



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 27

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Monday

[Preliminary Transcript]

6 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege. The hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a very serious matter. In our view it is a very serious matter, and I trust the House will take it with the seriousness with which it is intended. It is a point of privilege raised at the earliest opportunity because, until today, we did not have the Hansard from Thursday, and it relates to transactions and debate in the House last Thursday.

I would like to begin by passing on some references to Your Honour, that you might wish to consider, when this matter is being thought about.

First of all, Beauchesne, as Your Honour knows, says that "A question of privilege is a question, partly of fact and partly of law - the law of contempt of Parliament."

I intend to make a case, Mr. Speaker, in connection with transactions, as I say, in the House last Thursday, November 2, which will show that the Premier has misled the House. This case will show that very contempt of Parliament, and will clearly indicate, that because of the actions that I will outline, the privileges of Members of this House have also been breached.

When I am finished, Mr. Speaker, I

believe that you will have no alternative but to determine that the matter is of such a serious nature as to entitle my subsequent motion, in other words that a prima facie case does exist, which would allow it to take priority over the Orders of the Day. This too is pointed out in Beauchesne, as Your Honour knows, which says that Your Honour does not rule as to whether or not there is a point of privilege. We do not expect you to do so, that is not your role.

You will also see, Mr. Speaker, I think, that this is not a dispute as to the facts. The facts are clear.

Beauchesne, I want to point this out for Your Honour, paragraph 31, page 13, in its 6th Edition, outlines examples of what does not constitute a question of privilege. The example I will present - you will clearly see - does not fit in any of the categories in paragraph 31 and for very good reason, because our example does fit as a question of privilege.

You can also refer to the House of Commons Journals, June 19, 1959, pages 582-586 - where you will see that when a Member's actions are brought into question a specific charge must be made. I intend to conclude my presentation, therefore, as I must, with a specific charge.

And lest one might think that this is not a matter for the House to deal with - I refer you to Sir John Bourinot, Parliamentary Procedure, 4th Edition 1916, pages 135 to 140 - where it clearly indicates that many facets of electoral propriety have been examined by the House and there

are also many examples in Beauchesne, 6th Edition, pages 19 & 20.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the case. I refer to the questions asked in this House by my colleague, the Member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I believe it was Wednesday of last week, and that concerned the matter of political interference by the former Minister of Social Services in carrying out his duties, as a Minister at the time, in the overturning of a decision of his professional staff, and providing something other than the normally accepted accommodations for a single able-bodied person. I am sure the Premier will recall the question.

In his statement the Premier on November 2, last Thursday, stated in the House 'that he had examined reports from four different officials of the Department of Social Services, and that this was a simple act of compassion,' and went on to say 'that the case involved a nineteen year old client, who had come to St. John's as a witness in the Hughes Inquiry, who had been offered accommodations at the Wiseman Centre, but that the group home atmosphere of the Wisemen Centre would not be appropriate in this case. And that a private bed sitting room or single room unit was provided to this client, and that the client required some degree of privacy.' These are all quotes from the Premier's statement of last Thursday, which I am sure all hon. Members have a copy of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in summation, on that day, the Premier clearly sloughed off this question as if it were a minor matter. He then

proceeded to berate and attack the Member for Port au Port, who we can all now see was simply doing his job in asking questions about information that he had received as an Opposition Member.

Mr. Speaker, we now learn that the Premier totally misled the House with his response. First of all, there were no nineteen year old witnesses at the Hughes Inquiry, we are told. Secondly, witnesses who are brought to St. John's to testify at this Inquiry have their accommodations paid for by the Commission, in question.

We now learn that the client was, in fact, a twenty-four year old, single able-bodied person.

We also understand further that this individual did not simply come here to testify at the Hughes Enquiry. Indeed we understand the individual came back to Newfoundland before the hearings even took place. That certainly was not the impression left in the House by the Premier's statement. We further understand that accommodations at the Wiseman Centre would indeed be very appropriate for young men in these circumstances, because contrary to the Premier's impressions of a group home atmosphere, it is evident, we understand, that the Wisemen Centre indeed has private, single rooms available, and indeed what is perhaps even more important, they have professional social workers and counselors on staff. That again is not what we were led to believe by the Premier's statement on Thursday. Mr. Speaker, in this entire matter it is apparent and clear that the Premier misled the House, because of the impressions he left with us on Thursday. But, what is truly amazing in all this is, that the

Premier said he had examined reports from four different professionals of the Department of Social Services - four reports. I would like to ask, in presenting this point of privilege, were all of these reports, all four of these reports, unanimous in providing this incorrect information? Was there not anything at all in any of those four reports that might somehow twig the Premier's mind, that would allow him to say, or think, that perhaps the information he is about to relay to the House was, in fact, incorrect, false and misleading? Finally, to quote from the Premier when he said in Hansard on Thursday, Page R2, he says, "We have learned on this side of the House not to give credibility to such allegations raised by Members on this side of the House." Would he not agree now that perhaps he was a bit hasty in making that kind of a comment and that kind of a reflection towards the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder)? Those are questions that we would like to ask. Now, Mr. Speaker, the evidence is very, very clear. It is a very serious matter, as Beauchesne says. The Premier has misled the House, has reflected negatively on the honour, the integrity and character of the House, and has shown a high contempt, therefore, of the privileges of the House, and particularly in this case, the privileges of the Member for Port au Port.

I want to conclude by providing Your Honour with two final parliamentary references, Beauchesne, 6th Edition, Page 20, Paragraph 69, "It is very important to indicate that something can be inflammatory, can be disagreeable, can even be

offensive, but it may not be a question of privilege unless the comment actually impinges upon the ability of Members of Parliament to do their jobs properly." In this instance the answer provided by the Premier, in our view, does just that.

But finally the most telling reference in our view, your Honour, is also from Beauchesne's 6th Edition, page 25, paragraph 97 and I quote: "The Speaker has stated - while it is correct to say that the Government is not required by our rules to answer written or oral questions, it would be bold to suggest that no circumstances could ever exist for a prima facie question of privilege to be made, where there was an attempt to deny answers to an honourable Member, if it could be shown that such action amounted to improper interference with the honourable Member's parliamentary work". Now we see the Premier smiling and laughing at all of this, Mr. Speaker, one of these days that grin is going to come back to haunt him. My opinion Mr. Speaker, is that this is exactly what has happened in this particular instance, so Mr. Speaker I have presented the case, I have done so with references, I have done so with evidence, I have made a charge as required, and should your Honour rule that the matter is serious enough to be debated, and that I have made a prima facie case, then I am prepared to move the appropriate motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. The Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Opposition House Leader is rising

on yet another point of privilege. He is using an opportunity to express an opinion on an incident that has been ongoing for some time and something that was stated in the House on Thursday. I respectfully put to your Honour that this is not a question of privilege at all, it simply provided the Member opposite with an opportunity to get up and express an opinion, in actual fact the Premier, in answer to that question, indicated that he had received information from the officials in the Department, which is all that can be expected of the Premier in this instance, he cannot go out himself personally and investigate every single little thing that comes up. He had information from his officials and he gave to the House that information from the officials, so he was simply relaying to the House what he was told. There are a number of references that could be used, Mr. Speaker, concerning this, first of all in terms of what is a valid claim of privilege, Beauchesne paragraph 92, page 25 " A valid claim of privilege in respect to interference with a Member must relate to the Member's parliamentary duties", I do not see where there is any interference in parliamentary duties, so the only bone of contention here is, whether the Premier deliberately misled the House. It has nothing to do with interfering with the parliamentary privileges of Members opposite. I just want to find one more reference Mr. Speaker. Beauchesne's, page 151, paragraph 494 " It has been formally ruled by Speakers that statements by Members particularly within their own knowledge must be accepted." The Premier made a statement to this House based on the knowledge

that he was given, and he gave that statement accurately, there is no doubt.

Even today, Mr. Speaker, the facts surrounding that particular case are probably not exactly as stated by the Government House Leader. In fact, the acting Minister of Social Services has since done further investigation upon the appearance of that particular story that the Member refers to, and there is further information that we are now putting together on that particular thing. And once it all becomes available, the House will be notified.

