deal with this matter.

Orders of the Day

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

Resolution

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I have a few words on some comments that were made at the proceedings of the Committee last day on this resolution. The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) wondered why an Interim Supply Bill is being brought in. I do not think that needs to be answered. It was a rhetorical question, obviously, because it is quite obvious why it has to be brought in.

More substantively, he said that a number of departments seem to have quite a large proportion of their allocation in the Interim Supply Bill. Now, as hon. members know, when the main estimates are being debated they are debated in special committees which sit for quite a number of hours and give detailed consideration to each item under each department. So that is a fairly long process. If I were to answer the hon. member's question in the detail that I think he is probably looking for, it would take a very long period of time in this House and I really do not propose to go into it now. I will say, however, that there are in the House ministers who have details on their own departments and they can probably answer in a very capsulated form, in a very summary form, without taking up too much time of the Committee, these questions that are to be put in that fashion. I think that is the appropriate way to go, because I think we do have remember that,

when we get into the main supply bill, all the items on the Interim Supply Bill can be brought up for discussion and for question and comment and, as I mentioned, that will be done in specific committees set aside for that purpose giving a considerable length of time to do it. So it really would be duplicating effort and it would really be taking up the time of the Committee unnecessarily.

Let me make just for a general comment. At the beginning of a year very often departments have to have funds available for them to expend up front. In other words, not a very good example possibly, but suppose a department has \$1 million for, say, purchase services, and purchase services are almost always computer services. Now that money really has to be contracted out to NLCS, to Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services, fairly early in the year so that NLCS can be in a position to put in place the computer requirements for the department. So, obviously, if they are going to do that they have to put in the bulk of that \$1 million - and that is only a hypothetical amount I am mentioning - into their Interim Supply Bill. So that is why the Interim Supply Bill often looks unduly heavily weighted in comparison to the total proportion of the allocation to a department or to a division of a department. So that is just a general comment. I can assure hon. members of the committee that many of what seem to be unduly large amounts in the Interim Supply Bill are put in for that specific purpose, that there has to be up-front funding of departmental activities.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Carried.

DR. COLLINS:
Now, I hear an hon. member saying the resolution is carried, so I will sit down and let the Committee vote on the resolution.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Chairman.

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

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

Since we have a wide latitude of discussion in financial bills I am afraid I am going to exercise that latitude quite extensively today in entering comments that it has not been possible to enter into either in the Private Member's resolution last Wednesday and since we are adjourning next Tuesday will not be possible to enter in next Wednesday, because we are not likely to be here.

AN HON. MEMBER:
We may be adjourning?

MR. FENWICK:
I would say 'may be adjourning.' I think that is probably the most appropriate thing.

I just want to touch on a few things, since ten minutes is not a long amount of time -

MR. TULK:
Time is no problem with us.

MR. BAIRD:
We will stay here.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

There are two or three meetings

going on.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

- Mr. Chairman, and comment not on the dispute that is ongoing because I am quite pleased, over the last couple of days that the position of Tuesday in which there seemed to be no common ground available at all, has changed, it seems to me, significantly. Whether there are discussions going on or not the government is, in my opinion now, committed to a form of discussion and I am quite pleased to see that. Rather than get involved in that, which I think seems to be moving in the right direction anyway, I would like to talk a bit about last Tuesday and the experiences that I had when I had the opportunity to be on the picket line with the individuals of the MOS bargaining unit and a number of other individuals, including John Fryer from the National Union of Provincial Employees and Bill Parsons, who is the President of the Federation of Labour, Frank Taylor, who is the Secretary/Treasurer, and a number of other NAPE members as well. By the way, there was a member of the Lab and X-ray component and a few others as well.

Quite frankly, I was there because I felt that it was important that I should be there, not because of any other motive that I could think of. In the fifteen years that I have been working, since I graduated from university, I have been a member of that union consistently.

MR. MORGAN:

No political motive?

MR. FENWICK:

I do not know, 'Jim'. All I am saying is in the time that I have been working I have been a member of that particular union, the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees. I have been a member of it for sixteen years, I was an executive member of the organization back in the middle 1970s, I worked for the union for a year in 1975-1976. It is just, from that experience, what I find is the kind of thing that you have to do, and from that point of view that seemed to be the most reasonable thing to do at the time.

But that is not what I wanted to talk about this morning. I just wanted to mention that there were forty-seven people, I recall, arrested that day, four or five or six of us were, quite frankly, not in the bargaining unit, and not the same people. But the other ones, the forty or forty-two who were arrested, struck me as being some of the most sincere people I ever met, people whom I would have never imagined would have been in such a situation or would have exposed themselves to a situation like that. They were, by the way, a large number of them, I think - and the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is here today from Placentia itself. A large number from Ferryland, and I think the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) should know that, and a number from Harbour Main, the district of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). Most of the people who were arrested last Tuesday were not from St. John's. Only a small number was, because most were from the Southern Shore, and from other areas on the Avalon Peninsula. And these were individuals who had worked for the government for twenty-five or thirty years, some were in their sixties, maybe one or two or three

years from the time they would retire. Really, in terms of the collective agreement and whatever they get out of it, it was not a lot, they were there because they felt that it was important. Some of them were people who had worked on loaders and heavy equipment for years cleaning snow in conditions that none of us would ever want to be out in, and because of the rough treatment they had had, had kidney problems, and some of them had hearing problems because of the excessive noise that you have in these vehicles, and all of them had a very weather-beaten look, if you want, from working in the outdoors and working in exposed conditions like that, and it reminded me very much of the people I had worked with in the union in a long time.

When the experience was over and when the mug shots were taken - by the way, in case anybody else goes through it, my mug shot number is 4999, and John Fryer, who was right after me, had mug shot 5000, and we felt because of that he should have gotten a free tank of gas or something, but he evidently did not.

MR. BAIRD:

You will get a free tank of gas all right.

MR. FENWICK:

We may.

After that they did the finger printing, which was somewhat unsettling because you do not like people grabbing your hands and sticking them in ink and taking your finger prints and so on. But when they let me out afterwards, the predominant feeling I had was that these fellows were there because they strongly believed in what was going on. They were

breaking the law, there is no doubt about that. They were defying the government, there is no doubt about that as well. But they were doing it from a conviction that I felt was worthy of support. They were not doing it because Fraser March told them to be there. These were people who could have stayed down in Ferryland, they could have stayed down in Placentia, they could have stayed in Harbour Main and all of the other places, very easily just missed the bus coming in, but they came in and they stood up for what they believed in. Now they are charged and they may get a criminal record out of it.

Mr. Chairman, all I would like to enter into the record today is that I was extremely proud to be arrested with them, to go through the process with them, and if it comes to a trial and there is a punishment to be meted out for it, I will be extremely proud to serve whatever sentence that is handed out as a result of it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Does the resolution carry?

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I want to have a few comments on this Interim Supply Bill.

I want to, first of all, just comment on some of the comments that are consistently made by members opposite. When we talk

about the squander and the waste that the government is committing, the first thing that hon. gentlemen opposite say is that this party here was in agreement with a salary increase for MHAs. Let me point out first of all that that committee had a majority of government members. There were three members from the opposition and four from the government side. So let us please give up playing that silly game of saying that the opposition agreed to this package presented by this committee on salaries. The government had a majority on that committee. Let me say unequivocally today that I would support that salary increase again today, or that package that we dealt with.

We offered an opportunity for the government to do above board something for politicians in this Province, to increase the credibility and the respectability of politicians in this Province and indeed to reform this House of Assembly. That is what we asked for in that committee and the Premier did not have the courtesy to do it. Mr. Chairman, what he did do was find a way to increase salaries for members opposite. That is what he did. He found a way to increase salaries of members opposite. That is what we found offensive about that particular move, the hypocrisy of that situation, of saying that he was not going to accept the recommendations of this committee, a majority report, an unanimous report by members from all sides of the House sitting down, discussing, and deliberating on what was the situation in other parliaments throughout Canada and putting together what we thought was a reasonable package on the basis of that study and the basis

of that research. The Premier said he was not going to accept the report titled Tools For The Job. He was going to reject it outright and what did he proceed to do then? He gave his own members salary increases through the back-door, that is what the Premier did by using these car allowances and a very prerogative thing to do in this particular time when we had workers out there on picket lines trying to gain parity and equality. To say nothing for the new principle that is now on the go, to say nothing for the new fight that is now throughout Canada and in other parts of the United States, equal pay for work of equal value. That is what is happening in other parts of Canada. That is what is happening in other parts of the Western democratic world. They are onto something altogether bigger than we are onto. They are debating equal pay for work of equal value. Here we are just demanding equal pay for equal work which is two entirely different principles. We have not yet got beyond the stage of equal pay for equal work which is motherhood, an acceptable principle throughout all the Western world. We have not yet been able to look into the bigger one. We are so far behind that we have not been able to look into this one of equal pay for work of equal value. We have not been able to look at that yet. That is how far behind we are.

For hon. members to get up in the House and to say that we supported the increase for MHAs is just a low, hypocritical way, Mr. Chairman, of trying to duck out from under the responsibility that this government must accept.

MR. TOBIN:

Did you get the increase?

