



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 26

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Monday - *Fri*

5 May 1986

*9 May*

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

On Wednesday last, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) rose on a point of privilege in connection with a shareholder in a particular company. The next day, the member rose to explain that he was mistaken about the company, that in fact it was a different company and apologized for the mistake. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) rose on a point of privilege in connection with the above. I feel the apology of the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage has taken care of the matter.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage rose later in the day on a point of privilege in connection with comments made by the hon. the President of the Council. On Page L1413 of Hansard of Thursday, the hon. the President of the Council stated, and I quote, "The hon. gentleman got up in this House with the pure purpose, obviously, of trying to draw this to the attention of the House to try to discredit the government and obviously Mr. Martin."

On the same page, referring to the Leader of the Opposition, he comments and I quote, "His avowed intention in trying to discredit everything in government." I refer hon. members to Beauchesne, Page 104, Paragraph 319, sub-paragraph 3 which states, "A member will not be permitted by the Speaker to impute to any member or members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case." I feel that was done in this particular case.

I would call on the hon. member to withdraw any imputation of unworthy motives.

MR. MARSHALL:

Your Honour, of course I do withdraw but I think it is a new principle of parliamentary practice, that one is not allowed to say that somebody is criticizing the government. But if Your Honour wishes me to, I withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Thank you.

I checked Hansard and I found the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) stated, "That is a lie," on two occasions in connection with comments made by the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). That statement is unparliamentary, and I refer hon. members to page 108 of Beauchesne where practically the full page is occupied with rulings to that effect.

I call on the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to withdraw these comments.

MR. DOYLE:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Thank you.

000

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of

privilege. It is a rare occasion, Mr. Speaker, when I take the opportunity to do that. It has nothing to do with any hon. members of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I made some comments on second reading of Bill No. 25, which has to do with the setting up of the Real Estate Foundation. All members, in my opinion, with the exception the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), agreed in principle with this bill. Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, I did an interview with the press, and I refer specifically to CBC. On Friday evening, Mr. Speaker, I was watching the Here and Now news and when the story came on with regard to this particular bill, I could hardly believe, Mr. Speaker, what I saw and heard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is blatantly wrong, and very irresponsible of CBC or any medium. In this Legislature all of us as members have a responsibility to make statements and give facts and be responsible for what we say or we have to apologize and withdraw any comments. And that is the way it should be. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that CBC, in that newscast on Friday, certainly misled the consumers of this Province on a very factual matter, not a matter of opinion as to what I said or some other hon. member said, by saying that this bill would give the real estate people \$5 million of a fund to work with. That, Mr. Speaker, is an absolute lie.

As I explained, and as I will explain when I clue up the debate later this week, hopefully, on the principle of that bill, the \$5 million figure, Mr. Speaker, came from the total deposits that could accrue over a period of one year. I will have more to say on the

nitty-gritty details of that later.

I do not want to take the valuable time of the House to get into that now because I do not think it is relevant to the submission.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the time has come or is fast approaching when this House and the Internal Economy Commission must take a look at the Terms of Reference and the responsibilities of people in the press gallery. I think, Mr. Speaker, that CBC owes an apology if not to this House or to me as minister, certainly to the real estate people and to the consumers of this Province for lying to them, by saying that this bill would deliberately give them \$5 million to work with. I raise the point, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is important. This has nothing to do with freedom of the press. They can report matters from this Legislature - I was going to say as they see fit - but certainly the facts, Mr. Speaker, should be accurate. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to review the terms of reference for the members of the Press Gallery Association and to take a look at the whole matter, because if they are not being responsible in what they report in this Legislature, then I think we have reached a sorry state.

One of the recommendations, I think made by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) in response to this bill, is that perhaps a scholarship could be set up, one of the purposes of it. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we could use that to educate CBC, get them to graduate from Grade 2 to Grade 3, so that they can perhaps understand the principle of this bill.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister makes a valid point, in that I think the gist of this legislation has been somewhat distorted by the remarks of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) Several years ago, the same approach was taken with respect to trust funds that for centuries in this Province, the banks had been getting the interest on from law firms.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I remember that.

MR. BARRY:  
What has happened is that the Law Society has now set up a fund and, in fact, government has managed to avoid many of its responsibilities and a great part of its cost for legal aid by basically forcing the Law Society to divert funds; not give them carte blanche as to how they should be spent, but telling the Law Society that these funds should go to legal aid. For individuals who cannot afford to hire a lawyer themselves, the money from these trust accounts is now providing us very valuable community service, as well as providing scholarships and so forth.

Now, the position of our party, and I think the debate was started by the member for Fortune - Hermitage and the member for Twillingate, on Friday, is that a fund such as this be partially for the education of real estate agents but, we would hope, broadened to include other community projects, other projects

of value to the home buyer or the home seller. We think the focus of this bill may be a little narrow when it just addresses the education of real estate agents.

Mr. Speaker, it comes down to, I guess, the problem that we have from time to time in getting points of view across in this House, and all I can say is that the minister has to take a lot of the responsibility for whether or not his position, government's position on a bill is communicated thoroughly and completely. I would say, with all due respect, that one would have to question whether the minister on this bill or on a number of other issues has been very successful in expressing the point of view of the administration.

I think the position of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is a clear example of the division between the philosophy of his party and the philosophy of our party. This party believes in the free enterprise system, we believe in encouraging entrepreneurs to take a responsible position in their trade. We do not believe that the state has to act as the guardian and the dictator. To say that a board, responsible individuals appointed by government, supervised by government would end up spending the money at Las Vegas, that gives an example of how the NDP believe that everything should be controlled by the state, Mr. Speaker, rather than by entrepreneurs and by individuals who I think history has shown have made a very valuable contribution through the free enterprise system.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

I will take that matter under advisement and have more to say about that tomorrow.

Before recognizing the hon. minister I have great pleasure in welcoming to the Speaker's gallery, the last Leader of the Opposition, a very long time member of this House, Mr. Stephen Neary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Statements by Ministers

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 2, we were informed by the President of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, Mr. Carl Nickels Jr., that the company has adopted a restructuring programme that will lower iron ore pellet costs to the steel company shareholders of Iron Ore Company of Canada.

This restructuring effort will help to assure the company's survival in a highly competitive iron ore market and, as well, help to provide greater job security for IOC employees.

Mr. Robert Anderson, the Chairman of IOC and the M.A. Hanna Mining Company said that the restructuring means lower cost raw materials for IOC's steel consuming partners, but also helps assure a more consistent operating rate as the company strives to compete in the global iron ore

industry.

Bethlehem Steel Company, the third largest steel company in North America, has just increased its ownership in IOC to 33 per cent, or about 33 per cent from its former 20 per cent, and thus becomes the largest shareholder of the company. The increased ownership was achieved by the acquisition of the 12.58 per cent interest of LTV, which was one of the seven steel company owners of Iron Ore Company of Canada.

One of the benefits of the restructuring program for IOC is that the steel-producing shareholders have designated the company as a preferred iron ore supplier by extending their ore purchase contracts, however, the price that will be paid for ore will not be tied to world market prices and this means that the company, of course, will have to continue its efforts to remain competitive.

IOC is the largest iron ore producer in Canada, and its owners include some of North America's largest steel producers.

The employees of the company have been informed of the restructuring process and have been assured of IOC's optimism about the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we thank the minister for supplying us with a copy of his statement beforehand. I have to say we do not see that there is enough information provided in the minister's statement and I have

some difficulty in following what is the restructuring programme. Is it the restructuring of ownership? This would not normally be considered a restructuring programme. Is it the fact that Bethlehem Steel has increased its interest from 20 per cent to 33 per cent, or is there something more going on? Is it an internal reorganization of the company's method of operations? If so, we would like the minister to inform the House.

The minister mentions one of the benefits of the restructuring programme being the designation of the company as a preferred iron ore supplier. Now, we think that is a good idea. The minister said that is one of the benefits. What are the other benefits of restructuring? Are there any disadvantages of restructuring that the minister can see? Basically what we have now, as I understand it, is that the owners of the iron ore company will be buying from themselves and will be giving a first option - is that it? - to the iron ore company to sell but the iron ore company still has to remain competitive in the sense that the owners will not buy from their own company if the price is consistently higher than what they can buy from the world market. Is that what the minister is saying? If so, it does not seem to be all that significant in terms of security for IOC. If the shareholders were saying we are going to buy from our own company, IOC, in any event, and we are going to make sure that the efficiency is there in the operation, that is one thing, but if they are going to say, Well, we are just going to give IOC a chance to compete with other companies, I fail to see whether that is a very significant thing

to announce. If he wanted to by leave, we would be very interested in the minister clearing this up. Just what exactly are the components of restructuring? Is there any threat to the work force? Are they talking about restructuring the work force at all? The minister shakes his head, no. So, it consists only of the increase of Bethlehem Steel's interest from 20 per cent to 33 per cent. Is that the only thing that is involved in restructuring as far as the minister is aware?

MR. DINN:

Yes.

MR. BARRY:

I have to confess I am not sure of the significance of that fact in itself. It is good to have the largest steel company in the United States increasing its interest and showing its faith in this company. That, I suppose, is some degree of additional security, but I am not sure I see the full significance of what the minister has stated here today. If the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) wanted to have a statement on it I would be happy to grant leave, seeing this is his district, if government is prepared to do the same.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I, too, am a little bit puzzled by the wording of this. When you say that a company has adopted a restructuring programme that will lower iron ore pellet costs to the steel company shareholders, the only way you can do that is by lowering the price to which the Iron Ore Company of Canada sells the pellets to the companies. So what you are announcing here is a price cut for IOC pellets to their owners. That is what it seems like to me. I wonder if the minister could say what effect that will have on its profits and, therefore, on the taxes we get from IOC? Somewhere along the line I would like to see some answers to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement to make today. I want to call the attention of all hon. members to the fact that National Forest Week which began yesterday is being observed in this Province now as well as in other parts of Canada.

The week is set aside each year to focus public attention on the forests and, of course, its importance to our economy and our way of life. This week is actually sponsored by the Canadian Forestry Association, but is supported by individual organizations as well as the federal and all provincial governments.

One of those organizations is the Newfoundland Forest Protection Association and, as hon. members will recall, just the other day I tabled the annual report of the NFPA. I would like to point out

in passing, Mr. Speaker, that they are becoming much more active in working to increase public awareness of the importance of the forest and in fact they are sponsoring activities marking National Forest Week in this Province and I commend them for it.

Mr. Speaker, National Forest Week this year opened just six days after the signing of a new Forest Resources Development Agreement between this Province and the federal government, so the timing is particularly appropriate, from our point of view. This \$48 million agreement will enable my department to carry out its important forestry work in the spirit of National Forest Week, which is, of course, to encourage the wise use and enhancement of a major renewable natural resource.

In addition to that, of course, it creates jobs. I might just say in passing that just today I had representation from the former member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary), who is now a student, wondering if there was a student job available for him, perhaps in forestry or some other resource sector. I want to tell him, since I know he is in listening distance, that his own member, I think the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), has already made representation on his behalf. So perhaps the possibilities are good.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite all hon. members, as well -

MR. SIMMONS:

You are looking after you colleague, that is good.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes, we have always done that. I would like to invite all hon. members, as well as everybody

in Newfoundland and Labrador, to take a moment or two to reflect on the importance of the forest and the industry it supports to our economic well-being, as well as the outdoor recreation activities that we often take for granted.

I would also like to invite hon. members and members of the general public to attend a brief ceremony at the Valley Mall in Corner Brook on Wednesday evening, when I will be there to officially open the observance of National Forest Week in this Province.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of sending around to all members of this House and the press gallery a small memento of National Forest Week.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We all recognize the symbolic occasion of National Forest Week and recognize the good work done down through the decades by the NFPA. Some of us can remember more decades than others. I would suggest to the minister that if he is considering a job for this former member of the House he is referring to, that he give him a job as his special assistant in his department to help him clean up his department. I am sure the hon. member would do an excellent job in that regard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:  
I see the minister connected the beginning of this week with the

occasion of the signing of the forestry agreement which suggests that if he had a flair for the dramatic, he would have signed that agreement to start that week six days earlier rather than six days later. Seeing as we have waited so long for that agreement anyway, what is six more days?

He suggest that we all take a moment or two to reflect upon the importance of the forest and the industry it supports to our economic well-being and so on. I would suggest to the minister that he make that point very strongly to the federal Forestry Minister who has turned up, after waiting so long, with a measly \$12 million a year to put into an industry that is so very important to our existence as a Province.

MR. SIMMS:  
The largest one ever.