I should point out that the individual involved was down here, the R.N.C. did bring him down. It was in connection with the Hughes Inquiry, and we were informed that that individual may, in fact, within the next two weeks be testifying for the Hughes Inquiry. So it was in connection with the Hughes Inquiry.

The actual detail will be given to the House after the full investigation has been done, but to summarize, Mr. Speaker, the Premier was giving the facts from his knowledge at the time, and that does not constitute a point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair will just take a little time to think about this matter. The matter of Privilege is an important matter. I just want to reflect a little, then I think I can make a decision. I will just take a little time, and some time later today will rule on the point of privilege.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker before we -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

- before we get to the regular business of the day, I rise to ask your Honor and all other hon. Members of the House, to extend condolences to the families of the four men who recently lost their lives in a tragic accident off our shores. They are Mr. Pierre Gallien, a senior engineer from Caraquet, New Brunswick, one of the Coast Guard members who was trying to retrieve the diver that was in difficulty in a storm situation. That man's body has been found. Leading seaman Raymond Welcher, of Badger's Quay, also lost his life in service to his fellow man. His body has not been recovered. Captain Greg Peddle of Mount Pearl also lost his life, and his body has not been recovered. Leonard Caul, the diver the three members of the Coast Guard had been attempting to rescue or recover at the time, they knew not which, also lost his life and his body has not been recovered.

With such a lengthy time having passed, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the men have been lost, that they are dead, and it is highly unlikely that their bodies will be recovered. When we bear in mind that these were three men providing coast guard service to people, particularly in Newfoundland, who go down to the sea in ships to wrest their living

from the waters of the sea, I think it behooves us all to acknowledge the contribution they make and I would ask this hon. House to extend its condolences to the families of the four men who lost their lives.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, and my colleagues on this side of the House, certainly wish to join with the Premier in asking your Honour to express to the families of the four people involved the condolences of this House.

Those who risk their lives and in final reality give their lives in service to the people in trying to protect the lives of others, certainly deserve to be held in the highest esteem by all of us. It was a very tragic accident, one that touched the lives of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, I know.

I attended the memorial service just a week or so ago, I guess, along with other Members of the House, and it was a very touching experience, a very moving experience for all of us, in our own way. I think there may be a Member in the House who feels a little closer than most of us, in that I understand the Member for Port de Grave may have had a relative involved in this particular incident. We would all like to be associated with the condolences, and it is right a proper that this House so do.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair will act accordingly.

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. In view of the fact that 2,500 or 3,000 fishermen and fish plant workers have not received enough work to this point in time, and at this late time in the fall, to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits, and in view of the fact that the vast majority of those workers through no fault of their own will not, at least from the fishery, receive enough employment this year to qualify for UI benefits, and in view of the fact that the Federal Government, on Friday I believe it was, announced a totally inadequate \$2 million response program to help address this particular problem, I want to ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, what specific proposals and recommendations did his Government make to the Federal Government to deal with this crisis that everybody has known was on our doorstep since July or August and had to be dealt with? And when did the Province make representation on particular programs and proposals to the Federal Government? What were those recommendations and proposals that the Provincial Government made to the Government of Canada to deal with this matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries:

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Employment and Immigration did announce a \$2 million program but, I am told, that was inadvertently referred to as the limit of the program, when, in fact, it is going to be a \$5 million program; \$2 million announced on the weekend, plus \$3 million that is currently in the Budget.

The Province brought to the attention of the Minister the plight of a large number of our fishermen. I do not have the exact dates, but it was probably around the first part of August that we alerted the Minister that we were having a bad fishery in the Province and that as we saw it then, there would have to be a response program put in place.

Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, we did a survey, having sent that letter, to ascertain exactly how many fishermen and plant workers would be affected, whereupon it was found that around 3,500, I believe, would be affected by the poor fishery. We wrote the Minister back identifying the number of fishermen that would, in our view, be affected, and the number of areas in which they live. We asked the Minister then to come up with an emergency response program, and we offered to assist in any way we could in order to identify the types of projects and programs that would, in our view at least, serve the best purpose.

So, I repeat, we wrote the Minister in August suggesting to him that a program would be necessary, and we followed it up a few weeks later with a letter to the Minister identifying the areas

and the number of fishermen affected.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his information. Just let me say that even if it is a \$5 million program, judging from the experience we had last year, that, too, will be totally inadequate to address the problem that is facing us this year.

Mr. Speaker, let me address my supplementary to the Premier. Has the Premier, as Leader of the Government in this Province, made an effort to communicate with the Leader of the Government in Ottawa, the Prime Minister, to make sure that he was personally aware of the magnitude of the problem facing thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians because of the failure in the fishery this year? If so, when did the Premier make that communication with the Prime Minister, and what form did that communication take?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to go to my files and dig out my correspondence with the Prime Minister to see exactly what was done with the Prime Minister as far as this Government was concerned. My experience in writing to the Prime Minister about Fisheries matters is such that I have no great confidence in addressing any such matter to the Prime Minister. Because I wrote him specifically, as I recall, dealing with an urgent matter in

the Fisheries, and my proposition to him in the letter was, 'this is of such importance, not only to Newfoundland and Labrador, but of such importance to Canada as a whole, that it is important that it be attended to by the Prime Minister. It is not sufficient for the Minister of Trade, or the Minister of Fisheries, or the Minister of External Affairs to do it, it is important that the Prime Minister do it.' The letter I got back from an assistant said something to the effect that, 'Thank you for your letter. It has been referred to the Minister of Fisheries.'

So I have no cause to have any great confidence that he will. Nevertheless, I have persisted and I have written the Prime Minister fairly regularly on urgent matters relating to the Fishery. I have no quarrel. I will provide copies of all that correspondence. I will ask my Parliamentary Assistant to get it. Hopefully I should have it by tomorrow, and then I can table it all.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A further supplementary to the Premier. In view of the fact that the Premier is admitting here that he is not having very much success in dealing with the Prime Minister in terms of written correspondence - and that may or may not be so. We shall see - following Question Period today will the Premier go down to his office, pick up the hot line and call the Prime Minister, and, first of all, ensure him that he is not calling to have the call degenerate into a

nasty dispute over Meech Lake or something of that nature, but he is calling to ask the Prime Minister to get personally involved with him in developing a co-operative federal/provincial emergency response program to ensure that the thousands of Newfoundlanders who face disaster as a result of the Fishery this year have a program that is adequate to their needs to qualify for unemployment benefits for this winter. Will the Premier do that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The answer is, no, Mr. Speaker, for two reasons: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is three months behind. We took those steps three months ago, when it was appropriate to take them and when the response of the Federal Government at the time was, do not rock the boat. Do not be drawing attention to these things. Maybe it is not that bad. We do not have to respond now, let us leave it until December or January. We said, no. We took a firm position and we made the issue known and made sure that the federal government responded properly. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is three months behind in raising the question. The other reason why there is no point in doing it now is that I intend to address it, not alone to the Premier Minister, but to every other Premier in the nation as a major item at the First Ministers' Conference on Thursday of this week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question was for the Minister of Fisheries, but after listening to the Premier, it is like going to a poker game and asking to play on your face all night. That is exactly the action of the Provincial Government in trying to deal with the Fisheries Emergency Response Program.

MR. HOGAN:

(Inaudible) better face.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I would ask that the member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) control himself.

We know he has had trouble doing that.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries. I ask him what measures his department considered this year in addressing the very serious fisheries crisis we have around the Province.

When he was Opposition critic, in June, 1987 he asked questions of the then Minister as to what he was going to do to try to help the troubled fishery. In May, 1988, when he was critic, he asked the same question.

I would like to ask the Minister what measures did his Department consider in trying to address the very, very important fisheries crisis we have in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

If I were to start now to tell the hon. Member and the House what measures we have taken and to what extent we have reacted to the impending crisis, I expect this House would be open until well after Christmas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

I should point out to the hon. House, Mr. Speaker, that I forgot to mention in my reply to the Leader of the Opposition that I met with the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa two weeks ago tomorrow, at which time we discussed at length the problems facing the fishery, especially the need for an emergency response program, and I was given an assurance then by the Minister that the announcement would be forthcoming, and it has come, Mr. Speaker. The extent to which it will adequately respond to the program is yet to be found out. My people are now doing an assessment on the announcement, on the number of fishermen who will need assistance, and the exact money that will be available to them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition so rightly points out, he has met with the Minister twice in the last three months to try to get a handle on the program.