MR. LUSH:

Yes. Mr. Chairman, I am not ashamed of anything I get. I deserve every cent of it and that is why I recommended an increase, that is why I recommended more and that is why I recommended more for the hon. member. I recommended more for every member in this House. I believe that it should have been done properly and not through the back-door.

That is what we did, Mr. Chairman, and I am not ashamed to stand behind that report which was a report recommending changes which would have changed the face of democracy in this Province, would have changed the fact of this House of Assembly and would have put it in line with other democracies and other jurisdictions throughout Canada. But no, we did not want to do that. We still wanted to keep on to the old traditional, obsolete, backward way. That is what we wanted to do. They were afraid, Mr. Chairman, to stand up for Parliamentary reform. They were afraid to do it. They were afraid to follow the example of their colleague in Ottawa, the member for St. John's East. They were afraid to follow in his footsteps and really develop some Parliamentary reform in this Province. They were afraid to do that. So they took the low road, Mr. Chairman. They were not against the increases. They were only against giving any increases to this side. That is all they were against. They were not against giving increases to members but they did not want to give it to all members. They were against Parliamentary reform. So they just took the low road, Mr. Chairman, and decided to give it in disguise, in car allowances and this kind of thing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have shot holes in the arguments that hon. gentlemen have been shooting across this House every time we talk about squandering of public funds and every time we talk about how they provoked NAPE into going on strike.

MR. TULK:

You put a hole in that big enough to fit a Mack truck through.

MR. LUSH:

Exactly. Mr. Chairman, that is where we stand on that particular issue. It is too bad that hon. gentlemen have to go so low in debate to try and distort, to try and put out of perspective, what is the reality of a situation. It is unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, another issue that I want to get onto this morning while talking about this Interim Supply Bill is I am wondering if there is any money allocated here for this false advertising that the government have been involved in over the past little while. I am just wondering how much money is coming out of that for false advertising, a situation which if it happened in the private enterprise, in the world outside of government, outside of politics, the person responsible would have been arrested and put in jail for that very false advertising, to say nothing, Mr. Chairman of the other insidious motives behind this advertising. Just imagine in this day of high unemployment, when we are talking about possibly close to 80,000 people unemployed in this Province, for the Premier and his government to try and associate themselves with 8,000 part-time jobs, to try and take credit for two programmes.

Let us first of all take a look at Canada Works, we call it, the Canada Jobs Strategy Programme, which created 4,000 jobs. That would have been, not fair ball, but it would have been reasonable for the Premier to say that he was a part of that. How much a part of it was he? Do hon. gentlemen know?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Ninety per cent.

MR. LUSH:
No. Do you know what the contribution was from the Province? There was \$38.5 million allocated for that job. The Province's contribution was 10 per cent. What is 10 per cent of 4,000 jobs? Four hundred. That is the Province's contribution. Nothing wrong with that in that sense, but to spend all of those dollars to try and tell the people of this Province that this government was creating jobs! They spent 10 per cent. That was their contribution, 10 per cent. Four hundred part-time jobs and this Province with 80,000 people unemployed! I mean, the affrontery and the audacity of gentlemen who would do that kind of thing to try and insult the intelligence of the people of this Province!

If that were not bad enough then they went on to try and say they created jobs in the Fisheries Response Programme. I would like to know where the media in this Province are and what they are doing that they do not expose this kind of hypocrisy? Let us look at it. The big programme, the Federal Jobs Strategy Programme cost \$38.5 million for 4,000 jobs. Look at the Fisheries Response Programme, how many dollars were spent? \$9.5

million. How many jobs did they create? 4,000. I mean that would baffle the intelligence of anybody and yet nobody picked it up. How could it be that for \$9.5 million they could generate 4,000 jobs and for \$38.5 they could still only generate 4,000 jobs? Now how was that? How is it that for \$9.5 million they could generate just as many jobs as they did for \$38.5 million. How was it? Does anybody in the press know? Has anybody ever thought to figure that out? Has anybody ever try to figure out the hypocrisy, what a colossal hoax this was? Has nobody ever thought to figure it out?

MR. TOBIN:
What is your principal today?

MR. CALLAN:
Yours is down in the Bull and Bear on Duckworth Street.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):
Order, please!

MR. LUSH:
Now, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please! I have to tell the hon. member his time is up.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Chairman, I would hope in concluding that somebody would be able to figure out the mathematics of that, how for \$38.5 million, four times the money, you could create just as many jobs, 4,000, as they could for \$9.5 million. Some genius may be able to figure out the wonder of that great make work programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):
Order, please!

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I commend the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) on his excellent speech and his excellent points.

I was going over these figures here on this Interim Supply Bill, running down through I notice that Public Works and Services need \$40 million in the next three months to spend. I want to point out a few points to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). He had better go and sit down in his seat. If the hon. Minister of Public Works knew how to add up one and one, we probably would not have to have this high figure of \$40 million here in this expenditure for the next three months.

I am going to point out a few areas where he did not, probably not by his own judgement, but just by a little error that he did not spend money very wisely. One of the questions I asked him in the House of Assembly just last year was concerning the addition to the Confederation Building which cost \$40 million. He very wisely and very intelligently stood up in his seat and said, "Well, we are spending \$3 million in rental around this city and we need to bring them back in so we can save some of the taxpayers' money." The eyes of all the people opened up until I took a pen after he answered the question sat down in his seat, and realized in order to spend that \$40 million it had to be borrowed. Does anybody disagree with that? We have to

borrow \$40 million. We had that thrown around in a kitty that nobody knows anything about. And if you borrow -

MR. BARRY:

It might have been in his art fund.

MR. EFFORD:

Yes, it might have been in his art fund he had stashed away in that little corner. But if you spend \$40 million and you have to borrow \$40 million, we are told by the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that we have to pay interest on it. Using a figure of a mere 12 per cent interest on \$40 million, we are talking about \$4.8 million each year in interest we are paying out to save the taxpayers \$3 million rental.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We have a new Minister of Finance.

MR. EFFORD:

We have a new minister over there.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is a lot of sound bones.

MR. EFFORD:

That is a lot of sound bones, believe me.

MR. YOUNG:

Quite an amount of stoves too.

MR. EFFORD:

It sure would. It would keep a lot of people in this Province a lot warmer than they are today.

On top of that money that we are paying out in interest to save \$3 million, we have to look after the maintenance of that building at the government's expense. I find that the Minister of Public Works

(Mr. Young) neglected to give that in answer to the question.

MR. FLIGHT:

Twenty-eight dollars a foot is the approximate cost to rent that place.

MR. EFFORD:

I see I have made the Minister of Public Works run because he knows now that the error he has made is going to come back to haunt him.

MR. TULK:

He does not run, he slithers.

MR. EFFORD:

Slithers out from under the covers. It is unbelievable that this government could be so irresponsible and supposedly have so much intelligence on the other side that they could stand up in this House of Assembly, go on the news media, and tell the people of this Province that they are going to spend \$4.8 million in interest to save \$3 million in rental. That is before maintenance, before upkeep, before repairs, that is what is going to happen.

Make no wonder the Province is in the situation that it is in today!

MR. TULK:

I know what it was. He wanted to give some contracts to his buddies.

MR. EFFORD:

I have a little point to bring up about contracts to his buddies also. There is another little point that has got to be brought up with wasteful expenditures of money.

It has been brought to my attention just recently that through some error in the Department of Public Works, some error through the inspection, just

recently there was a major construction job going on in Carbonear. Listen to this for the public attention! It was a major construction job in Carbonear, an addition to the senior citizen's home down there. The inspector, who, by the way, is a personal friend of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) from his own district of Upper Island Cove, did not foresee what was happening and they built an addition on to the Harbour Lodge. When they built an addition on to the Harbour Lodge, they took down the partition so the two floors could be joined together and in the new addition the floor was nine inches higher than the original floor. It is going to cost the taxpayers of this Province perhaps around \$90,000 to \$100,000 to correct. This is type of expenditures that we have to stand up in this House and say, 'Okay, we are going to let go. We are going to pass.'

I was going to ask the Minister of Public Works, if he had stayed in his seat, if this was a new way that he had to increase his own personal ambulance business down where the senior citizens would trip over that when they were walking up there.

Certainly in the way in which they answered the question of spending \$4.8 million to save \$3 million, they are going to give us an answer that the ground sunk or we had a lift of attitudes in Carbonear that they did not mind the nine inches in the variation of the floor, so, no problem. We will just go ahead and build it. Who cares!

What it goes to show is it is not a mistake that could be made by an individual but it goes to show the callousness of this government.

