



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 5

---

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

***Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas***

Thursday

5 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, before getting into Statements by Ministers -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- I just heard this morning that VOCM received a national award - I think the award ceremony was held in Edmonton - for a winning documentary entitled Waiting For Hibernia. The award was presented to VOCM News Director, Gerry Phelan, in Calgary, Alberta, last night by the Canadian Petroleum Association. I thought it might be appropriate for us to go on record in this House as congratulating one of the oldest radio station establishments in the Province for its continued journalistic excellence and to compliment and congratulate them on behalf of the House. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to join me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear of the national award having been given to VOCM, because in the media as in any other field of endeavour that is what it is all about, showing excellence in your field. Newfoundlanders have regularly shown that they can

compete with the best across Canada and indeed throughout the world. They have excelled in many areas, in many walks of life, and I am delighted to see that, in terms of this media presentation, they have been recognized as having done an excellent job.

I have to say they probably got the award for the appropriateness of the title of their documentary, because there are a lot of people waiting for Hibernia, anxiously waiting, I might add, and they have been waiting a long time.

#### Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to address a matter and I do not have a prepared statement and therefore, I do not have copies for the Leader of the official Opposition and to the Leader of the N.D.P. Party. But I wish to make a statement on behalf of government arising out of a question asked in the House yesterday, which I think as Premier I should address now, quickly and at the first opportunity.

The member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) yesterday raised some questions to the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) as to whether the Minister of Development and Tourism was aware of a certain potential or actual conflict of interest which might exist in his department through some of the employees who work for him and

come under the guidelines for employees who have to report if they are doing any business outside of government which might conflict with what they are doing in their job with government.

The Minister of Development and Tourism has come to me - he did a review overnight - and while we do not have all of the information at our disposal now, a number of incidents have come to light where employees have technically, perhaps, lived up to the guidelines - perhaps technically. And I am trying to choose my words carefully because I have not had time to prepare a statement.

In looking at it this morning, both myself and Cabinet - and this is the first time that it has really come to my attention this way - in going through the guidelines as quickly as we could this morning, we have the following problem here which is a very difficult one to deal with, and I am going to suggest what government intends to do about it. We have however many, say twenty deputy ministers or deputy minister status people in the departments as well as in the Crown Corporations and agencies, and the deputy minister is the head of the department. Under the conflict of interest guidelines, after the deputy minister decides after he or she has been informed by an employee of what the employee is doing outside of government, that deputy minister can, of his or her own volition, decide whether in fact the conflict of interest situation exists or not based upon the spirit and letter of the regulations. So you can have a situation - and this is the first time it really has arisen - a set circumstances in one department,

say, just for example, the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, where an individual employee has a set of circumstances where the employee is doing something other than his or her job - has a company or whatever - and the set of circumstances are A, B and C, and the Deputy Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth rules on it, as he has the power to do now under the legislation or regulations; but you can then have in the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies a completely identical situation with another employee in Career Development and Advanced Studies, reporting like the employee has to that he or she is doing this work outside of government and have a company, and the Deputy Minister of Career Development Advanced Studies might rule one way on that circumstance and the Deputy Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth would rule another way. So you could have a whole multiplicity of standards applying across the system as it relates to that. That can pose a big problem. In light of the information that the minister now has of a couple of incidents in the Department of Development and Tourism, which are difficult to adjudicate on and which could be different from department to department when they come up, we have decided in the case of ministers it is the Premier who decides; at least there is only one, not twenty premiers - we need to amend the regulations. We will amend them to apply not only to public employees but also to the ministers and myself. We will establish a totally independent tribunal which will take these cases; then there is only one tribunal and its precedents then will govern them as they go along

to arbitrate or decide upon these matters. It is very, very difficult for a deputy minister or deputy ministers to do it, or for the government to try to do it, because there are a lot of gray areas there. So we are going to, in the next few days - we will, of course, inform the House - establish an independent tribunal to adjudicate on these cases and the deputy ministers will be relieved of that responsibility. Now the conflict of interest guidelines read that anybody who does something has the obligation to report it to the deputy minister, and that will still be in place. That report comes in, 'Mr. Deputy Minister: I am an employee of your department, I have set up a company to do A, B and C, and I want to inform you, as I have to and as I am obligated to do under the regulations, and I am now informing you, that I think I am not going to be in a conflict of interest.' Then the Deputy Minister writes back yes, you are or no, you are not. So we are going to take that out of the hands of the deputy ministers and set up an outside tribunal, which will adjudicate both as it relates to public employees and as it relates to members of the Cabinet, to try to overcome this problem that I perceive we are going to continue to have.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Well, we thank the Premier for that information. I would suggest to him that it is probably not necessary to create a completely independent board. It is a good idea to have an independent adjudication but with the financial position of the

Province, with the possibility of political appointments made to any such new board, I would ask the Premier to consider utilizing some mechanism already in place, whether it be assignment to the Ombudsman or to the Labour Relations Board. As to a committee of deputies, there is no reason why deputies should not know what is going on in each other's department. They are supposed to be meeting. They used to meet on a regular basis to discuss this sort of thing and to make sure that they had their act together and were not going in different directions in different departments. So it would seem to me that it is a simple matter to put conflict of interest matters on their regular agenda, they meet at least every month if not every week, and they can make sure they have uniformity in these types of decisions.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am willing to consider that.

MR. BARRY:

I just suggest that to the Premier before running to create another expensive independent tribunal.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Even if we do something right, we have to be perceived as doing something right.

MR. BARRY:

That is right. There is a provincial court there that might be utilized, as an example. I will not belabour that point, but I would ask the Premier to consider whether it is necessary to set up a completely new board for this.

Now on the matter that was raised by the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons)

who is in his district today, I do not know if he gave the name of the individual to the minister. If he did not, I will give the name of the individual in this particular case to the minister. We do not want to do it publicly because we want to be responsible and not attack a civil servant, a public employee, before we know there is anything there, but let me just state what this particular problem arises from.

There is an individual who has been hired by the Department of Development in a management position and we understand there were no interviews or no advertisements for the position. Whether or not that is correct I have not been able to check out, but there is a problem as to whether or not there was an interview. But the greater problem is that the competitors of that individual, who was involved in a commercial enterprise before going into the department, believe that he still has ties with that commercial enterprise. In his new position he has access to all of the confidential information which his competitors supply to the Department of Development, and their concern is, if he still has a link to the commercial enterprise, that that confidential information about their businesses will get on to the competitor with whom he was connected, so that was the purpose and the thrust of that particular question. In any event, there would be a conflict of interest if he did not have access to confidential information because he has to vet who would get jobs with Development, who would be retained to do different jobs, and if he is directing jobs to the company with which he had a particular connection rather than to the competitors, that would be

a conflict of interest. We ask the minister to check out that particular case. But also on a general basis, we ask the minister to ensure - and that was the purpose of the question - that any individuals who are working in his department, or in any other departments, if they have outside commercial interests they should be declared, and it should be very clear that there is no conflict.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, under the regulations they have to be declared.

MR. BARRY:

I am pleased to hear the Premier give the information he gave the House earlier. Now, one final point, and I will not blame it on the minister, I will blame it on the zealously of bureaucrats, but I have seen applications coming from the minister's department. For example, if an individual applies for a grant to go to a trade show, which the minister's department has, I understand, funds for, even though the amount of the grant, say, might be a \$500 subsidy or something like that that you have in your programme.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Could I by leave finalize the point?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. BARRY:

I ask the minister to take a look at whether it is necessary in many

cases to request the type of confidential information that is requested from private enterprise. For example, where a travel grant of \$500 or a subsidy of \$500 is applied for one of the requirements is for the company to file its financial statement. Now, the decision on whether or not the grant is made is not whether or not it is needed.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not a question as to whether he is broke or not broke.

MR. BARRY:

That is right. That is something that really galls people, really irritates them, to reveal their private financial situation in order to have access to a government programme that they should have access to whether or not the department has that particular information. I ask the minister to take a look at that and just see whether some bureaucrat in an over-zealous fashion in preparing his application form has not gone too far in the type of information they are requiring the various businesses around this Province to supply.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, later today I will be presenting to the Legislature the Fisheries Loan Board's financial statement for the 1983/1984 and 1984/1985 fiscal years. This is in accordance with Section 15 of the Fisheries Loan Board Act which requires, in part, that the Board's financial statements be laid before the Legislature within fifteen days after they are

submitted to me if the Legislature is in session; and if not in session, then within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session. Both these financial statements have been audited by the Department of the Auditor General.

Mr. Speaker, the Fisheries Loan Board's financial statements reflect the government's commitment to assisting the Province's inshore and near shore fishermen. This assistance is provided by low interest vessel and equipment acquisition loans not exceeding \$50,000; interest subsidies for loans exceeding \$50,000 which are guaranteed under the Bank Loan Guarantee Programme; and bounties (grants) for new vessel construction, rebuilding and repair of large vessels. I should note that the Fisheries Loan Board's financial statements reflect only the interest subsidy related to the Bank Loan Guarantee Programme.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide some details of the activities of the Loan Board in these two fiscal years. The number and value of the loans approved were 634 loans valued at \$7.7 million in 1983/1984 and 579 loans valued at \$6 million in 1984/1985.

Included in these approvals for both years are seventeen loans approved under the Bank Loan Guarantee Programme for a total cost of \$5.4 million. Funding for all loans in excess of \$50,000 is obtained through the chartered banks with a provincial government guarantee and the Board subsidizes the interest on these loans where the interest rate is in excess of the rate charged by the Board. All loans less than \$50,000 are

processed and funded directly by the Board.

Mr. Speaker, the Fisheries Loan Board also assists fishermen through the provision of bounties (grants) for the construction and rebuilding and repairing of vessels. In 1983/1984, the Board provided 267 bounties valued at \$806,000 and in 1984/1985 it provided 211 bounties valued at \$532,000. These programmes of assistance continue today.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it necessary to emphasize the importance of the Board's financial assistance programmes in these difficult economic times in the inshore fishery. All available information on the harvesting sector, as collected by my Fishing Industry Advisory Board, the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and others, substantiate the difficulties presently being experienced by inshore fishermen. It is for this reason that we have instituted short term assistance through Loan Deferment Programmes in the past two years and are currently assessing the available options for longer term assistance.

Mr. Speaker, we are committed to our continued efforts in support of the inshore fishery.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for providing me with a copy of his statement before he made it. We are looking forward to receiving from the minister the

financial statements of the Fisheries Loan Board, as promised in his statement. We are happy, too, Mr. Speaker, that the Loan Board is obviously functioning, and functioning very well. It is playing a very important role in the development of our inshore fishery.

We do have certain reservations as to the new process that is now in place whereby loans in excess of \$50,000 are negotiated through a chartered bank. That is a relatively new departure from the long standing policy of the Board. We are being told by fishermen in that category that they are not too happy with having to deal with the chartered banks. We all know that chartered banks sometimes, especially when times are rough, are not too tolerant or understanding when it comes to dealing with fishermen who sometimes, through no fault of their own, are unable to meet their commitments.

We are looking forward, Mr. Speaker, as well, to a statement from the minister, as he promised, I think, during the dying days of the last session of the House, with respect to the new policy that was promised at that time for the restructuring of the debt load of, I think, our longliner fishermen. In fact, we are disappointed that something has not been said on that in recent months, because when that statement was made, I believe it was in the Fall of 1985, or it might have been the Spring of 1986, it was well received. A lot of fishermen in the Province looked to that proposed programme as one that would provide some relief for them in some of the problems they were then experiencing in the fishery. Of

course, we all know that because of the depletion of the stocks, a problem over which fishermen have very little control, in fact no control, a lot of our fishermen are today finding it extremely difficult to manage the loans that they have acquired from the Fisheries Loan Board and, as I said, in some cases through the chartered banks.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the minister that he make good on that promise whereby he did indicate I think quite clearly that arrangements would be made to assist the larger longliner fishermen to restructure their debt load.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) for a copy of the statement prior to his delivery. The Fisheries Loan Board is a uniquely Canadian or even uniquely Newfoundland solution to a particular problem, in the sense that it is a combination, it seems, of government being in the market and also supporting the private lenders in the market to provide funds in an area that they might be quite leery of otherwise.

It would be a shame, I think, if this Board were to be sacrificed in any way in the future. I think one of the things we should be very careful about and one of the

things I think the Premier, who is responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs, and the Minister of Fisheries should be careful about is that the Fisheries Loan Board does not end up a casualty of the free trade negotiations that have been on and off between the Governments of Canada and the United States. I would remind the minister that we must be quite diligent to ensure that this does not occur.