Over the last three or four years, the provincial government has been involved in the Emergency Response Program. Two years ago, they were involved in a mackerel/herring subsidy to help the income of fishermen who were having trouble

in the cod fishery and so on around the Province.

Last year, the Provincial Government put about \$2 million in a material component to top up what the Federal Government had provided for the program.

My question to the Minister is, how much money is he going to put into the Emergency Response Program? The Federal Government, to date, has only announced \$2 million. Since \$8 million to \$10 million will be needed to deal with the problem for 3,500 people in the Province, how much money is he willing to put into the program, and when is he going to put it in?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's response was only made about forty-eight hours ago. I think Ottawa is now prepared to accept the proposition that the problems that we are encountering in the fishery with respect to the resource crisis stems from - I would not say bad management, but maybe wrong management. I do not want to be unkind to them - wrong management on the part of their scientists. They acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, their responsibility to do something to correct the problem and to respond to the crisis, and certainly the Province is not going to jump in and start offering millions or whatever it takes to buoy up what they are doing. Give them a chance, Mr. Speaker, to see what they are going to do. They have acknowledged responsibility. The fact that they have come forward with an Emergency Response Program is an indication that they are

willing to do something about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It is just unbelievable that this Minister has been going around this Province for the last two or three months meeting with fishermen and he stands in this House today and says he is not going to put a cent into an Emergency Response Program on behalf of some 3,500 fishermen and plant workers in this Province.

We saw this Government cancel the Private Sector Employment Program, Mr. Speaker. They are now not going to get involved in the Fisheries Response Program. Why does not the Minister do the honourable thing and resign today, and give it over to someone else? Or why does not the Government resign and let Ottawa run the Province? Because every time the Premier opens his mouth, he says it is Ottawa's problem. Put your money where your mouth is and resign.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the Minister is this: Has the Minister held any consultation with the Federal Minister of Fisheries and the Federal Minister of Employment and Immigration on the guidelines that have come down on this program this year? It is going to cause additional hardship in this Province when you have a requirement that in order to qualify, a fishermen or plant worker has to have at least six weeks work in the fishery. As well, if they were involved in a Fisheries Response Program last year, they do not qualify this year. The problem is more aggravated this year, so has the Minister made any representation

to the Federal Government to get those guidelines changed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I did, in fact, mention to the Minister of Fisheries during our meeting in Ottawa that very fact, that maybe severe hardship would be imposed on a large number of people who would not come under the guidelines. But, certainly, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the program has only been announced a few hours and we will have to wait and see what happens.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It is hard to believe that here we are, November 6, and this Minister of Fisheries is not willing to do anything to alleviate the very serious problem in all areas of our Province when it comes to the fisheries crisis. Is the Premier going to consider interest free loans for fishermen this year? Is he going to look at deferred loans for fishermen? Is he going to put \$2 million or \$3 million into the Fisheries Response Program? Is he going to come up with any other subsidies to help the fishermen and the fish plant workers in this Province? Can he stand on his feet today and tell this House and the fishermen and fish plant workers around this Province if he is going to do anything to help them this year?

Because we have had instances around this Province, one right on the Northern Peninsula this day,

where a lady cannot afford to send her kids to school. She has been trying to get hold to her Member for the last eight weeks, who happens to be the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey), and her Member of Parliament, to deal with this issue. This highlights how serious it is. Will the Minister stand on his feet and tell us if he is going to put \$3 million or \$4 million into the program this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I will not tell him what I am going to do, but I will tell him what I am not going to do, which is I will not play politics with this very serious problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

I will give the hon. Member an assurance, Mr. Speaker, that I will not play politics with the fishermen of our Province who, right now, are going through a pretty critical period. Shame on the Member, who represents a fishing district by the way, to stand in this House and start playing politics with such an important issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it seems that -

MR. MATTHEWS:

You are only here for pension purposes, not to do your job.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the best defence for lack of action and negligence on the part of the Government and the Minister is a good offence. Well, the Minister knows, Mr. Speaker, that when he was over here day after day, week after week, month after month he was asking us what our response was going to be to this crisis in the fishery, that crisis in the fishery, this failure in the fishery, some other failure in the fishery.

MR. SIMMS:

The hypocrisy!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister directly is the Provincial Government going to participate in a financial way with the Government of Canada to try to address in the short term the thousands of Newfoundlanders who did not qualify for UI benefits this year when, in fact, this same gentleman, from over here, was demanding that we as a Government do the same thing every year for the last three or four years? Is the Government going to participate, or is it not? What is the situation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Play politics with that!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I said to the hon. gentleman,

we are not yet even aware of all the details of the program announced by the Federal Government. Once we are aware, then we will make that decision.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, does the Minister want 3,500 fishermen and fish plant workers in Newfoundland and Labrador today, November 6, to believe the fact that this Government does not have a top-up component ready to go for a response program, that they do not have interest and principal deferrals at the Fisheries Loan Board ready to go, that they do not have some kind of an interest free loan, which the Minister talked about so much about when he is over here to get fishermen back in the boats next year? Does the Minister want 3,500 people in this Province to believe that for the last seven months this Government, and he in particular, have been sitting on their butts doing nothing about the crisis in the fishery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the 3,500 fishermen the hon. Member alluded to have enough confidence in me and in this Government to know that we will do what needs to be done to help them over this crisis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary for the Minister. Will the Minister quit the rhetoric and tell this House and those 3,500 people exactly what programs he has now in his Department ready to go, to tap in with whatever the Federal Government has already announced, to try to alleviate the crisis they are facing over the next four or five weeks in this Province?

MR. SIMMS:

A good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, maybe I should ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to quit playing politics with this very serious problem.

MR. RIDEOUT:

What programs do you have?

MR. W. CARTER:

I can only tell him, Mr. Speaker, if he can hold himself back long enough to hear what I had to say -

MR. RIDEOUT:

You have not said anything.

MR. W. CARTER:

If he can hold himself back, Mr. Speaker -

MR. RIDEOUT:

You have not said anything yet.

MR. W. CARTER:

Once we have assessed the extent of the Federal Response Program, then we will make that decision, Mr. Speaker, and not before.

MR. RIDEOUT:

So there is no program. There is

nothing ready. For seven months you have been sitting around drawing your salary and doing nothing.

MR. HEWLETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A few days ago the Minister of Energy (Dr. Gibbons) indicated in this House that negotiations were proceeding well on Hibernia, and that he would keep the House up to date. Later on that evening, or I think the very next evening for sure, I was interrupted while at supper by a news flash stating that the Minister was getting a new package on Hibernia. This weekend the Premier rumbled on at the convention about the business of leaving the oil in the ground. I would ask the Minister of Energy who speaks for the Government on this matter, and exactly what sort of signal is the Government trying to put out to our people?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. Member that we have received a package. Our people met with the consortium on Thursday of last week. They received a presentation on the package, they brought back the package, and they are presently assessing it. We are going to strive to get the maximum for Newfoundland out of this. We certainly hope we can get more than was in the Statement of Principles that was signed last July 8.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the Minister with regard to this package, is this package a new offer from the oil companies, or is this package merely an analysis of what it means to us in negative terms for losing the main support frame?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, this package is the new proposal relative to the new design for the top sides particularly, and also relative to the potential change in location of construction of the G.B.S.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In terms of jobs in technology, one of the super modules involved in a new design phase, the drilling module, could possibly replace, in terms of jobs and technology, what we would lose on the main support frame. Has the Provincial Government targeted the drilling module? Are they going after the drilling module like bulldogs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, we have analyzed and

are doing further analysis of all of the five super modules. We are not just targeting one particular super module, we are looking at all of them, and we want to maximize what we can get from all of them.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. Marine Atlantic has stated that a study is under way into the year-round service between North Sydney and Argentia. Could the Minister tell the House what position his Government has put forth to that study?

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

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for his question.