It certainly goes to show that when you spend all this money and try to turn around and make excuses for it and try to turn around and tell the people of this Province, 'yes we are doing the right thing, we are cutting back, we are not allowing any extra hospital beds to be open because we have no money because the funds are going down but we can take \$15 million and spend it in this Confederation Building to satisfy somebody's ego to have an impressive place so that he can get a bit of attention from the general public and the news media with it.' At the same time that this \$15 million is being spent we have waste on top of that by the Department of Public Works. We have waste by the Premier who has spent \$1 million this past month in his office to boost his own ego. We will turn around then and tell the senior citizens or widows in this Province we can only afford to give you \$252 a month to survive on. We can tell a family of four in this Province that we can only allow you \$500 a month to buy groceries, to buy food, to put your kids in school, and to pay your heating bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

But at the same time we do that, you can take these numerous, exorbitant amounts of money to satisfy your ego. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the people of this Province are awakening to it. The people of this Province are now being made aware and they are starting to realize the grave error they made last year and whenever the next election comes,

whether it is today or whether it is tomorrow or next week, beware. The people of this Province know and the people will tell when they mark that X on the ballot sheet about the carelessness in which their tax dollars are being spent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

I have one more point before I conclude. I find there is going to be another hardship placed on the fishermen of this Province again this Summer. We have the brilliance of the Department of Finance or possibly the brilliant Department of Fisheries, after the devastating year that the fishermen of this Province had, and everybody is well aware of the little amounts of money that they made, that in order for them to fuel their boats this Spring they are going to have to pay cash up front. They are being told by the provincial government that they are not going to receive any more credits at the marine centres for fuel. In other words, if a fisherman needs \$500 worth of fuel in order for him to get his gear in the water to catch fish -

MR. DINN:

That is about as accurate now as your electricity dissertation.

MR. EFFORD:

My electricity dissertation was very accurate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

You ask the people of this Province who have to pay the bills how accurate my statements were.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

You ask the senior citizens of this Province -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

- how much their electricity bill was, how much his home heating bill was last month -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Let me tell you that this government is going to hear from the fishermen of this Province again this Spring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! The hon. the member for Port de Grave has the floor and there are five other people talking.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Chairman,-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please! I wish to advise the hon. member his time is up, if he would conclude his remarks.

MR. EFFORD:

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, what

I just spoke about, the fishermen of this Province having absolutely no credit at the Fishermen's Marine Centre this Summer, is a very serious thing. I would ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) or all of the government members who are responsible for this to take this under very serious consideration, and take into consideration the seriousness of the fisheries last year. These people do not have the money and will not have the money to fuel up their boats. They will have to change that new law that they are going to bring in, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few words on Interim Supply. The Department of Mines and Energy obviously will be needing money for expenditures for the next three months, and also the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

Before I get into that, I would like to comment upon what the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has said, a person who generally makes a very good speech in the House of Assembly. I want to also say a few words about what the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) had to say in his few words to the House of Assembly.

MR. TULK:

Go ahead and say it.

MR. DINN:

The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is interrupting again. He

will get a chance to say a few words. The gallery heard him this morning and were so impressed that they walked out.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to job creation, I am proud of the record of this government with respect to job creation last year. Now, Mr. Chairman, we went through very difficult times but the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) was insistent enough, he adjudicated very well the programme and, Mr. Chairman, according to the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) created something like 4,000 jobs in the Job Strategy Programme, 4,000 jobs in the Fisheries Response Programme. He made fun of it, by the way, Mr. Chairman, he said out of the \$38 million we only participated to the tune of 10 per cent. The hon. gentleman neglected to mention, Mr. Chairman, the \$27 million that was spent through my colleague here, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), with respect to the community development projects. So, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that what could be done was done within the means the government had available to it. Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Career Development, who is walking into the Chamber now, we should thank that hon. minister for going to Ottawa and sitting down with his federal counterpart and negotiating such a great deal for the people of this Province with respect to job creation and training in 1985. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. minister will do exactly the same this year and next year fighting on their behalf.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the Minister of Social Services for his eloquence when it

came to providing dollars for the people of this Province with respect to job creation under his community development project. Twenty-seven million dollars was allocated last year, and that is no small amount when we are talking about what this Province has available to it to create jobs here. Mr. Chairman, I always get a bit of a kick out of the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) when he talks about jobs. He says, 'Are these real jobs?' Well, Mr. Chairman, if there are jobs created in the hon. member's district where people are employed, where people get some work during the Summer through this job strategy, fisheries response and through the community development projects, if he thinks that these people do not want it, Mr. Chairman, he has got another thing coming. Mr. Chairman, these programmes are very valuable especially during times that we are going through right now.

MR. BAKER:

What about the Daniel's Harbour mine?

MR. DINN:

I am pleased to say I will get onto the Mines section fairly soon.

I am pleased to say we are coming out of this recession. It is gradual here in Newfoundland. We always seem to be a little bit behind but we are coming out of it. In the Department of Mines we will be requiring some funding in this Interim Supply in several areas. We will be requiring money, for example, Mr. Chairman, to prepare to continue with the regional mapping of minerals in the Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, what does this regional mapping do? What is the purpose of putting \$689,000 in Interim Supply

for regional mapping? Well, as a result of this sort of thing, this regional mapping, this geochemical, geophysical work, etc., what happens is that mining companies, around October and November, come into St. John's where the result of the previous Summer's programme is laid out for them and, as a result of that, it gives them an indication where they should go to look for minerals, whether those minerals are gold, which seems to be the thing that most mining companies at this point in time are doing their exploration work for, or claim staking for. Mr. Chairman, that is what this funding is there for. Mr. Chairman, as a result of that mapping we have, for example, the possibility of a gold mine down in Chetwynd. Selco right now is going through what we call a feasibility study for the purpose of determining whether that is going to be a commercial operation, a mine in Chetwynd. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) I know would not want to see a mine start in this Province; he is over there shaking his head, he does not want the mine to start in this Province but we do. I will tell the hon. member another thing, by the way, the company, BP-Selco, has purchased from Abitibi-Price and Asarco, their lands for something in the order of \$5 million so they can carry out an exploration programme in that area this year. Now I have not gotten the complete details of that but I do know, and I can tell the hon. member I do know, that up to this point in time, while we have not got the complete detail, they will be setting up a little office in Buchans this year, a field office in Buchans, which they will work out of this year to do their exploration in that part of the

Province. But it is not just BP-Selco, Mr. Speaker. As a result of the mapping, as a result of what I hope hon. members will approve in this Interim Supply, we will identify other areas of the Province where companies will go out and claims stake and do their exploration work.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, we had something like \$16 million spent in exploration. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a sizeable amount of dollars to be spent in the Province of Newfoundland, especially, Mr. Chairman, when we do not have all the advantages that other Provinces have. We do not have for example a piggy back on the federal tax incentives to get mining companies in here to do their exploration. And, Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things we should do as a Province is have a look seriously at that programme, the programme they have in Quebec and in Saskatchewan and in Ontario with respect to giving incentives to mining companies to get in here and do some exploration. But as a result of the mapping, etc., over the past few years, Mr. Speaker, we have -

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Since the minister has taken the opportunity to talk about BP-Selco (inaudible) I wonder would the minister undertake to tell us what the situation is with the barite, and that is a mineral by the way, in Buchans right now? Would he give us the details and update us on exactly what the status of barite production in Buchans is?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, obviously there is no point of order. What is going on with respect to barite in Buchans, the hon. member knows. I mean, he knows before he asked that question what the story is with respect to barite. If he does not know, Mr. Chairman, it is neglect on his part because he can get that information, Mr. Chairman, any day of the week. I can inform the hon. member that the Minister of Development is having a meeting with respect to the barite in Buchans on Monday, Mr. Chairman.

The hon. member knows why the development of barite in Buchans is not quite up to scratch. It is because the hon. member knows that to produce the barite in Buchans, to ship it to the markets, costs a lot more than the companies can get it for in other areas.

MR. FLIGHT:

Morocco and Algiers.

MR. DINN:

Exactly, in Morocco, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member knows that they cannot produce barite in Buchans and get it - the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is looking quizzically at that - but it is true that we cannot produce barite in Buchans and ship it to St. John's cheaper, we cannot do it cheaper than it can be done by mining it, putting it in ships -

MR. FLIGHT:

Could the minister tell us why? Why is that?

MR. DINN:

Mostly it is transportation. A lot of it is transportation.

The hon. member knows this. He does not have to have me explain it. He is from Buchans. Surely, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans knows this detail. If he does not know this detail then, Mr. Chairman, I would be willing - it would take a lot longer than ten minutes - to inform the hon. member, but I am sure that he is quite aware of what the problems are with respect to transporting the barite to St. John's and the reasons why it is not a bigger operation than it is right now.

Mr. Chairman, just to give the hon. member an indication of the outcome of this mineral mapping, etc., in the Province, we have a pretty exciting gold find at Tomiadluk Point down in Labrador. The occurrence runs for about seven kilometres, it is about fifty yards or thereabouts wide, it is a very exciting area of the Province, and we hope that this year mining companies will indeed go in there and do some exploration. It is not only Tomiadluk Point in Labrador because Strange Lake or Julian Lake iron deposits are pretty well defined, Mr. Chairman. I understand the hon. Chairman is indicating to me that my time is getting close, so I will not be able to get into all the areas of the Province. I think it is interesting for people, especially members of the House, to understand the reasons why we are asking for monies in the Budget and what happens when you do some mapping, when you do some geoscientific work, when you do some geochemistry on this stuff. Our geologists go out every year,

they bring back the information, they do their work on it and then in October or November of every year they present that information to mining companies and last year at the end of 1985, we had record claim staking activity in this Province. In other words, claims in good standing in this Province amounted to, I think, over - I will get the accurate figures because I do not like to put before the House inaccuracies, so when I get those accurate figures and when I get another opportunity, my next ten minutes, I will inform hon. members exactly what has happened with respect to claim staking, claims in good standing, amounts of money that being spent on exploration, what is going to happen with respect to Chetwynd, a prognostication on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Energy with respect to Chetwynd, and what will be required to make a commercial activity happen down at Chetwynd, down on the South West corner of the Province, about four kilometres in from the coast, about seventy kilometres, I guess, due east of Port aux Basques. The hon. member for the Port aux Basques area is sitting with bated breath, he is waiting for me to tell him that the plan of the company right now is basically to ship in and ship out so that during construction, if the announcement comes between now and the first of July, we should have some 400 people operating at the Chetwynd operation if indeed it proves to be a commercial operation, and 275 people, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) will be interested to know, should work in the mines for ten, eleven or twelve years during the operation of that mine.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how

close my time is.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

I wish to remind the hon. member that his time is up.