Finally, the only other comment I have to make on it is that I recall in previous sessions of this House where we did raise some problems that individual fishermen had when they secured loans when the interest rates were quite high, and that a couple of years had passed and yet they were still paying the very high interest rate when new applicants were paying a lower rate. Since the interest rates have declined over the last year or two, I would ask the Minister of Fisheries if perhaps he might have another look at the rates that are being charged to see if there is a possibility that older loans, at a higher rate, may be looked at in the same light as they were in the past? Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:  
Mr. Speaker, March 8, International Women's day is celebrated by men and women around the world, as a symbol of women's struggle for labour force equality. In 1908, a tragic fire at the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory in New York City killed 128 women



garment workers. On March 8, 1908, thousands of women textile workers marched in the streets protesting working conditions and low wages. In 1910, March 8 was designated as International Women's Day and the day was celebrated for the first time in 1911.

Mr. Speaker, women are still seeking a better life for themselves, their families and their communities. Much has changed for women since 1911, but still much needs to be done. Government recognizes that true equality for women is a goal we must continue to strive toward. For this reason government has undertaken several initiatives to improve the status of women.

In 1980, Mr. Speaker, government enacted legislation establishing the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. The Council advises government on matters of special concern to women and acts as an advocate for women. The Council has published many documents and made numerous recommendations to government, many of which have been accepted and acted upon.

In 1985, government accepted the Report of the Task Force on Affirmative Action for women in the public service. The recommendations of the Task Force are currently being implemented.

Government has established, Mr. Speaker, the Women's Policy Office, to act as a co-ordinating agency within the bureaucracy to assist with the development of policies that will improve women's economic and social status. Research is currently being done on non-traditional training for women, women's contribution to household economies and the effect

of income support proposals on women's economic status. A community awareness manual on the problems of wife battering is being prepared.

Child care remains a major issue for Newfoundland women. Government has increased the start-up grant and instituted an annual learning resources grant to licensed day care centres. We recognize that much more needs to be done in the area of child care and the Province is currently involved in discussions with the federal government on improved funding for child care services.

At the 1986, First Ministers' Conference our Premier and his colleagues endorsed a strategy for improving women's access to training -- a first step in moving towards labour force equality for women.

Our government will continue to support initiatives to improve the status of women. We join with women across this Province in recognizing International Women's Day, celebrating women's achievements and continuing to move toward an improved quality of life for all our citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister. I understand he tried to get me a copy of the release earlier but it went astray somehow.

Mr. Speaker, the minister and the administration of which he forms a part has, for many years, been professing to have the interests of the women of Newfoundland and Labrador at heart. Regrettably, their actions do not come up to their words.

Now, I have to say that I was quite proud of the way in which this Province generally, I think, was prepared to deal with the issues of concern to women in this Province. But you know, Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of years we have fallen behind. We are no longer, in this Province, the leaders in terms of putting forth good policies for the women in our society. I give you as an example Ontario, which only this year, within the past six months, under a Liberal administration, Premier Peterson, has actually implemented legislation - not just talked about it - but implemented legislation to enshrine as law the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. Now we want to know, Mr. Speaker, when will members opposite have the courage to follow-through with the brave, bold words they have come forth with? When will we see legislation to guarantee for women of Newfoundland and Labrador equal pay for work of equal value? When will we see the dollars in place, Mr. Speaker, for a comprehensive day care programme and not just the lip service that is being paid to it now? When, Mr. Speaker, will we see serious action being taken in terms of pensions for homemakers, in terms of the transferability of pensions because of the large number of women working in part-time employment and the great difficulties they have in establishing any type of pension because of the problems of

transferring pensions when you move from one job to another? This is what women in this Province want to see from members opposite, not these brave, bold statements, empty promises, vague generalities, Mr. Speaker. Cold hard dollars, legislation, that is what is needed if the minister and members opposite really believe in the words that they have been spouting for the last seven or eight years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to give thanks to the minister for providing a copy of his statement in advance, and also give our appreciation from this party for bringing this to the attention of the House, in particular, the minister's efforts to put on the record some of the history of the celebration of International Women's Day and, indeed, its origins; the fine socialist tradition of women, ordinary people, working people taking to the streets to demand their rights. I would have a concern that this minister and this government would continue to express some of the concerns of issues to women throughout the year and not just on one day. It is a good indication that with some of what is in the content of the statement that the government is attempting on this issue to be more progressive than conservative and we would hope that that would

continue throughout the year and over the years. We are concerned about some of the slowness of movement on some of the issues which are mentioned, namely affirmative action.

There is a story in the paper today about the federal government politicizing its own announced initiatives on day care, in that it has not brought in any money this year and will probably wait until before the next federal election to bring in spending estimates to upgrade day care. That is also a concern to us in this Province, that we do not wait so the government can look good before the next election with lots more promises to women.

We also have a concern about the lack of protection for many women workers working in very lowly paid situations, domestic workers, part-time workers. I would just like to personally mention a woman I spoke to in the last couple of days who is responsible for cleaning our office and our floor, and who is without any kind of decent protection because of the contracting-out policies of this government. That is not an indication of a progressive attitude towards women in this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, I have two statements here. They are fairly short, so I will probably, with leave of the House, handle both at the same

time.

I would like to inform members that I am continuing to pursue the prospect of reactivation of the Newfoundland Zinc Mines, Ltd. operation at Daniels Harbour.

To that end I have succeeded in getting agreement from Teck Corporation to attend a meeting here in the third week of March. The tentative date is March 18th. At that meeting I will explore, with senior officers of Teck Corporation, their current assessment of the markets for zinc and the alternatives that we can consider for the Daniels Harbour property.

Both ourselves and the company are fully aware of the scheduled termination of unemployment benefits next month. Laid off workers wish to know where they stand in terms of whether or not to seek employment elsewhere and we would like to be in a position to tell them something definite one way or the other. I shall attempt to get a clear understanding at the meeting to which I referred.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to inform members that Newfoundland's gypsum operation near St. George's has been acquired by Domtar Inc., which is a Canadian company. Domtar, which produces pulp and paper, building materials and chemicals has been expanding in the gypsum wallboard area recently. As a result of its acquisition from Genstar Corporation, Domtar is now the third largest wallboard maker in the U.S.A. and a large part of its gypsum requirements will be produced at Flat Bay, near St. George's.

The Newfoundland operation has been renamed St. George's Gypsum Mines, Incorporated and this year's production is expected to exceed a half million tons for the U.S. market in addition to satisfying the requirements of Atlantic Gypsum and North Star Cement in Corner Brook, Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the latter statement first, we welcome that statement. We see that the Newfoundland gypsum operation near St. George's has been a significant contributor to the local economy in this area of Western Newfoundland for quite some time. I believe, as the minister pointed out to me, the Minister from St. George's, that it used to be Flintkote Holdings. I can recall, during my days there as a teacher, Mr. Speaker, that this particular corporation was a very good corporate citizen and, indeed, in many ways helped fund and look after many of the local activities. I recall that in my teaching days, for example, they sponsored some drama activity, where we could take children across the Province to perform in other parts of the Province.

So, we welcome Domtar, which is a significant national company, into the St. George's area. We look forward to a prosperous future for this company in the St. George's area, and we hope that all the jobs currently there will be

protected, Mr. Speaker, by this new company. In fact, we hope to see new jobs created in Western Newfoundland, particularly in light of the fact that the latest unemployment figures for Western Newfoundland shows a dramatic increase of from 21.1 per cent to 26.5 per cent; a 4.4 per cent increase in Western Newfoundland. So we, too, align ourselves and welcome this company into the Province and we look forward to good things.

With respect to Daniel's Harbour, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of unanswered questions to this tremendous problem for these people in this section of the Northwestern part of Newfoundland, in my riding. There are 165 miners and their families who, at the end of this month, will have no unemployment insurance, Mr. Speaker, they will have absolutely no income. There are a lot of unanswered questions which, in the course of the next number of weeks, we will be putting to the government, particularly with reference to public money allocated to other mines throughout the Province, and I offer three specific examples.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

By leave, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. Sit down.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Brief leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, Please! Does the hon. member have leave?

MR. FUREY:

The House Leader offered leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has been granted.

MR. FUREY:

Just briefly: We look to examples of mines and mining companies around the Province that were given significant and healthy chunks of cash by way of grants and we, in Daniel's Harbour, look for a guaranteed loan of \$2 million, significantly less than the cash grants outlayed by this government to mining companies in the Province, and we just wonder why we are being forgotten about when we ask for a loan which would be repaid at prime.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I was actually going to finish the member for St. Barbe's (Mr. Furey) comments on it if he was going to be cut off, because I, too, wanted to say something in a similar vein. Looking at the warrants that were tabled yesterday we see millions of dollars spent in Baie Verte and yet little or nothing spent in Daniel's Harbour. Before I make a judgement on it, and I do not want to make a judgement on it, quite frankly, because I do not think I have enough information on the circumstances at Daniel's Harbour, but I have seen the press release the minister put out and hopefully in the Estimates Committee we can get into much more detail as to why Daniel's Harbour was refused the assistance it asked for. I do not know if it was justified, I do not

know if it was not justified, but I certainly want more answers.

The tradition, as the hon. member for St. Barbe said, of donating money to mines is a widespread one. Indeed, in this Province several mines have received it. Quite frankly, in my own district the same kind of thing is happening with the iron ore industry. We have just heard of an announcement from the federal government that it has contributed money to Mt. Wright, which is the iron ore operation just across the border and is one that competes with the two iron mines that are located in my district.

One of the things I would like to suggest to the House, to the member for St. Barbe and to the minister responsible for mines is that maybe we should be looking to the federal government for a bit of assistance. Since it seems to be willing to assist a mine located in the federal district of Manicouagan - and we wonder why - it may be appropriate to ask for the same thing for the Daniel's Harbour operation. As to the St. George's operation, I have no information on it.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before I call Oral Questions I would like to welcome to the galleries a delegation from Norris Arm Town Council, Mayor Fred Budgell, councillor Bruce Gillingham and councillor Colburn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, two days ago we heard from the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) on behalf of the Premier the following statement. "With respect to a question asked earlier today by the Leader of the Opposition in Question Period concerning vocational instructors pay, whatever problem existed was apparently an administrative problem. The operative point is that the problem no longer exists and, in fact, the instructors will be paid on tomorrow" - that would be Wednesday, yesterday - "as usual, which is the normal payday."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to inform the House that the vocational instructors of St. Anthony - we checked this morning - had not been paid, and the vocational instructors of Bonavista had not been paid. Now, this is where we got calls. We did not bother to go check all the other vocational schools, but would Your Honour deal with the fact of the minister misleading this House or require some clarification or something? These vocational instructors have not yet been paid, as of ten o'clock this morning, despite the assurances of the minister on Tuesday that they were being paid on Wednesday.

Now, we know the Province is in a financial mess, we know members opposite are incompetent in terms of dealing with that mess, but surely when you come into the House and say something is going to be done it should be done.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would just submit, and I am quite sure the hon gentleman will probably agree with this, there really is no prima facie case of breach of privilege. The matter does not concern privilege, it is a matter which would very regularly be pursued in Question Period where the Leader of the Opposition would ask for an explanation or ask if the facts have changed or what the facts are. It is not a question of privilege. Nobody has even alleged that there was any attempt to purposely deceive anybody. Whatever the facts are, or their judgement on them, there can be a difference of opinion on. It is not a matter of privilege but a matter which would logically be pursued in Question Period.

MR. BARRY:

Just briefly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I thought it was established that a Minister of the Crown standing up, whether in response to questions or otherwise, and misleading the House, that that is clearly a breach of the privileges of every member of this House. And on the facts, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands came in and mislead the House and I think Your Honour should deal with it.

MR. FLIGHT:

Probably deliberately.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It does not appear to me that there is a prima facie case of breach of privilege.

### Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I guess the first question would have to be, the Premier, who was here but has disappeared. The Premier gave an undertaking to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the question we put to him on Tuesday on this matter would be answered. Now it was not answered. Sorry, it was answered falsely! It was answered in a misleading fashion. Will the Premier, if he is in the precincts of the House, or will somebody over there tell us when are these vocational instructors going to be paid and why have they not been paid up to now? Is it because of the financial situation of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is obviously trying to create a mountain out of a molehill. What we were asked to investigate or check out the other day was whether or not there was a problem with respect to getting the cheques for the vocational school instructors. We checked it out and we were advised that the Department of Finance had in fact issued the cheques for the salary units to be paid the vocational school instructors. That is what we checked out and that is what I

was commenting on. And, therefore, assuming -

MR. TULK:

That is not what you told the House.

MR. SIMMS:

If the hon. members would like me to answer, I will try to answer.

MR. BARRY:

Read it out! Read it out!

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I mean, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is obviously trying to play on words or something, but the fact of the matter is we checked to see if the cheques were going to be issued. The cheques were, in fact, issued, so we assumed that the instructors would be paid. I know a lot of instructors who were paid, who did get their checks.

MR. FLIGHT:

After you got the Special Warrants.