As the Member is aware, I am sure, this is a Federal problem. At the present time a study is being done, with recommendations coming from the various people concerned. We, as a Government, have written and asked Mr. Bouchard to lengthen the time of the study to give everybody in Newfoundland, who has an interest in this, time to present a brief to the committee. We will be assessing the study when it is done, and then we will be taking a position. Once the consultants have completed their study, which is going to be put forward to the Federal Government, the Federal Government will then be releasing

the consultants' report. When we see the consultants' report, we will certainly be having a look at it and we will put forward our position on it.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I tell the Minister that I know that Marine Atlantic comes under the Federal Government. I also know, Mr. Speaker, that he is the Minister of Transportation and this is the Government of the Province, and he has to be able to make decisions in the best interest of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. And he cannot shirk that responsibility, Mr. Speaker, like the Minister of Fisheries, who does nothing for the fishermen because it is a Federal responsibility. Let me ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, rather precisely, does the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador support a year-round service for Argentia or does it not? What is the answer? The people of Argentia want to know.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the consultants are going to recommend what is going to happen. The position being put forward to this point by Marine Atlantic is to carry on a limited service to Argentia, and we are going to be looking at it. Once we get all the facts and see the consultants' report, we will be making a decision on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

What is the Minister's position? Is it the same today as the one he had last week?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

My position is the same as it always was, Mr. Speaker. Government has not taken a position, nor have I as a Member of that Government. I am waiting until I get all the facts, unlike the previous Government which made decisions before they had the facts. When I get the facts, I will be making a recommendation to this Government and we will make a decision then.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Premier.

I would like the Premier to tell the House within what legal framework he expects Mr. Justice John Mahoney to carry out the investigation into allegations of wrongdoing on the part of the Member for Port de Grave?

At the end of last week, the Premier told the House that Section 56 of The Federal Judges' Act authorizes the appointment. However, that federal legislation simply authorizes the use of federally appointed judges for

this sort of task; it does not give authority for any such appointment, that authority has to come from, in this case, laws of our Province.

Will the Premier tell the House what is the legal authority for his Government's appointment of Mr. Justice Mahoney?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, Section 56 of The Judges' Act is an empowering section that permits judges of the Supreme Court to undertake certain commissions provided that it is specifically provided for either by a Statute of the Province or by an Order in Council of the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this particular case the Government wanted an individual who would identify the facts, bring the facts to the Government and express an opinion, and the Government would make its decision known and table the report in the House. That is all we did. There is nothing magical. You do not need a formal structure, you do not need a court, you do not need subpoenaing powers or anything. We simply want a good independent, competent person to do an assessment of certain allegations that were made. When that is done, we will table the results in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the Government has appointed a good, competent, independent person, but,

unfortunately, hath given that person no legal framework within which to carry out the task.

Mr. Speaker, the Order in Council referred to in Section 56 of The Judges' Act has to have some legal authority. There is no authority for this Government's Order in Council that was tabled in this House last Thursday. This is without precedent in all of Canada. I have checked with authorities in Ottawa who administer The Federal Judges' Act and they have never heard of this being attempted before.

Mr. Speaker, how does the Premier expect Mr. Justice Mahoney to do his work? How does he expect the Judge to know whom to talk to? Who is going to draw up a list of witnesses? How does he expect the Judge to have any confidence in testimony that is not sworn? And, most importantly, how does he expect all of us and the people of the Province to have any confidence in this kind of one-man private enquiry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

The answer is fairly simple, Mr. Speaker. The Judge does not need a framework. He is doing a fairly simple task as an individual, as a competent individual. I could have assigned the Minister of Health to do it. I could have asked Your Honour to do it. I could have asked the Leader of the Opposition to do it.

I asked an individual to do it in whom I had great confidence, and pursuant to the authority of The

Judges' Act, which enabled a judge to conduct the enquiry that we wanted conducted. We spelled it out. It has been tabled in the House. The Leader of the Opposition stood here and said it was the right course to follow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the hon. Member for Humber East -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, he did not! No, he did not!

PREMIER WELLS:

We will see what is in the record.

I want to remind the hon. Member for Humber East that we are not here conducting an enquiry into anything that is proven to be a serious breach of advance of funds, misuse of Government funds, we are here conducting an examination to see if some rather serious allegations made by one Mr. Petten has any merit, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows what I am talking about.

Let me read to the House, Mr. Speaker, a letter from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to this same Mr. Petten. Just listen, Mr. Speaker. It was sent by way of a telegram, and I can never figure out the dates on these things. When the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Fisheries he wrote to Mr. Arthur Petten of Eastern Shipbuilders, the same Mr. Petten we are dealing with "Re your request for a meeting with me: I have discussed your visit of yesterday to the Fisheries Loan Board with the chairman of the Board, Mr. Reg Kingsley.

"I am advised by Mr. Kingsley that he will be communicating with you further re his telex of December 22, 1987 and yesterday's meeting.

Additionally, I want to clearly state that I am not prepared to interfere with the Board's position which will be communicated to you by Mr. Kingsley" - hardly proper conduct for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. "The Board's position is consistent, applies to all shipyards, and is in the best interests of the safety of fishermen" - a very commendable action.

Now listen to this Mr. Speaker: "I am obliged also to inform you that following your abusive and threatening behaviour of yesterday, I am taking the unusual step of instructing Mr. Kingsley and his staff to refrain from any further meetings with you, or any further meetings in which you are a participant, until Mr. Kingsley and his staff have received an apology from you.

"It is my policy that people of goodwill, no matter how difficult the subject, must treat each other with courtesy and respect. I, therefore, cannot and will not subject my officials to the abuse exhibited by you yesterday."

Now the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Humber East want us to establish a massive inquiry with a framework, and legal counsel, and subpoenaing witnesses to respond to the kind of nonsense that comes from an individual that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has recognized in this telegram.

Mr. Speaker, I have done what is entirely proper and appropriate in the circumstances, and we will await the outcome of the assessment being done by Mr. Justice Mahoney. I remind the House, and I remind the hon. the

Member for Humber East, Mr. Speaker, that one of the mandates of Mr. Justice Mahoney is to make recommendations for a public inquiry if that is necessary, if he deems it to be necessary, and it is entirely up to him to do. But I am not prepared to conduct witch-hunts on the basis of the allegations of a man whom the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows behaves in this way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me address a supplementary to the Premier, and let me say that I would look forward to being called before a commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will say now and I will say anywhere, that I did not always have a cordial, co-operative relationship with the gentleman in question, as is obvious from that letter.

Let me ask the Premier this, Mr. Speaker: Since he was so loud in my praises of having dealt with that particular incident properly, in the way that I did as Minister at the time, without any interference, letting the Loan Board do its work, how would the Premier square that with the fact that the then Member for Port de Grave and the now Member for Port de Grave, was giving the Minister,

in that particular case me, a very, very difficult time for not dealing properly with Mr. Petten and not overruling the Loan Board in Mr. Petten's favour, when the then Member was lobbying me to overrule the Loan Board. Is that proper conduct on behalf of the Member, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, to answer specifically the question of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition about the Minister for Social Services' role when he was a member of the Opposition and the member for the district of Port de Grave, I assume he was making the kind of representation on behalf of a constituent that all members in this House have made on occasion to the Minister or to the Premier. Whatever role the hon. gentleman was in at the time I do not know, but I do not see anything at all inordinate about the hon. Minister of Social Services, then in his role as an MHA, making representations on behalf of a constituency. I do not disagree with that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

Before moving on to the next item of the Orders of the Day, I would like to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery today, on behalf of all hon. Members, the Mayor of Come By Chance, Mrs Betty Gilbert.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Notices of Motion

MS COWAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Employment And Labour Relations."

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it was Thursday last that the hon. Member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) rose and asked another question in this House and cast what has turned out to be a scurrilous allegation against the Minister of Social Services.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what you said about the other one, do not forget.

PREMIER WELLS:

His allegation then, as I recall it, was that the Minister of Social Services caused the President of his district Liberal Association to be appointed to a position with the Department. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the House that I have asked officials to examine this and find out the facts for me. Here are the facts, Mr. Speaker:

There were six positions opened

and advertised through the Department of Social Services. Apparently, this was a temporary position through the Department of Social Services. One of forty-seven applicants who applied was a man named Edsell Parsons - he was one of forty-seven who applied. He was also one of twenty-five who were chosen to be interviewed. They were interviewed by a Mr. O'Brien from the Justice Department and a Ms Higdon, a social worker at the Whitbourne Boy's Home where the work was to be done. At the time of application he was not in any manner involved with the Port de Grave Liberal Association or any other Liberal Association, so far as I know. He earned the position, I am assured, on his merits. I do not know. I did not interview the people. I can only tell Your Honour what I have been told, that he earned the position on his merits. Subsequent to his being appointed and having earned the position on his merits, he participated in political activity and became the President of the Association, after getting his job through proper channels.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is not so. That is not so.