MR. DINN:

If hon. members want to give me leave, I will be only too happy to go on about what would be required to develop the gold operation in Chetwynd.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wish to remind the hon. member that his time is up.

MR. DINN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, I would give the minister leave if it were another situation, but we are into those ten minutes sessions so he can get back again.

I just want to carry on with the equation, Mr. Chairman, that I was trying to develop. The Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) mentioned that I did not refer to the jobs in Social Services. I did not, of course, because I was referring to this false advertising that the government placed in all the papers some time ago. What I want to say is anybody looking at that who were not in the know of what this was all about, the first question that should have occurred - and I am going to put the question to hon. members and let us see who can answer it - looking at that, where we said for \$38.5 million, we created 4,000 jobs and then for \$9.5 million we created 4,000, the first question that would have occurred to me as well,

if they can create 4,000 jobs for \$9 million, how come they only created 4,000 for \$38.5 million?

The question is, if for \$9.5 million - listen to the question - you can create 4,000 jobs, how many jobs can you create for \$38.5 million?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sixteen thousand.

MR. LUSH:

Sixteen thousand, exactly. Now, has no one thought to ask why it is so that we could not create the 16,000 for the \$38.5 million? No one ever thought that, how for \$9.5 million you can create 4,000 and for \$38.5 million you can still only create 4,000 when to follow the equation on to its logical conclusion, for \$38.5 million, we should have been able to create 16,000. No one thought to work out that equation. No one thought to look at how ridiculous this figure looks.

The answer is quite obvious. The Fisheries Response Programme was not a job creating programme. They are not jobs. The programme was given because the fisheries was an abysmal failure and fishermen did not work long enough, did not get enough weeks, did get a sufficient amount of work, to get their U.I. So some of them only got six weeks. Some of them got seven weeks and they needed ten weeks to qualify for their U.I. So there were people who got jobs out of this programme who needed only one week's work, people with nine weeks. So in order to make sure they could qualify for U.I. they gave them one week's work. Then they went on and gave another person in the community another week's work or another two week's

work. Then the government had the audacity to call this a job creation programme, that they created 4,000 jobs. That is how come they created the 4,000 jobs. That is how come when anybody looks at that they have got to say how ridiculous is it that for \$38.5 million the government created 4,000 jobs and for \$9.5 million, just for that little bit of money, they were able to create the same number of jobs. The reason why is simply that there were not jobs in the \$9.5 million, the Fisheries Response Programme. That was just a fisherman or a plant worker being given one week's work, two week's work, whatever the case might be, to help them qualify for U.I.C.

The Province's contribution to that programme was 20 per cent and 20 per cent of 4,000 is 800 jobs. So put the two together. In the first programme they contributed 10 per cent, 400 jobs. In the second one they contributed 20 per cent, 800 jobs for a combined total of 1200. That was the Province's contribution.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the major point. The major point is that the government would see fit to squander away so much money to falsely advertise the creation of jobs. That is what is the important point, 8,000 jobs, fine. But why squander this money to advertise it. So there are two things wrong with it. One, that it is false advertising. The government disproportionately tries to claim rights to this programme. So, Mr. Chairman, there are two things wrong with it. To squander the money, that is the important thing.

How much did they squander? Nobody seems interested in it.

How much did they squander? In any other Province in Canada I do not know but the government would have had to resign for this false advertising. Any other Province in Canada, this would have been taken as a very serious matter to squander this money in advertising. Now, is anyone on the other side going to tell us how much it costs to falsely advertise these 8,000 jobs? Can anyone tell us? When I talked about it I knew that it was going to all the papers and I figured from all the papers and the figures I could get that it would cost \$10,000. Now on the basis of the Fisheries Response Programme that would have been enough to get 100 jobs for sure, would it not? Ten thousand dollars that is what it cost in the newspapers in the Province.

I did not know whether they were going to do it with the electronic media, with radio, but I found that after they did that because as I was driving on the Trans Canada I would turn it on and I hear this 8,056 jobs created. So certainly with the media that must have tripled the figure. So I would not be surprised but this advertising that we saw throughout the Province, this false advertising, cost about \$50,000. Will somebody prove me wrong? Will somebody give me the exact figures? I would say that it cost about \$50,000 of this Interim Supply money that we are approving today.

Do hon. members agree with that? Approving \$50,000 for this kind of false advertising. It would have been much better if they had put that \$50,000 into job creation and maybe given another six or seven or eight or ten or a dozen jobs in Newfoundland rather than trying to

give people the false impression that they had of their own money created 8,056 jobs. The fact that they were cost shared, the fact that they were joint programmes, am I to understand that the federal government shared the cost of the advertising? Did the federal government foot any of this bill? Did the federal government share any of this bill? I doubt it very much because the Premier is trying to give the impression that he, himself, that his government alone was responsible for these 8,056 jobs but the ending got to be the biggest hoax of all. The ending which says 8,056 created. 'People working and a government that works.' What hon. members would have the decency to be a part of that? 'People working and a government that works.'

What is the truth of the matter, Mr. Chairman, with respect to employment in this Province? What is the truth of the matter to be able to say that? Why would a government have the nerve to say, 'people working and a government that works' and that is not false advertising? Let some hon. member get up and defend this and say that this is not false advertising, people working. We have never had so many people unemployed in our history. As a matter of fact, there are so many that we cannot put a figure on it in terms of being able to really find out according to the statistics. Most people are saying right now that the figure is close to 80,000. Am I right?

AN HON. MEMBER:

One hundred thousand.

MR. LUSH:

No, one hundred thousand.

MR. DECKER:

The figure is something over 100,000.

MR. LUSH:

There you are, it keeps on going. This will give us an idea of the monstrosity that we are talking about. One hundred thousand people, that has got to be over half our work force. Our work force is only around 200,000, 207,000, or 210,000. So that means half our work force are out of work and a government having the nerve to say, 'People working and a government that works,' and then to do that on the backs of taxpayers of this Province. So, Mr. Chairman, that is what I am talking about here, false advertising, spending the people's money in this nonsense to try to create the impression that this government is creating jobs. Here we are with 100,000 people unemployed.

The statistics in the way that we measure, Mr. Chairman, gives some truth, and we know that the statistics have a certain formula. We could condemn them, as I have heard the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) do from time to time, condemn the statistics, but we have to have some measure. They are accurate insofar as the measurement they have. We have to accept it, but the thing is that the way they do it is that, as a matter of fact, it does not give the full truth of the story. It does not give the full impact. But in so much as we have them, this is what they say.

In 1981, for example, the average number of people employed in this Province was 179,000, that is the average taken for the year. The average of our work force was 179,000, the year 1981. In 1985

what was it? It is at the end of the year, that is all we have, in 1981 the average number of the work force was 179,000, in 1985, it was 176,000. We have lost 3,000 people from the work force. We have lost 3,000 jobs from 1981 to 1986, the time when this government, when this particular administration came to power. Just about all the members opposite were a part of the government. That is what they have done. In 1981 to 1985 they saw our work force drop from 179,000 to 176,000.

What happened to these 3,000? They became discouraged workers. They are not a part of the work force any more, they are out there, but they are not a part of the work force, but they have given up looking. So in that period of time we lost 3,000. In that period from 1981 to 1985, we had a job loss of 1 per cent in Newfoundland. In that four year period, and the hon. gentlemen talking about the jobs they have created, 1981 to 1985, we had a job loss of 1 per cent.

What happened in the rest of Canada? In the rest of Canada, nationally, there was a 6 per cent job gain. Now, Mr. Chairman, these are the facts. You cannot deny that. We cannot reject that. This Province we had a job loss of 1 per cent in the four year period from 1981 to 1985, whereas the rest of Canada had a 6 per cent job gain. We also lost 3,000 from the work force who became a part now of that monstrosity that is growing out of control, that monstrosity of the discouraged workers that we are almost unable to put a number on. This was coming during the time of the infliction of prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, these are the facts as we can tell them. Here is a government blatantly saying 8,056 jobs created, 'people working and a government that works.' I mean there was never a government in a our history that would be so blatant as to do this, and then do it on the backs of the taxpayers.

MR. TULK:

They work part-time as well.