MR. SIMMS:

That is irrelevant, that is beside the point. But I mean it is just a matter of clarification.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister's words were 'will be paid on tomorrow', 'will be paid tomorrow', 'be paid tomorrow', 'as usual', and 'they will be paid; not cheques issued.

Mr. Speaker, on another matter, if you dial the following phone number in Calgary, Alberta, 403-293-3457 -

MR. TULK:  
Who do you get?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY:  
- a receptionist will answer, Mr. Speaker, 'Peter Loughheed's office.' If you ask for the main switchboard when you call the same number, a receptionist answers, 'Bennett Jones Law Firm.' Now, Mr. Speaker, we have in the Special Warrants an amount allocated to Bennett Jones Law Firm for Professional Services.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! It appears the hon. member is making a speech.

MR. BARRY:  
It is a good one too, Your Honour.

Your Honour, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is the amount of \$400,000 allocated in the Special Warrants, which the minister tabled, in addition to the \$40,000 per year which the Premier indicated that Mr. Loughheed would receive as compensation for services provided in offshore negotiations?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
A good question!

MR. FUREY:  
Get up and answer it. Come on!

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did

not indicate which Warrant he was referring to. What was the amount you were acquiring about?

MR. TULK:  
\$400,000.

MR. BAKER:  
The Warrant is \$250,000.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take that as notice. I do not have any information.

MR. BARRY:  
It is the minister's own department, the Department of Finance, involving \$250,000.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:  
I do not have any information here that would any way collaborate the seemingly outrageous comments of the Leader of the Opposition. But I will certainly look into it, see if there is any possible grain of truth in the comments he has made.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I refer the minister to the Minute-of-Council which is dated January 20, 1987 - it is Minute 28-'87 - whereby it was 'Ordered that approval be given for an expenditure of \$400,000 for the services of the legal firm Bennett Jones of Calgary.' So an additional \$250,000 was added to subdivision 2.3.03.05 - Offshore Negotiations, Professional Services.



Would the minister indicate is this in addition to the amount the Premier said would be paid to Premier Lougheed, when he was retained, which was \$40,000 a year? Is the minister aware that if you work it out on a forty-hour week basis, fifty-two weeks of the year, that comes to \$192 an hour? Does the minister feel that that is appropriate for the four quarterly reports that Mr. Lougheed is supposed to be supplying to this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, that \$250,000 was additional funding in regard to offshore negotiations. Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition is giving the impression that the only consultant involved in offshore negotiations is Mr. Lougheed. I can assure him that that is not the case. There are other consultants involved. But, despite that comment I have just completed, I will look into the seemingly outrageous remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and see if there is any grain of validity to the point he is trying to make.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have read out the Minute-of-Council. It says \$400,000 will be paid for the services of the legal firm Bennett Jones. As I have mentioned to you, Mr. Lougheed is associated with the firm Bennett Jones. It is his office.

Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate, in accordance with the local preference policy which they are enforcing so strictly at Come By Chance and other places around this Province, are there no lawyers in Newfoundland who can provide the services? Mr. Speaker, where is local preference as far as this government is concerned? Why is this \$400,000 going out of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that Mr. Lougheed has not been engaged because he is a lawyer. That is a farcical, ridiculous, totally slanted interpretation of clear, obvious facts, facts that would be clear and obvious to any child of six or older. Mr. Lougheed is being engaged not because he is lawyer, but for other reasons.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. In regard to the events that have occurred this week in Sheshatshit, the community in Labrador, the minister is quoted in the newspaper today as saying, 'Our aim is wildlife protection.' I do not think the minister would find any disagreement by Native People with that as an objective. Our concern is whether there is some commitment to protect the Native People themselves. My question to the minister is if mediation is underway, as he has suggested in

the media, does this mediation include efforts to provide alternative access to caribou herds - for example, further North the George River herd - which would allow for the protection of the Mealy Mountain herd and also would give access to the Innu people access to a caribou hunt?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank the hon. member for the question. He so rightfully said that as Minister of wildlife I am very concerned for the wildlife resources, of course, on the Island portion as well in Labrador. The situation, of course, with the Innu is that they are completely ignoring wildlife regulations and the laws of the Province in the Mealy Mountain caribou herd where we are very concerned about the low numbers. For the past twelve years or so we have not permitted a hunt. The herd has been on the increase and, of course, we were very seriously considering initiating a controlled hunt in the next year or so there in the Mealy Mountains. The situation is that they do have access to other caribou in the Northern zone. We give them licences free of charge, we do not have any limit on the number of licences that they can so have because it depends on the number of animals that they need to survive, for subsistence. As well, they can designate other people to hunt for them in the case of the elderly and so on. So we feel there are other options to it. I think it is a case here, in this particular situation, where the people of Sheshatshit are just

totally disregarding our wildlife regulations and the laws of the Province and we are very concerned about it. I have taken an approach, a tone of mediation and moderation on the issue, because I did not want a situation of confrontation and hostility to develop there, which both our wildlife officers and the RCMP felt, was very possible if we went in there in force.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

My supplementary I would put to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Premier. Given that in all other jurisdictions in the country where there is unoccupied Crown land and aboriginal people in the area of unoccupied Crown land, exemptions exist from wildlife regulations which are a recognition of the right of aboriginal people -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member pose his question?

MR. LONG:

My question for the Deputy Premier is what is this government doing in preparation for the First Ministers Conference at the end of this month in Ottawa, addressing Native rights and the Constitution to speed up the process of recognition of Innu people and to speed up the process of land claims negotiations by the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, first I must disclaim, I am not the Deputy Premier, but I am certainly pleased to answer the question.

First of all, the first part of the question was with respect to the substantive issue. As I understand it, this herd is very small, its position is fragile in terms of its ability to continue and to be a resource for the Innu people or for anybody else, and that, indeed, if proper conservation measures are not implemented their herd will be destroyed and it will be of no benefit to Innu or anyone else. The herd has to be conserved before it can be exploited in a reasonable manner.

With respect to the First Ministers Conference, the government has participated during the past couple of years in the various ministerial meetings preparatory to it. The Government of Newfoundland is on record as being supportive of the principle of Native self-government. The government also points out that this will mean different things in different parts of the country, that one model cannot be imposed because of vastly different circumstances from one part of the country to the other. Also, what self-government means in a particular circumstance will be defined in negotiated agreements between the Native People concerned, the provincial government and the federal government, because there is such diversity in various circumstances across the country that naturally the instruments or modalities of self-government are going to be

very different, let us say, from an area in the Northwest Territory where perhaps 98 per cent of the people are Inuit and, let us say, an area in another province where perhaps 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the people are Inuit or Metis or whatever one is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The hon. gentlemen are interrupting me, but I would be glad to give the hon. member additional information at a later date if he so wishes.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. I would like to ask the minister, under these Special Warrants referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, we see approval being given of nearly \$500,000 to a law firm in Calgary, Alberta. I am wondering how the Minister of Finance can justify, in all good conscience, giving \$500,000 to a legal firm outside this Province and in the same breath turning down a \$2 million loan to protect 165 jobs in Daniel's Harbour?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the connection between the two items. However, I did say that I will look into this matter further in the light of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition and if there is anything further to be

added to what I already said I will be glad to bring that information to the House.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, you have created one job in Alberta and we have lost 165 jobs in Newfoundland; that is the difference. Now I would ask the Minister of Finance can he table in this House documents showing how Mr. Lougheed and that law firm earned this \$400,000 for legal work?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious what Mr. Lougheed did. Mr. Lougheed advised the Province on an extremely important matter, a matter that is extremely important to this present generation of Newfoundlanders and to future generations of Newfoundlanders. As I am sure all people know, when you have consultants of great expertise on extremely weighty matters, matters that are of great importance to large groups of people like the total population of a province, you have to pay a fee. I do not think there is anything very strange about all that.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, since we have just paid Premier Lougheed \$400,000 under a Special Warrant alluded to by the Leader of the Opposition, that \$40,000 agreement that we agreed to last year to hire Premier Lougheed and pay him \$40,000 a year for four meetings as a consultant, are we still paying him that \$40,000 a year, plus travel, in view of the fact that we paid him \$400,000 last year by a Special Warrant? That is more money than was spent in my district, the district of Windsor-Buchans, for the whole year last year by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame. Shame.

MR. FLIGHT:

So we paid \$400,000 to Premier Lougheed, more than was spent in the district of Grand Falls where a water treatment plant is needed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Do not be so silly. You are making a fool of yourself.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, can you protect me from the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is beginning to make a speech. I would ask him to direct his question.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, would the Minister of Finance advise the House whether we are still retaining Premier Lougheed on a consulting basis at \$40,000 a year plus expenses in

view of the fact that we have just paid him \$400,000 under a Special Warrant?

MR. MATTHEWS:

It cost that much to put out the forest fire in your district.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, there is a certain amount of jumping at conclusions here and I am not going to become party to that. I might also point out that I think it is unparliamentary to point your finger at someone, but I will let that go by.

Anyway, as I have said, if there is any further relevant, pertinent information to be brought forward on this point I will be glad to try to do so.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said he would prefer that the Premier were in the Legislature where he should be to answer questions. I want to remind the Minister of Finance of a couple of things before I ask my question. The Premier promised Mr. Lougheed \$40,000, then secretly and privately the government authorized another \$400,000 to be paid to Mr. Lougheed through the guise of his law firm. That is \$440,000.

I want to ask the Finance Minister why was it that the government did

not come clean with the public, whose money they were using to give your mainland Tory buddies a good retirement fund, when he announced that Mr. Lougheed was getting \$40,000? Why did you not then tell us that you were going to spend \$500,000 to pad his pockets in the name of Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am getting a bit tired of reiterating or repeating myself. I said I would look into this matter and if there is any more relevant information I will bring it forward. I do resent the implication that Mr. Lougheed is being engaged for his own benefit. If Mr. Lougheed gets benefit from his engagement with this Province it is well earned, and I think that it is a disgraceful allegation to make against a prominent Canadian, a Canadian who has served his Nation and a Canadian who is serving the people of this Province, and serving well. To have his name brought down by innuendo and besmirching, I think is beneath the dignity of this House.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo, a supplementary.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, you can call it what you like. The fact of the matter is that you have passed \$440,000 to Peter Lougheed. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that the Premier and the government -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Yes. I will put my question. Is this the Premier's way, when we have just phased out twenty jobs at \$20,000 a year for twenty Newfoundlanders, of carrying out his commitment, to Newfoundlanders living in Alberta, to bring them home? Is this the way, to pay Peter Loughheed \$440,000? He is back in the House. Perhaps he will answer the question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Sure I will answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is nothing like coming into the House, Mr. Speaker, and not even have to sit down. It is just unreal.

The question has to do with Mr. Loughheed. I am very, very proud that Mr. Loughheed is a consultant with this government, who is consulting us on a regular basis, working for us on the whole Hibernia fiscal negotiations, that we are paying him so much for his services, and we are going to continue to do it. We will hire other people, if necessary, if it is going to mean that we need that kind of expertise to get Hibernia going. This is a very worthwhile thing.

As I said yesterday, talking about the Special Warrants, we cannot predict floods, we cannot predict whether there is going to be a good inshore fishery or a poor inshore fishery. That means we do not know exactly to the dollar, to

the cent, how much money the Minister of Social Services is going to need. Because if there is a bad inshore fishery in Conche, there are going to be more people looking for social assistance. We cannot predict when the fish are going to come in and when they are not. We cannot predict a flood in Rushoon.

I am not at all defensive on this business of Special Warrants. We are, in the last couple of years, into a very difficult economic situation as it relates to the inshore fishery. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we were able to find the money to give the people who came for Social Services some money. I am proud that we are able to do that. If it had to be done through a Special Warrant, so be it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can talk about Special Warrants and try to move off this question all he like. Let me ask him a question. When he made the announcement in November of 1985 it was \$40,000 for Loughheed. I want to ask him, is it now \$400,000 for Loughheed? Is it \$440,000 for Loughheed? Just how much? We had a massive reception for the hon. gentleman. Is that coming out of the \$400,000? I want to ask him straight, pointblank, just how much is this patronage deal with his Tory buddy in Alberta costing the employed

and unemployed in this Province?  
Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I do not know off the top of my head, but we will get the information for the hon. member and break it down on what it is all about.

MR. FLIGHT:  
What are we getting for it?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
What we are getting for it?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I would like to know what we are getting for paying the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) to sit in this House! what are we getting back?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
What are we getting back from the member for Windsor - Buchans?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
What are we getting for all of the money? What are the citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador getting for the money that we are giving the member for Windsor - Buchans? Very, very little.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
You are getting honesty.