MR. BAKER:  
I am glad to see that the minister mentioned the recreational use of the forest. I would suggest that he also talk to a few of his Cabinet colleagues to point out some of the problems existing in this Province with forestry roads that have now fallen into disuse which people have gotten used to using. Whole industries have developed around these forestry roads and the minister and his colleagues are allowing them to fall into a state of disrepair and to destroy industries in communities in this Province associated with recreation and associated with tourism. So the minister, perhaps, would have a few things to do in this regard himself. I am glad that the minister gave me a copy of this ahead of time. It is sort of a formality and I do not want to become negative in this



statement. I would simply congratulate him for reminding us of this very important week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of a letter, sent by the Premier to Ms Maura Hanrahan, which the Premier sent to The Evening Telegram for publication. I would like to ask the Premier if he would explain why he is taking the position that the right of the Province to a railway is weak. That seems to be a very strange position on which to enter into negotiations, Mr. Speaker, with the Government of Canada, for the Premier to write a letter to the newspaper downgrading the extent of Newfoundland's constitutional entitlement to the preservation and maintenance of a railway. I would like to ask the Premier does he have the intent of giving away the railway before the negotiations ever start?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have any intention of doing that, but I do recognize that if you read the Terms of Union, and I do not have a copy of the exact Term before me right now, the phraseology is such that it says 'where market or

demand warrants' or something to that extent. And that was in response to several letters that I have received where there has been the contention by some people that the Terms of Union are absolutely air-tight, if you will, as it relates to that, but it has to do with market and demand. Obviously, we will use the Terms of Union, as we have in the past, to the ultimate, but there is not an air-tight situation as it relates to the Terms of Union, and it has to do with relating to demand and relating to market. That is what I was pointing out to the lady who had written me.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I asked the Premier would he agree that for the Premier to take the position that the federal government could turn around and deliberately downgrade the railway and thereby escape its constitutional obligation, which is what the Premier is implying here by this letter, that that would require a very nefarious interpretation, a very slippery interpretation of the intention of the Fathers of Confederation when this Term of Union was joined between Canada and Newfoundland, the Fathers of the Newfoundland Confederation being the then Liberal administration in Ottawa and the Liberal administration of this Province.

Is the Premier saying that when the Terms of Union were signed that it was the intention of the federal government of that day, and the understanding of the

provincial government that the Government of Canada could get out of its obligation to maintain a railway merely by permitting the railway to be so downgraded that it would discourage traffic and thereby could say subsequently, 'Well, obviously, nobody is using the railway and we can do away with it'?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have seen what has happened over the last ten or fifteen years as it relates to the railway. We have, and I have personally fought very hard not just for the retention of the existing infrastructure as it relates to the railway but to a significant upgrading of it. Because without, as I have consistently said, a significant upgrading of tens of millions of dollars per year for the next ten years, then we are going to continue to see the railway de facto be deteriorated and not be a very viable mode of transportation in this Province. That is what we are pushing for with the federal government. Now what the motives were of the Fathers of Confederation in 1949, I have my own personal views about that from time to time when it relates to the fishery and it relates to other things. All I can say is I am not going behind the wording of the Terms of Union, I am just saying what the actual wording of the Terms of Union is. Now obviously there could very well be in any argument before a court some substance to the contention that the motives of the signers or the signatories at that time was a lot more substantial than was the actual wording that was in the Terms of Union, and whether a

court would look at that as more important than the actual words in the Terms of Union I do not know. I do know what the Terms of Union say, and what they clearly say is related to market and demand, therefore that obviously is something that no doubt the federal government of the day, when they cancelled the passenger service across Newfoundland, was arguing with the then provincial government of the day. That is all I can say in relation to what the Leader of the Opposition said. We continue to advocate the retention of the railway, but not just stopping there. We want the retention of the railway with significant upgrading because if that does not happen then the railway is going to go in the way it has in the last decade.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Is the Premier referring to the clause in accordance with the traffic offering? I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, that the Premier does not have these Terms of Union at his fingertips, because we are now in the throes of a battle to try and maintain this railway and the Premier should be on top of the situation. Will the Premier state whether he is prepared to take the position that the Government of Canada cannot reduce the traffic offering by permitting the railway to be downgraded, which is what they have been doing? Is the Premier prepared to take a firm stand and tell the Government of Canada that they are not permitted

MR. DAWE:

How are you going to control the traffic offerings?

MR. TULK:

Easy.

MR. BARRY:

Now here we have the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) interrupting but making a better point than the Premier has.

Is the Premier in agreement with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada, which, by the way, is the one responsible, not CN, CN is only an agent, that the Government of Canada can discourage the traffic offering by downgrading the railway?

MR. DAWE:

That is not what I said.

MR. TULK:

That is basically what you said.

MR. BARRY:

That is what you said. Is the Premier prepared to stand up and say that the Government of Canada has an obligation to maintain, or is the Premier going to continue his lip-sync contest where he tries to lip-sync with the Prime Minister of this country on every issue affecting this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, you have come down hard in the last few days about questions and answers and you have, from time to time, Sir, I respectfully suggest, stopped ministers in answering questions because their answers were getting too long. And I would respectfully suggest that when

questions get a bit long and certain some debate, even though there were some interruption, that does not automatically give the Leader of the Opposition the licence to launch into a debate. So if I can have some time to answer the question as well on the Term of Union, I am not negotiating in this House. I mean, if the Leader of the Opposition thinks I am negotiating with him over the Newfoundland railway he has got another think coming.

MR. BARRY:

You should still know what is going on.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Sure I know what is going on. I did not know the exact word and I am very sorry if the Leader of the Opposition finds that somehow insulting to his intelligence that I did not have the exact wording as it related to Term 31 of the Terms of Union.

MR. BARRY:

The people of this Province find it insulting.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, you know, we will see about that. We will find out how is the most insulting one to the people of this Province.

MR. BARRY:

We will.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You take your 7 per cent and build on that, that is what you should be doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Let us see the polls. Table it.!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You take your lackluster imagine and get around this Province and see what is going on instead of staying with your -

MR. BARRY:

You are gone!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

There is far too much interruption on both sides.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let the Leader of the Opposition take his lackluster imagine from Water Street and get out around rural Newfoundland and get to understand it.

Term of Union 32 (1): 'Canada will maintain in accordance with the traffic offering a freight and passenger steamship service between North Sydney and Port aux Basque, which, on completion of a motor highway between Corner Brook and Port aux Basques, will include suitable provision for the carriage of motor vehicles.

32 (2): For the purpose of railway rate regulation the Island of Newfoundland' - which is a bit stronger, by the way.

MR. BARRY:

That is only referring to Gulf now.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, it is also referring to the railway on the Island, because 31 (a) talks about 'the Newfoundland, railway including the steamship and other marine services,' the Newfoundland Hotel, postal and publicly owned telecommunications services.

Mr. Speaker, the long and short to it is we have researched constitutionally, legally and all the rest of it, and we maintain that there has to be a commitment by the Government of Canada as it relates to this, and we put that forward. But I cannot answer back a constituent or a person of this Province and tell an outright lie when I know the difference of it, when there are clauses in the Terms of Union that would make it easy for that lady to come back to me and say, 'You are completely wrong, because the wording of such-and-such says the following.'

All I am saying is that it is not completely airtight so that we could categorically say something, because there are these other wordings in the Terms of Union. Now everything that we have said to the federal government is that they have a commitment to transportation in this Province and one of them is the railway, in our view. And we want them not only to retain the railway but to significantly upgrade it. That is our position and we are waiting to hear back from the federal government.

MR. DAWE:

Notwithstanding the weakness of the Terms of Union.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon.

the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier should look at that section and look very closely at it. I ask the Premier if he commit himself? He says he is not going to bargain in public. Will he commit himself to not bargaining away in public our position before the negotiations ever start, because that is what he is doing with this letter? And I would ask the Premier rather than standing up in this House and trying to save himself by inventing polls, figaments of his imagination, to table them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I would ask the Premier to save himself and his administration by doing the job for which he was elected, which is fighting for this Province. Just because there is a Tory administration in Ottawa does not mean that the Premier should roll over and play dead because they are of the same party stripe in Ottawa today. Will the Premier take as firm a position with his Tory colleagues in Ottawa as he was taking with the Liberals when they were there?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is an unqualified yes. I do not have to go to the Leader of the Opposition to find out whether the people of Newfoundland know that I stand up for Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I am sure he will be aware now that the rather well-known and reputable oil analyst, Ian Doig, made some comments on the weekend which were reported in the media. To summarize, at the very least the analyst, Mr. Doig, was decidedly cautious about the offshore drilling prospects and about an early start-up for Hibernia. Would the Premier indicate whether he feels Mr. Doig's remarks represent a realistic assessment of the situation and, in particular, does he have some concern about Hibernia not starting up this year, a possibility of it not starting this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I read some other gentleman in the business community this morning, too - I think it was a gentleman by the name of Birch - who made some optimistic comments, who is also well known. I am not familiar with it. I do not associate in those quarters. Mr. Speaker, there are experts and then there are experts. You can get as many opinions as there are experts as it relates to where the price of oil is going to be in September, where it is going to be three years from now, five years from now, or whether Hibernia is going

to start this year or not. I do not intend to engage in those kinds of speculations. All I am going to say is that we are continuing our negotiations with both the Mobil group of companies and with the federal government to try to get the Hibernia development going this year. We are doing everything in our power to see that that occurs. We have no control over the price of oil, obviously, and obviously that is a concern to some of the companies in that group because their cash flow is not as great through the production that they now have on stream. But we are still very hopeful that we are going to be able to move this development this year.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

The Minister responsible for the Petroleum Board (Mr. Marshall) has repeatedly said to this House over the past few months that the current price of oil is not really a factor because it will relate more to the price down the road somewhat, so we can assume that the current price is not a factor. The Premier has said, and I agree, that experts say various things about the same issue. More to the point, is he saying to us now that the start up of Hibernia relates only to a successful resolution of these negotiations? Does he still hold to his earlier time frame of about the end of May to have these matters resolved in order to proceed with Hibernia on schedule?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I said at that time the end of May or early June, if I am correct. I never just said the last of May. I said the last of May or early June, and I still stick to that framework, that time frame. And whether Hibernia goes ahead this year or not will depend largely upon the negotiations that are now underway between the Mobil group of companies and the federal government.

MR. SIMMONS:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Doig also had some concerns about the offshore drilling prospects. We have noted in the last few days that Alberta has been turning to Ottawa for some assistance to prop up its oil industry. Can the Premier indicate whether his administration has made any representation to Ottawa for assistance to encourage drilling offshore?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we have and we have done that in the context of the negotiations that are now ongoing. Let us be clear on what has happened in Alberta. It has not really been all that much and it has been primarily in the servicing sector of their small and medium sized companies and not related directly to the whole question of that much more

drilling by the multinationals in Alberta, Saskatchewan or British Columbia. Yes, we have, and they are forming part and parcel of the negotiations that are ongoing right now.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Health. In recent years, according to a publication from Health and Welfare Canada, the causes of death among the older people have shifted from infections to chronic ailments. Therefore, as the minister is aware, I am sure, the focus in health care for older people has shifted to a promotion of measures to stay in good health by adopting a healthy lifestyle. I want to ask the minister if his department has organized, or encouraged some group to organize a series of workshops to help older people draw up a personal plan to keep well? Has that been done?

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
Thank you very much. Over the past year we have immensely increased our benefits to senior citizens and the chronic health care systems. We have made various efforts in the interfaith homes and in the hospitals to bring in people for day care only. We are sending out our Public Health nurses and we have them practically in every large community. They cover an area all over this Province and in

Labrador. We have not specifically designed Public Health seminars for people, but I believe it is done on an individual basis by some hospitals and some institutions.

MR. SIMMS:  
A good answer.

MR. DECKER:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:  
Has the minister set up or encouraged the setting up of health drop-in centres for senior citizens? I understand this is being done in other provinces. It is okay to talk about the health nurses, they have been around for quite some time, Mr. Speaker, but they are for the population in general. I am specifically asking about the senior citizens of this Province.

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
As regards building specific centres or organizing specific centres in the health care system, no. But this government has helped senior citizens in many ways by providing money to help them to build halls and refurbish halls in various communities in this Province. We have given them funds every year. The senior citizens have banded themselves together in many communities. They have followed designed programmes from the Department of Health and from various federal government agencies.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:  
I want to ask the minister, in considering the growing proportion of this population which is made up of senior citizens, is he satisfied that the senior citizens are getting adequate attention from his department as compared to other divisions of the population?

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any special survey has been done in this Province or in any of the other provinces of Canada to say whether sufficient money has been designated, but if you look at the amount of money that has been put into the chronic care homes and into home care services, you will find that it corresponds favourably with that of any other province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier.

As the Premier knows and as all hon. members know, we in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador have been without yet

another of our constitutional rights by an arrogant and insensitive federal government, we are minus a senator. I wonder if the Premier can indicate what he has been doing in this matter? I wonder whether there is a scarcity of candidates? We have heard a lot of names - the former Premier, Premier Moores, the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) and even the Premier himself - so I am wondering can the Premier indicate what he is doing in this respect, whether he is sponsoring any one individual, and whether he can give us some names here today?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, under the rules, that is a matter which comes completely under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Now, I know that the hon. member might feel a bit 'shaky over there and might want to be considered, and this is his weird way of trying to get his name on a list in the federal government. And perhaps the federal government is still considering Mr. Rompkey, I do not know. He was supposed to be appointed and it got stopped by certain other members of the Liberal Party. But the issue itself is one that unfortunately is in federal jurisdiction. Although I think even in our constitution now we could have an Upper Chamber in the Province. We could have our own Upper Chamber. So perhaps I could help the hon. member by suggesting that we give some thought over the next week or two to having our own Upper Chamber and then we would have a place for him.