MR. LUSH:

They work part-time as well. That is for sure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to do it is one thing. The other thing is to charge it to the people of this Province. What is the figure? I would like the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to tell us. What did this false advertising cost the people of Newfoundland? If it were done in a private enterprise, the person responsible would be prosecuted. They would be put in jail possibly. If this were done by Sears, if this were done by Woolco, Woolworths, any business, they would have been prosecuted and possibly end up in jail for this false advertising.

I know the Minister of Finance is not listening. Mr. Chairman, I know we cannot legislate him to listen. We certainly cannot legislate that he understand. I cannot legislate that he answer any of these things. Although the Minister of Finance is not listening, I hope that he will respond and tell us, right from the horse's mouth as opposed to the other end, how much of this false advertising is coming out of this Interim Supply. Let us hear it. I would put a figure on it and say it is costing \$50,000. That is a conservative figure, that this false advertising cost

the people of this Province \$50,000. On the basis of the \$9.5 million, that \$50,000 could have possibly created a couple of hundred jobs, the numbers of jobs they created there.

DR. COLLINS:

When was that done?

MR. LUSH:

This was done two or three weeks ago.

DR. COLLINS:

That was done for the next fiscal year.

MR. LUSH:

Well the people of Newfoundland have got to wait until next year to find out how much this cost? He should have told us last year.

DR. COLLINS:

I did.

MR. LUSH:

Well maybe. The Minister of Finance no doubt knows.

MR. TULK:

He has got the face of a robber's horse.

MR. LUSH:

That is right, but he can get up and tell us now. Being the Minister of Finance, he should still be able to do this, to tell us what this false advertising cost the people of Newfoundland. Let us see what it cost us because it was done in all the newspapers.

They started out with a quarter page. Then they said, 'Golly, nobody will see that quarter page.' Then they called around and said, 'Change it to a full page.' Some of the contracts had been done by the time they asked

to change it to a full page, so some of them never got the full page. But my reckoning was in the newspapers alone it cost about \$10,000. Then it went on the electronic media and they are much more expensive than the newspapers. So I have no idea of what is costs with the radio, no idea but I would put a figure on it somewhere around \$50,000. I would say it cost around \$50,000 to carry out this false advertising. So I hope that the minister will address this in replying.

Mr. Chairman, that is as much as I want to say on that point. I do not know whether my time is up but in fairness to the Minister of Mines (Mr.Dinn), he said he wanted to speak but he is now gone. I will see if somebody else wants to speak. If not, I will carry on.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:
The former Opposition critic for labour cannot forget his past, I suppose, and the new one is not allowed to speak or ask questions because I guess he is not familiar with the real situation in the Province. I guess it is the responsibility of ministers to correct Opposition members when they falsify things mainly through a lack of understanding and a lack of knowledge and a lack of appreciation for what has happened. I guess I will just take a few moments to correct some of the false impressions left by

the member for Bonavista North because obviously they could, in some people's minds, interpret that nothing has happened in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, obviously in this Province we have had a very difficult time in job creation since 1979. Nobody denies that. Not a soul in the world, not a soul in Canada, except the most backward person, does not know about the recession that took place in 1981 and 1982, and that we, in Newfoundland, were severely hard hit by it because of the nature of our economy, because of the fact that we have an export economy, because we have had a fishing industry that has been in trouble since, I guess, back in 1978 and 1979, that has had very few good years. We have had a very, very difficult time creating jobs as we had all hoped we would be able to do in 1979 giving a reasonable decent growth in the economy. But what we have done, Mr. Chairman, is to make sure that if there are 3,000 less people working today in Newfoundland than there was in 1979, which is quite provable, it is there as a statistic, and you can prove it and we do not deny it; but, Mr. Chairman, without the efforts of this government that that could have been easily 30,000 or 40,000 or 50,000 less people employed today than there are in this Province, because we took action, as a government, to make sure that we had our fishing industry. If you want to take out the \$30 million that we have in government guarantees to small fish plants - some in your riding, I believe; three or four in my riding - if you want to add another 4,000 or 5,000 people to that list just take out your government guarantees to small fish plants.

If you want to take out the \$30 million or \$40 million that we guaranteed to the Kruger Corporation to take over Corner Brook, you want to have another 4,000 people unemployed, as the Chairman very well knows. We as a government took taxpayers' dollars and guaranteed a corporation to come in here and take over the largest industry in the second largest city in this Province. And we did it because as government we are concerned about jobs, we did it as government because we simply know that people have to be able to work. And if we had allowed the recession to work exactly as the member for Bonavista North might have liked, then we would have had 30,000 or 40,000 jobs less. Mr. Chairman, I know that we are not suppose to impugn motives, but sometimes you honestly suspect that the members opposite like to see the unemployment rates going up. They like to see chaos, they like to see confusion. And obviously, Mr. Chairman, it is government's intention to give order, to give direction and to put into place programmes which are of a long term nature.

I know that there is one member opposite, sitting in the Leader of the Opposition's seat, and I believe he did run for the NDP one time. I suspect that there is an NDP socialist attitude there about the economy, that the government can step in and do everything. Last year when we put in \$7.5 million in job creation for youth, for workers in the Fall, and money in the Fisheries Response programme, it was great to do, but it was not enough. The member for Bonavista North, in particular, believes that how you solve the unemployment problems in Newfoundland or anywhere else is

for direct government programmes, direct government interference. And it has been proved in almost every part of the Western World, in Manitoba, a good NDP province as well, that you cannot stimulate the economy by direct government intervention. The Canada Works kind of approach is not the way to solve problems in the economy.

I have to admit, Mr. Chairman, sometimes, especially when I took over this department first, I thought the way to get the Newfoundland unemployment rate down might be to have a massive, massive job creation programme for this Province, a massive programme where you would employ large numbers of people, but it does not work when you look at the figures, when you look at the long term benefits. We could borrow, I suppose. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could borrow several hundreds more millions of dollars every year, and we could borrow \$300 million or \$400 million more, and we could put everybody to work for a very short period of time, like the money that we spent this year, but that is not the solution for unemployment for youth or for anyone else in this Province. The solution has got to be in sound, economic policies built on your resource industry, your resource sector -

MR. TULK:

Well, what are you bragging about?

MR. POWER:

We are bragging about the fact that as a government we have compassion, we have sympathy, we have understanding, but we know that to solve long-term problems it is going to take a period of time. We cannot do it all in one month or one year or one term of office. And you have to spend a

fair amount of time to solve the long-term problem. But at the same time that we solve the long-term problems by putting into place resource management programmes that work, that can stand the light of day, that could stand on their own economic merits, even with that those kinds of programmes you still have to be understanding that today there is a very serious problem in Newfoundland, a crisis in many peoples lives relating to unemployment, what it is doing to our society in alcoholism problems, and other social problems that ensue with unemployment. And I remember the Royal Commission on Forest Protection and Management back in 1981 said that you should spray the forest, which members opposite, in particular my nemesis who was in Gander at the time, said you should not spray the forest because it had health hazards, and the Newfoundland Medical Association said, yes, spray the forest because the known hazards of unemployment, which range anywhere from wife battering and child abuse, to alcoholism, to suicides, all those range as social problems related to unemployment, all those known factors are much greater than the unknown factors of spraying. The Newfoundland Medical Association recommended it to us.

It would not surprise me some day to see the member who is now temporarily occupying the Leader of the Opposition's chair - maybe after the next election when some of that same group are over there, there will be a new face in that chair - so I would not be at all surprised if the member for Gander (Mr. Bakaer) is one of the persons who might very well occupy that chair permanently for a period of

four or five years.

MR. TULK:

You got that right, 'Charlie'. There will be a new face in that chair because you will be over there.

MR. POWER:

No, I did not say that. I had the first part right, that you will still be over there looking for a face to fill that chair, and it would not at all surprise me, Mr. Chairman - you can mark down my prediction - of the group that is there, and of the small portion of that who might survive the next election, that that member might survive and might fill that chair on a more permanent basis than he now does.

Again, Mr. Chairman, in job creation, members opposite tend to believe that the NDP social attitude of direct government interference is the way to create jobs long term. I say that we have long term programmes but we also have short term programmes. That is where those 8,000 jobs came from. It is not easy.

MR. TULK:

What about the leadership problem over there?

MR. POWER:

I am not the least bit worried about the leadership. They have problems over there. We do not have problems.

All I am trying to do is correct some of the misconceptions outlined by the member for Bonavista North because he does not understand how economic principles work. All he sees is a little small ad in a paper that says there are 8,000 temporary

jobs and he assumes that, therefore, the Newfoundland Government has done nothing else to safeguard the jobs that are in this Province.

I say that our long term programmes they object to. Spraying the forest, for instance. Should we not spray the forests this year for the hemlock looper? Should we allow another 4,000 or 5,000 Newfoundland workers to become unemployed because of a forest management plan which members opposite support, which we do not support and will not condone? We are going to spray the forests. We are going to protect the forests. We are going to put money into aquaculture to put jobs in the fishery. We are going to protect our small fish plants. We are going to give them government guarantees when they are in trouble. We are going to make sure that FPI is a sound, economic, viable company on its own merits, without government guarantees or government support. We are going to do things in mining, like our mining exploration laws, which encourage people to come in, which is why we do have two possible mining sites in this Province which might be developed. The fact that we have a company in St. Lawrence today when another company left is because of this government's action. Those are the kinds of things that this government is going to do in the long term.