MR. GILBERT:  
My question is for the Premier. The House Royal Commission states that the number of people living under the poverty line has increased to 21 per cent during his administration. The average annual income for a family of four living on social welfare is \$6,750 a year. The average annual income for Newfoundlanders is \$13,653. With these facts, how can the Premier justify paying Mr. Loughheed \$400,000 a year, or \$192 an hour if he worked forty hours a week, fifty-two weeks of the year? How can he justify it with Newfoundlanders starving to death?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
You can bring that to its logical conclusion and just say that anybody who is getting paid by the government is not doing enough because all that money should go to pay people who are on social assistance who deserve more. How far do you want to take it? What we are trying to do is get the biggest project ever in Newfoundland's history going for the benefit of people so that we will have some money so that we will be able to pay more to social assistance recipients, so we will be able to do more for the people of Bay d'Espoir or the people of

the Great Northern Peninsula or wherever. That is what we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, and in order to do that you need people who are expert in the field. Now how far do you take it? How many experts do you want us to layoff now around the various government departments so that we do not have the expertise to do a good job on getting something going for Newfoundland? You know, that is the question, Mr. Speaker. Can you afford to do without them? That is the question.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

The Premier promised that by 1986 he was going to have Hibernia going. Now he has paid \$400,000 to Mr. Loughheed, \$150 an hour to Cabot Martin, so when is he going to get something done instead of spending money? Look after the people in Newfoundland first.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is the hon. member down there, a businessman, and he should know about prices. He has no control over how much has to sell his cars for, because that is going to be decided by the Ford Motor Company. And whatever that figure is that comes down, that is what he is going to put his profit on top of. It is not my fault! Go ask the King of Saudi Arabia why the price of oil went down. What I have been

trying to do since 1979 is to get a good deal for Newfoundland, long term, on the offshore, which we got, which your party would not give us, Mr. Speaker. That is what we got and that is what we fought for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I never, never said Hibernia would be going today, tomorrow or the next day. I am fighting to get it going as fast as I can, but I am only one. I do not control the oil prices, in the same way as the hon. member for Bay d'Espoir does not control the price of cars.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier indicate -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I recognized the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. SIMMONS:

He yielded. He yielded to the Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I will now recognize the hon. the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!



MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). On Monday, when we asked him about alleged violations of the Labour Relations Act at the Come By Chance oil refinery, he indicated he had no complaints that had been registered either with him or, I assume, with the Labour Relations Board. My question to the minister is, Have you received any complaints since that time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is, no, I have not.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, in that case, Mr. Speaker, I have a complaint here, that I have had over the last two days, that has been lodged with the Labour Relations Board about the practices at Come By Chance having to do specifically with the thing. I also have the names of several individuals who have alleged that they have been forced to sign the form saying that they would not join a union with that same company. We now have enough information to indicate that there is something entirely suspicious going on at Come By Chance with regard to their labour practices. I will give the minister all this information so that he will have it. My request is will he then get back to us within a day or two and indicate if there is enough evidence, at this point, to do an

investigation of the labour relations practices at this refinery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, any and all complaints lodged with me as the minister are always investigated promptly, and officers assigned. The hon. member is talking about a complaint, I understand, that has been lodged with the Labour Relations Board, and that would not necessarily come to me. Certain sections of The Labour Relations Act are administered by the Board, Mr. Speaker, and would not necessarily come to me. But the way is open to any party who feels a violation of The Labour Relations Act has occurred to make a complaint under Section 118 of the Act, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In view of the concern that has been expressed by Newfoundlanders particularly over the past few weeks, over the fact that many law offenders, many law breakers are getting their period of incarceration reduced on appeal, mainly because of weaknesses with respect to the Criminal Code of Canada, one in particular which states that probation cannot be granted on periods of incarceration of over two years, I wonder since probation cannot be given on sentences in excess of two years, causing appeals to be reducing prison sentences, if the Premier has made any representation to his federal counterparts to see that

this weakness in the Criminal Code of Canada is eliminated?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity or a chance in the last several days as we have been busy dealing with the implementation of the new initiatives in the Throne Speech, preparing for a budget and other things. But, I am sure if the hon. member has strong feelings about it as a member of the Legislature of Newfoundland he could write the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn) in Ottawa and express his view, write his MP and spread his views. It is not up to the government, if we believe or do not believe in something, to make representations on his behalf. I am sure the hon. member would be highly insulted if every time he agrees or disagrees with something and needs to get onto another level jurisdiction, he does not want me to speak for him. I am sure he is quite capable, as a leading educator in this Province, a very articulate spokesman, an outstanding Newfoundlander -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

- that he could very, very effectively argue for a various justice precept like he is talking about, and do it directly to his MP or to the minister in Ottawa under whose jurisdiction the Criminal Code comes. That is where the situation is on that.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I would like to know from the hon. member, when he gets up to ask a supplementary, has he made representation to the Government of Canada?

MR. LUSH:

It is clearly, again, a case of the Premier trying to get rhetoric to take the place of action, and not assuming responsibilities for all matters related to this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another reason for these reduction of sentences is the fact that our prisons are not equipped, obviously, to have training programmes, rehabilitative programmes, and consequently we have sentences reduced and law offenders walking the streets. In view of the fact that our prisons are not equipped to take care of training and rehabilitative programmes, again has the Premier made any representation to his federal counterparts to see that this is corrected?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, number one, as the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) to my right has already indicated, the judiciary are totally independent of the government. So I am not going to get into -

MR. BARRY:

The penitentiary service is not.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just one second now.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Can I answer the question? I know what is under what. I do not have to be a lawyer, like the hon. Leader of the Opposition, to know what is under what. I know where the various jurisdictions are. I do not have to go to law school to know that, Mr. Speaker. We all do not have to go to law school to know that. We do not have to practice law downtown to know that. I already know that. I learned that back in Grade VII in civics, Mr. Speaker, and I have not forgotten it, besides.

Number one is the whole question of the independence of the judiciary which is operative here in some of the questions and concepts that have been asked of me. Number two, the hon. member talks about the prison system and that there is no training going on in the prisons. I do not think that is true, Mr. Speaker. I think there is training and rehabilitation going on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot get a chance to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

As I understand it, we built a new correctional facility in Bishop's Falls, we built a new correctional facility in Clarenville, and we built a brand new correctional facility in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, all in the last three or four years, three new correctional facilities. If I am not mistaken,

we are involved in rehabilitation, work programmes, and the like for the people who are incarcerated in that brand new Tory, P.C. prison system that we have established in the last three or four years.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. BARRETT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:  
Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of presenting to the House the annual report for the Economic Council of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I am presenting the financial statements for the Fisheries Loan Board for the year ended March 31, 1984 and March 31, 1985.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the financial statements of the Newfoundland Crop Insurance Agency to March 31, 1986, and also the financial statement for the Livestock Owners Compensation Board to March 31, 1986.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I table the 1986 annual report of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation.

Whilst I am on my feet I may as well also table the report of the Public Accounts, the Public Accounts of the Crown Corporations, the Auditor General's Report and the compendium of Departmental Observations on the Report of the Auditor General.

#### Notices of Motion

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act Respecting The Encouragement And Regulation Of An Aquaculture Industry In Province."

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act To Amend The School Attendance Act, 1978."

#### Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, in debate yesterday the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) made the following remark. I will not give the full quote, just the relevant one: He said, "If the Warrants are obtained when the House is in Session then it is under Section 28, subsection 3 of The Financial Administration Act and it requires" -

MR. BARRY:  
Wrong section.

DR. COLLINS:  
I am reading from Hansard.

- "and it requires that it be an expenditure that is unforeseen, not continuing as in subsection 28.2," and so on and so forth. Then I said a bit later on, "The hon. the Leader of the Opposition thinks he has a point. I do not think he has a point but I will look at his remarks in more detail and possibly comment on it later."

Now I have to rap the Leader of the Opposition on the knuckles a little bit because he has been a very bad boy, he misinterpreted, he misunderstood subsection 3 of

section 28. He has it all back to front. So I have to rap him on the knuckles for it and say he is very naughty.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I have had the Comptroller General and the Director of Internal Audit check out in detail the question of whether the Warrants were tabled as they were properly supposed to be tabled. I have an assurance from them that it was all done according to the act.

MR. SIMMS:

Naughty, naughty, you mislead the whole Province.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not recall whether I said what the minister said I said or vice versa but the act speaks very clearly that under Section 28.2 it is a payment for a continuing service and if it is something that should have been foreseen -

MR. SIMMS:

This is a question or debate, not a point of order.

MR. BARRY:

How would the minister know? He has not given me a chance to finish.

MR. SIMMS:

I can tell.

MR. BARRY:

If it is a payment that should have been foreseen, then it is a case of the Minister of Finance having cooked the books and

deliberately omitted it from the budget when he set it out in his budget.

If, however, it is a new expenditure then it falls under section 28.3 and if the House of Assembly is in Session it must be done in this House because there can be no new expenditures without the approval of the Legislature but if it is when the House of Assembly -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This does not seem to be a point of order. I think the hon. member is taking the opportunity of debating the answer that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) gave.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the minister is deliberately misinterpreting and misleading this House in getting up and misinterpreting what was said yesterday because it does not matter -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member cannot say that the hon. minister is deliberately misleading the House.

MR. BARRY:

Okay, I withdraw the deliberately. The minister has gotten up and he is misleading the House, Mr. Speaker, because it does not matter whether it is under 28.2, as I have just mentioned, or under 28.3 where it expressly says in the Section that it has to be a new expenditure not foreseen, if the Warrant is sought, not foreseen or if it is sought when the House is not in

session.

So if it was something that should have been foreseen, then it was illegal for the minister to go out and get a Special Warrant for it when the House was not in session. So whether the House was in session or out of session, what the minister has done is illegal, wrong, contrary to law, contrary to the privileges of this House, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will have to answer more on this tomorrow. This will be brought up again tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order. It is not my position to rule on any point of law.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It is a difference of interpretation concerning a statute.

Mr. Speaker..

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A question was asked earlier today with respect to payment of vocational school instructors and I am informed that the St. Anthony vocational instructors received their pay by Priority Post at approximately 3:15 P.M., one hour and six minutes ago.

### Petitions

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Today I would like to sort of close a chapter on a project that I started last year, approximately this time, and that is to table 31 petitions with over 1,700 signatures on them, all of which are asking for the financial support of the provincial government in order to complete the Smallwood Encyclopedia.

I table them now knowing full well that the provincial government has, by comments from the Premier made in January I believe, indicated its support for the endeavour now and I feel that that is an excellent move for the provincial government to make.

It is with no small degree of dismay that there seems to be an impasse that has developed between the government's offer, which in my opinion, by the way, was a satisfactory solution, and the Smallwood family which seems to be refusing the offer.

I have tabled the petitions. They come from 31 different areas. There is also a list of them here which I would like to table in case other members would like to have a look at them. I do not think it serves much point in reading the individual names out but they should be tabled.

I am quite pleased that the provincial government has seen fit to try and undertake this. I sincerely hope that for the best interests of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, especially those individuals who are in our school system and who would benefit greatly by the completion of this work, that some way is found out of the current impasse and that we

can go forward and see a positive solution to this particular project.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take a great amount of pride in tabling the news release that I have issued today and also a list of the last 31 petitioners, or schools that have petitioned, and I am hoping that the provincial government can continue on with the progress it has made and get a solution.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I will speak in support of that petition as I have done before. Mr. Speaker, it is a difficult situation in terms of Mr. Smallwood, and I must say I was a bit disappointed when I heard the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), although he has expressed support for the Encyclopedia project. I was disappointed to hear him make a public statement where he seemed to be pressuring Mr. Smallwood to accept the government offer. I think Mr. Smallwood should be dignified for being permitted to make his own decision as to whether or not he accepts the government offer.

I understand the government, through the Premier, I believe, directly made contact with the Smallwood family and offered to provide some nursing services and some other forms of assistance sometime after we started to raise the issue in the House. It was then the Premier responded, but it was done in a fashion where the reaction of the family was that it

was being done as a form of charity and it was rejected.

You can debate whether or not it should have been rejected. I know I would have liked to have seen the services available to Mr. Smallwood, but you have to respect the wishes of Mr. Smallwood and his family. There is a limit beyond which we cannot intervene in terms of matters of family.

However, it could have been done in another way in terms of providing personal assistance to Mr. Smallwood, and I would ask members opposite to consider whether, and maybe this should be brought to the Premier's attention seeing he is not in the House, I would ask the Deputy Premier, the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer), whether any thought has been given to the idea of an *ex gratia* increase in Mr. Smallwood's pension. I understand because of the length of time that he has been out of the House that the pension is fairly small. I wonder if members opposite, whether the Premier has given consideration to approaching personal assistance to the former Premier on that basis? It would not be of the same -

MR. DAWE:  
Personal assistance was offered.

MR. BARRY:  
I just mentioned that. I do not know if the minister was listening or if he was in the House. I mentioned the fact that it was offered sometime after we started to ask for assistance in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:  
Yes, yes, yes.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was offered and the minister can read Hansard and he will find out what I said on it. I have dealt with that.