MR. LUSH:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.



MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, what a change has come over the Premier in the last couple of years! Mr. Speaker, if we can not even keep our quota of senators free from the Mulroney/Nielsen slashing, it does not look too good for other larger matters, for example, the fisheries and the railway.

I wonder if the Premier will give a commitment here today that he will immediately insist that Mr. Mulroney will fill this most important position, a position on which Newfoundland is losing out?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I honestly do not think, with all due respect to the Senate of Canada -

MR. LUSH:

Now you are going to denigrate the Senate of Canada.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. member mentioned the fisheries and the railway and so on, and I think that is where we should be concentrating our efforts. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has been concentrating his efforts on the fishery. It is because of the Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland that Harbour Grace is opened today with an enlarged quota offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is because of the present

Minister of Fisheries that Fermeuse has been sold to a viable entity without any government involvement because we got additional fish offshore. So we have been doing very well offshore and in the fishery and forestry and transportation. Are you so devoid of questions over there that the only question that you can ask is whether a Senate seat is going to be filled, which, by its very nature, is completely under the control of the federal government?

MR. TOBIN:

What a priority!

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier, in view of his decline in the polls, is not holding this position for himself? Secondly, is the Premier now denigrating the Senate and saying that position is of no importance to Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. I am just saying in relation to the fishery and in relation to forestry, that I think those things are far more important. As far as the polls go, the poll that I quoted some time ago, and I do not mind saying it again, I am very modest so I do not like saying it, but now under this kind of stimulation of the hon. member again I have to say that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was behind his party in the polls, the hon. the Leader of the NDP (Mr.

Fenwick) was behind his party in the polls, and I was ahead of my party in the polls and our party was ahead of the other two.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

MR. BARRY:  
I think for the first time in a long time we have seen the press report a poll which exists only in the imagination of the Premier. I would submit that a more appropriate poll would be the fact that the Conservative party was unable, for the first time since 1979, to have its most significant social event, Newfie Night in Gander, because they were unable to get enough people to turn out to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I know this grates the Leader of the Liberal Party, but it was a poll of a sample of 500 that was taken in middle March.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Table it. Table it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
No, I will not table it. It was done in the middle of March with the assistance of people who were expert in polling on the Mainland. Number two, Mr. Speaker, and more importantly is, on a Friday I released some of the information in the poll and on the following Monday VOXM had an open line show that asked, "Do you in Newfoundland agree with this poll, 7 per cent for Mr. Barry, 30 per cent for Mr. Fenwick, 60 per cent for the Premier?" and over 70 per cent said, 'Yes, that is accurate'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I had already recognized the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Communications (Mr. Russell). This morning CBC radio conducted its own poll, Mr. Speaker. It was a spot poll on the closing of Memorial University's television station, Channel 13. Callers were unanimous on the value that the service provided, especially in terms of cultural Newfoundland. In view of these considerations, will the Minister of Communications undertake to lobby his colleagues in Cabinet for finances necessary to continue support of this vital communications system?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
This is up to the University. They got a 14 per cent increase.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have to advise the hon. member what I shall advise or request or discuss in Cabinet with my colleagues. This government, Mr. Speaker, has made, in my opinion, a very significant and appropriate increase to the budget of Memorial University and they have to make their own decisions and live with them with regards to this Channel.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. FUREY:  
I would like to ask the minister what his own personal views are on the closing of this Channel.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
That is out of order.

MR. FUREY:  
Does he agree with it? If he does not agree with the closing, what will he do, Mr. Speaker, to undertake to fight for the retention of this very important station for the University?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker, I would submit, Sir, that if you pursue Beauchesne you will find that that question is very hypothetical and thus out of order. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions ministers of the Crown have been asked to give their personal opinion. I am not so

sure, Mr. Speaker, that you can distinguish between, when one happens to be a minister of the Crown, a personal opinion and a ministerial opinion.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a new question.

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

MR. FUREY:  
The Memorial television service was unique in Canada, Mr. Speaker. It communicated the doings of the University to the people of Newfoundland at large and provided a very important educational service to individuals.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
The hon. gentleman was asking a series of questions and he cannot get up and say it is a new question and make a comment on the hon. minister's statement. He is out of order. He is usurping the rules of the House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Another Rexogram.

MR. FUREY:  
I have a new question, Mr. Speaker. That is just silly foolishness.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

To that point of order, it does appear to the Chair that the hon.

member is asking what appears to be a supplementary to the question that he had already asked, and not a completely new one.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, if I had been given my proper time rather than being interrupted by the Premier and by the House Leader -

MR. SPEAKER:

I would ask the hon. member to pose his question?

MR. FUREY:

- you would have seen that my question was to the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), Mr. Speaker. My question is this: If the Minister of Communications will not protect that very important educational Channel for Newfoundland, will the Minister of Education do what is right and just and speak in Cabinet on behalf these people and get the financing necessary to keep this Channel?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the responsibility for post-secondary comes under the Department of Career Development, but I do not want to duck the question that way. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has provided Memorial University with a very generous this year, and in previous years in that budget they were able to carry on with Channel 13 and their other priorities. Certainly this year, with the extra funding that we gave them, they should be able to find a way to do it also. So the request should be addressed to the University and hopefully they will find some way to carry on

with this very worthwhile project.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, you cannot seem to get a straight answer from any minister over there, they duck, deflect, distract, and push it away.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

My supplementary is this: Is this one final example of our the University's essential functions are being castrated by the government's bungling of the restraint programme?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to whom the question is directed, certainly I suppose it should be to the minister responsible for the University. However, once again I want I want to make it quite clear that we have been very generous to the University. They have always been very responsible in the way they handle the funding. I presume they have looked at the priorities that they had in the department and decided to cut one of them. That is certainly a priority that the University has to deal with and not the government.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Twillingate. There is just time for a brief question and answer.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, Fisheries Products International when they announced their intention to divest itself of some of the plants owned by them around the Island, I believe they indicated they were going to sell or get clear of plants in Black Tickle and Williams Harbour. I wonder can the minister tell me what is the status of those plants at the present time?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, yes, the FPI Divestiture Committee has just over the last day or so, Thursday or Friday, I believe it might have been, made a recommendation to the two shareholders for the divestiture of plants at Black Tickle and Williams Harbour. As is normal in the Memorandum of Understanding between the two governments, I will be taking that recommendation to Cabinet as quick as possible.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. W. CARTER:

I wonder can the minister tell the House if the company buying the two plants is a Portuguese owned company?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, up until such time as Cabinet has an opportunity to review the recommendations from FPI, I certainly do not think it would be appropriate for me to comment and thereby identify whomever the successful proponent might be.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am fascinated by this poll that the Premier keeps referring to. At a previous time he told this hon. House that he has 64 per cent and today he is saying 60 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That does not appear to be an point of order.

MR. DECKER:

Well, what is the figure? Is it 64 per cent or is it 60 per cent? What is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

### Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Power To Approve By-laws And Regulations Passed By Various Associations Of Professionals." (Bill No. 34).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act."

### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 3. Concurrence Motion, Resource Committee.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MARSHALL:

Just before the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) gets up, more or less to a Point of Order and I hope to a point of agreement, we are in the House and the normal way for Concurrence Motions is half hour and half hour, but if the Houses wishes to we could do it the same way as we do in Committee, fifteen minutes to introduce, fifteen to reply, and ten and ten.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we agree. You are talking about fifteen to lead off, the same as if we were in committee?

MR. MARSHALL:

Fifteen and fifteen, ten and ten, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, as the Chairperson for the Resource Committee Estimates, I do indeed consider it a pleasure to begin the Concurrence Debate. We know that it is a very wide-ranging debate, however, Mr. Speaker, being the impartial person I was in the Committee meetings, I would like to report, in a very nonpartisan way, to the hon. House the proceedings of this past several weeks with regard to the Resource departments that our Committee had to consider. They were, as we all know, the Departments of Development and Tourism, Fisheries, Forest Resources and Lands, Mines and Energy, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, which the Minister of Mines and Energy is responsible for, and Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

I think it would be in order, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, to thank the staff of the House of Assembly for their patience and their guidance at many times, and

to thank certain members of the media for their attendance at meetings. However, as we all realize and have heard reported to the hon. House, a problem arose at the beginning of our Estimates Committee meetings because of the nonpresence of the media. As well, Mr. Speaker, I would want to sincerely thank members of the Resource Estimates Committee for the very co-operative manner in which we got through those estimates in the nine days we sat. I have to refer to the great co-operation I received from the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons).

I guess it should be noted that it did not go without some problems. The Committee seemed to start out reasonably well at the beginning, with the member for Fortune - Hermitage being away for the first week of the meetings on some government business, which is fair enough. Then, of course, when he did return to the House and to the Committee meetings, as was it his role to fill in for the Chairman and to take, I suppose, the burden of some of the task of sitting in the Chair, on one occasion he did take the Chair and, according to members of the Committee present, they were concerned that he was trying to stifle and muzzle the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) which was, as Your Honour will remember, reported to this hon. House. As Your Honour rightly suggested at that time, the Committees are masters of their own fate and therefore those matters should be dealt with in the Committees.

After that, Mr. Speaker, there was never any great problem, because the Vice-Chairman refused, on a number of occasions, to take the

Chair as Vice-Chairman and, as a result, I found myself quite often having to Chair the meetings for the entire three hours. However, the matter of the Vice-Chairman trying to muzzle the member for Torngat Mountains was settled when the Committee challenged the ruling of the Vice-Chairman, who was acting Chairman, and the ruling was overturned. Subsequently, the member for Torngat Mountains, in a very gentlemanly fashion, withdrew a brief comment he made to the Chair, which he thought inappropriate. However, a couple of nights later I found myself in a very awkward position when I could not get any member of the Committee to replace me in the Chair. I do recognize the fact that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did come forth and volunteer to fill in for a few minutes while I broke for coffee, and it was at that point in time, I am not sure if it was his inability to Chair the meeting or the partisan way in which he thought he should act, that he did indicate -

MR. BARRY:

Now, that is the thanks I get.

MR. PEACH:

I have to thank him for giving me the ten minute break to have a coffee, but I cannot really thank him for the mess he left the Committee in, which I had to come back and clear up. He did indicate that he had left his glasses home that evening and he did not see the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) come across the floor of the House here and -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Where were his contacts? Where were his dark glasses?

MR. PEACH:

I think he was wearing his shaded contacts that night and he could not see in the dark.

MR. BARRY:

I was totally enraptured by the minister's statement. I was listening to him.

MR. PEACH:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, he did indicate he did not see the member for Fogo come across and make a verbal attack, and an indication of some physical attack, according to my colleague, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). That matter was resolved when I resumed the Chair, and the meetings from then on proceeded reasonably well.

I have to also, Mr. Speaker, thank the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and the member for Bonavista South for their outspokenness in the Committee meetings. They asked some very hard-hitting questions of our ministers, even though they are members, of course, of the same side of this hon. House. On occasion, of course, this caused quite a lot of disruption in the meetings.

I attended another meeting, Mr. Speaker, with those two very hon. and capable people, at the Colonial Building, when the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) had his estimates on. I went in there with my mouth zipped pretty tightly and I was accused the next day of echoing all kinds of sounds to other members present, which was reported, I must say, by the Evening Telegram very accurately. They did not report the fact that I was making comments, because I did not make

any comments. I have to thank the Evening Telegram for that. The member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) were on the Committee, as well, and the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). I have to sincerely thank those members for their great co-operation.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to report for the Resource Estimates Committee. For the second year in a row brought our report back to this hon. House, the first of the three Committees, no reflection, of course, on the other two.

I think, Mr. Speaker, our Committee did find one thing worked extremely well, and it is probably extremely worthy of note, because I think all who sat on that Committee agree that one of the most practical methods of dealing with six departments is that you schedule a department per day and if debate on the estimates of a particular department does not conclude, then you reschedule it down the road. That way, you get a full three hours on each of the six departments. So you get eighteen hours of very varied debate.

Mr. Speaker, if my calculations are correct, we did have nine meetings of three hours each. So we put in in excess of twenty seven hours on the Resource part of the budget. Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and Fisheries each got through in a three hour sitting, the remainder got through in two sittings each.

As I said earlier, all did not run smoothly but I would have to agree, as will, I am sure, my



friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) when he gets up to make some comments on this, that on many occasions we got a lot of very important answers and the debate back and forth was very good indeed.

I would also comment, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that quite a lot of members from both sides of the House, particularly from the Opposition, who were not on the committee, showed up at our meetings. They were permitted, as is their right, to ask questions very freely, which they did, and I am sure they were enlightened by the responses they were given. The Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate was exceptionally informative one day. It was one of his better days, I must say, Mr. Speaker. The information was just flowing out of him. I am sure he gave the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) quite a scare when he was so free with this information.

MR. SIMMONS:

He had two days like that, really.