Our offshore, which has not been developed just yet but is the highest potential that we have in the creation of new jobs and new wealth for this Province, is going to be developed because we have a certain system in place for it. It is not the system that was favoured by the members opposite.

The members opposite wanted a Nova Scotia system, which was a big boom Nova Scotia had for three or four or five years, and now Nova Scotia has a much bigger bust because they simply have not been able to put in place a sound management regime for what they want to do.

When the Leader of the Opposition on the other side was saying, 'Accept the Nova Scotia agreement. Sign the Nova Scotia deal because it is the best in the world,' is it not awful funny now that our resource management plan for the offshore then was so soundly criticized opposite and now Nova Scotia comes meekly through the backdoor and says, 'Can we, Mr. Prime Minister of Canada, have the same deal that Newfoundland got?' Says it very quietly, very meekly, but they asked for it because our management system is better, our resource planning is better. It is long term. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I do not for one minute deny that we have a very serious unemployment crisis in this Province. The short term make work projects will be in place again this year by both the Canadian government and the Newfoundland Government.

MR. TULK:

When?

MR. POWER:

When? I have got a few figures. Think of this now. The Fisheries Response Programme, do you know how much money was spent in Bonavista North for fishermen in your district who could not catch fish through no fault of their own? In Bonavista North, Fisheries Response, \$192,317. In the district of Fogo, \$354,667. Port de Grave, \$312,000. St.

Barbe -

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We accept the congratulations of the minister, the congratulations that that is a good member. The Liberal caucus did the job last year it had to do for fishermen. We accept that because if we had not the Minister of Manpower certainly would not have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies has about thirty seconds left.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman, I was not trying to make a point by quoting figures of how much money Their district got that members opposite were either good or bad or better or worse than somebody else.

I do say, Mr. Chairman, that, as soon as I start reading the figures, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), the member who is soundly criticizing the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) from borrowing money for these 8,000 jobs, gets up and says, "I wish I had to get a little more. I got less than everybody else." That is what he says across the House. So on one hand the programmes are soundly criticized and complained about and should not have been done and they are a

waste of money and the people are not really working, and on the other hand he says "I wish I had to get a little bit more." Now either you can have it one way or the other. Really the problem was is that the member opposite, who was the Labour critic said, should have given me some ammunition and the Newfoundland government some ammunition to get more money for you, should be in here saying to the Minister of Finance, "go out and borrow some more money for these very meaningful projects in all the districts of this Province."

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, we gave him the bit of information that he had to get some money for some fishermen last Fall. Surely he could have found some himself to get some more money for him. We gave him all the information that he had. He did not have any until we got in this House and gave him some.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I would ask the hon. member if he would clue up his remarks.

MR. POWER:

To that point of order, and I am not even talking about the point of order, but just for an information point of view, Mr. Chairman, these dollar values that we have, that the Opposition soundly criticized us for doing last Fall, now soundly criticizes us for putting an ad in the paper saying what we as a government had

done with taxpayers' money and Canadian taxpayers' money. We told the people what we did with their money, their \$9.5 million. We try to tell the people of Newfoundland that with their \$9.5 million we created temporary, short term, in emergency response, 8,000 jobs. Now is that somehow or other dishonest?

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TOBIN:

He is still speaking to the point of order.

MR. POWER:

I am not speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK:

The minister cannot have it both ways. He has already admitted in this House that it was this side of the House that got the money for those people and created the jobs, so how can he now stand up and say that the government had a right to claim that 8,000 jobs that were created?

MR. POWER:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman, I was not planning on getting involved in this debate this morning, I have some other matters I wanted to deal with, but the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) gave out some very inaccurate information. I gather

from that point of order just raised by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who also brings out very inaccurate information, says that the Liberal Opposition is somehow or other responsible for these programmes so I will have to rise again here to correct the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

You said it.

MR. POWER:

I am speaking to a point of order.

MR. TULK:

You ruled on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

We are attempting to get all the information.

MR. POWER:

Certain things happened in this Province last year in a job creation sense, the members opposite on one hand are embarrassed that the government did something well and on the other hand they tried to come back through the back door and say, 'do more of it next year.'

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I declare there is no point of order. There is the unusual situation of a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tell us about real estate in Florida.

MR. GILBERT:

That is all right. There is nothing wrong with real estate in Florida. I am not at all ashamed of the fact that I own some there. I done it by the sweat of my brow without any government help, thank you. You can find that any time at all.

MR. TULK:

You did not get any \$5,000 car allowance did you?

MR. GILBERT:

That is right, I did not get any \$5,000 car allowances. Not at all. As a matter of fact, I am not at all ashamed of anything I done outside the House or anything that I have done inside and that is more than a lot of those members over there can say. You talk about small business and private enterprise and yet when I stand up to make a speech in this House, the members that are the ones that espouse private enterprise are certainly casting aspersions on it maybe because I was and am a successful business man. That seems to me to be -

MR. TOBIN:

Are you a conservative?

MR. GILBERT:

I would not be under any circumstances.

To get back to this debate, we have just heard the hon. the minister of jobs strategy get up and try to defend this ad about 8,056 jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

May the hon. member continue with

his speech?

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman, how can I?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I ask hon. members to maintain their silence please. The hon. member is having difficulty making his remarks.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, throw him out.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I cannot throw anybody out unless somebody moves a motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman, I am asking for the protection of the House to make my statement on this Interim Supply Bill.

We just heard the minister of jobs strategy get up and try to put in a defence for the 8,056 jobs that supposedly were created by his government and yet it seems a little strange that at the same time their statistics came out, the same month, and said that Newfoundland had just made another record. We have just gone over the 100,000 people drawing unemployment. This seems to me to be sort of a strange statement. We get an ad in the paper saying they created 8,050 jobs and then

the same month we are getting statistics coming out saying there are over there are 110,000 Newfoundlanders drawing unemployment for the first time.

If these 8,056 jobs that we hear about have been created -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

There is debate going on from both sides of the House. There is no one side any more guilty than the other. The hon. member is attempting to make his remarks and he is being interrupted constantly. Let us have order.

MR. GILBERT:

If those jobs were created, first of all, I would like to know where. In the area that I represent in Bay d'Espoir, 95 per cent of the people are unemployed, Mr. Chairman. I have talked and asked questions to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) and the Premier about 120 jobs that were just done away with down there. I have been told that those forestry jobs were to be replaced by Jobs Strategy jobs. Right now there has ten jobs in place under Jobs Strategy. None of the 120 people who were involved in the forestry programme in Bay d'Espoir have been told they are going to be rehired or told they have any hope of a job when the time comes to hire them back again this May or June.

We have heard the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) stand up in the House and say that he has now concluded a forestry agreement. I hope that it will be some comfort to the

people of Bay d'Espoir to know that their jobs are going to be protected. Maybe the minister would like to get up and comment on that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. GILBERT:

When I am finished. You know the thing about Interim Supply with this government is that they wait until the crunch is on and then, all of a sudden, we must rush through Interim Supply and it must be done now otherwise we are not going to be able to pay people and we are not going to be able to provide the care to the sick of this Province. This year they certainly cannot use that as an excuse for Interim Supply.

They have put themselves into a situation by forcing the public service into a strike, forcing them by intimidation to walk out. So right now the Interim Supply Bill is here and they are saying that they must do it otherwise there is going to be a cut in service. Well, this year they cannot say that if we do not pass it the service will suffer. They have already put the people of Newfoundland in jeopardy by their attitude. They say that health care people are not going to get paid, but they have done it now. They have forced the public service into a strike.

You can find editorials in all the papers now talking about bad timing and they talk about the grants that this government have just given to the Deputy Ministers and the Assistant Deputy Ministers, which were really not palatable as far as the public service was concerned. All of a

sudden, as the straw that broke the camel's back, last week they gave a 6 per cent raise to their management people and we find that was just before the General Service withdrew their services. It was done primarily because of the attitude of this government. The day before they went out they announced that they were going to pay car allowances to political hacks. We even heard the Premier stand up and say if they did not have a car, they would rent one. I wonder if they rented it would they foot the bill or would they take it out of their car allowance. I would like to have an answer to that question.

Then you talk about when we vote for Interim Supply. We are supposed to have the time to do it. All of a sudden it is rushed through. When we talk about Interim Supply or the government spending of money we sometimes think about the waste factor and we wonder. We always hear that there is such a thing as the waste factor in government spending. Sometimes it is even pointed out to us and I asked the question in this hon. House this morning. I asked the Premier if he would table the minute of Treasury Board 616, \$785,000 for repairs to the eight floor. I asked him was the \$150,000 to decorate his inner throne room included or whatever you are going to call the place there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A place your leader will never see.