But I know the Premier made an approach and wanted to assist in a particular way. I am suggesting another way that perhaps would be better received by Mr. Smallwood.

Now, with respect to the encyclopedia itself, I understood there was some concern that government was seeking a transfer of the entire copyrights at one time. I understand since that that might not be the case, that the government is prepared to forego taking over the copyrights on books already published and that it was with respect to future volumes that they were seeking the copyright. If that is so, then that I think is a fairly reasonable approach and is not an excessive acquisition of the assets that right now, as I understand it, are all that Mr. Smallwood has to show for the investment that he has made in the encyclopedias to date.

But on the final point, the sticking point seems to be the house. Now the house is a political issue. There are political ramifications, I think, from years gone by. But I do not accept the notion that is being put forth by members opposite and by the Premier that this house should be reserved as a museum. It is not the birthplace of the former Premier. It is not the place where he lived most of his life. It is not designed, and, I would submit, probably not appropriate for a museum. It is not the place where the most people are likely to come and view it, if there was a museum. So I do not accept that that is the

explanation for not acceding to the Mr. Smallwood's wishes, if in fact it is his wishes, that the house be transferred back.

Now, there may be some concerns as to what are the wishes of the ex-Premier, Mr. Smallwood, and what are the wishes of family members. I think that this is important to be clarified and to be set straight.

Let me just end off by saying - I know the Government House Leader and the Speaker are giving me some leeway here to finish my remarks, because everybody, except one member of the House, seems to feel that it is of some significance - that we have a senior statesman, recognized across Canada and internationally as having made a great contribution, even in Torngat Mountains, to the welfare of the people of this Province. It is sad if we see this gentleman, in his recent years, suffering personally as a result of his dedication to try and get an encyclopedia published.

I would ask members opposite to look once again, to leave no stone unturned, and to make another effort to see if they can put forward a package that would be acceptable to Mr. Smallwood, and that would recognize that there is public interest, as well as the family interest, but that would ensure that this great statesman is not, what across Canada seems to be the case, apparently ignored by the Government of the Province for which he has done so much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.



MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, of course, as hon. members, I think, are aware, the government is, and has been, sympathetic and understanding and has wished to be helpful.

A number of months ago - I do not remember how long ago it was, a year ago, but quite some time ago - an approach was made to see if there was any way in which we could be helpful to him, and various suggestions were put forward. It was not his wish, or the wish of those speaking on his behalf, that that be pursued.

Then, when the question of the encyclopedia developed, as members are aware as well, it was the intention of the government to co-operate with the foundation which was being formed in terms of assisting in the publication of the encyclopedia, and also of taking other measures for Mr. Smallwood's comfort and convenience. Some very distinguished Newfoundlanders were involved in that. Ones that come to mind - there are others as well - are Moses Morgan, Arthur Lundrigan, and Mr. Campbell Eaton were involved, and with whom the government and the Premier personally had conversations, and certain parameters were defined. These gentlemen and others, who were prepared to head up the foundation, were in agreement that this was a fair and equitable and appropriate way for the matter to proceed.

Then, of course, a new element came in, and that was sort of a refusal of this by Mr. Smallwood's son, by Mr. Bill Smallwood, a

condition coming with respect to the house. Of course the house at Roaches Line, as the situation now is, is there for the use and enjoyment of Mr. Smallwood and Mrs. Smallwood for their lifetime. After that, it reverts to the people. That had not been an issue at the beginning. Then it appeared that one family member took the position that they were not going to co-operate with this foundation unless the house in question remained, not after both Mr. and Mrs. Smallwood were deceased, but indeed forever. Part of the agreement as well was that the upkeep and maintenance of that home, during the life of both of the Smallwoods, would be looked after by the public. Things seemed to be going very well, and then this new element came in.

The Premier, as I recall, discussed this with other people who were on the foundation. This is the way the matter resulted. It is most unfortunate. But, you know, the government's offer is still there.

We would wish to do what we can in terms of the encyclopedia and in terms of providing for the health and comfort of both Mr. and Mrs. Smallwood. The condition put on, which really is totally unrelated to the encyclopedia and unrelated to the comfort and health of Mr. and Mrs. Smallwood, is whether, upon their demise, Mr. Bill Smallwood should own the house or the people of Newfoundland should own the house. That is unrelated to the issue of help for the encyclopedia and looking after Mr. and Mrs. Smallwood during their lifetime.

MR. BARRY:

Be fair now, there are other heirs to Mr. Smallwood other than the

one you mentioned.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes, but no matter what heirs, it is not directly related with the comfort of Mr. and Mrs. Smallwood and it is not related to the encyclopedia. It is another issue which, in our opinion, should not have come in. I think when the government acted it was in discussion with people who were willing and wishing to be associated with the foundation. What was done was not contrary to the judgement of other people who were interested and concerned but felt that this was inappropriate, the introduction of this issue.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

As the Government House Leader just stated, the government's offer is still on the table. The question still has be asked, are we still not going to go back and negotiate to make sure that there is nursing care and make sure that the home is looked after and upgraded?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! That is no point of order.

Are there any other petitions?

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition

from the student body of Truman Eddison Memorial School which is in Gunners Cove on the Northern Peninsula. The students of that school, Mr. Speaker, are concerned with the deplorable condition of the road in the area. In their WHEREASes, which I will not go down through because the evening is moving by, I will the petition:

"We, the students of Truman Eddison Memorial hereby petition the hon. House of Assembly to instruct the Minister of Transportation to institute a two operator system at the St. Anthony depot from December through April."

Mr. Speaker, I spent most of this Winter in St. John's and I have heard all the uproar that there has been about the big snow falls that we have received in this city during the Winter. It makes me smile when I hear them talking about the amount of snow. Mr. Speaker, probably compared to other years in St. John's it is a fair amount of snow but, if members of the hon. House want to see snow, they have to go the Straitsview, they have to go to L'Anse-au-Meadows, they have to go to Gunners Cover, they have to go to Goose Cove and they have to go to Raleigh because it is on the Northern Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, where the heaviest snowfall in Newfoundland accumulates.

That snowfall, Mr. Speaker, is blown around by the winds which have the genesis in Greenland. When you get a coupling of a heavy snowfall and the winds blowing off the Atlantic you have a combination which makes it impossible to keep roads open under normal circumstances. An hon. member says he has travelled there for many years and he is

aware of what I am talking.

Even if there were a genuine concern, a genuine will to keep these roads open, Mr. Speaker, it would be extremely difficult. Difficult but it is not impossible. This petition is suggesting that one of the reasons that the roads are not being kept open is that the snow equipment is only being operated for one shift, one crew. What we have on the Northern Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, is expensive snow clearing equipment, costing probably \$300,000 per machine, parked for eight to sixteen hours out of a twenty-four hour shift. For the sake of another \$80.00 per shift, another operator could be taken on and this equipment, instead of being parked, could be used. The extra night shift, Mr. Speaker, could make certain that the roads were kept open.

Now, the Department of Transportation uses the argument that the reason for using one shift is that the machinery can be more adequately maintained. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the machinery which is being used on the Northern Peninsula is in so bad a state of repair that it takes eight to sixteen hours a day to keep it maintained, then there is either something wrong with the way it is being maintained or else there is something wrong with the manufacture of the equipment.

There is no need, Mr. Speaker, to keep this extra shift off the machinery. It is not an argument, it is solely an excuse. The fact of the matter is that years ago, when every little community in that part of Newfoundland had their own schools, when Straitsview had their own schools, when Noddy Bay had their own

school, there were two shifts on the machinery up there, there were two shifts clearing snow. But in recent years government policies have forced school boards to consolidate the schools in the area and, on top of this consolidation, we have a Department of Transportation policy which has taken one shift of snow clearers off the equipment so the students are required to travel more than ever before. While they are being required to travel more than ever before, the Department of Transportation changes the policy, takes of an extra shift and what we have is the children in the area missing an unbelievable number of school days.

The children in Truman Eddison Memorial School are concerned about that because they know that they are already starting off with one hand tied behind their backs because they are forced to study in rural schools where their chances are already second class to urban schools. They are starting off with a loaded deck, Mr. Speaker, and on top of that, they are being penalized by a government policy which makes sure that the roads will not be kept open.

I am supporting this petition. I trust that this House will instruct the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to review the policy up there and put that second shift on the snow plows so that the roads can be kept open a lot more than they are now kept open.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, just briefly I rise in my place to support the prayer of this particular petition from the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker).

He talks about the Department of Highways cutting back snow clearing equipment to one shift. I cannot see why the minister over there, who has been known to be pretty shifty himself on certain issues, why he cannot come up with two shifts to look after this particular problem.

I think the crux of the matter, as outlined by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, what it boils down to, is a matter of public safety. These particular children, through no fault of their own, are required to take buses between communities, over very sub-standard roads, in very hazardous winter conditions, to high schools and elementary schools in other parts of the district.

I offer as an example children from New Ferolle, way out on the point on New Ferolle in the Northern section of my riding, which would be the Southern section of the riding of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), have to be bused thirty kilometers over an absolutely ridiculous road in Summer or Winter.

I just drove that road myself last week, Mr. Speaker. It is amazing, you are driving through a tunnel of snow. It is just absolutely incredible, the mountains of snow. And what do we see from this administration?

Do we see the recognition of children having to go through this torment, and that is all it is, a torment on these buses over substandard road? Do we see an administration showing a caring, putting aside certain amounts of emergency funding to look after exceptional areas such as these Northern zones, to ensure that these children are transported safely in the Wintertime?

No, we see cutbacks, we see contracting out when deemed necessary by the Department of Transportation, when they can get the equipment. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough in this day and age. That is not good enough.

The number one priority has to be the safety of these children. I look at the member's petition and I noted Gunners Cove, which we all saw I think on province-wide television one night, where the buses could barely make it, barely get a tunnel through this mountain of snow, packed with children from other areas in his district. Now that is just not good enough.

If we cannot find the money to look after our children, and the measure of any society, the yardstick that we have to use is how we treat our young people, our children and our aged. If we cannot find money for those young people maybe we have to question whether we in this Province are enhancing and promoting the civilized nature of our society. Perhaps we are not, perhaps we are being regressive. Perhaps the regressive Conservatives cannot find money for our children. It is just absolutely ludicrous.

And we call upon, through this petition, submitted I think by

children, this petition came from children through the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle, we do beg, through this petition, the government to find extra money to look after the safety of these children. That is the priority. The measure of any society is how we treat our young people. The yardstick is up. The people are watching. We are waiting to see how you measure up.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### Orders of the Day

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Development And Tourism Act," carried. (Bill No. 4)

On motion, Bill No. (4) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Occupational Therapists," carried. (Bill No. 8)

On motion, Bill No. (8) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The St. John's Fire Department Act, 1972," carried. (Bill No. 2)

On motion, Bill No. (2) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act And The Uniformed Services Pensions

Act," carried. (Bill No. 3)

On motion, Bill No. (3) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Veterinary Medical Act, 1971," carried. (Bill No. 10)

On motion, Bill No. 10 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 6)

On motion, Bill No. (6) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act," carried. (Bill No. 9)

On motion, Bill No. (9) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Unimproved Lands (Redistribution) Act," carried. (Bill No. 7)

On motion, Bill No. 7 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

#### MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling Motion 1, I would like to say that there are three questions for debate at the adjournment today. I received

five questions, so I am taking the first three that I received.

Number one is by the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) who is dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to his question on Special Warrants.

The second is from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) who is not satisfied with the answer to a question he asked of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Premier. He would like to have the opportunity to discuss that question.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Is there something there to indicate the subject matter of that second one, or is it not indicated there?

MR. SPEAKER:

No, it is not.

MR. TULK:

It has to do with the fish cages.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Cages, okay, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The third one is from the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who is dissatisfied with an answer given to a question by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) concerning the Workers' Compensation Board.

The debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) who is not present. The hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to

be able to speak to this resolution so ably presented by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a small town just North of here, Flatrock, and from the time I could crawl, I suppose, and certainly since I can remember, I had an association with the fishery. I was with my father when every Spring we tried to get aboard the old trap skiff, and I helped out when I could because those were trying times, as the fishery is on every occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I went away for a few years and came back and again participated in the fishery. I trap fished, handlined and gillnetted. I might add here, Mr. Speaker, that that was before the advent of the gurdy, and I am not sure, if they had been available, if we would have had the money to buy one.

Mr. Speaker, I watched and took advantage of the situation as I went around the countryside, from the Southern Shore to St. Mary's Bay, Trinity Bay, St. John's itself, St. John's East, St. John's East Extern, and watched the decline of the inshore fishery.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is terrible.

MR. PARSONS:

The hon. member opposite says, 'It is terrible', and so it is.