MR. PEACH:

Yes, it ran over into the second day, really. He became very nice. He did not take his naughty pills at all that day. I am sure he will have something to say to me outside afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, the first department I would like to make a few comments on is the Department of Development and Tourism. I gained a great deal of knowledge from the minister with regard to the make-up of the Department of Development and Tourism. He indicated to us, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Development and Tourism had four directions in which they proceeded, number one

being the direction of promotion of industrial development. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all realize that many hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars have been put out in our Province through various federal/provincial agreements in industrial development, whether they be done through our own department directly, whether they be done through DRIE, or whether they be done through the federal/provincial subsidiary tourism agreement.

A second direction of that department, Mr. Speaker, is the new industries based on natural resources. I am sure we all realize, over the past number of months, that ministers in their Ministerial Statements quite often have indicated various companies which have expressed interest in developing our natural resources here in this Province. They have always been encouraged and invited to come into our Province, and we have, on various trade missions, gone to other parts of this world to entice and encourage people to come in and get involved in the development of all our natural resources, not just the offshore.

A third direction is that of modification of existing businesses. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, we could look in any direction except at what has happened to our pulp and paper industry on which, at our Committee meetings, we got information from the minister to the effect that the modernization programmes at Kruger, Bowater paper company and, as well, at Grand Falls, are proceeding on schedule. As a matter of fact, both companies have indicated that they are putting more funding than had been originally anticipated

into the modification of their paper machines. I am sure we all realize that our pulp and paper industry has a lot of great potential left. I think we are getting into the development and the cutting of some new timber stands on the West Coast. My good friend from Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) informed me this morning that he had visited with the Minister of Environment this past weekend, the Main River part of our West Coast operations, now about to be part of the pulp and paper company at Corner Brook.

The fourth direction of the Department of Development and Tourism has to do with feasibility studies and economic opportunities. It is always very gratifying to see, Mr. Speaker, that we have many Newfoundlanders and Newfoundland companies who have taken the opportunity to get involved in the business world. It is unfortunate that some of those people's names have been brought up in this hon. House over the past week or so, and probably not on the highest level or the highest plateau, and their business transactions discussed, but it is always great to see a group of Newfoundlanders who are prepared to get involved in such a very trying and new area of development.

Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated to us that the Department of Development has four divisions. Quite often, I guess, we just look on it as the Department of Development. I tend to agree with comments made by members from both sides of the House to the effect that the tourism part of development is one that we probably have not put enough emphasis on. We could well do with having a department of

Tourism Tourism, because the number of dollars that can come into a Province such as ours through tourism, I am sure, can be doubled and even tripled what we are getting at the present time.

The Division of Offshore and Marine is another division. Trade Promotion and Small business - I think the small business part is one that affects all of us who represent rural Newfoundland. We have to realize that a month or so ago the federal government, in their budget, indicated some help and some new initiatives, some new approaches for the small business community.

During our discussions and debate, Mr. Speaker, on the Department of Development and Tourism, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) brought up a rather trivial matter that constituted some debate for some time and that was, as he called it, the blowing up of the bridge with Abitibi Price. I think that matter was cleared up in the House.

I understand I will get a chance to make some comments at the end of this debate, in that there are fifteen minutes to begin and to end. Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the Department of Fisheries: The Department of Fisheries was the department, I guess, that we all agreed we did get a great deal of information on. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) and the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) attended the meeting. I indicated that the answers were put forth very capably by our provincial Minister of Fisheries, were very enlightening and very encouraging.

We all realize that on the last day of our meeting on Fisheries

the topic of debate, of course, was the problem that arose with regard to the Port de Grave trawler. In Committee meeting that day the member for Port de Grave indicated that he was very pleased with the answers he has received, but as the day went on, other things unfolded that he got involved with. I guess we all are concerned and can certainly share his concern and questions with regard to the fishery out in the Conception Bay area, particularly in Port de Grave, where we have some of the best fishermen in the Province.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will take my seat and make way for the Vice-Chairman, the member for Fortune - Hermitage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this is the Concurrence Motion and I should give notice now that I shall be voting against this particular motion, because to do otherwise, to vote for it would be to aid and abet what went on during the Committee process, and I have no intention of doing that.

Let me correct a couple of points that my good friend for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) made erroneously to the House a moment ago. He had indicated, in particular, just to get rid of a detail first, that I as Vice-Chairman had refused -

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please! The hon. member for St. John's North on a point of

order.

MR. J. CARTER:

I took it from the member for Fortune - Hermitage to say he would be voting against this Concurrence Motion. Now, presumably all the Concurrence Motion does is bring the debate on the budget into the House. It is not necessarily a vote to pass or not pass the budget but merely to bring the debate into the House. That is all it is. I think the member is unwittingly misleading us if he suggests he is going to vote against it, because he has no reason not to bring this debate into the House. I mean, what are his purposes?

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the motion is to concur. I refuse to concur, and therefore I will be voting against. That is not the purpose of the point of order at all. The purpose is to cut into my fifteen minutes, and if he wants to persist in doing that -

MR. J. CARTER:

The hon. member (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- I withdraw my leave and then I have a half hour. So if he wants to play games, two can do that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please? Order, please!

Order, please!

There is no point of order. There is an expression by one hon. member and obviously the other hon. member disagrees.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Carbonear, the Chairman of the Committee, indicated wrongly to the House that I, as Vice-Chairman, had declined on a number of occasions to take the Chair. The truth of the matter is that I declined on one occasion, and he referred to the instance, actually, that rather stormy night when subsequently the Leader of the Opposition took the Chair. I did not take the Chair for a particular reason, and he knows why I did not take the Chair, because he had so badly demeaned the Chair by allowing the gentleman for Bonavista South to go on for eleven minutes on a point of order. I felt the gentleman for Carbonear was not being impartial at that point, and I was not going to aid and abet the process by sitting in the Chair. That is why I declined that night and he knows that is why I declined. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, he knows, as he ratherly backhandedly told the House later in his speech, that he had the full co-operation of me as Vice-Chairman, and of the Opposition, in matters of scheduling, in matters of the procedures adopted in Committee about calling certain heads at the top of the session and so on. He knows, and I challenge him to say otherwise, that he had the fullest co-operation on procedural matters, housekeeping matters in that particular Committee.

That does not mean, Mr. Speaker,

that we were going to sit idly by and allow a badly flawed process to be even more demeaned by a very partial approach by people on the government side.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come to the second point that I want to make to this House at this time, and that is that I believe the time has long since come to do away with those Estimates Committees. They are not serving any worthwhile function. They are becoming a continuing, ongoing partisan hassle, where you have the Chairmen of the Committees who, Jim McGrath, the Tory for St. John's East, federal, says, 'should not be even in the Chair.' He says that on the public record. They should not be there. They should not be there at all. That aggravates the process. You have people sent into the Committee on instruction to disrupt, and they did quite a job of disrupting. Mr. Speaker, they are able to do it because very few of the press are able to attend because they have other responsibilities; a couple of Committees going on at once and so on; Committees sitting at night, when the press does not have their full complement of staff as they do during the day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come to bring the process of the Estimates completely back into the House, have it here where the officers in the Chair are officers of the House, not paid hacks of the government. Instead of having three Chairmen who are parliamentary secretaries, however full of integrity they are, and I do not question their integrity for a moment, however oozing with integrity and a sense of fairness they are, they are marching to a different drummer. They are

wanting to make sure that the minister who is before the Committee think well of their performance, they want to make sure they give that minister all the breaks, whereas here in the House, Mr. Speaker, as you know, Sir, you are an Officer of the House, your stipend comes in respect to your capacity as an Officer of this House, and so does Mr. Speaker's and so does Mr. Deputy Speaker's. So we have in the Chair three people, here in this House, who have the confidence of the House, who are Officers of the House. In Committee we have three people who their own partisans, say, people like Mr. McGrath says, should not be there in the first place. And we do not need even Mr. McGrath to say it, we only need to sit here one hour during the Committee process and see the disgrace that gets transgressed here in the name of examining estimates. Let us bring the Estimates back into the House. We have had a fairly lengthy experiment with them and it is not working. The experiment is not working. It is absolutely abominable what has gone on in those Committees, demeaning and abominable, and we should call a halt to it now and bring them back here into the House and let the full House deal with it, the Committee of the Whole, where we have Officers of the House to impartially handle the Chair, and where we have the press who are normally available during the working day, when this House normally sits, up until six o'clock. Do away with it and, in the process, do away with the night sittings, do away with the requirement that the press have to be two or three places at the one time.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about

the Resource Committee, but I believe the same can be said for the other Committees. I dropped in on them from time to time. Indeed, it was interesting this time, Mr. Speaker, that the complaint from government was that there were too many Opposition members there. They saw something suspicious and sinister, that Opposition members were actually coming out during the evening in their numbers, seven or eight at a Committee; they were actually complaining out loud that there were too many of us here. Now, Mr. Speaker, how do you like that for performance? We were not there because we could vote, because only three of us had a vote anyway, but others came because they had an interest, they tried to get some answers.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that when the people who had their instructions to come and disrupt left, or got exhausted, or went to sleep, the process, for all its flaws as I have just mentioned, had some positive aspects and we got a few answers. The ministers I saw before the Resource Committee by and large - I will not qualify, not by and large, every minister who was before the Committee for the most part made a sincere effort to respond to questions and we got some answers through information. That is not meant to contradict my argument that the committee process should be brought back into the House, because you would obviously still get those answers. Here in the House you would get those answers. The difference would be that you would get them on the public record in the sense that the press would be reporting them, and you would get them without the harassment from a partisan Chair and a partisan group of people who

are sent to disrupt. The process would be much better served in the House than in Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I attended most of the Resource Estimates Committee hearings, and the message was reinforced again, just as it is every day in this House when you watch the fumbling, the lack of direction, the stonewalling, the message came through once again in Committee that what you have here, Mr. Speaker, is an administration that has stopped governing. It has given up on the job. It has stopped fighting Newfoundland's case in Ottawa. It has stopped making fair provision for education, so we see cutbacks at the University, we see higher tuition fees. We see people out there who have not got adequate educational facilities. They have stopped attending to the needs of education. They gave up long ago attending to the needs of health in this Province. If ever there was a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, it is what is being done to people in this Province who need an operation, who need surgery, who need admission -

MR. J. CARTER:

How come you have not been operated on to close your mouth?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Not only have I been operated on but what they took out of me sits over there as the member for St. John's North. That is the part I rejected.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

The word is that the gentleman for

St. John's North had an operation. He was in his riding, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We were doing fine. I would ask the hon. member to go back to his very serious side.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am going to be very relevant, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman was in his riding - a rare occurrence in itself - and somebody took a shot at him and in the process -

MR. J. CARTER:

I live in my riding.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- hit him in a particular place. He had a transplant and, after three days, it rejected him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an administration that has stopped governing, stopped looking after education, stopped fighting Newfoundland's case in Ottawa, has put the shaft to anybody who needs health services in this Province and, Mr. Speaker, if you need further examples, look at what it is doing to the labour movement in this Province, look at what it is doing to the conduct of public affairs in this Province. It has ostracized, it has set out to intimidate by arresting people. It is a government on the run, Mr. Speaker.

Did you realize, Mr. Speaker, that when the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mulroney, got his mandate of historic proportions in September, 1984, with 211 seats in the House of Commons, that his popular vote,

the approbation for him publicly was around 55 or 56 per cent? Do you know now, Mr. Speaker, that the man who leads this Province maintains now, as a result of his poll, that he is now more popular than Mr. Mulroney was in September, 1984? I say to them, if they are going to concoct a poll, at least make it sound sensible, at least make it sound realistic, at least come up with some figures -

MR. MATTHEWS:

It is realistic.

MR. TOBIN:

VOCM confirmed it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I am sure. Dream on! Mr. Speaker, not only was I glad to hear the figures in the poll, I hope they will keep repeating them and I hope they will believe them. I hope they will believe their own propaganda because, Mr. Speaker, not only is this a government that is on the run, a government that is desperate, a government that has lost direction, it is also an arrogant government. I hope it gets more arrogant. In partisan political terms I hope it gets so arrogant it does not understand any realities. It understands very few right now.

They are morally bankrupt. They are without any direction at all. The only governing they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is looking after their friends; a government of patronage, a government of \$150 an hour consultants.

MR. TOBIN:

His time is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

His time is not up, he is.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

The goons are here again.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is unparliamentary, you know that.

MR. SIMMONS:

I withdraw that. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is they just do not care anymore. They do not understand. They are insensitive to the thousands and tens of thousands of young people who are out there without jobs. They are high-handed, they are dictatorial in their approach to people. They have stopped governing.