MR. GILBERT:

My leader will be there.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

I wonder if that was included and would the Premier table it? We are talking about a bunch of people who are out there now because they cannot find anybody to sit down and negotiate with them. They have been sitting there for years waiting for them. They have been in a freeze situation and now they are out on the street. Nobody wants to negotiate. Believe me, I know how unions work and I know how management works. I have been a member of it and I have negotiated successful contracts with my employees. I have no problems with it at all. I have a contract in force right now. The council that I negotiated a contract for says it is the best one they ever got. I have no problems with unions, I know the union's place and I know management's place and this is something that members opposite do not know. This is why they are in the situation they are in now because they do not know.

They have let the situation get out of hand. They have let men walk out and they did not sit down and negotiate. Those fellows want to get back and negotiate, yesterday they were here sitting down, they are here again today, and where is the government? They are not sitting down negotiating. The union wants to negotiate but unfortunately government does not. I am aware of how this thing works, it is a combination.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I would like to ask the Chairman if it is proper for the Minister

of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) and the gentleman from the opposite side to be snickering over some piece of paper they have there? Is it proper for them to do that? Should they not tell us what that piece of paper is?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order.

MR. TULK:
There is no point of order, that is just the ignorance of the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), ignorance in the sense of not knowing any better.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
There is no point of order. The hour is growing late and I take it that is the problem.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:
I want to speak in the debate.

MR. TULK:
He is not finished yet.

MR. MARSHALL:
Is he going to say something?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

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

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We just heard the Minister of Career Development, or Job Strategy or whatever it is, talk about the Nova Scotia agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

I have to inform the hon. member his time is up. Would he conclude his remarks.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Chairman, I will be back to finish off my remarks.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman, we will wait with bated breath to hear the hon. gentleman when he gets on his feet again. Hopefully he can spend his ten minutes in saying something relevant. This, Mr. Chairman, is an indication that the official Opposition is going to continue on in the same manner that the official Opposition has continued in every debate of this nature. What we have before Your Honour's Committee is the expenditure of some \$715 million, which is three months of supply. The hon. gentlemen there opposite have not made one single comment with respect to the bill. The hon. gentleman for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, I think, made the most outstanding speech.

MR. BAKER:
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
The hon. member has made a statement that is obviously not correct. There have been many references by gentlemen on this side of the House in their speeches so far to that particular bill. I would ask the Government

House Leader to be a little more accurate in the comments he makes with regard to what has been said.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I declare there is no point of order but obviously a difference of opinion.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, talk about relevancy! Here is a fellow who was hee-hawing about the flights of Air Canada to St. John's and trying to incite the people from Gander against the rest of the Province, and he gets up to give his Private Member's resolution and does not even breath a breath about it, has not even opened his mouth about it in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

That is how relevant the member for Gander is. The reason is he is hurting on it and he is going to hurt more by the time it is over.

Mr. Chairman, as to the relevancy, I want to point out something and point it out very, very clearly for the House and, hopefully, for the press, what the timetable of this House is. I hope that we will be able to conduct our business in an efficient and an effective manner. We have before this House now Interim Supply and Interim Supply is going to be necessary to pass before the end of this month. If we do not pass it before the end of this month the consequence is going to be that we are in jeopardy of not being able to pay for essential

services, to pay hospital workers, to be able to pay government workers their salary after April 1, because constitutionally we run out of the power to spend money on March 31 as a result of a legislative vote.

Now that is the situation. On March 10, Mr. Chairman, I want to make this abundantly clear, I wrote to the Opposition House Leader and I indicated to the Opposition House Leader as follows: I told him that the House would reconvene on Tuesday, March 18, which it has. I told him the Minister of Finance intends to bring down the Province's budget next Tuesday, on March 25, that the Interim Supply Bill permitting continued government expenditures between April 1 and the passage of the budget would be introduced as soon as the House convenes, which it was and will be brought immediately before the House for consideration on Thursday, March 20, which it was. I pointed out to him, as you are aware, March 25 falls on Tuesday before Easter. Because of Easter week the House will thus have no opportunity to sit between the delivery of the budget and March 31. There is no opportunity.

Additionally, it is intended, as it customary, to adjourn the House after the budget speech until April 7 for the usual Easter break. It was therefore hoped, I said, that Interim Supply can be passed by March 24 to enable the government to have authority to meet salary and other expenses payable after March 31.

I want to reiterate that, Mr. Chairman, before this Committee. Because if Interim Supply does not pass by Monday next we are going

to bring in the budget speech and, Mr. Chairman, what will happen is we will not have the money to pay the bills that come up April 1. There is no excuse in Heaven for doing it because the Minister of Finance will be bringing in his budget speech on Tuesday. So the full details of expenditures and revenues and other measures, any fiscal measures for the ensuing year, will be known. So there is absolutely no excuse for not dealing with Interim Supply in that period of time. And you can also consider it as well that under the rules all the hours used on Interim Supply are deducted from the time spent in the main estimates.

I would also point out that the House of Commons can seemingly deal with matters in a much more efficient and effective manner, some \$130 billions last year goes through in six days. And the hon. gentlemen have the habit of spending, you know, hour after hour. Did we not have recently the experience of some three to four weeks that they spent debating a Supply Bill whereas other jurisdictions can operate in a more effective manner?

Now what we are told by the Opposition is this, and this goes once again to show their lack of perspective; they say, 'Oh, no. We are not going to consent to the adjournment of the House until the labour issue is settled.' Now they are two and separate, distinct issues. What the hon. gentlemen there opposite are doing when they are saying that is they are trying to knit them in together and they are really just trying to inflame the issue itself, it does not serve any purpose.

But I want to make it abundantly clear, on the part of government, so that there will be no misunderstanding by the hon. gentlemen there opposite, that we have asked for the Interim Supply by Monday of this week. And if that is not passed it is highly probable, and it is possible, that unless we can find mechanisms to the contrary, but we would like to do it under this mechanism to show our respect for the House, that hospital workers may not be able to be paid, essential services may not be able to be paid, and we just will not have the monies. So if the hon. gentlemen there opposite want to take that responsibility upon them, Mr. Chairman, they can do it. They can take that responsibility upon them and see that the government does not have the money. They cannot say that they were not given sufficient warning with respect to it 'warning' is not the word, sufficient notice, I would say, and warning in the sense of sufficient notice. There is a letter that went to them on March 10.

What they are doing is they are saying that they are not only going to play games with the lives of people who are on strike, but they are going to play also games with the people who are not on strike, who are working, by precluding them from receiving their salary payments, by precluding the purchase of essential supplies to the hospitals.

MR. TULK:

You are not going anywhere, are you?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

So what I would suggest to the hon. gentlemen there opposite that what they do is get a little bit serious about what they were elected for in this Province. Come in and deal with the business that is brought before the House in a reasonable basis. Let us not hear such erudite speeches as we heard from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir a moment ago, I mean, talking about non-entities and things that he has brought up in question period and what have you. Why does he not just come up and ask us a few questions if he wants to? The \$2 million for the Legislature; what is that voted for? There are other things as well. There are other expenditures. But I can tell the hon. gentlemen there opposite that you are on a very dangerous wicket, you are showing your incompetence, you are showing your inanity, and you are showing your stupidity and your puerility by the way the hon. gentlemen are getting on in the House with respect to this measure, as they have done in the past. And, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Is there a point of order? I thought somebody got up on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

So did I.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I hope I have made the point. I am just going to urge the hon. gentlemen to pass the Interim Supply that has been brought before this House in an orderly manner, to remember the letter of March 10 where the programme was put before the hon. gentlemen, and to co-operate with the business of this Province so that people who are employed by this Province can be paid after April 1, and so that we can get supply to pay for essential services needed in hospitals and other areas of the Province.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Chairman, that bit of sanctimony is going nowhere at all. The submission by the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) that this bill and the labour dispute are unrelated is an interesting comment, it is also a lot of nonsense, but let us look at it first as an interesting comment. We are told by government that they are head over heels in love with the union in terms of the issue of parity, it is just that they do not have the money. Well, surely if that is the kind of reason they are giving, if it is the basic reason of dollars and cents, then this bill is all about dollars and cents and the kinds of questions I would like to have answered is whether in those subheads there is any provision to get that union a step closer to parity? Now, how the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) can submit that the two are unrelated boggles the

mind. They are very, very related, Mr. Chairman. He lectures us, as he is good at doing, but it goes nowhere with us. He lectures us, Mr. Chairman, on the subject of asking questions. Well, I am still waiting for the answer to some questions I asked yesterday, questions like why almost the entire vote for Transportation is asked for under Interim Supply, what appears to be more than the vote in terms of last year's allocation is being asked for for Public Works under Interim Supply, when the pattern clearly with Interim Supply bills is to ask for two or three months supply, but not to come in and ask for what appears to be eleven or twelve months supply, unless, of course, the government, the administration, is projecting something like a several hundred per cent increase in Public Works and so on and so forth.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the sooner we in this Committee realize that we are convincing nobody with this sarrealistic rhetoric that is up there somewhere, we are convincing nobody as a House, I say to the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and others, and you can score all the cheap Grade VIII points you want, I do not care if you amuse yourself, then I have made your day happy. Okay? Enjoy yourself. The issue I want to address, Mr. Chairman, is that we are deadly serious about the stance we have taken. You can minimize it, ridicule it, do what you want with it, it is there. It is there, Mr. Chairman, as a stance because we believe very strongly that this business has gone far enough, it has taken on all kinds of very unsavoury connotations. I have seen lots of

flag waving and I have seen lots of reminders about who got the mandate and so on and so forth.