PREMIER WELLS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is indicative of the kind of scurrilous twisting that the member for Port au Port has done with these kinds of allegations that he has made in the last few days. That is totally unwarranted, Mr. Speaker, and leaves me to give no credibility to any such further allegations that the hon. Member should ever make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday the hon. the Member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) asked a question of the Premier concerning tenders by Hydro, particularly the letting of a contract to E. W. Adams. I was asked whether I could check into it and report back on the possibility of re-tendering. I would like to report today that that contract has been let and it will not be re-tendered.

However, the situation that happened in that particular contract, and has happened to the one in Bay d'Espoir, concerns us on this side of the House. We do not particularly like some aspects of the tendering process, whereby the POA has to be there immediately when the bid comes in, and the discrimination against local companies, so we are presently looking at the possibility of amending the legislation to allow the appropriate thing to be done in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

0 0 0

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Answers to questions for which notice has been given?

DR. GIBBONS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Also, on Thursday, the Member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) asked questions about the change of Board Members on the Hydro Board, the Hydro Group, and today I would like to table the information promised by the Premier, the present members and the former members.

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Order 8, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act". (Bill No. 15).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, Bill 15, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act, No. 2" is housekeeping really. What we are trying to do here is to make changes in our Income Tax Act such that when the Federal Government changes its Income Tax Act we will not be forever having to amend our own Income Tax Act.

What basically is happening here is, when the Federal Government changes its Income Tax Act we have to change our Income Tax Act to mirror the changes that the Federal Government has introduced, because our tax rate, as you know, is a percentage of the Federal tax rate. And for that reason we are forever making changes in our Income Tax Act to correspond to changes that the Federal Government has made in their Income Tax Act. What we are

trying to do here, what we have done in this Bill, is to arrange it in such a fashion that we will not have to be forever changing our Income Tax Act as the Federal Government changes their's. So as you trace these items through from the present Income Tax Act, change these amendments through, you will see the simplicity of following what will happen afterwards.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if it is necessary for me to trace some of these items. But I think I will try to do one or two here. If the present Section 2 of The Income Tax Act, that is Section 2 of our Income Tax Act, is amended by adding immediately after Subsection (5) the following. Now there are five parts to Section 2, five subsections, and we are adding another one now which says that 'interest computed under any subsections 1, 2, and 11 of section 161, subsections 3, 3(1) and 4 of Section 164, and subsection (8 3) and (9.2) of Section 227 of the Federal Act as they apply for the purpose of this Act, shall be compounded daily and, where interest is computed on an amount under any of these provisions and is unpaid on the day it would, but for this subsection, have ceased to be computed under that provision, interest at the rate provided by that provision shall be compounded daily on unpaid interest from that day to the day it was paid.' And we are adding also to that section a series of other - Subsection 7 - with several parts to it. And as we trace our way through it, we will see that all we are really doing here in this Bill is to make it possible for the amendments to the Federal Income Tax Act to apply virtually automatically to our Income Tax Act.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments, as this Bill has come to our Legislative Resource Review Committee. It is mainly, as the Minister has already stated, a housekeeping item. There are a few changes in the Bill with regard to just changing of wording such as the one he mentioned, 'immediately' or 'just after'.

As all Members probably already know, the Province does not run the income tax system themselves, it is looked after by the Federal Government, with no charge whatsoever. One of the questions that did come up pertaining to that is, I guess, why do they not have to charge? One of the questions that was asked in Committee, was about an overpayment, or the interest charges, or something like that, they charge an individual who owes taxes for sometime. It all goes into the Federal coffers thereby, I suppose, negating any charge to the Province for any services rendered.

But the main thing, I suppose as a prime example, is why the Minister would have to bring in an amendment to The Income Tax Act strictly pertaining, I suppose, to personal income tax under the Income Tax Act, and not the Corporation tax? I understand that that is a separate category. As an example, I would like to refer Members to the increase of 2 per cent in personal income tax in last spring's budget, that would necessitate an amendment to The

Income Tax Act in order for the Feds to collect it, because they are the sole collector of revenues in this Province. They collect it and just send it back to the Province at no charge.

So apart from that, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, it went through Committee. There were some questions asked on it pertaining to certain sections under the explanatory notes, but nothing significant, mainly housekeeping. It went through Committee without any other questions.

Thank you.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act".(No.2) (Bill No. 15).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow". (Bill No. 15).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973." (Bill No. 16).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, this Act is not merely housekeeping. There is some substance to it. What we are attempting to do with Bill No. 16, is to enable the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation to licence not only brewers but distilleries and wineries. And what this Bill does in its various sections, and subsections, is to alter the wording of the present Act so that where brewer appears, we can put in things like distillery and winery. So we are broadening the wording of the Act so that it will

permit the Liquor Corporation to licence not only breweries but distilleries and wineries. Particularly wineries, because we feel there is a possibility that we may be establishing a winery, or a winery could be established.

As you see in the printed Bill 16 here, a "winery" means an establishment licensed under the laws of Canada to produce wine by the fermentation of the natural sugars contained in fruit, vegetable or vegetable products, or honey or the like. The importation of wine concentrate for blending, the importation of bulk wine for blending, and bottling and packaging wine for sale to the Corporation, or to other provincial liquor authorities. So, that is the winery. I think virtually all the other items here, the amendments to the Liquor Corporation Act, are to insert the word, winery and distillery where right now all we have is the word brewery. In Sections 29 and 30 where it reads brewer now, we are changing it to licensee, a broader term than just brewer.

Mr. Speaker, I think I covered everything here and that is the substance of our amendment to the Liquor Corporation Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation was reviewed by the Government Services Legislative Review Committee and certainly, as the Opposition, we have no problem with it. It was initiated, I believe, by the previous Government in order to facilitate some commercial ventures dealing

with the natural berries of Newfoundland being turned into wines. As such I think it is an extremely good idea, because with the current state of the economy and the fishery, it is going to be very important to have people do anything that they can, especially in rural Newfoundland, to contribute to the economy. As I understand it that is the only change of substance and, as such, it really is housekeeping and we have no problem with it passing.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance. If the Minister speaks now he closes the debate.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, all I wish to do is close the debate. The previous remarks have covered the items and I thank the hon. Member opposite for her comments.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 16)

Order No. 5.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976." (Bill No. 18)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, this Act is a bit of housekeeping as well. There are a number of clauses that are somewhat significant in the changes to the Quarry Materials Legislation. Clause 1 changes the definition of quarry materials to

those that are generally used for construction purposes. Previously it said that it also included items that were capable of being used, and that created some problems for us, particularly relative to tailings that might be more appropriately mined for the gold content, for example, so now we want this to be changed to just directly deal with materials that are used for construction purposes, clearing up the definition. Another clause, and probably the most significant part of this amendment, deals with making the Act binding on the Crown. Previously the Quarry Materials Act was not binding on the Crown or its agencies. For example, the Department of Works, Services and Transportation could go put a quarry anywhere that they wished without referral to our Department, and without the appropriate regulations from our Department. Now, that must be done through our Department and through the full process. So, the binding on the Crown part, to me, is the most significant part of the amendments that we are dealing with in this particular piece of legislation.

Another clause change is that we are now going to require permits to start the initial digging. In the present legislation you do not have to have a permit to actually do the quarrying and do the digging. You only have to have the permit when you do the removal from the site, and this has caused problems in the past. So we are now asking that permits be required to actually do the quarrying, in addition to the removal.

Another clause deals with the issuance of leases. Presently under the existing regulations and

legislation, permits have to be issued first, and a permit is only issued for a one year period. This is inappropriate when we are addressing such a significant quarry operation as, for example, the major limestone aggregate quarry on the Port au Port Peninsula, in case where one would expect to give a lease for about twenty years. So we are introducing a clause that would allow the issuing of a lease immediately, rather than that interim permit at the beginning.