MR. TULK:

The best example we have is what happened to the Port de Grave boats.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in another time, what a fuss there would have been about the arrest of that Port de Grave boat, Mr. Petten's boat, what a fuss it would have been. Instead, what do we have? The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) first was an apologist for Ottawa, until he realized that that was not going to work and then he tried to get on a bandwagon and say all of the right things. It is not enough to say the right things, Mr. Speaker, it is time to do the right things. It is time to say to Ottawa 'you cannot do this to law-abiding people'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has about a minute left.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I will clue up now. I have the understanding I will get a chance later in the debate. I have given my leave on that understanding, and I will have a chance later in the debate to respond to some of the insightful comments that I am sure the gentleman from that great fishing district of St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) will be making during the course of the debate.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

May I remind hon. members now that from now on each has ten minutes.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a member of that Committee, I was sort of getting the impression, Mr. Speaker, that I was not at the same meeting as my colleague for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Speaker, of that Committee indicates how well he co-operated with the Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I was present when he did see fit to refuse the request of the Chairman to sit in the Chair and to relieve him while he went to get a coffee. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said in his statements that my friend and colleague for Carbonear, the Chairman of that Committee, was permitting himself to be partial during these discussions. Mr.

Chairman, I do not know of any description of anything in these committees that could be more partial than when the Leader of the Opposition, who was sitting there in the Clerk's Chair, said he could not see the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who crossed in front of the Chair, Mr. Speaker, and threatened my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). If I have ever seen anything in this House that was partisan, it was when the Leader of the Opposition could not see the member for Fogo crossing the House in front of the Chair. He was sitting right there. The member for Fogo got up from his chair, crossed the House and threatened my colleague, Mr. Speaker, in that seat right there and yet the Leader of the Opposition, when asked to rule on it, said, 'I did not see the member for Fogo crossing the floor.'

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Fogo, on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

I have to correct the hon. gentleman, the member for Fogo did cross the House. The member for Fogo did not threaten the member for Bonavista South, in particular as it relates to beating his mouth in because how would you find a fist big enough to beat his mouth in anyway.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please! There is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. TOBIN:



Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is just an attempt by the member for Fogo to waste the ten minutes that I have been allocated. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, he can stand in this House as often as he wishes, he cannot clear the record. The news reporter was sitting down directly behind you when you threatened the member for Bonavista South.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible) your mouth, the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is I was not going to get involved in this -

MR. TULK:

No, I could see that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

MR. TOBIN:

- but if the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) wants to talk about impartially or partiality then, Mr. Speaker, he had better get the record straight. That was a blatant attempt, Mr. Speaker, by a Chairman to be very partial as it relates to what happened that night. I know what happened, Mr. Speaker, and the member for Fogo knows full well I know what happened on what he said to my colleague for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) talks about the government members complaining about so many people

from the Opposition showing up. Mr. Speaker, I was never present at a meeting where anyone complained about the Opposition showing up at these meetings. Mr. Speaker, we did complain on a couple of occasions about the fact that the Opposition would not ask pertinent questions.

When I came in this House to be a part of and a voting member of the Resource Policy Committee in this House, the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) was being questioned. I believe I asked him some very pertinent questions as it related to the Marystown Shipyard. My questions, Mr. Speaker, at that time, and Hansard will show, were very pertinent as it related to the operation of the shipyard, as it related to the lack of a federal government policy on boat building subsidies, Mr. Speaker, and as it related to the plans of the middle-distance trawlers. These were very pertinent questions, Mr. Speaker, information I was about to get out to the public. However, the member for Fortune - Hermitage stood on a point of order and asked the Chairman to deny me the right to ask these questions. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? He thought that I knew the answers.

Mr. Speaker, I thought that the purpose of these Committees was not to satisfy the knowledge of the member but to try to extract from the minister and to make public the operations, not only of the Marystown Shipyard but, indeed, the entire operations of government. By asking these questions, it was my intent to extract that type of information and get it out so as the people not only in Marystown and the Burin Peninsula but, indeed, the people of all of Newfoundland

would have the opportunity not only to see, Mr. Speaker, what this government has been doing for the Marystown Shipyard but, to see and hopefully acknowledge, as government does, the tremendous and significantly capable work force that the Marystown Shipyard has.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Premier again today made reference to his poll. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was shouting and screaming. The member for Fortune - Hermitage gets up in debate and he shouts and screams. The fact of the matter is, a few weeks ago or a month ago now, I guess, there was a poll conducted in this Province and the Leader of the Opposition had a 7 per cent credibility rating in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Table it.

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, table the poll! I can tell you what, the Leader of the Opposition will not only not table his poll, he will not even show it to the members opposite because it was such a disgusting and disgraceful showing as it related to the Leader of the Opposition, the man who, as the Premier indicated today, is far behind his party in public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the poll was conducted. It showed the Liberal party, I guess, in desperate shape and it showed the leader in even more desperate shape than the Liberal Party. Why are they talking about the polls? The Premier threw out figures on a Friday. The next day was a

provincial holiday in Newfoundland. People who are not usually home, Mr. Speaker, and do not usually get the opportunity to participate in open-line programmes were home and the question was thrown out by the moderator: Do you agree with the poll that only 7 per cent in this Province support the Leader of the Opposition, and that just about 64 per cent support the Premier of this Province? That was thrown out, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Woodford):  
Order, please!

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

MR. CALLAN:  
I was going to make reference to this in my ten minutes but I would rather waste his time than mine.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the member is intentionally misleading the House. He intentionally misled the public on a news media item last week when he said, regarding the remarks about being drunk in the Committee, that he did not start off at nine o'clock in the morning to get drunk for a meeting at 9:30. He was misleading the public because the meeting was not in the morning, it was at night. But the member, in his wisdom, decided, 'I will make the media and the people who watch the media believe that the meeting was held in the morning and therefore I could not be drunk that hour in the morning.'

Mr. Speaker, the member is again misleading the House. He is refusing, Mr. Speaker, to tell us that the open-line poll he is

talking about was set up by his party and the people who phoned in were Tories told to phone in a day or so before that poll was taken.

MR. BAIRD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Woodford):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), by his own admission, did say that he got up to waste the hon. member's time rather than waste his own. I suggest there is no point of order, just a spurious point of order to try to muzzle the member and prevent his having something concrete to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

One point more.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it was the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) who raised the whole issue of polls. I mean, I did not hear anybody on this side shouting about polls. If we want to concentrate back on the debate and on to why 80,000 Newfoundlanders are unemployed and why 100,000 Newfoundlanders are on unemployment insurance, if we want to deal with those meaty issues, Mr. Speaker, we are quite willing, in the words of John Diefenbaker, to 'leave the polls, like the hydrants, to the dogs.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order, just a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was a desperate attempt by the member for Bellevue, Mr. Speaker, to certainly demonstrate to this House how low a person can stoop. The fact of the matter is the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) got up in this House, has withdrawn his comments and has apologized to me outside. I believe the matter has been fully dealt with.

If the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) wants to stoop low and if he wants to get into personalities, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the member for Bellevue. It is low, too low to talk about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk in this debate, but I do not want to talk about silly nonsense. I

would like to talk about this Province and the number of unemployed we have and, of course, the need for this government to create some jobs, Mr. Speaker. You would expect members opposite, the parliamentary secretaries and Cabinet ministers and all members who are members of the government or the government party, would be talking about jobs and the efforts that they are making and have been making, some of them for fifteen years.

The man who is now the Premier of this Province has been a Cabinet minister for fifteen years. He became Premier in 1979, but he was part of the Moores Government, Mr. Speaker, long before that. What have we seen, Mr. Speaker? What have we seen from this government in the last fifteen years?

We saw a feasibility study and much money spent, even by this government, to help a private company down in the United States do a study on the feasibility of setting up an aluminum smelter in Labrador, and while this government was procrastinating, Mr. Speaker, and waiting and fumbling around in the dark, we saw that aluminum smelter being built in the Province of Quebec. The smelter should have been built in this Province, in Labrador, which not only, Mr. Speaker, would have meant jobs in Labrador in the aluminum smelter industry, but would also possibly have meant - well, not possibly, but probably, would have meant the development of the Lower Churchill. But no, Mr. Speaker, we saw it slip away to another Province.

We have another study ongoing at this moment, Mr. Speaker, a ninety-day study pertaining to the future of the Come By Chance

refinery and also the probability of a petro-chemical plant next door. Dor Chemicals of Israel, Mr. Speaker, have it just the opposite of what Joey Smallwood and the former Liberal Administration had before 1971. The hope and the wish and the plans of the previous Liberal government in this Province, Mr. Speaker, were first of all a refinery and then a petro-chemical plant to follow, a petro-chemical plant using the residual materials that come from an operating a refinery to be used in a petro-chemical plant. But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, it does not matter.

If Dor Chemicals of Israel or any other company can see fit, Mr. Speaker, to set up a petro-chemical plant and also see an operating refinery at Come By Chance, more power to them! But, Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling and I have a very, very unhappy feeling that what this ninety-day study is designed to do is to put to bed, forever and a day, any thoughts that the refinery will ever be reactivated; that it will, in the middle of the Summer when the Legislature is closed and people are scattered thither and yon in this Province, mean the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) or some junior minister will announce the project is not feasible. The Premier is not a bearer of bad news. He leaves that to one of his lackies or flunkies. He is never out front and center to tell us the bad news; he is only there to tell us the good news and to preach the gospel of bluff. Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that the opposite happens but I have a feeling in the middle of the Summer the Minister of Development will announce that the Dor Chemical

study has decided that a petro-chemical plant is not feasible, the reactivation of the refinery is not feasible and, therefore, the Greenspoons out of Toronto will start immediately to scrape the refinery. I have a funny feeling that is what is going to be the end product of that study.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this Legislature for ten years. The good people in the district of Bellevue have sent me back here four times. I have been here for ten years, Mr. Speaker, and what have I seen from this government, from the former Moores administration, a Tory government, and from the present Peckford administration? Fifteen years of Toryism, as a school teacher before I came here in 1975 and as a member of this Legislature in the ten years since, and what have I seen? What have the people in this Province seen? We have not seen anything in the way of new initiatives, Mr. Speaker. All we have seen is a housekeeping government and not even a good housekeeping government. We saw knee-jerk reactions to the possible closure of the pulp and paper industry in Corner Brook.

We have seen the fishery, Mr. Speaker, battered about from dog to devil and the fishery is in no better shape today than it was 450 years ago.

MR. DINN:

That does not say much for Joey's twenty-three years.

MR. CALLAN:

Whatever Joey accomplished in the twenty-three years has been torn down by people like the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) federally and the member for St.

John's North (Mr. J. Carter) provincially, all these anti-confederates and people who hate Joey with a passion. That is what has happened, Mr. Speaker. That is what we have seen in this province, Mr. Speaker. As my colleague from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) mentioned, we have a downgrading of health care in this province and we have a downgrading of the school system in this province. This administration is not even doing a half decent job of housekeeping while administering this Province.

Mr. Speaker, whatever glimmer of hope and promise there was that the Premier preached about since 1979, all our hope on the offshore oil, looks, Mr. Speaker, as though that is gone out the window as well. The Premier tells us now that probably the end of May or the first week in June a decision will be made. Mr. Speaker, there are things that should be ongoing regardless. We hear about the possible loss of the railway and a possible twinning of the Trans-Canada Highway. Mr. Speaker, where is the Secondary Roads Agreement? Where is that one? They are talking about getting an agreement from Ottawa to twin the Trans-Canada Highway when we cannot even get a Secondary Roads Agreement and they are supposed to be our friends in Ottawa, friends of this government, the people who are supposed to inflict prosperity on this Province. Mr. Speaker, where is the prosperity? What are the Tories in Ottawa waiting for? Why do they not inflict the prosperity on this Province that they talked about? Unemployment now, Mr. Speaker, in this Province is at an all time high.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I will get back to it.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there are a few points that should be made. I do not think it is necessary for the Opposition to get up and just hurl insults. I do not think that is productive of anything. I would like to try and keep my few remarks on a positive note.

When we studied civics in school we were told that there were three branches of government, the executive, the legislative and the judicial functions and that all government could be divided into those three divisions. I do not really think that is accurate because my experience has taught me that there is really a fourth arm and it is called part of the executive branch in political science but it is the civil service. I feel that the civil service is a fourth distinct division of government. One of the things in these committee hearings has been to allow civil servants to participate, however slightly. There has been a very small amount of participation by the civil servants.

The minister comes into these meetings and he brings whatever officials he wants, usually his Deputy Minister, his Assistant Deputy Minister and perhaps the

heads of various divisions. It depends upon the department under consideration. If the members ask reasonable questions that need some facts, usually the Deputy Ministers or the Assistant Deputy Ministers, the officials, supply these facts. It used to be that they used to pass these facts along to the minister who would then relay them to the Committee, but more and more, especially in the Committees in which I have had anything to do with, the officials have been heard directly. This has been allowed and there has been no real objection. In fact, it has been very useful.

I hope this development continues because it is going to mean that the upper echelons of the civil service will be accountable. I know the theory is that the minister is responsible for his department and for everything that goes on. The buck stops there. However, the real situation is that the minister can only say, 'I am acting on the advice of my officials. I have done this and I have done that and my officials are not accountable to this committee, I am accountable to it.' Well, that is true, in fact, but more and more the officials are participating in these committee hearings and in these debates and I think it is a good development. I hope it continues because I feel that the officials should be accountable for some of their decisions.