We were lucky in that part of the country, on that part of the Northeast Coast, because we were not treated by the shortage of fish as badly as other areas. Five years ago I saw trap crews with three traps have in excess of a million pounds of cod. Last year it came down, it was on a slide, on an annual slide, to

approximately 300,000 to 400,000 pounds of cod. Again, they caught that amount by using twice as much effort; men who had used three traps to catch a million pounds of cod five years ago were now using eight traps to catch 300,000 to 400,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose anyone who lives in a small community will readily see what happens when fish is scarce, when there is no fish. Living in a small town I can certainly and readily see it. When fish is plentiful you can see the difference in the children, the difference in the nutritional, going to school they have more food, more clothes, the men have better access to equipment, new trucks and cars; churches benefit, schools benefit, everything benefits. And it is a myth, Mr. Speaker, when you hear someone say, Well, I do not know much about it. I am not involved in it. I say to them, Mr. Speaker, that each and every Newfoundlander, if he is a Newfoundlander, in some tangible way has an involvement in the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it set a precedent in Newfoundland and Labrador when last year people became alarmed, people were upset, they did not know where to go when they saw the shortcomings in the fishery. They saw it coming over a period of years, and in many instances, in many areas, the condition of no fish had arrived. So a group of people, again setting a precedent, aligned themselves, several different areas of the industry, plant owners, plant workers, fishermen, businessmen, people from town councils, all associations, church people, you name it, people from all walks of life got together and

said they had to do something about the shortcomings in the inshore fishery. At a meeting in the Goulds where about a thousand people were present, we were amazed at the interest; we even had farmers there. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) spoke of the grave concern that the provincial government had as it concerned the inshore fishery. Mr. Speaker, from that meeting and other meetings, one held in Carbonear when my friend here, the hon. Mr. Peach, spoke and again voiced concern about the problems that existed in his area, there was another meeting held in Fogo and again concern was expressed. Out of that, Mr. Speaker, came NIFA, the Newfoundland Inshore Fisheries Association. NIFA presented many briefs and spoke with the scientists at DFO to try and explain to them their concerns, to try to say to them, Look, we are not on the right track, there has to be changes, and in that respect it fell on deaf ears. We are not blaming the scientists. We are not saying that. They were overworked. They did not have the facilities and they did not have the biologists. Again, it was something that was not treated as an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of NIFA, which I attended, we, as a group acquired the services of three biologists from Memorial University, Dr. Keats, Dr. Green and Dr. Steel, all people who had an interest in the fishery. One in particular, Dr. Green, worked with the Department of Federal Fisheries and Oceans in that capacity. Mr. Speaker, we asked those people, those biologists, those scientists to present to us an impartial report on the condition of the fishery as it

pertained to the biomass and the TAC. They did just that, and it showed without a doubt that there were many discrepancies. There was no concrete scientific evidence as to that biomass that was talked so much about being able to stand the overfishing that apparently was taking place.

Mr. Speaker, that brief was presented to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans in Ottawa, and included with that brief there was a ten point plan that NIFA presented to the minister, as well. This ten point plan dealt with the problems that existed in the inshore fishery. Mr. Speaker, we were pleased not altogether with what the minister did but we were pleased that he accepted the report, and he wrote a letter to NIFA saying that the contents of the report was excellent and he would take it under advisement.

There was no fight, Mr. Speaker, between the inshore and the offshore. The only thing that people were aware of was the shortage of fish and that eventually the inshore problem would become an offshore problem if there was not something done in the interim.

Mr. Speaker, out in what we call our Northern cod there is 2J+3KL, three distinct areas really, 2J, 3K and 3KL. Now, in 1985, 99 per cent of the effort was directed in 3KL; 2J had 1 per cent. 3KL are the fishing grounds that supply the fish to most of the Northeast Coast. When Mr. Siddon announced his groundfish plan for 1987, he did not take into consideration all the requests of NIFA, but what he did do was direct his department to cut the TAC, which last year was 266,000 metric tons, to 256,000 metric tons. But, Mr.

Speaker, I want to make it clear here now that his own scientists within DFO had already suggested that the TAC be cut to 246,000 tons.

Mr. Speaker, he did, by 10,000 tons, but he did several other things in accordance with that that we were pleased with: He put observers on each Canadian trawler. The observers had lots of work to do, but their main reason for being there was to look after the discards, to look after the fish that was thrown away.

Mr. Speaker, we met with the trawler men, we met with FPI and we know that on occasion as high as 30 per cent of the fish taken aboard the trawlers is discarded. In other words, they were getting a better price for the larger fish, they did not want the small fish so they threw it overboard. And that 30,000 tons out of 100,000 tons, using round figures, was not counted against their quota.

So what he did was put observers on the boats and now, once they take that 100,000 tons over the stern of the boat, it is counted against their quota.

He also said that scientific research would increase drastically, and that would again determine the actual biomass that feed the stocks that are so important to the Northeast Coast. What he did in the 2J+3KL was instead of the 99 per cent effort in 3KL he said, 'Okay, each one of the areas, the 2J and the 3KL will be given thirty-three and one-third per cent effort.' Although we did not get that. Because in the Keats Report Doctor Keats suggested that the federal government cut the TAC to 185,000



metric tons. We did not get near the 185,000 metric tons. But taking everything into account, the observers, where the discards were discontinued, and taking the overall picture as it pertained to 2J+3KL, we figured it was down perhaps to 225,000 metric tons.

Mr. Speaker, all the while this was going on, all the while the people in Newfoundland were so upset from coast to coast, everyone was upset with the situation, the provincial government had another problem, and Newfoundland had another problem. On the Southwest Coast, in 3Ps, the French were overfishing. There was no way to stop them. Out of a quota last year of 6,500 tons, they raped 3Ps and took 26,000 tons. Mr. Speaker, some way or another it has to be stopped. If not, it will end up where there will be no fishery on the Southwest Coast of Newfoundland.

It has been said, I suppose looking at the geographics of it, that 2GH is part of the Northern cod, but only in the sense of geographics. Because there are 12,000 metric tons of fish up there, a quota of 12,000 metric tons, and Canada has never used in excess of 500 tons per year. So that is excess fish up there, surplus fish. If the federal government pressured the provincial government by saying, 'We have to offer France something to get them to the bargaining table,' what else could they offer them? They wanted fish. So they did offer them 1,000 tons in 2GH. By the time that had gotten to Paris it was 3,000 metric tons.

Mr. Speaker, then came that deal, the infamous deal of 1986. There was no involvement at the latter

stages by the provincial government, none whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, it is funny when you think about it. They were involved in all the negotiations, right up until the Minister of Fisheries received a phone call from Ottawa asking what he thought of Northern cod being placed on the table. Needless to say, the Minister of Fisheries was alarmed, was amazed that Northern cod be even thought about as a bargaining tool. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for anyone, and I am sure I speak for 95 per cent of Newfoundlanders, saying that the minister was not being truthful. In fact, I am sure both the minister and the Premier were truthful in their saying that they were never notified, except for the phone call that reached the minister saying that they were wondering what our Province thought about Northern cod going on the table. God knows, everyone knows what our government thinks about Northern cod as a bargaining tool.

Mr. Speaker, we met with the hon. the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) and he did not know, he was not told. He was told there were people going to Paris but they had no authority to sign anything. Mr. Speaker, that was the first lie; because the next day, after he thought everything was okay, fine, there was going to be no deal signed, at least they are only over there, he learned that they did have signing authority, that they were going to sign this infamous deal, they were going to give away, they were going to make it bad for every Newfoundlander.

But what we did not get to was the fact that in 1972 they also signed a treaty and gave them rights to

fish around the shores of Newfoundland, but they were not specific. What the 1986 agreement did was it spelled out 'cod', it spelled out 'codfish', and that, in essence, signed away the rights of an awful lot of Newfoundlanders.

Our government, I do not think there is any doubt about it, did what they could. They did everything they could. There was nothing left undone. I mean, what more could you do? Crosbie did not know, and the hon. the minister, he did not know it was going ahead. I mean, there was no recourse to him. He, I suppose, did his best as well. He said he did not know, he was lied to. So, I mean, what recourse did the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries have but to come and tell the people of Newfoundland what had happen and that they did not have anything whatsoever to do with it?

Mr. Speaker, I feel justification in saying that the hon. the Minister of Transport, being a member of that Cabinet, should have known. He should have known. Why he was not told of that I do not know. I cannot realize or visualize what could happen in a Cabinet of forty-odd men for one man to be left out of something that was so directly involved with his Province.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back a little bit in history and we will talk about the French situation in general. Mr. Speaker, in 1759 the French were beaten on the Plains of Abraham, they were turned out, all finished, gone, but some Englishman in his good heart said, All right we will give them a bit of fish, we will let them have those two islands for their ships to go into during the Summertime.

No inhabitants were supposed to be there, just enough people to facilitate the working of the ships. And they came waving a piece of paper. They had something. In 1904 they said, Okay, we are going to let you inhabit the French shore but up until this day, although they vacated it, up until this day they say that they own the waters around there. They only vacated the land. They let us live on the land, but they did not vacate the waters, they still say they own it; always waving a piece of paper, we have an agreement, we have a treaty.

In 1972 they were back again and they said, Look, we want a new agreement, and this is the agreement that came up, this agreement of 1972, which gave them the right to Canadian waters. It gave them the right to fish in Canadian waters, again not being specific, but it did give them the right. It also gave them the right to establish quotas, and it also said that a commission would exist whereby if they were not satisfied with the quotas they could have the commission and see if their quotas were satisfactory to both parties.

MR. PEACH:

That was your buddy, was it?

MR. PARSONS:

The people who signed this committed a misdemeanor. There is no doubt at all about it in my mind, nor do I think in anyone else's.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier does not agree.

MR. PARSONS:

It was a misdemeanor.

MR. HODDER:  
Who did it?

MR. PARSONS:  
Who did it?

MR. HODDER:  
The Liberals of Canada, right?

MR. PARSONS:  
In 1972.

MR. PEACH:  
You were supporting them then.

MR. PARSONS:  
Mr. Speaker, in 1972, they came back and they said, Okay, we will forfeit all previous rights. What rights? They had no rights, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Right on! Right on!

MR. PARSONS:  
They were waving a few pieces of paper. They had no rights, they were a foreign country, from Europe. We again said, Okay, we are going to give you some more; up the ladder they are going. Now, in 1986 a lot of things are after changing. They decided they were not getting enough. Now they are pressing that 3Ps bit. They want to have that boundary dispute brought to arbitration, so we must get something on the table so we will have it to bring to the arbiter. So what they did very simply - they are sleazy to say the least - they decided, all right, we will try to get this bit of fish from 2J+3KL and we will have it there if ever we go to arbitration. But I do not think they will ever go, because they have everything to lose and nothing to win. So what are they going for, Mr. Speaker? But they wanted it on the table. They wanted to say for three years,

While we are talking to you - they did not say anything about actually going to arbitration, they are just going to talk - while we are talking to you we want X number of thousand tons or whatever from 2J+3KL.

Mr. Speaker, they could not control those people in 3Ps, they could not control them in a restricted area, now, with the acreage in 2J+3KL, how in the name of goodness will they ever control them as to how much fish they will take? You cannot do it, Mr. Speaker. It is impossible!

You know, when I heard the Minister of Fisheries speak the other day he spoke about all the politics of it, all the agreements, all the ways the government went about trying to have this agreement abrogated, torn up, shredded, finished with, and then he said, and it confused me and it amused me sort of too, that at one point in time when all this was going on they talked about the gunboats coming over. A few years ago there was nothing about gunboats coming this way, it was the other way. But, anyway, perhaps that is the answer to it, drive them out of here. They were driven out of everywhere else. They were driven out of Africa and driven out of everywhere else, so drive them out of here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:  
There is one place in Africa where they still are, in Chad, and as soon as they have the wherewithal, they will turn them out of there, too.

MR. PEACH:  
You have lots of time, boy, go on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for St. John's East Extern, carry on.

MR. PARSONS:

The Premier did everything. He supported all the people, he supported all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. He did his utmost. What else could he do? He had a meeting of all the Premiers, again setting a precedent. They all agreed that we are getting a raw deal. They all agreed that Newfoundlanders could not sustain this type of thing. We cannot sustain it. We cannot lose any more cod. We cannot lose it! The federal government apologized. Big deal! We had the French President coming over here. That was a big deal, they apologized. But there was nothing they were going to do about it. They have other things to bargain with. Why did they not bargain with the other things they had?

MR. PEACH:

Wheat.

MR. PARSONS:

Wheat, any kind of agriculture, any kind of commodity. In fish it was not there. What I am saying is it was never determined by any of the biologists that there was enough fish out there to sustain the effort that we had already in place. How in the name of heavens were they going to give the French some of what we did not know was there when there may not be any there, not enough anyway to sustain our own effort?