Relative to that also, clause number five addresses the renewal of quarry leases. Present circumstances allow renewal, but with the approval of the Lieutenant-Government in Council, beyond the first two terms. We are making it appropriate that the Minister would be able to renew.

Also Clause 6 is going to be amended to allow regulatory control so that we, as a Department of Mines and Energy, can add appropriate terms and conditions to both leases and the renewals of leases, in addition to permits. That covers this particular piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. It is not major, but certainly very necessary for the proper regulation of the quarry materials in the Province.

MR. WOODFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Humber Valley,

MR. WOODFORD:
Mr. Speaker, a few short comments with regards to the Bill. Quarry permits, I know in my District over the years, have been a very contentious issue. Pretty well

every year there is always something coming up with regards to councils looking for fill for roads in municipalities, and when you have ten, twelve or thirteen municipalities in one district, I do not have to tell you of some of the issues that come up with regards to getting fill.

But in any case that is the thing that concerns me - Clause 5 - I do not know what the minimum would be, if there was a minimum there. I know it is a housekeeping thing, but you give the power to the Minister to extend it beyond two terms, for a maximum of twenty years. To me it seems an awful long time. My experience with municipalities and construction companies is that every year we have a road program they are looking for permits, a prime example under Transportation, of \$70 million or \$75 million a year, whichever. Say for instance Lundrigan's came to a municipality looking for a permit to quarry at the end of the Cormack Road when they get the contract. If it was issued on an annual basis in certain areas, it would be a lot easier to deal with, both for the municipality and the construction company. Now there may be something - I do not have a copy of the other Bill - that says they would have to, for instance, if Lundrigan's or McNarmara or Western Construction or someone, came in to do a job, they would have, say, for instance, Lundrigan's had the quarry permit, would have to give the material to the other company, I do not know, at the regular charge. That question may be answered. But it always has been a contentious issue because of the municipalities involved, construction companies and whoever, someone got a quarry tied

up, for instance. And it is the only one in the area that would be suitable to do the job under highway specifications.

The other one that the Minister referred to was the tailings. That was sort of overlapped into The Mineral Act which has already gone through under our Committee, and that is a good thing because, for instance, in Buchans a prime example of that would be with ASARCO. A few years ago when they wanted to start using the tailings for barite, they ran into some problems, I think, with regards to ASARCO and Sprague - Henwood and a few of the other companies involved. So that to me is a positive step and then to carry it a little further, I guess it would also overlap in The Minerals Act with regard to rehabilitation, that I think the Minister also referred to, which is another positive step, and again, relating to an area of the Province that I am quite familiar with and that is the ASARCO properties around the Buchans area. And I do not have to tell you about others around the Province. Bell Island is another example, that the hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Walsh) brought up in earlier meetings.

So my biggest concern with it is the length of time given, for instance, a company, or even a municipality, and more or less having a monopoly on a certain pit in a certain area. Maybe the Minister could justify that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

If he speaks now he will close the debate, but I think we have other

Members over here with some comments so perhaps we will just go through questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Act, or the amendments to this Act were also reviewed in committee. And one of the problems that we had in doing the review is that although we had explanatory notes, we did not have access to the entire Act. So the answer may well be in the Act, but it was not evident from the text of this document.

The matter I am referring to is clause 6, where it gives the Minister power, or it does state the terms and conditions through which leases may be given or renewed. I was wondering if anywhere within the Act there are any conditions that would require sites which have been used for quarrying, to be restored when that operation is completed? It may well be there, because I would prefer to see it explicit in terms of a requirement, rather than implicit in terms of the power it grants the Minister to make such conditions.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister made some reference to tailings - mining tailings, I assume, for putting it back through, reclaiming it or whatever, to reclaim viable mineral deposits that still might be present. Will the Minister tell me what section he is specifically referring to?

DR. GIBBONS:

In section 2, the present definition says that the quarry material was any substance that is used, or capable of being used, in which case a tailing is something that is capable of being used. So, we are changing the definition to just say that substances are just generally used for quarry materials.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, the question I want to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is this, the Minister as a professional in the Department of Mines before he took on his new life and his new role, would know that there was some difficulty encountered between perspective bidders and/or operators - eventual operators hopefully - for the tailings pile at the Consolidated Ramblers site in Baie Verte. In fact there was, up until the time we were about to leave Government, there was still some indication that there was going to be some legal action taken to try to determine, as the company was arguing, that the material did not belong to the Crown. That therefore the Crown, when the Government of the day acting through the Cabinet, when the Crown put that mine site up for bids for further exploration and development, it was argued by some of the potential bidders that the Crown did not have the authority to put up the tailings site. That that was the property of the original owner, and that when the Crown acted under the authority of the Minerals Act to take back that particular material, or that particular mine site, and further dispose of it, that it did in fact have the right to take back the tailings pile. I do not know whether or not that particular case has ever been

adjudicated, but certainly the tailings pile at Rambler does have some economic value, as the Minister knows. Any potential bidder for that property, well in fact it has been disposed of, but for any potential operator for that property it would form an integral part of any future operation, whether or not the new operator had the authority to remill that tailing site.

What I hope the Minister will address in his response, when he rises to close debate, is whether or not this particular amendment will cover that kind of situation so that there can be no doubt ever again who owns that material, who has the right to dispose of the material, whether the Crown has the right to dispose of it by offering it to another operator through the bidding process.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, relative to the comments to the -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! I ought to say if the Minister speaks now he closes the debate, and I almost invited him because I saw no one else standing. We should make sure that everybody understands, and that we are not closing off any debate from any hon. Member of the Opposition. If the Minister speaks now he closes the debate.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern of the Member for Humber Valley about sites being tied up for long periods of time. We certainly prefer to give leases in the five to ten year range, with

the preponderance in the five year range for local quarry materials and local aggregate materials. The quarry permits are on a one year basis, and these are the ones that change annually and can change operators annually. But where there is a stable operator, it is appropriate to try to have it tied up for about a five year period so that operator can plan the rehabilitation that is necessary in the quarry. That is the normal time frame that we usually use for a road construction operator, for example, and we put conditions on the lease at that time to make sure that rehabilitation is carried out.

We do face a lot of questions and concerns every year about renewals of permits and renewals of leases in various areas that are sensitive, particularly around some municipalities and in some municipalities. We recognize what the Member for Humber Valley is saying. The long term, for example twenty years, is more direct to something like the export operation at Lourde Cove, where there has to be a major investment of many millions of dollars to put in the infrastructure. That is where you would get a twenty year lease that is subject to renewal, but definitely subject to renewal.

This sort of answers the comments and questions that were raised by the Member for St. John's East regarding rehabilitation. As I said, the conditions of rehabilitation are then built into a lease that is of five years duration or longer. The question raised by the hon. the Member for Baie Verte is a very good one, on what happens with the tailings. Really what happens in this regard

by removing tailings from The Quarry Materials Act, is that they now fall under The Mineral Act where we can more appropriately take care of giving out the ownership. The question of the legal matter, as I understand it and recall it, that was resolved. I am not absolutely sure, because we are, as far as I am concerned, addressing that now as a property owned by the Government and administered under The Mineral Act for potential reprocessing to recover the gold by the Rambler Joint Venture Group in the future. That particular tailings pond contains many millions of dollars worth of gold from the work that we have done on it. That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No.18.).

MR. BAKER:

Order 1, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. TOBIN:

No more legislation? Oh, my! Oh, my!

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, it is really surprising that this House has been in session for two weeks and so far we have seen three pieces of legislation. When this Government started this Fall

session, it was to deal with legislation. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bit ridiculous that they do not even have the bills changing the titles of the Departments ready to be discussed in the House.

That being so, for the next thirty or forty or fifty minutes, Mr. Speaker, I hope to address the Throne Speech. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, once my colleagues on the other side get me wound up they will not mind giving me leave for fifteen or twenty minutes, because I do have a lot to say.

In fact, I want to start off by saying that I was interested in the way the Premier reacted this afternoon to statements and comments concerning the Member for Port de Grave, concerning his influence in an individual getting employment at the Whitbourne Boys' Home. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know for a fact, Sir, that the Member for Port de Grave did intercede in assisting this Mr. Parsons get work at the Boys' Home. That is a fact, Sir.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I do not mind the hon. Member making allegations, but I think it is proper when a Member addresses a Minister of the Crown, or another Member, to give him his right title. I am still The Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? What?