It is not enough to fluff it off on the minister and say, 'Oh, no, it is the minister who makes these decisions.' It is true that the minister has to take the responsibility for the final decision but the decisions are often tailor made for the minister. I would just like to

mention two or three specific projects to illustrate what I am trying to say.

The Harbour Arterial, which was a joint federal/provincial project, seemed to develop a life of its own. It was very hard for any member of this House or any member of the federal House to have much input or to criticize it effectively. I am not suggesting that there were not lots of naysayers but for those who wanted a productive and constructive input found it very hard to be heard. As a result of that, the final route of the Harbour Arterial is such that it has divided the land by the old CN Railway Station. That means that the land that should have been available for the synchrolift - a synchrolift is merely a device for raising boats - and if all that flat area there, which may become available if the main terminal of the railway station is moved further outside the city, then all that level, flat area could have been available for relatively small boats. They could have been brought up and parked there. It would rather like a glorified parking lot. There would be room, I suppose, for 100 vessels of modest size.

Meanwhile, that Harbour Arterial Road could have entered the city a few hundred yards West of where it comes in. I am not speaking from my personal observations but officials have told me that it is a pity that that piece of land was fooled up the way it was. We will live to regret it. The cost of changing it would be in many millions of dollars and probably prohibitively expensive.

Now, the same thing is happening on the Ring Road. Some changes

have been made with the eventual route of the Ring Road. It has been decided by officials and not by the minister. The minister merely says - and I understand his predicament - 'My officials, in their wisdom, have done all the research necessary and they have decided that this route is the best route.' Well, because of this, a number of secondary roads have been constructed to align with this route. I feel, myself, that these secondary roads that were constructed over the last couple of years are not in the best possible places. They are not really serving the needs for which they were designed and it is because of the unaccountability, if you like, of the officials of the Department of Highways.

Now, it is not that they are doing anything wrong. They are doing the best job that they can and the minister is doing the best job he can but this is almost a mega-project. It is something over \$100 million and, in my book, that classifies it as mega-project. It seems to have developed an unassailable life of its own and that is a direct result, I think, of the way we handle the estimates.

So I would suggest that we encourage civil servants to take a more active part in the Committee hearings. I would hope that in future there could be more Committee hearings held and that there would be a more positive attitude towards these Committee hearings. I think that the beneficiaries will be the general public.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Woodford):

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I am really at a loss to understand what the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is talking about because I chaired a meeting here one night and, according to our Standing Orders, there is really no problem, at the minister's discretion, to have his officials answer and have all the input in the world into these particular meetings. I think it was the Minister of Mines and Energy on that particular night and his officials were very helpful, as I am sure everybody on this side would agree, most officials from all of the departments are. I do not know why you stood and wandered in a kind of awkward circle on that kind of -

MR. J. CARTER:

I want more of it.

MR. FUREY:

You want more of it. Well, we have to understand that while officials are here and while they do have a significant input into the Estimates meetings, the accountability ultimately has to lie with the minister. I think he would agree with that.

Mr. Speaker, I have been doing some reading lately. I read a book just the other night called, *One-eyed Kings* by Ron Graham, that famous Canadian journalist, probably best known by most members for his articles in *Saturday Night*. It is interesting because government really is a reflection of the kind of leadership that is provided by the top man in control. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a prestidigitator in charge of this Province, boy do we ever have

one now!

AN HON. MEMBER:

A what?

MR. FUREY:

A prestidigitator.

MR. TULK:

Yes, you have that right.

MR. FUREY:

I have that right, have I?

Mr. Speaker, I isolated some of the comments Mr. Graham made about our current leader in this Province just so that I could share them with the Assembly. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the reflection of any government is truly a reflection of that person in charge of that government. I found in his book, when Mr. Clark was Prime Minister of this great country and he uttered forth the concept of selling Petro-Canada, amongst other things, there are an awful lot of Premiers in this country who were very upset and, in essence, rightly so. But look what Mr. Graham says about our Premier:

"The mean-spirited and greedy treatment of Joe Clark" - Conservative Prime Minister of Canada - "by Tory Premiers, particularly Peter Lougheed of Alberta and Brian Peckford of Newfoundland, was an important lesson" for Canadians watching this new government operate, the greedy treatment! So, Mr. Speaker, I do not use the word 'prestidigitator' loosely. It is applied to pianists in some sense, as the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) well knows. What it applies to is one with fast fingers. In another context it could be applied to the world of



magic, a magician. Boy, is there ever a magician here who goes forth to the people, waves his magic wand, creates incredible false enthusiasm, lets expectations get beyond any reasonable sense of control and, in a sense, takes a population and sucks it in the backdoor to relax for four years until they have to walk out the backdoor and perform his magic again.

What else did he say about this Premier, Mr. Speaker? He said this Premier, "Premier Brian Peckford of Newfoundland declared that he preferred René Lévesque's vision of Canada to Pierre Trudeau's" vision of Canada. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker? René Lévesque, that man who will go down in history as wanting to break this country up, to isolate it, fragment it, destroy it; Brian Peckford would subscribe to that vision of this nation! Ridiculous!

Mr. Speaker, what else did he say? It was interesting to note when Prime Minister Mulroney took office on September 4 and there shortly after, I think it was in November, Mr. Wilson ushered forth his first economic statement and subsequently has brought down two budgets, I believe. All of these budgets, Mr. Speaker, are tied into giving the private sector a chance, making the private sector the engine that drives the economy that creates jobs, that creates wealth, that make our citizens live with a sense of dignity. Well, do you know what Premier Brian Peckford said after these budgets, Mr. Speaker? He said two words. He called these budgets, 'Great stuff'.

MR. DECKER:

What budgets are you talking about?

MR. FUREY:

I am talking about Mr. Wilson's federal budgets when they first became the Tory government and, subsequently, the budgets as they continue their mandate to create jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs. Well, Brian Peckford called those budgets time and time again 'Great stuff'.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer you to this book One-eyed Kings and a quote from Mr. Peckford. He called these budgets 'Great stuff.' These budgets were based and premised on small business being the engine that drives the economy that creates jobs. Here is what Brian Peckford said and I quote: "Regional development cannot be left solely to the private sector." Now, can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand he is saying these private sector driven budgets are 'Great stuff,' and on the other hand he is saying "regional development cannot be left solely to the private sector." Which is it? Talking about a walking contradiction, a prestigiditator, fast fingers, a magician, a magus, there it is, taking flesh, full form, in the life of Brian Peckford.

Mr. Speaker, Premier Peckford went on and said, "The private sector is extremely weak in most disadvantaged regions. Often private-sector development, even in activities where the region has a comparative advantage, requires a programme of facilitative regional development activities by government. Because the private sector is so weak, the tax-based approach, or even the standard grant approach to industrial development, will not bring about any significant measure of regional economic development.

These approaches presuppose the existence of a strong, vibrant private sector."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not, unfortunately, have a strong vibrant private sector in Newfoundland. That is too bad, I wish we did. But I heard some of the hon. members across the way criticizing Mr. Smallwood for his twenty-three years as leader of this Province.

You can say what you like about Joe Smallwood. He went out and he tried to attract people to this Province. He started to build things, some of them worked, some of them did not. But what have we seen, Mr. Speaker, under the Moores/Peckford, Bobbsey Twin, fifteen years Tory government? Here is what we have seen: a dismantling of what was left, not a building up, a tearing down, a destroying of every single thing that Mr. Smallwood has done.

Mr. Speaker, we can look to modern history, only a number of weeks ago at the Estimates and see whether or not this is true. We have an opportunity in this Province for Mr. Smallwood to finish his encyclopaedias, to leave us something that, regardless of politics, all of our children, and their children's children can be proud of, an encyclopaedia which talks about our Province from the beginning to the present. Mr. Speaker, they turned it down time and time again, \$800,000 to finish what would be a monumental piece of history forever recorded for our Province, for our Province's children and their children.

Why did they turn it down? I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there are those on that side who have not forgiven Joe Smallwood for

bringing us by the toes and by the feet into the twentieth century and into Confederation to become part of Canada. If you believe what Brian Peckford said about this great country, that he prefers René Lévesque's vision to Pierre Trudeau's vision, you can understand why they turned Joe Smallwood down flat on that simple, honourable, dignified request.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing when we hear the other side talking about their so-called poll. We have 7 per cent, they have 60 per cent and the socialists have 30 per cent. What a pile of garbage, Mr. Speaker! What utter nonsense! The nation took our pulse, Mr. Speaker, and look what they found. Mr. Speaker, from coast to coast the nation took our pulse and they found a province in despair. Polls, boys! Polls, my rear end; get some real polls done because you are out of touch with reality. The grass roots are speaking loudly and clearly, Mr. Speaker. They do not like what they see; they do not like what they hear; they are frustrated by a government that is intransigent, by a government that is content to carry on business as usual.

Mr. Speaker, look at what the nation says about what is happening in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I am not proud of this. I do not think anybody on this side is proud of this. Who could be proud of seeing their Premier like this? He is my Premier too, and everybody on this side's Premier, the Premier for St. Barbe, I think. Let us transcend the political colours for a minute. When we see our Premier leaning on his fist, chin sunk into his knuckles, eyes bagged, black, he looks like a man who

does not know where to turn, and the nation is saying that our Province is in despair. I am not proud of that, but if ever there was a poll for this crowd over there to take notice of, this is it. The nation has taken our pulse and what they found has been despondency, despair, desperation, poverty, unemployment and a sick, sick economy.

What happened in that article, Mr. Speaker? Let us look at some of the things it said. "This time however this Premier has picked a fight not with outsiders but with Newfoundlanders themselves." You talk about it, Mr. Speaker, he picked a fight with Mr. Trudeau and blamed him for all our woes. When Mr. Trudeau stepped outside of it and asked Mr. Lalonde to conduct negotiations, he blamed Lalonde. When Mr. Lalonde stood aside and they asked good, conciliatory Jean Chrétien, the hon. the Minister for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) almost wanted to sign but was overruled in the dying eleventh hour by his Premier, much like the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), who was Minister of Fisheries and signed on the dotted line for restructuring was overruled by this Premier because this Premier is so politically partisan and blind in his dealings that people come second, politics come first.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FUREY:  
One minute to clue up?

This time, Mr. Speaker, instead of picking a fight with Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Lalonde, even his Tory

Premier friend in Nova Scotia, he chose to fight from within. Mr. Speaker, the enemy is within, it is called Brian Peckford.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words in this Concurrence Debate. Listening to the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), I do not think he yet realizes that World War II is over.

I attended a number of the Committee hearings. I know I was at the one on Development, RAND, Mines and Energy, Housing but, unfortunately, I never got a chance to get to the one on Fisheries except for the last hour. However, Mr. Speaker, I must say that with the exception of one hon. member opposite, I will not name him because I believe that that hon. gentleman knows who I am referring to - I will not say whether he is sitting over there now or back in the Common Room - but with the one exception of one particular member on that side, as far as I, as far as any media, as far as the minister and the staff who had their estimates before them were concerned, with the exception of one hon. member on the opposite side, I do not think there was one intelligent question asked to the ministers. I say that in all fairness to the hon. fifteen colleagues on the other side who attended some of these meetings. I must say that one gentleman over

there did ask some genuine, serious questions to the administration, not only concerning his particular district but concerning all other districts in Newfoundland.

As far as I am concerned, this hon. gentleman is really concerned about what happens to Newfoundland and Labrador. I would not be one bit surprised if, in a very short number of months, we may see that hon. gentleman moving his seat. That hon. gentleman, I think, has shown indications during the past year or so that he is very unhappy, very discontented, very disillusioned with the Leader of the Party. He knows he cannot get anywhere under the present leader. In fact, Mr. Speaker, he is quite noticeable on many occasions because of his absence from the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), who just finished, does not really understand, cannot really understand and has no idea of what is going on in the House of Assembly. The guy barely made it in here with eighty or ninety votes. He is only just here until the Premier calls the next election and he is gone again.

I would strongly suggest to the members opposite, those Estimate Committees are very, very important. Here is a chance for members, such as the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), to ask some good questions. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) could ask some good questions but, unfortunately, I do not think the member for Fogo has asked very many sensible questions in the Estimates Committees this year.

Mr. Speaker, I think in the Department of Fisheries there is a budget of \$26 million and the hon. gentlemen can spend most of the time of the Fisheries Estimates Committee on spurious points of order that are not getting them anywhere. As I said, the only time that the minister was really asked some serious questions was when the hon. member - I will not say where from - made a comment in the closing remarks to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) saying what a good job he was doing.

So I would suggest strongly to the hon. members that there are two ways to find out what a member needs to find out. That is, number one, to approach the ministers or the administration in a way that shows you are interested in your district. The only thing the hon. members opposite are interested in now is maybe one day forming the government. But I think the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) knows, he knows and I know, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) knows, that they have a long wait. There is a long, long road before they will achieve that goal.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, before he concluded, talked about the poll that was done. He said there was no poll done. I should tell the hon. members of the House there was a poll done and the poll does show that Fogo Island is in trouble. The poll does show that Bonavista North is not as good as the member for Bonavista North thought it was. The poll does show that the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), if he keeps doing his work, if he keeps plodding along, there may be a close contest. But, the member

for Bonavista North is not saved yet. He may be saved by the bell but he is not saved by the bell yet.