Mr. Speaker, this situation is serious. There is no doubt at all

about it. What do we do about it? I believe all parties in the House should take a stand on it, a unanimous stand. What do we do about it? Number one, abrogate the agreement, get rid of it, tear it up. The Minister of Transport promised that at the next Constitutional Conference, for the first time jurisdiction will be an item on the agenda. Mr. Speaker, that is one answer.

Extend the 200 mile limit to the nose and tail of the Banks. Mr. Speaker, that is another thing. That is something that we did again prior to a general election; someone wanted to do it in expedience. The precedent had been set by Equador and Iceland and the United States when they conceived the 200 mile economic zone, because the 200 mile economic zone took in all their fishing grounds, all of it. There was none left. They were satisfied. But in Canada the situation was different. The nose and tail of the Banks were left out and they have to come in. We have to get control of the nose and tail of the Banks if we are going to provide the necessary fish that our people need for survival, and we are survivors.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on is the House Report. The House Report suggested very strongly that a commission be set up to investigate the failure of the inshore fishery, including the TAC and the methodology used in evaluating the TAC.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to think about Newfoundland, N-f-l-d. Sometimes we use it, N-f-l-d, Newfoundland, never found lying down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

I say to all hon. members that the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries were never found lying down. They did not crawl under the table, they stood up for Newfoundland like good Newfoundlanders and they said that Newfoundland was first and foremost.

I do not know but there should be a monument to the two men, the Fighting Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

They did a great job and all the people, and I am sure all the people on the other side of the House, too, agree that they did a wonderful job of it and the only thing left now is the effort that we all have to put together, both sides, to send this resolution to Ottawa to show that we are all Newfoundlanders, each and every one of us are Newfoundlanders, and we want to remain Newfoundlanders.

Remember a few years ago when some guy said, "Export them, export 200,000." Is that what you want? Export us? Perhaps that is what you want, to let Newfoundlanders be sent to Ontario. We do not want to go, so we are going to stay.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting this resolution.

MR. J. CARTER:

Keep going by leave.

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The hon. gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) has made his maiden speech. He wanted a few more minutes and it is churlish in the extreme for the Leader of the Opposition not to give him a few more minutes by leave?

MR. BARRY:

No.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think this is disgraceful.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's North was obviously asleep when the member got up and gave the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, which was his maiden speech.

MR. SIMMS:

That was not his maiden speech.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the protection of the Chair. I have a few minutes and I have some important remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Now, normally, Mr. Speaker, even though it was not the member's maiden speech we would have been delighted to give him extra time but I am going to be away tomorrow and I am afraid that the debate might clue up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I did not want to be away without making a few points just to show the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) even though he cannot take responsibility for it, he does not have to take responsibility for it, just how the wool has been pulled over his eyes by the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, who was it who first traded off Northern cod for a deal with the French? Do you know who it was? It was the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries in December, Mr. Speaker. They agreed to give Northern cod off Labrador to the French in December and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has admitted that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That was not Northern cod.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member is getting confused, as I am sure was the Premier's intention, as to what is Northern cod. I refer to the Premier's pamphlet, which he has put out at taxpayers' expense, Strength From The Sea, which has already been tabled by the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter). Northern cod, according to the Premier's definition, runs right up to Cape Chidley. So what is it about Labrador cod? Is Labrador cod not as important because it is off Labrador?

MR. SIMMS:

It is surplus.

MR. BARRY:

It is surplus! They say it is surplus. Tell that to the fishermen of Smokey when they go up there this Summer. Tell them it is surplus when there is no fish coming in for them. Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen do not understand that these cod stocks move down the coast of Labrador. They are there for the fishermen of Smokey, not just for residents of Black Tickle and other residents of Labrador, but the residents that go up from the Island of Newfoundland to fish those stocks which were traded off in a treacherous fashion by the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries because they thought they would not be found out.

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:

The Leader of the Opposition has certainly completely lost control of himself and I wish to table the following document which will perhaps explain why he is so upset. I have two copies, one for the Leader of the Opposition and one for the table.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I ask for protection. The member for St. John's North has regularly done that on a number of occasions when I have gotten up, risen on an excessive number of points of order. I ask for your protection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) in his few remarks indicated he still had not learned, because he was still talking about trading fish to the French when he stood up in this House. Look, I would not even read it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I would not even bother reading it. Mr. Speaker, whatever comes over from the member for St. John's North, that is the attention it deserves.

In his remarks, the Minister of Fisheries indicated that that fundamental fallacy is still there in his thinking. He still talks about the need to trade fish to the French, to give into blackmail, Mr. Speaker. He still talks about it but he says it is all right as long as it is surplus fish. Well, the member for St. John's East Extern, I do not think

he thinks we should trade any fish, surplus or non-surplus, to enforce our rights, to enforce Canadian conservation laws. I like the cut of that man's jib, Mr. Speaker, but I will tell you that the Minister of Fisheries should sit down with him for awhile and explain why he was prepared to give into blackmail, and he is still talking about doing it. He says it is all right as long as it is surplus fish. What garbage!

Mr. Speaker, on the matter of federal/provincial relations I think we see the real reason why this problem arose. Brian and John were not talking to each other, they were not talking to each other for months before this development occurred, before this agreement was entered into with France, and the interests of Newfoundland and Labrador were put behind the petty feud that went on between the Premier of this Province and our representative in the federal Cabinet. That is the reason why this Canada/France agreement went into place.

Now, one other final point, and this sums up all of that issue, Mr. Speaker, in this Canada/France fishing agreement dispute.

The other point is that the Premier desperately needed an issue to try and save his political skin and he was prepared to eat, devour other Tories in Ottawa. He would devour anything that came in his way in order to try and cling to power, to try and get an issue. He is the Pac Man, the political Pac Man of Canadian politics, Mr. Speaker. He would devour anything that would come in his way in order to get an issue that he thought would help stop his declining popularity. It did

not work. The people of this Province see through him now, Mr. Speaker. They saw through him and he realized that the issue was going nowhere. If you want to know, Mr. Speaker, what it has all gotten us, let us just ask ourselves this question: With all that ranting and roaring and raving, with all those attacks on the Newfoundland representative in Cabinet, on the Canadian Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon), calling him a liar, the attacks on Mr. Mulroney in saying he was not credible, with all this ranting and roaring, where are we? Is the agreement cancelled? Is the agreement torn up? Is the agreement changed, Mr. Speaker? Nothing. One member, I think St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parson) said, 'Oh, he got all the premiers together and they agreed with him.' I suggest the member go back and read the communiqué that came out of that Premier's Conference where the other premiers of Canada said, Yes, we think that that agreement should be reviewed. They did not say it should be torn up, Mr. Speaker. They did not say it should be modified, 'it should be reviewed', looked over, looked over again, viewed again. Well, it has been viewed again and it is still there, Mr. Speaker. It has not been torn up, it has not been cancelled and that is true of every issue. Where is the offshore oil? How many jobs have we got in offshore oil?

MR. TULK:

Did he not bring home the Constitution?

MR. BARRY:

He brought home the Constitution, yes, and he brought home the offshore oil, and now he has brought home the Canada/France

fisheries agreement.

This is an issue, Mr. Speaker, that has been dealt with by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. They see through the Premier. They see it as a purely desperate political grab to try and get an issue whereby the Premier could try and save his political hide. The sorrow of it all, Mr. Speaker, is that he has cost this Province thousands of jobs, millions of dollars, millions and millions of dollars.

MR. DAWE:

Do not be so foolish, boy.

MR. BARRY:

Whatever the Minister of Transportation might say, he is a man with a long memory. And while it is pleasant to see Tories fighting each other, we on this side of the House have to be seriously concerned about how much it is going to cost the people of this Province in jobs and in money. We on this side of the House have to ask, how much is it going to cost the Province in jobs and money to have the Premier of our Province and our representative in the federal Cabinet fighting and scratching and clawing at each other? What, oh what, is it going to cost us before it is all over?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Debate on the Adjournment  
[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:



It now being 5:30 p.m. there is a motion made to adjourn.

I call on the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) to debate that. He is not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on the question of Special Warrants.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is obviously not around, and other people are leaving. Maybe there is going to be nobody left over there to answer this question. Maybe the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) - it is his first day in the House in quite some time - might be able to answer this question and explain about his visits to the Far East.

I was concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the Special Warrants. Remember I asked a question about Special Warrants, whether they had been issued and other questions related to these Special Warrants. The concern that I have with regard to Special Warrants, Mr. Speaker, is that they are being used in such a way as to abuse the privilege that this government has been given through the Financial Administration Act.

The intent of these Special Warrants is of an emergency nature, Mr. Speaker. It is of a nature where emergency expenditures come up that were not foreseen, new expenditures come up, the House of Assembly has not been sitting for thirty days, the House of Assembly is not available to give new money to the government, therefore, under these special circumstances, the government has the right to obtain

a Special Warrant.

Also, if the government finds that, because of the vagaries of the Province and the financial state of the Province and the mess the Province is in, under a heading, Mr. Speaker, where a certain amount has been allocated, then under that heading, if the government is overspending, they can then get a Special Warrant, but they then have to report to the House of Assembly within three days.

We heard last Fall the Premier of this Province say, 'There is no need to open the House of Assembly,' Mr. Speaker, 'We have covered everything we need to.' How come we see these stacks of Special Warrants then, all these emergencies that have come up all Fall and during the last few days? How come?

These Special Warrants, Mr. Speaker, are being used in place of the House of Assembly, to create a quasi dictatorship. That is the purpose of these Special Warrants. We see in the Special Warrants, Mr. Speaker, a number of things. First of all, Salaries for Vocational School Instructors. They could have foreseen - and obviously did, if they knew what they were doing - a year ago they would need the salary allocations. These are continuing allocations. Nothing unexpected happened there. Yet, what do they do? They cooked the books a year ago, so that now, through Special Warrants, secretly, they can get the money that they knew full well they had to spend a year ago.

We also see, Mr. Speaker - unfortunately I have not very much time left - \$400,000, new

expenditures allocated to the law firm of Peter Lougheed. The House, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you, is available to discuss that and would have been available to discuss that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

We could have been discussing that in the last couple of days, as to whether, in fact, this new expenditure that I suspect might have been a part of the original agreement to pay Peter Lougheed \$40,000 - maybe that was the first advice he gave the Newfoundland Government, to hire his own law firm and put \$400,000 into it. Maybe that was his first piece of advice. I do not know if he ever gave them any other advice. We have heard nothing of these quarterly reports that Peter Lougheed is supposed to supply to us, not a word, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that Special Warrants have been abused seriously by this government to the detriment of this House and the rights of this House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that the hon. gentleman opposite is really setting himself up as a substitute Auditor General because when the Auditor General examines the financial reports of the Province, he is the one appointed by this House, accountable to this House, not accountable to the

government, not accountable to the Opposition, accountable to the House of Assembly for the appropriate running of the financial affairs of the Province. We will be looking to see what the Auditor General has to say. We are not too concerned about what the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) has to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

There has not been a motion in this House yet that the hon. the member for Gander should be the Auditor General of the Province and there has been no motion to fire Mr. McGrath.

MR. BAKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The hon. gentleman is getting up on his point of order, and we shall hear from him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The President of the Council (Mr. Ottenheimer) is in effect taking over my rights as a member of this House, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think that is correct. I do not have to wait for the Auditor General to comment a year later on

an expenditure in this House before I am permitted to comment on it in the House. He is suggesting that I should forego my rights as a member which I refuse to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the great defender. There is no need for Your Honour to waste his breathe.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference. I would not call it an opinion, but I would not wish to argue with Your Honour. The hon. gentleman is a great defendant of rights. Nobody whatsoever is worrying about him exercising his rights. All we are saying is that we shall look to the Auditor General for his analysis of fiscal management. If there is anything which is not in accord with The Financial Administration Act, we have no doubt the Auditor General will inform the House and that will be the appropriate way to do it.

I do not suppose there is a province in Canada which does not have a Lieutenant Governor's Warrants tabled. There has never been a year since Confederation, never since 1949, to the best of my knowledge, when there have not been Special Warrants tabled. I am sure there is not a province in Canada where Special Warrants have not been tabled. It would be ridiculous to go through what most of them are because that was done yesterday, things which were unanticipated and which was impossible to anticipate. When you bear in mind that not one year

since Confederation has there been a budget whereby Special Warrants were not required, and when you bear in mind that not one province of Canada has gone through a year without Special Warrants, and when you bear in mind that the Auditor General will in time have his opportunity to review this, then we think there is very little but hot air from the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I now call on the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, who is not satisfied with the answer he got from the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier about the fish cages.

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I feel really sad that I have to stand up and even ask the question that I had to yesterday when it concerns the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and the area of Bay d'Espoir which I have mentioned in this House many times. I am sure that the government is aware of the desperate situation there with 90 per cent unemployed.