MR. WINDSOR:

I thought you resigned.

MR. RIDEOUT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is not a point of order, it is a point of discourtesy to interrupt another hon. Member when he is speaking, and that is exactly what the hon. gentleman has done.

Secondly, to respond to the substantive part of the Minister's comments, how the Minister, the gentleman for Port au Port -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Port de Grave.

MR. RIDEOUT:

- Port de Grave can say that he is still a Minister of the Crown is an issue we will have to pursue, maybe tomorrow. As we understand it, Mr. Speaker, the Premier announced that the Member for Port de Grave had asked to be relieved of his ministerial responsibilities, and the Premier informed the House that he had so done. So we would like to know whether the Minister is on paid leave, or is he a Minister without portfolio? If so, maybe we can start addressing questions to the Minister tomorrow? Maybe somebody can tell us exactly what category the hon. gentleman falls in, now that he tells us himself that he is still the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The point of order raised by the Minister of Social Services is, in fact, a valid reminder to the Member for Torngat Mountains, who is speaking in the Address in Reply. He, in fact, is still the Minister of Social Services. His duties are temporarily being taken over by the Minister of Health, until the matter of the allegations is straightened out. I would simply like to point that out for all Members Opposite. He is the Minister of Social Services. I hope Members have that straight now. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, it is a valid point of order, that he should be referred to as the Minister of Social Services. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion as to exactly what the Member for Port de Grave's position is at the moment. I think we were led to believe, as was the media certainly by their reports, and I suspect everybody in Newfoundland and Labrador, that the Member for Port de Grave had been relieved of his responsibilities as a Minister.

MS VERGE:

That is what the Premier told the House.

MR. SIMMS:

As a matter of fact, if you look at Hansard, October 30, L2, and this is contrary to what the President of the Council just said, the quote is: 'Accordingly he' - that is the Member for Port de Grave - 'has asked that I relieve him of responsibility as a Minister and as Minister of Social Services.' So he asked to be relieved from his responsibilities and duties as a Minister and as Minister of Social Services. Now, we understand, we assume from the comments made here today, that the Member is still a Minister and still Minister of Social Services. That is what was sort of cast across here, unless he is joking.

MR. WINDSOR:

The Minister of Health was appointed Minister of Social Services.

MR. SIMMS:

We understood the Minister of Health was the Acting Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

You are not proven guilty before you are tried.

MR. SIMMS:

That is not the point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, that is not the point. The point is the Premier stood in the House and sanctimoniously said, 'the Member has asked to be removed as Minister and as Minister of Social Services.'

MS VERGE:

And that the Premier had accepted.

MR. SIMMS:

And that the Premier has acceded to his request. Now the Member is shouting across the House telling us that he is still a Minister.

MR. WINDSOR:

He was at the meeting that set the terms of reference for the inquiry.

MR. SIMMS:

It is a job to get the words in.

He is still a Minister, he says, and still Minister of Social Services, I understood him to say. So there is a considerable amount of confusion, and I would urge the Government House Leader to clarify this matter.

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible) over there.

MR. SIMMS:

When I am ready. Do not get too anxious. Because when the Member for Port de Grave says what he has said, obviously he is giving the impression that he, in fact, sat in on the Cabinet meetings that have been held in the last couple of weeks.

MR. EFFORD:

I did not.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I mean, you said you are still Minister. Make up your mind. Are you or are you not? Maybe the President of the Council can clarify it for us?

MR. WINDSOR:

Who was present at the meeting (inaudible) Inn over the weekend?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will repeat once again very quickly, the Member for Port de Grave is still the Minister of Social Services. His duties have been temporarily, very kindly, taken over by the Minister of Health who now has added duties and has agreed to carry out that particular function until the inquiry is finished. It is a very sensible, simple situation. I am telling you exactly what it is. The statement read out by the Opposition House Leader can easily be interpreted in a number of ways. However, I am telling you what the situation is as of the present time.

Now, then, I would suggest to Members opposite that if they want to kill the time of the Member for Torngat Mountains, a very colorful speaker I was looking forward to hearing. I would much rather listen to the Member for Torngat than some other Members opposite simply prolonging this unnecessary point.

The Member for Port de Grave, I will repeat it again, is still the Minister of Social Services. Is that clear?

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

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Is the hon. Member speaking to the

point of order?

MR. WARREN:
No.

MR. SPEAKER:
I have listened to the arguments put forward here and it is clear to me that there certainly is a misunderstanding here, not really a point of order, a misunderstanding which will have to be clarified at some point in time. At this point in time, there appears to me to be no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I still say, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Port de Grave did intercede in finding employment at the Whitbourne Boys' Home for an individual, a person who was knocking on doors last April in the District of Port de Grave.

Mr. Speaker, when Members are elected to this hon. House I think we have a duty to perform, which is to make sure that we will represent our constituents in the best way possible. I am in receipt of copy of a petition that was sent to the Member for Eagle River. It was sent to his office two weeks ago, the House has been open for two weeks, and the Member for Eagle River has not yet presented this petition in this hon. House.

Mr. Speaker, I have to read the prayer of the petition. It is a copy, therefore, I cannot present it. I think it is incumbent upon any Member in this House, whether he is from Eagle River or from Harbour Main - Kelligrews, or from

anywhere else, to present petitions when they are asked to.

There are two prayers to this petition which are as follows: 'We, the undersigned residents of Cartwright, Labrador, in the electoral District of Eagle River, do hereby petition the newly formed Liberal Government to make their promise of an enclosed arena to the residents of Cartwright, made by Danny Dumaresque, a reality in the immediate future.'

That is one of the promises the hon. the Member for Eagle River made during his election campaign. This petition has 254 signatures attached. However, the hon. gentleman has been told by his Premier and has been told by the Minister of Recreation, do not present it in the House. He has been told not to present the petition. He is afraid to present the petition in this House.

Mr. Speaker, what I have done now is write a number of letters to the residents of Eagle River asking them to please forward their petitions to my attention. At least they will be presented in the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent upon the hon. Member to make sure he presents that petition. I would hope that the hon. gentleman will present that petition tomorrow. I want to advise the hon. gentleman that I will support his petition, so the least he can do is make sure that it is presented in the House of Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three or four different issues which pertain to my District, and I want to address them. Some of them may make Members on both sides

uncomfortable, however, as my constituents have decided to send me back into this House to represent them, for the fourth time, I think it is my duty to bring a number of those issues to the forefront.

Now, Mr. Speaker, health care: We will talk about the Minister of Health whose family members can get free rides on the IGA plane. We will talk about that, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, a while ago he appointed a very highly respected and a really good person from Labrador, Chairman of the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board, Mr. Harry Baikie. I think he is a really good individual, a good chairperson. But he only did this to camouflage the whole thing. The hon. Member, the Minister of Health, knows that there has been some work done by his Department to overhaul the Regional Grenfell Health Services Board, and the whole setup has to be changed. His Department has the documents ready for the Minister to make the move, but the Minister will not make the move for one reason, and my hon. colleague, the Member for Eagle River, knows that. The main reason the hon. the Minister of Health is not making a move to overhaul the Regional Grenfell Health Services Board is because of the Executive Director of the Board. And who is the Executive Director? The brother of a former Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. HODDER:
What?

MR. WARREN:
A brother of a former Leader of the Liberal Party is the Executive Director of the Regional Grenfell Health Services Board, and that is

why the Minister will not move on a recommendation of his officials.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention education. I hope the Minister of Education is listening, because this is very, very important. During the Estimates Committee meetings, I asked the Minister of Education - now we are talking about four or five months ago - if he would consider having one school board in operation in the District of Torngat Mountains? The Minister said he would check it out and see what would happen.

Mr. Speaker, I am now calling upon the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to put aside the denominational education system in the District of Torngat Mountains and look at the well-being of the children first.

Let me read something else. 'During the past number of years, we have witnessed an improvement in education in this Province and in the District.'

I will read it, Mr. Speaker, word for word.

'However, we are curtailed because of the setup that we presently have in place in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.' Mr. Speaker, there are three school boards in my District, in which there are six communities, neither of which is connected by road, and there are approximately 800 or 900 children.