MR. TULK:

He could always cross over.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is a good scenario the hon. gentleman used because I believe the hon. gentleman was quite influential in getting the Leader of the Opposition across the House. I might say also, he was quite influential in getting me to leave that side too.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I deserve credit for both of those things.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I must say I have to give the hon. gentleman credit for that because a particular phone call on the night before February 8 from the hon. gentleman has given me the assurance that I was quite pleased with the move that I made. With that, I will not say anything further on that, I do not think.

However, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK:

No, you should not either.

MR. WARREN:

No, I would not say, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it would be appropriate for me to reveal the conversation that took place.

MR. TULK:

And it would not be for me because

I would have to tell what you were worth. We were only offering what you were worth.

MR. WARREN:

You see, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman did admit - I did not say it - that I was offered something.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely right. We offered him what we thought he was worth, he wanted what he thought he was worth and there was a large difference in that amount.

MR. SPEAKER:

I must rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if I could add up what the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) offered me, what the hon. Mr. Tobin offered me and the amount of money that Mr. Rompkey offered me, I would say there would be a substantial amount of money that I could have accepted, if I had stayed. However, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. gentleman opposite does not want to know the total number of dollars that I have been offered because that would be more interesting.

MR. TULK:

Oh my, oh my, I did not think

Rompkey was that silly.

MR. WARREN:

A substantial amount! A substantial amount!

MR. PEACH:

(Inaudible) what he is worth and sell him for what he thinks he is worth.

MR. WARREN:

I must say to the hon. the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), if I could buy the hon. gentleman for Fogo for what he is worth, it would be \$1.98, and you would have to sell him for about \$10,000. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

We are thoroughly enjoying his brilliant wit but otherwise, without wanting to rob the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) of this moment, I believe it is beneath the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to say what he said just now about Mr. Rompkey and Mr. Tobin, neither of whom are in this House. I do not know first hand but, I do not think for a second, I say to him, that either of those men offered him any money at all. On the other hand, on the off chance that I am wrong, I ask him to make the statement he made in that respect outside the House to give Mr. Rompkey and Mr. Tobin, who are not here to defend themselves, the proper opportunity to defend themselves or else he should really get off that kick and get

on with the subject at hand.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to advise the hon. the member from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) that if he wants to find out the facts, why does he not ask Mr. Tobin or Mr. Rompkey? Mr. Speaker, if he wishes to find out the facts, that is what he can do. I am sure, if Mr. Rompkey and Mr. Tobin are honest, they will give him the facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the past two or three weeks I have had the opportunity to visit several areas in the Province. To go back to the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) talking about the poll, I will just tell the House about some areas that I have visited over the past several months on behalf of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Aylward).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN:

I would appreciate leave, Mr. Speaker. I can clue up in five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Leave is not granted.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I know I am new to politics but I find it cheapening when you hear all those weird things, whether it comes from our side or whatever side, about money being offered under the table and all this nonsense. Nobody ever offered me any money and they probably had reasons why. They probably knew I would not take it anyway.

MR. TULK:  
As a matter of fact, it probably cost you money to get here.

MR. FUREY:  
It did. It cost me a lot of money to get here.

It does not do much for the image of politicians, Mr. Speaker, when that kind of stuff goes on in this House. If you can assume the hon. gentleman is stating the facts correctly, we can only assume that we did not offer him enough money and that does not do much for the role of a politician.

Mr. Speaker, I will speak about the Committees. When the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) got up a little while back and gave his speech, he was talking about the role of the civil servant, about the importance of the civil servant and how those committees, among

other things, gave the people of this Province an opportunity to ask questions of the civil service. Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's North is pointing to a fact of life that exists in this Province today and it was seen clearly in the Committee meetings. Because, by and large, the ministers were totally dependent on the deputy ministers and other civil servants in the departments. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is by no means a compliment to the ministers at all. It is not meant to be a compliment. I do not know what the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) was getting at, but he was pointing out the importance of being able to question the civil servants, which is what has become of government in this Province and which it should not have become. Because it showed to me ministers who were totally bankrupt of ideas, totally without knowledge as to what was going on in their own departments, Mr. Speaker. Under our system, it is the minister who is responsible, it is the minister who has to give direction, it is the minister who has to have vision, it is the minister who has to give leadership. The member for St. John's North alluded to it. It was sickening and disgusting, as I am sure the people of Newfoundland would agree with me today, had they been able to see what was happening in those committees, they could see what is, in fact, happening in the departments of government today. We have ministers who have switched around the whole process of government. Now it is the civil servants who are staking out the directions in which this Province should be going, Mr. Speaker, and that is a very sorry condemnation of government in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say in fairness that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) was a little better than the average minister when it came to answering questions that were directed at him by the members of the Opposition. He was not totally, 100 per cent in control of his department, Mr. Speaker, nor was he 50 per cent in control of his department, nor was he 30 per cent, but I would say he was somewhere in the vicinity of 7 per cent to 10 per cent in control of his department, which is 7 per cent to 10 per cent times greater than that of the average minister in this administration today. I understand that one of the ministers who sits in the front row came in without his officials and he got himself so tangled up that he practically made a fool of himself. But I am only got that second-hand. I did not attend that particular Committee meeting, so I can only quote what I have heard. I have heard that he made a total fool of himself. He could not answer any of the questions, Mr. Speaker, and this shows all the more what is happening in this Province today. There is a lack of vision.

Now, the people out there, when they decide to elect members, when they decide to change a government or what have you, they are not voting for the civil service, they are voting for men who potentially can get out there and stake out a direction that this Province, and ultimately, this nation should be going in. What have we seen, by the member for St. John's North's admission? We are being led by civil servants.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

It is a well-established practice in this House that when a member hears information that he believes not to be correct, it is not only his right but it is his duty to get up and set the record straight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing from the member opposite is quite, quite wrong. There never was any suggestion that the ministers are not responsible and not willing to shoulder the responsibility for their own departments. The point I tried to make - and it is a serious point, I am not trying to play politics with it - is that because government is so complex, therefore, one person cannot necessarily be on top of it all, although he must take ultimate responsibility for it. That does not mean to say that he can possibly have all the facts and figures at his fingertips. He relies upon his officials.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, he is using up my time.

MR. J. CARTER:

No, I am not wasting the time of the House. Mr. Speaker can be the judge of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:

This is a very important point. I tried to make a serious point when I got up and spoke for my allotted ten minutes, and I will perhaps



have a chance again, but I do not intend to keep my seat when I hear misinformation coming from the hon. member, I think it is only right to set the record straight or try to.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, on the off chance that I misunderstood what the member for St. John's North said, I will state categorically myself that I believe - I thought the gentleman for St. John's North did - that I personally believe that one of the problems with our Province today is that the ministers are acting like civil servants. They are reacting to events instead of causing events. They have abrogated responsibility for running government and they have given it to the civil servants. That is one of the major problems which the member alluded to. In his thickness of brain he is unable to put it in words for fear that one of these ministers might just be a Tory. He cannot rise above politics. I would not care if they were Liberal ministers, or if they were Tory ministers or if they were Socialist ministers, that is not the point. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that ministers of the Crown are given the position to stake out a path, to have some vision as to the direction that this Province should be going in. That duty and responsibility has been abrogated to the civil servants, and it is a sorry day for this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) spoke about Joey Smallwood. Over the past number of years there has been a lot of propaganda put out by members opposite to discredit the name of the only Premier - history, I am sure, will say that Joey Smallwood was our greatest Premier to this date. Now it is time for someone to get up and stop listening to the propaganda that has been circulated right from the days of Frank Moores, to the extent, Mr. Speaker, that old, established Liberals in this Province have almost been ashamed to admit that Joey Smallwood was one of us. Well, I think it is time for us, on this side, to realize that Smallwood was indeed a man of vision. When Joey Smallwood was there the member for St. John's North did not have to get up and say, 'Oh, the civil service is running this Province'. Ah, no! When Mr. Smallwood was there, Mr. Speaker, the civil servants did not have to run this Province.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

At no point did I say or suggest that the civil servants are running this Province. What I did try to say, and I guess I did not say it successfully because I did not penetrate the hon. gentleman's head, was that the civil servants must be more accountable, and one way of making them more accountable is to let them participate in these Committee hearings. I think it makes good sense.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order. The hon. member has explained his point of view. I would like to call the hon. member's attention to the fact that his time has now elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to speak after my friend from Tornгат Mountains (Mr. Warren) made his few remarks. I must say we were all sitting on the edge of our seats while he was speaking, wondering who it was he was referring to. At one point I was conceited enough to think maybe he was talking about me, but then he said a few things that sort of cooled me off.

There has been some talk here in this debate about the Committees and whether or not they are working properly. I am not too impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the Committees.

MR. J. CARTER:

What do you suggest in their place?

MR. W. CARTER:

When we take over the government we will have a system that will work, I think.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Do not hold your breath.

MR. W. CARTER:

My friend from Pleasantville, and

with respect to what the gentleman said from the Strait of Belle Isle, I have one criticism of his performance in Committee in that he refused to allow his officials to enter the Chamber with him.

MR. DINN:

I did not need them.

MR. W. CARTER:

Maybe so, but I think the Committee would have preferred to have had the officials, say, of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation at least somewhere where you could eyeball them and ask questions and they could answer, of course, through the minister, as is the custom. But I would have felt much more comfortable and maybe convinced of some of the answers had the officials been there.

It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that we had to waste so much time talking about fictitious polls that have been conducted, when you realize that we have today about 80,000 people in this Province looking for work. We have students trying to get Summer employment, some of whom have succeeded in getting jobs off the Island, but because there is no programme in place and obviously no such programmes forthcoming, a lot of these students have had to forego the opportunity to accept jobs on the Mainland to earn a few dollars for the Summer.

In the Resource Committee on Fisheries the minister appeared and, of course, his officials. I had some comments to make relative to the Fisheries Loan Board and I think, Mr. Speaker, they are important enough to bear repeating. I have some reservations about the operation of the Fisheries Loan Board. I

realize the complexities of running the Loan Board; you are dealing in millions of dollars with probably thousands of fishermen around the Island. I am not convinced yet, Mr. Speaker, despite the minister's efforts, that we are getting maximum benefit from the Fisheries Loan Board. I have the distinct impression that the Board has become a bit too bureaucratic. They appear to be too inflexible in certain cases, bureaucratic, and that is putting it mildly. I think sometimes they are inclined to drag their heels and maybe take too much time arriving at decisions when those decisions affect the livelihood and maybe future prospects of a fisherman. I have cases in my own riding where fishermen were desperately anxious to get a decision rendered by the Loan Board, for example, maybe a loan to buy a boat or a chance to lease a boat, a vessel to go fishing in. The Loan Board, certainly from where I sit, appear to see no great sense of urgency. They are inclined to sort of wait until the Board meets and they are prepared to just sit around sometimes and twiddle their thumbs, while some poor fishermen sees his chances of earning a decent living this Summer rapidly fading away. So I suggested to the minister then, and I have suggested to his officials, that maybe they should cut out some of the nonsense and red tape and get on with the business for which they were appointed.

I am hoping, within the next few days, to be able to elaborate on this, but I have my suspicions, Mr. Speaker, that in some cases there has been a little too much political influence on the Board itself. And we can understand the minister of that department.

Sometimes he is inclined, maybe, to favour his own constituents or people of a certain political stripe, but when that is being done at the expense of fishermen whose only chance and whose only hope is to be able to do certain things and to get assistance from the Board, then I find it difficult to accept.

The hon. member is laughing. Maybe he will have a chance, when I sit down, to stand in his place and to tell us what the joke is. I do not see too much to laugh about, Mr. Speaker, when fishermen are denied an opportunity to get from their government the assistance that is necessary to enable them to go fishing. Mr. Speaker, while we are on the subject of the fishery we all know, of course, what happened last week with respect to the Port de Grave fishermen. We know that these people were harassed by the federal government, by the Fisheries and Oceans patrol vessels. On the basis of what we have been told, I think it is quite obvious that a lot of the harassment was unnecessary and uncalled for. Mr. Speaker, the fisheries in this Province and the fish stocks on our Continental Shelf were allowed to be plundered and ravaged and destroyed, while the federal government sat on its hands, twiddled its thumbs.

MR. J. CARTER:

It was the Liberals.

MR. CALLAN:

It does not matter, Mr. Speaker, in my view whether it is a Liberal or a Tory government in Ottawa, I am saying that Ottawa, the federal bureaucrats and politicians - and it is no different now - sat back and for their own reasons, and I have a idea what they were,

allowed foreigners to ravage our fishery, elected to turn a blind eye to what was going on to the point where the fishery was almost destroyed before they were willing to take any kind of action to arrest what was going on. Now, that our fishermen are forced by virtue of that fact to go beyond the limits, maybe, that they should be going in the size boats they are fishing in, searching out fish to enable them to make a living, you find these same federal authorities right there ready to pounce on them.