The psychological mandate today, Mr. Chairman, I would be more concerned about, if I were the government, than the mandate of last April. And, Mr. Chairman, this administration is losing. There is going to be no election so I make this for no political reason as such, but I just lay this on you, Mr. Chairman, that this administration is losing the psychological war that they themselves launched, and I take you back some days to when a very different, a less chastened Minister of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) was out rubbing people's noses in, "You broke the law, you are going to have to pay the consequences." That was the essence of what he was saying it on television for several days. Now we thank God that he is not saying today and we give him credit, as the Leader of the Opposition did today, that he has changed his tune. But the point I make to you in calling it to mind, Mr. Chairman, is that several days ago the government strategy, this same crowd who would not be caught engaging in any politics today, this same crowd had a very overt political initiative going. It is clearly stated, it is understood by everybody out there. You do not have to believe me, ask anybody with a Grade IV education who has listened to the radio or television in the last week, and they will tell you that the overt political strategy of the government up until a couple of days ago was to use the NAPE unit, the MOS unit, as a scapegoat and play on the sympathies of people about restraint and, sure, we are for parity but we do not have the money, we poor people here in the

government. Mr. Chairman, they have used that line once too often. I am glad, Sir, you are in the Chair right now because you were Chairman of the Committee of which I was Vice-Chairman. Would you do me a favour, Sir? Would you tell the Premier, Sir, that there was a government majority on that Committee? Would you tell the Premier, Sir, that it was four government people who made the result of that Committee possible and that we, the three other people, the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), the gentleman for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and I, were able to take part in a consensus thinking we were doing it on behalf of the House of Assembly, not realizing that we would be browbeaten or attempted to be browbeaten by a Premier who conveniently forgets that it was four members of his side who made the consensus possible and that we felt our way through as a Committee - the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) knows what we are talking about and the gentleman for Humber Valley (Mr. Baird) and so on - and we had a consensus. There were people on all sides who had very different ideas about what there ought to be in that report. But we felt our way through and in good faith found a consensus, a unanimous consensus to the credit of the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) who happens to occupy the Chair right now, to his great credit and to the credit of all other people.

I do not think for a second, Mr. Chairman, that any of the seven on that Committee thought that we would get the kind of low blow we got today again. It was said in a little more covert terms before, but today it was said right out that somehow it was this terrible

Opposition that has been trying to browbeat the government into improvements so that members can serve their people better. That is the message today. That was the message for the gallery. Now who is playing politics today?

What about the little detail that four of the seven members on that Committee were government people, that all four of those signed that report, and that we have to assume - and I have no reason to assume otherwise - that all four of these men who signed that did it in conscience and knew what they are signing. Now the Premier tells us today that they did not. He tells us today that somehow they bolted ranks and they had to be stepped on. They were stepped on all right, quite publicly. I am surprised he brings it up. He is showing little sensitivity for those four people on the Committee from his side. I do not expect any sensitivity for us on this side, but certainly, Lord, he can show some basic, common decency for the four people on his side. He is showing now the same kind of sensitivity for them as he showed for the teachers a year or so ago, as he showed for the brewery workers and he is now showing for the NAPE crowd.

I guess, Mr. Chairman, without getting overly exercised, the question I want to ask is not how long you are going to be Tories or Liberals or when you are all going to parade across the floor, but when you are going to be men, woman and men? When are you going to stand up and say, 'I have had enough of this double talk?' When are the people in this Chamber, the people on that side of the House, going to just say, 'Enough is enough and I stand for some basic, common, ordinary decency.'

I am not going to stand by and see thousands of NAPE workers have their nose rubbed in it one day because it is convenient, and the next day, because it is politically convenient, to have a lecture on delicacy and so on?' Where does this hypocrisy end, Mr. Chairman?

We saw it happen with the teachers and it backfired badly. I say to the gentlemen over there, if they have no concern for being able to look in the mirror tomorrow morning, if they are just concerned about their political hydes, if that is all their concern is, I ask them to take to heart the example of what happened to this government in relation to teachers a year ago and extrapolate it to their present situation. Because just as the teachers did not forget, this crowd is not going to forget either nor should they forget, Mr. Chairman, what has been done to them in the past few days.

MR. BAIRD:

Does that make you happy?

MR. SIMMONS:

There he goes again.

Do you know, Mr. Chairman - you talk about the new age of conciliation that dawned in the last twenty-four hours about delicacy and so on - that the 3500 people who walked out a couple of days ago walked out despite an attempt to intimidate? Do you know that these people also had in writing before the fact that if they walked out they also would be subject to a thirty day suspension. They were covering all their bets were they not? Did you know that? The General Service, the 3500, also had in writing before the fact that if

you walk out you will be subject to a thirty day suspension.

Now we have heard a lot about the laws out there and we are in here, we are the government, do not bother us with things like law enforcement. We have heard all that. Mr. Chairman, what is crystal clear here is that the law and law enforcement have been manipulated covertly to serve the political ends of this government. The law has been manipulated, Mr. Chairman, to serve the political ends of this government.

MR. TOBIN:

I know there were times when it was manipulated.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Chairman, we can have all the aspersions we want from some guys who are feeling the heat, who are a little ashamed of themselves for sitting with an administration that would drive people so far into the ground, you can get dirty and you can get personal, but I will continue to talk about what this government has done. This government has manipulated politically, for its own ends, the legal system, manipulated law enforcement unduly and deliberately to win its end. It will not work, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

I wish to advise the hon. member that he has a minute left.

MR. SIMMONS:

I do not really need a minute. I think I have made the point that I want to make, that everybody, including people who were not on strike, were being intimidated by this administration. Senior

public servants with the little plum of an extra \$5,000 had no difficulties writing memos saying, 'By the way, if you walk out -

MR. TULK:

You say they wrote that to the General Service.

MR. SIMMONS:

They wrote that to the General Service people before they went out threatening them that if they went out then they also would be subject to a thirty day suspension. Mr. Chairman, I have heard of police states, I have read about police states, and I have pitied and empathize with people in police states, but I could never empathize before this week. I could never really emphasize. When you see ordinary people getting \$13,000 or \$15,000, fighting for their rights, being grabbed away and put in cells, being charged, and then when, Mr. Chairman, I see that only some get charged, I realize how close we are to the police state if this crowd persists in their present course of activity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words on the debate as it has progressed, or the lack of progress that has been made with respect to the debate. First of all, I want to say I only caught

the comments of the last two members opposite who spoke, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) and the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), two of my favourite speakers, I might add.

MR. BUTT:

And your cousin.

MR. SIMMS:

I will not stretch it that far.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to both members criticize and attack the government, especially on this particular dispute that we are now involved with, and I will tell you that if it was not so serious it would be laughable. How pious of the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage! Who does he think he is? I have never seen a member who thinks he knows so much about so little before in all of my life. That is the member for Fortune - Hermitage. He preaches to us as if he is pious, he is right, everything he says is accurate, they played to the gallery - and do not say you did not play to the gallery, all day long during Question Period. Then they got the gall to accuse us of playing politics with this particular issue in this dispute, got the gall to accuse us of that. Mr. Chairman, how pious. I say to the member for Fortune - Hermitage how pitiful both his and member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir's remarks were in this particular debate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, I might add, certainly is not in a very qualified position to talk about labour disputes. And to see him walk around with his Parity '86 badge on, if they could see him out in Grand Falls, the outside

workers, or if the workers in his garage could see him going around with a Parity '86 badge on I bet you they would throw up. They would have to throw up.

MR. BUTT:

Beating the windshields out of cars.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, that will not go unnoticed. I can guarantee you, Mr. Chairman, that will not go unnoticed.

MR. BUTT:

That is shocking, boy! What a hypocrite! What a hypocrite!

MR. SIMMS:

I know some people who will ensure that that gets out around, similar to some of the rumours and stories we hear down around the Bay d'Espoir area these days, comments from his constituents that have been made down there. Not very positive, Mr. Chairman, at all. It is typical of his attitude and his approach -

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman is getting down as low as he can -

MR. BAIRD:

Now you are crying.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

There is a point of order on the floor.

MR. TULK:

He is getting down as low as he can get in the mud. That shows the desperation that is involved, because usually the hon. gentleman, a former Speaker of this House does not do that. But, Mr. Chairman, let me ask the hon. gentleman, when he is circulating all this stuff about the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, if he would circulate the apology to the hon. member that appeared in The Coaster yesterday as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

There is no point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order, it is a difference of opinion.

MR. SIMMS:

Just in thirty seconds just let me say to the hon. member I did not say I was going to circulate anything.

MR. TULK:

You were going to see they were.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

I did not say that either. It is typical of the hon. member for Fogo who sits next to the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), who sits next to the Leader of the Opposition, that they remind you of the Three Stooges, Larry, Curly, and Moe. There you are over there. Look!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
They do not want to hear, Mr. Chairman. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, the House Leader is giving me a hard look there, so I will move that the Committee rise, report progress, and I will get at it again Monday afternoon.

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 (Hickey):
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m.