Yesterday I had the occasion to ask the Minister of Fisheries was he aware that his department, in conjunction with the Department of Social Services, were constructing fish cages here in St. John's to be shipped back to Bay d'Espoir? He was not sure but he told me he would get me the answer today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this to me is a crime because the fish cages that are being constructed here could very easily have been done in Bay d'Espoir and alleviated some of the suffering and taken some of the people that are on social assistance there and put them to work. As I have said in this House before many times, there is a little more dignity drawing your unemployment than it is in drawing a welfare cheque. This is the only thing that would have been achieved by this but it shows the amount of planning that has gone into this aquaculture programme in Bay d'Espoir.

There is no doubt about it now. The facility is there, the fish are soon going to be ready to be put out to be grown and hopefully harvested and sold, but there is even doubts about that now. The thing about it that I am very concerned about is that we have had this aquaculture programme going in Newfoundland now for the last six years and it was held out to be the hope of rural Newfoundland. The Premier himself said that they picked Bay d'Espoir because it had the ideal qualities for this and the fact that it had an unemployment rate that is oppressive and not acceptable anywhere in the Western world today.

When I asked the minister about the cages, he did not know it. However, the point I am concerned about is that here we are about ready to have those fish go into the pens or into the cages and I was hoping that I was going to ask the minister - he is building the cages in St. John's and they are made of wood. Now, hung around those cages is a thing called a net. We are getting ready for aquaculture in Newfoundland for

the last six years. The net that is put around this frame that we are making here in St. John's of wood and transporting down to Bay d'Espoir, I found out are not even available in Newfoundland. They are not going to have them in Newfoundland. They could not get the nets made in Newfoundland and they are buying them from Allan Reid Agencies in Moncton, New Brunswick.

Now, can you imagine nets for a fish cage. For those people who have not seen it, I have been to the Marine Institute and I have seen a net for a fish cage, the mock one they have up there, and it looks something like a cod trap as a matter of fact.

MR. TULK:

Where are they made at?

MR. GILBERT:

They are made at Allan Reid Agencies in Moncton, New Brunswick. Just imagine, an industry that we are developing for rural Newfoundland, we are going to create jobs in rural Newfoundland and yet we cannot find anyone in Newfoundland to knit cod nets. Now, that to me would be sort of ridiculous for anyone to say but I asked the Department of Fisheries and this is the answer I got. There were no nets available in rural Newfoundland so they had to go to Allan Reid Agencies in Moncton, New Brunswick.

I have a letter here which I tabled yesterday which sums it up. This man Jake Davies from St. Albans says, 'I hope you can get someone to realize the way rural Newfoundland is ignored by some departments of the government.'

That is a very strong plea from

the people of rural Newfoundland to be protected from this government that has lost its reason to be there. It has forgotten the reason it was put there to rule. I think when the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Association had their meeting in December with the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet and they said that the political apathy and bureaucratic aloofness has seriously handicapped the efforts of development associations to develop rural Newfoundland, I think this is very true. I think these points here, the fact that they are developing an aquaculture programme and they have to go to New Brunswick to buy the nets and go to St. John's to build the cages, Mr. Speaker, when we have an area where 90 per cent of the people are unemployed. Obviously the skill level is not to high.

If the social service recipients can do it in St. John's, I am sure social service recipients can do it in Bay d'Espoir. The other thing we know is that Bay d'Espoir has been know since it was settled for lumber. When I grew up in Placentia Bay the spars and planks for boats came out of Bay d'Espoir. Here we have a situation now, Mr. Speaker, where the minister was unable to tell me why he could do this.

Yes, and the hon. member had better remember it is the most famous place in Placentia Bay. It is to bad he did not get out there to teach but he was not qualified enough for that. They had to put him in a lesser place. If he had been qualified enough they might have taken him in Haystack. The serious problem here -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to respond to the hideous crime that we have been accused of here by the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. FUREY:

Hideous, hideous.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Some people have a better command of English than others. Some drop their hs and some do not, Mr. Speaker. I cannot help that kind of stuff. I can only articulate the way I am used to.

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all talk about the netting that goes into the making of those cages. If we did not, you would hear screams from one end of this House to the other. You would probably see references in the Auditor General's Report, Mr. Speaker. You would hear the Opposition calling for public enquiries. We are bound, Mr. Speaker, by an act called The Public Tenders Act. If things that we need are over \$15,000, at least, we have to call public tenders, Mr. Speaker. If I, as a minister, gave a tender to a firm, whether it was in Bay d'Espoir or in -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, would you please use Beauchesne to choke the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, if I gave it to Bay d'Espoir or Baie Verte or St. Anthony and it was in conflict with the Public Tendering

Act, I would be the worst criminal person that ever walked into this House, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is that those materials -

MR. GILBERT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

There you are, see. They do not want the answers, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

The Newfoundlanders that you could have put to work knitting those nets would not have mind it if you bent the conflict of interest rules.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I hope the hon. gentleman will tell his colleagues, Mr. Speaker, so they will not question me in Question Period to find out why I awarded a \$50,000 contract and did not use the lowest tender. I hope the hon. gentleman will tell his colleagues that, Mr. Speaker, so there will not be any questions asked me, so I will not be on the firing line during Question Period.

Let us get back to the cages, Mr. Speaker. That is the answer on the netting. It all went to public tender, Mr. Speaker, awarded to the lowest bidder. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that Bay d'Espoir is not the only place in this Province where we have need for cages for aquaculture purposes. We have need of them in Holyrood Pond. We have need of them in Salmonier. We have need of them down in Green

Bay. We have need of them in a number of places around.

Mr. Speaker, there are ten cages being made that are going to take three weeks to make. That is the wooden part around the cages. We are utilizing the labour from a Social Services make-work programme. They are the same people who were employed on the lobster pot replacement programme. When they ran out of materials for the lobster pot programme, Mr. Speaker, rather than lay them off, we asked them to continue for the extra three weeks and make up the headings that we needed for the ten cages. There is the great hideous crime, Mr. Speaker, exposed for all Newfoundland to see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I call on the hon. member for Fogo. He is not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Labour concerning The Workers' Compensation Board.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I asked the Minister of Labour to inform this House why it was that a piece of legislation that was passed last Spring, putting in place an Appeal Tribunal for this Province, for the Workers' Compensation Board, was not yet operative, was not yet put in place, why the people had not been appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I think we know part of the answer, but we still do not know why it is that the Minister

of Labour has not acted. Of course, we know full well that this government acts on very little when it comes to labour, except to stomp over people with the heavy boot.

Mr. Speaker, this Appeals Tribunal is a very important piece of legislation, because what it does is take away from Commissioners, who have formerly made a decision on peoples' right to a certain benefit, to hear the appeals. In other words, it gives the person who is applying for workers' compensation the right to be heard by somebody other than the person who made the decision. A very important piece of legislation.

As a matter of fact, when the minister introduced the legislation last Spring, I think it was last April or May sometime in this Legislature, we congratulated him on it because it was something that we believed was long overdue. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not in place today and we still have people in this Province applying for Worker's Compensation that have the onus put on them to prove that they are eligible. We still have people in this Province today - I gave the House yesterday a brief that came from a lady I think who described it very well, a ten page brief. You have not got a copy? Well, I will see that the minister is supplied with one.

There is a questionnaire which those people are put through with 496 questions. The very privacy of their life is invaded by some of those people who are asking the questions. They are put through almost torture to prove that they - the burden of proof is not put upon the Worker's Compensation Board, it is put upon the people themselves.

Mr. Speaker, why is that Appeals Committee not in place? It is very obvious.

MR. BAIRD:

Sit down now and he will tell you, sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

It is very obvious why it is not in place, it is that great Tory tradition of patronage to their buddies that is causing this problem for the people in this Province again today. We have three commissioners, buddies of Frank Moores, the former Premier, and buddies of this Premier, who have been put in place and we do not know how much it is going to cost to get them out of that position so that we can put new people in their place. That is the real problem.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) promised in January that this would be put in place, "A week's time the problem," he said, "will be solved." He promised it again in February, "A week's time and it will be solved." Well, Mr. Minister, - I want to say to you that if you are going to invade the privacy of people's lives, if you are going to allow the Worker's Compensation Board to go on -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

I will talk to the Minister of Labour through the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Labour is going to allow the patronage dealings of this government, and we just saw another example of it this evening with Lougheed, another \$500,000, if he is going to allow \$500,000 of patronage money to stand in the way of his giving justice to the people of this Province, then I have to say to him, Mr. Speaker, that he should not hold the office he holds. He will no longer be considered the white knight of labour, the white knight of the working corps.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is no longer considered that I will tell you.

MR. TULK:

That is gone. That is tarnished and if the present trend continues in the Department of Labour and in the Worker's Compensation Board, then the Minister of Labour - I was out to his district on the weekend, he is in trouble out there. Was there not an ad in the paper saying, "Where is -

MR. SIMMONS:

Where is Ted Blanchard?

MR. TULK:

He had his picture in the paper I believe with a headline saying, "I am your MHA," to make sure that they knew who he was.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he is finished out there but I would say to him he is not going to get elected again in Bay of Islands, so I would say to him -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What?

MR. TULK:

No, no, gone. Got it the last time by sixteen votes. He is

gone. So I would say to him, Mr. Speaker, he has a short time left in this Legislature and I would say to him, while you are here, try to do something for the people you represent.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, what a terrible substitute for what used to be a very articulate, very well spoken critic of labour in the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

What an awful let down to the previous labour critic, Mr. Speaker. He finds a great deal of difficulty in coming up with a good sensible, honest to goodness question. I answered his questions earlier this week, Mr. Speaker, in this House. He tries to tear down a process which all of that side of the House last year blessed when I introduced Bill 39, a bill which amended an already good piece of legislation.

Our Worker's Compensation Act is as good as any piece of legislation of its type in Canada. We made provision, Mr. Speaker, in that bill for the replacement of commissioners that the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) talks about. We no longer wanted a commission, we wanted a board which would have due



representation on that board, representation of workers, including injured workers. Representation from management as management were complaining that they did not have representation in the Worker's Compensation Commission and they are the ones who pay the shot, they are the ones who are assessed. So we have corrected that. We have established a board of directors, Mr. Speaker, with good, credible representatives. They will not appreciate the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) referring to them as patronage appointments. They are good representatives.

MR. TULK:

I do not care if they do or not.

MR. BLANCHARD:

I am sure you do not.

Mr. Speaker, the partridge from Buchans Plains is afraid he is going to get some answers now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I ask the hon. gentlemen on my right to please keep silent.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, we have in place a legislative review committee which is also comprised of duly nominated representatives, nominated by trade unions, nominated by employers. We have put them in place, Mr. Speaker, appointed them, representatives of injured workers on a legislative review committee. That -

MR. TULK:

How much (inaudible)?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Would you please let me answer your question. You do not want an answer. I know. You are afraid you will get good answers.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:

We have an excellent review committee, Mr. Speaker, that is going around the Province, right now during the last several weeks. They have been going around having hearings in various parts of the province giving every opportunity to not only workers, workers organizations, trade unions, to employer organizations, to members of the general public, Mr. Speaker, who may be interested and want to go in and make some representation on the workers' compensation legislation because, in effect, it is a general thing that affects everybody in the Province because employers are assessed. It is a form of taxation so there is provision that anybody from the general public can go in, Mr. Speaker, and make representation.

Now, he focuses on the Appeals Tribunal, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, that is perhaps the most important aspect of that Bill No. 39. As I told members from the opposite side during the week, Mr. Speaker, there are certain administrative procedures and processes in any piece of legislation. There are -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. BLANCHARD:

No, they do not know about that. He has not ever been in government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker, he has never been in government so he does not know the meaning of the development of regulations and administrative processes which has to put in place to bring an act into operation.

MR. TULK:  
What were you doing all summer?

MR. BLANCHARD:  
That is in the mill now and, by the way, I never made firm promises. I have been careful to say, hopefully within the next couple of weeks. In this hon. House, this week I said hopefully within the next ten days to two weeks an Appeals -

MR. TULK:  
I did not hear you.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Go back to Hansard.

Within ten days or two weeks there will be an Appeals Tribunal, I hope, announced. Also, that tribunal will be made up, Mr. Speaker, again of creditable representatives of workers, their union heads, representatives of workers and representatives of employers. Mr. Speaker, that will be put into place I would expect within the next ten days or two weeks keeping to what I said in this House earlier in the week.

MR. TULK:  
Ten days to two weeks for now, right?

MR. BLANCHARD:  
I really believe, Mr. Speaker,

that the hon. member is afraid that this process will be brought in in the next two weeks. I do not think they want to see it.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Before we adjourn, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Before you put the motion to adjourn, I would inform hon. members that tomorrow we shall be calling the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 6, 1987 at 10:00 a.m.