I think it is serious, yes, and ironic, too, Mr. Speaker, that that should be happening. It is no fault of the fishermen from Port de Grave or Twillingate or Bonavista as to what has happened to the fish stocks. They did not contribute to, they did not cause the crisis that we are now facing in the fishery, and the fact that the stocks were allowed to be depleted almost to the point where it became, in many areas, uneconomic to go fishing, or to gear up for the fishery. It is not their fault. I am sure that the fishermen from Port de Grave, last week, did not get any great charge out of getting aboard a 65 foot boat and heading 200 miles out to sea miles in April month. It takes a lot of courage. I think those men would have much preferred being able to go off twenty-five or thirty miles and fish in relative safety. Instead, through circumstances over which they have no control whatever and certainly had no hand in bringing about, these men were forced, by virtue of the fact that the stocks had been allowed to be depleted over the years because of a government that was unwilling to act when it should have - I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to

accept what has been happening to them - to go out 200 miles to fish.

Then when you realize that the West Germans last year - this has been said before but I think it bears repeating - were caught overfishing to an extent, I believe, of 11,500 metric tons. That is what they were caught overfishing. Lord only know how much they got away with, and other foreign nationals. But they were caught overfishing to the tune of 11,000 metric tons, enough to keep the Newfoundland longliners that are capable of fishing in that area going, I suppose, for - what? - four or five years. That is what they tell us, that 2,000 tons of fish a year would be ample to keep them fully supplied. Around 11,000 would be enough to keep them going, at that rate, for probably five and a half years.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I think I should take the opportunity to respond to some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman for Twillingate. Most of them, I think, I responded to in Committee. For the benefit of the hon. the gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle, I answered all my own questions in Committee. I do not think my officials answered either one. I would say that is the case with practically every minister here, except for technical questions on

statistics or something of that nature.

I want to make a couple of comments on the hon. gentleman's response to the loan board. He raised questions on the loan board in Committee which I responded to at that time. But since he has raised it in the House, I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot believe there is any organization in government today that is more sensitive to the need to move quickly on requests than is the loan board on requests from fishermen.

I have kept a fairly close eye on that board in the year I have been in the department and that board responds, Mr. Speaker, and has the capability of responding in emergency situations by telephone hook-ups with board members to be able to get approvals through in a matter of hours. So if the hon. gentleman might have a bee in his bonnet about an odd case or two, I do not know. If he does, he could give me the information and I will have it checked out. But 99.9 per cent of the time, that board can not be faulted with the degree of urgency, particularly during the fishing season. It is not so urgent during the off-season, you can do things in a normal manner. But particularly during the fishing season, if a fisherman loses an engine or something of that nature and has to have it replaced quickly, that board, Mr. Speaker, has the capability of responding and does, in fact, respond within hours, assuming all things are equal - if the fisherman has a reasonable record with the board and so on - responds within hours to the urgency of the situation. And that can be documented, Mr. Speaker, time after time after

time.

Now, the one comment made by the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that really caught my attention, was his alleged innuendo of political interference with the board. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is one hon. gentleman in this House who ought to know about political interference with the Fisheries Loan Board, it is the hon. gentleman who made the comment. Let me tell him, Mr. Speaker, that the Loan Board was thoroughly reorganized after he left the department, and while a minister may enquire, or a minister may ask for some detail, or a minister may do a number of things, the minister no longer has the authority to direct, and rightly so, the board. After all of their investigations, all of everything is looked at, the minister has no longer the authority to direct the board, 'You do it anyway.' I do not want that kind of authority, Mr. Speaker. I want the authority to be able to reasonably intercede and intervene and discuss, but I have not tried on behalf of my constituents or anybody else, for that matter, to use political interference on the Fisheries Loan Board. That day, I can say to the hon. gentleman, is gone. I hope it is gone forever. That does not mean to say that politicians should not approach the Fisheries Loan Board, it does not mean to say the minister should not approach the Fisheries Loan Board, but I hope the day is gone forever when all you had to do to get a fifty-five foot longliner in this Province was walk in with a pair of goat rubbers on, because that was basically the qualification.

MR. DECKER:

What is wrong with goat rubbers?

MR. RIDEOUT:

The gentleman should know, coming from our part of Newfoundland, what goat rubbers are.

MR. DECKER:

I asked what was wrong with them?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Nothing wrong with them, nothing! They are excellent. I use them myself when I am fishing. But there should have been more qualifications required, Mr. Speaker, and there are now. You have to be getting 75 per cent of your income from the fishery for the last two years, you have to be a bona fide fishermen, have a history in the fishery with a reasonable chance of being able to make a go of it in the mode of operation for which you are looking for financing. All those factors are now taken into consideration as opposed to political interference. And it was the hon. gentleman who made the comment. I did not make it, I am reacting to it. And I can tell him, in the twelve months that I have been in this department, there has been no political interference. There have been political requests for information and all that kind of thing but not a direct order, because you do not have the authority anymore anyway, and I do not think you should, to order the board to do something based on politics only. And that is the way it is going to stay while I am there. Other people can make their own decisions if and when they inherit the department, but while I am there, that is the way it is going to stay. There is going to be no direct order from the minister to the Chairman of the Loan Board saying, you do this because I want it done, and to heck with what your investigation shows about the

possibility or the credit-worthiness or anything else of that individual.

The hon. gentleman also made some further comments on the foreign fishing effort in and around our shores, Mr. Speaker. For a former minister, you know, he kind of mixes it all into one bag when he knows it is separate. The fact of the matter is, he was talking about allocations for the sixty-five feet and under in the area where they were fishing, in 3N0, and equates that with overfishing by the West German fleet last year, which we all decried. The overfishing took place, Mr. Speaker, in another zone altogether, in Zone 3L, from a separate stock.

MR. W. CARTER:

Is it not the same fish, though?

MR. RIDEOUT:

No. The 2J3KL fish is a separate stock altogether from the Gulf stock, which is the 3N0 region.

MR. W. CARTER:

They know where the line is, do they?

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, it is a different stock. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I am sure his officials tried to educate him to it: There are basically three fish stocks. There is the 2J3KL stock, then there is the other stock along the South Coast of Newfoundland, and then there is another stock altogether in the Gulf region. They are separate. The biologists have proven for years that they are separate stocks so you cannot throw it all into the bag and make that kind of a silly statement and expect to have any credibility. We are just as concerned and just

as upset about overfishing anywhere but do not say that the reason why you have a problem in 3NO is because there was a problem in 2J3KL.

MR. W. CARTER:

There is only a line that separates them.

MR. RIDEOUT:

They are hundreds and hundreds of miles apart. The hon gentleman knows that. They are two different regions altogether, two different stocks. I do not know when he is going to get it through his head that they are totally different stocks. They are not even cousins, Mr. Speaker, so that does not justify anything.

The hon. gentleman equates other things in his argument today about the foreigners. We have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that as of next year, when the LTA runs out, there will be no foreign effort in 2J3KL at all, none. The Spanish allocation has been repatriated to Canada. That was done earlier this year by the federal government. The Portuguese allocation has been repatriated to Canada just a few days ago and that was done by the federal government. The only outstanding foreign fishing effort now in 2J3KL, which is Northern Cod, is what still accrues under the LTA to the European Economic Community and that runs out next year. As of next year, there will be absolutely no foreign effort whatsoever inside 200 miles in the zone 2J3KL, none. Now, there is some foreign effort for under utilized species like silver hake and grenadier and things of that nature. That is fine, if we can do deals that way but there will be absolutely no foreign effort in the 2J3KL Northern Cod region at

all when the LTA runs out next year. You cannot make those kind of statements, Mr. Speaker, when they are not true.

I wish we had the same luxury in 3NO because what is happening there is they are staying just outside of 200 miles anyway, with the odd excursion in, which we see the results of down at the wharf again today.

MR. TULK:

Would the minister permit a reasonable question?

MR. RIDEOUT:

From a reasonable gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to permit a question anytime.

MR. TULK:

Could the minister tell us why they are called under utilized species or surplus stock? I have never been able to understand that stuff at all, to be quite frank.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The only reason why they are called under utilized is that the Canadian harvesting sector is not, for whatever reasons, interested in harvesting the amount of quotas that are available in the silver hake, as an example, but the Russians are interested in silver hake.

MR. TULK:

Is there any hope for change in that thing?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, I think the hon. gentleman understands that the traditional species like cod, flounder, flat fish, halibut and so on, our companies have been traditionally interested in that and have done well. I think they should be changing. There should be no such

thing as a surplus species and there should be no such thing as an under utilized species. If there is a market in the Soviet Union for silver hake, then let us harvest the silver hake and sell it to the Soviets if they want it.

MR. TULK:

It does not make sense.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Dog fish is another example.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I was about to clue up but that is basically the situation. There will be no foreign effort in 2J3KL at all as of next year.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I was reflecting, while sitting down listening to the hon. minister speaking, about the remark that my friend for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) made to remind me of what we saw in the committees and how the ministers are not really running the departments. It is the civil service that are running the departments and it is reflected in what is happening to the Province.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) makes a good point when he says, 'Well, that does not apply to me. I am running my department. I do not depend on my

civil servants or my officials to tell me what to do in Committee.' Maybe there has been a drastic change in the Department of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, because I had the privilege not too long ago of sitting at a Committee meeting where a former Minister of Fisheries sat. That minister was accused - Hansard will show this, Mr. Speaker - of not reading or answering his own correspondence. The lady who was giving evidence before that Committee on Privileges and Elections said quite clearly that letters were coming in, they were read, they were being answered by the deputy minister or what have you and sometimes the minister would be asked to sign the letter. Now that is the kind of thing that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) was talking about when he reminded me that there is a lack of leadership, there is a lack of direction and there is a lack of vision in this Province today.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The hon. gentleman is wittingly or unwittingly, I prefer to think it is unwittingly, twisting my words. I merely said, and I still maintain that it is an important developing function of these committees that upper echelon civil servants be heard and be allowed to contribute to the estimates debates. I think that this increases their accountability and it is a good and positive development but that does not mean for one moment to



suggest that the ministers are any less responsible, any less accountable or any less aware or energetic in the handling of their affairs. I refuse to accept the hon. gentleman's version of my words being put back in my mouth. It is just as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

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

MR. DECKER:

The hon. member cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. Either the civil servants are accountable to the minister or else they are accountable to the committee or accountable to the people. He might not have said this but he certainly reminded me of this. I attended the same meetings that the hon. member attended and I could see very clearly that it is the civil servants in this Province who are calling the shots today. It is the civil servants who are giving what bit of leadership we do have and that is not fair to the civil servants of this Province. It is certainly not fair to the people of this Province who elect a government to give direction, who elect a government to give leadership and who elect a government to have some vision, Mr. Speaker. This is what we had with Joey Smallwood. We had some vision.

MR. J. CARTER:

What vision?

MR. DECKER:

We had some leadership.

If the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) wants

to get up on a point of order, he can do it but I know how much he was against the former Premier of this Province, Joey Smallwood, and how he would not let him get up in this House and have his last speech televised. He would not allow the cameras in this House. Let us rise above politics and let us rise above petty dislikes or likes, the fact of the matter is that we once had a Premier who led. Everyone did not agree with the direction that he was leading in but no one could get up, the Chairman of no committee could get up, like the member for St. John's North, and say that the civil service was running this Province when Joey Smallwood was Premier. No one could get up and say that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I realize that the gentleman is probably trying to make rhetorical points but I did not say and I do not say and I will not say that the civil servants are running this Province. What I did say and what I say again is that the development that we saw in our committees was that civil servants were participating to some extent in the debate and that this would increase their accountability and I think that is a good thing. I still say that I think it is a good thing.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

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

MR. DECKER:

Maybe he is trying to wiggle out of what he said, Mr. Speaker, but he could well have said it because he would have been stating a truer truth than was ever stated before in this House by any other member. The fact is whether he said it or not he could have said it and that explains, Mr. Speaker, if the civil service are indeed running this Province - and I am saying that they are - that explains why you can have a half a minister because if the ministers in these department were running their departments, you would not have any room for a half minister. It would be ministers and a half that we would need, Mr. Speaker. So when the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) talks about civil servants running this Province, he is absolutely right. So he could have said it, whether he did or not, Mr. Speaker.

Let me give another illustration of what happened in one of those Committee meetings. The member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) gets up and he says, 'When I first came into politics some years ago, twenty-odd years ago, I was out to change the world'. That was what he said. Now, Mr. Speaker, he was sort of casting a slur on us young buckoes over here, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), those of us who are indeed out to change the world.

Mr. Speaker, when an hon. member or an hon. minister reaches the stage where he is no longer out to change the world, no matter how naive that might sound, he has reached his level of

incompetency. What is it they call it in the civil service?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Peter principle.

MR. DECKER:

It is the Peter principle. When he reaches the stage that he is no longer out to change the world, he becomes a civil servant, Mr. Speaker, and instead of leading he follows, instead of taking action he reacts to action.

As the hon. member for St. John's North could have said, the problem today is that the civil servants are indeed running this Province. What we need now is an infusion of new blood, Mr. Speaker. I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

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