Mr. Speaker, in order for members of the Integrated School Board, who are stationed in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, to go to Nain, they have to fly over Postville which has a Pentecostal School Board, and they have to fly over Davis

Inlet which has a Roman Catholic School Board. So here we have three denominations within the same District, 500 miles of coastline. Just imagine the amount of taxpayers' money it is costing to administer those three particular school boards.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Member take a question and answer it?

MR. WARREN:

No, Mr. Speaker. When I am finished, the hon. gentleman, the hon. the Minister of Education, will have a half hour to respond.

DR. WARREN:

On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of clarification, the hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Is the hon. Member asking for the abolition of the denominational system in the Province, or is he asking for the abolition of the system in his District?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Member has not been recognized yet.

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. the Minister of Education's question, if he had been just a little bit patient he would have understood what I am saying. Now let me continue with what I have

written down here.

I said before and I say now, Mr. Speaker, it is right down here in black and white, first I support the denominational education system in our Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, does that ...

DR. WARREN:
That is fine.

MR. WARREN:
If the hon. Minister cannot understand that, after I am finished reading this I will send it over to him. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not support the denominational education system at the expense of the students in this Province. That is one thing I do not support. In the district of Torngat Mountains it is definitely not the best system in this Province, therefore, what I am saying to the Minister of Education is it is time for the Minister to do what his Department had been requested to do last May at an education conference in the community of Sheshatshit, when the Naskaupi Montagnais Innuit Association asked the Minister's Department if they could take over the running of the education system for the Indians in Labrador. Now, that is all I am asking the Minister. I am saying, let the Labrador Innuit Association take over and run the education system in that part of our Province. At the present time, they are administering the funds from the Federal Government.

The Indians in Conne River are administering their education. Let me say one other thing about the Conne River setup. The year before they took over the administration of education in their community there were eighteen dropouts in high school.

Since then, there have only been three dropouts in the high grades. So, I say to the hon. Minister, he should take a serious look at giving the MNIA and the LIA more authority in the running of the education system for the children in their communities. I am not saying get away from denominational education, because there is still room for that, but there has to be a co-operative approach and it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, in the proposed Budget that our party had submitted, and the people of the Province decided they wanted a change in Government, and that is fine, there were two particular items pertaining to the Department which I was responsible for. One was to give Tourism a boost in Labrador, and it was not going to cost that much money. In fact, Mr. Speaker, one was that an appropriate plaque be placed on the side of a hill, or on a rock or something like that, in the abandoned community of Indian Harbour, in Labrador, in recognition of the former Lieutenant-Governor of this Province and his contribution to medical services on the Labrador Coast.

Mr. Speaker, it was only going to cost \$6,000 to give this recognition to an outstanding individual, a person who spent his life assisting the people of Labrador, to recognize his contribution in his hometown, where he was born, by placing a plaque there on behalf of Government to recognize the outstanding contribution the hon. Dr. Paddon made to the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

As soon as this Government came

to power, the first thing they did was cut this out, squash it. Mr. Speaker, that was the first item.

We talk about promoting tourism on the Labrador coast, throughout Labrador in particular. My second submission was that in the abandoned community of Okak, north of Main, there would be similar recognition given but in a much more serious manner.

In 1918, the community of Okak was destroyed. Practically 96 per cent of the residents of the community died from a disease that was transported from England to Okak by the motor vessel Armory. I think it was diphtheria or something like that. I have a copy of the name of every individual who died during a ten day period in this community. In fact, on November 21 twenty people died in that community of over 300 people. On the 19th. ten people died, and on the 20th. twenty-three people died. As quickly as that, people were dying of this terrible disease. There is only one person from that community we know of who is still alive today; she is 91 years old and she is living in Hopedale at the present time.

This is another thing the former Government was going to be looking at very seriously, going in and putting up a plaque in honour of all 211 people who died within that ten day period. But, again, this Government decided they were not going to spend any money on this. That, Mr. Speaker, would have promoted tourism on the Labrador coast, because people would want to go there to see where the community was where this great tragedy occurred. I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to visit this abandoned community two years

ago. In fact, I understand the present Minister responsible for Tourism had the opportunity to pass over this area on his way to Hebron.

And I was quite pleased this summer when the hon. the Minister of Development - I have to say this about him - asked if I would want to go along on a trip to my district with him. I must say, I did not refuse him. I went on the trip with him, oh, yes! In fact, the only expense I incurred was my air fare from here to Goose Bay and return. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we rode in a helicopter for two or three days.

MR. FLIGHT:
What Minister?

MR. WARREN:
The Minister of Development, and I have to give the hon. gentleman credit now.

If you gentlemen would just let me finish. I mean, it is not all rosy. Wait until I finish, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman went to Hebron and naturally I believe the hon. gentleman will go back to his Cabinet - maybe he has already done so - and say, We have to put money into Tourism in the Hebron area to restore the old Moravian Church. In fact, it is a must. It has to be done! At the same time, Mr. Speaker, he had a meeting in Nain, and a meeting in Hopedale. However, for some unknown reason, whether his patience ran out because I was travelling with him - which I doubt - after two days he was more interested in going on a fishing trip.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was one of two things.

MR. PARSONS:

It had to be the fishing trip.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get back. The hon. gentleman had a meeting in Makkovik. However, he had to meet with the Town Manager and the Mayor on the way to the airport, because he only spent twenty minutes in Makkovik. So he did not have too much time. And, Mr. Speaker, he spent twenty minutes in Postville, because he never had time. When we arrived in Makkovik, we had to make a phone call to Rigolet to say, We are not coming to Rigolet at all.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He did not have time for that.

MR. WARREN:

He did not have time, Mr. Speaker. I found it interesting, when I got back to Goose Bay that same evening, that the hon. Member had ended up in the interior of Labrador at a fish camp.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Go on!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, shortly thereafter the Premier of the Province went into Rigolet and the first thing the Mayor asked the Premier was, Could you tell us why your Minister of Development did not come to Rigolet on his scheduled trip but went fishing instead? Now, I do not know anything about this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

What did the Premier say?

MR. WARREN:

The Premier said he was going to check it out and get back to him.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here

I wrote to the Premier on October 10 concerning the Premier's trip into Rigolet. I will read from the letter, Mr. Speaker, so I will have to table it.

"October 10:

"Dear Mr. Premier: During a recent visit to Rigolet, the Community Council advised me that during your visit you promised you would review their request for firefighting equipment and advise them in a few days.

"Mr. Wells, I understand you were in Rigolet on September 7." I wrote the letter on October 10, and on September 7 the Premier was in Rigolet. "It is now October 10". I have in brackets "(Webster's Dictionary defines a few as not many, a small number). "I believe, Sir, thirty-three days should be ample time to give the Rigolet Council an answer to their very important request.

"I should remind you, Sir, that Rigolet's firefighting equipment was given top priority before your Government took office on May 5." My goodness! I only have ten minutes left.

MR. SIMMS:

By leave!

MR. WARREN:

"The Rigolet Council has 25 per cent of the funds required and are waiting for the shipping season" - and the question was - "Are you waiting for the shipping season to close before you advise the Council? If you do so, your Government is depriving the community of Rigolet of a very valuable emergency service.

I then closed by saying, "I ask you, Mr. Premier, to place

humanity ahead of political mischievousness."

And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WARREN:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am just getting into it.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member may continue.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I say to all hon. colleagues over there, I really appreciate it and I guarantee in another half hour I will be finished.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

The hon. Member's time is up.

MR. WARREN:

No leave?

MR. SPEAKER:

It is my understanding that there was an agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Placentia.

MR. HOGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would have bowed to the wishes of my hon. friend for Torngat Mountains and listened to his disarray of remarks for another half hour. However, I am delighted with this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to address my colleagues on both sides of the House. In particular, I would like to refer to the remarks of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, when he referred to me specifically as being a rookie, and the rest of my colleagues here in the corner as rookies, and that we should follow his seventeen years or sixteen years or fifteen years of example, and that we should bow to his wisdom. Indeed I do on some subjects, but on the practices of his Party and of himself over the last couple of days, I am not too sure whether I would like to follow that example.

I would like to mention the scurrilous - somebody has been using that terminology - remarks made against my colleague, the hon. Minister of Social Services, the Member for Port de Grave. I do not think these remarks are warranted in this day and age. There is no need of getting personal, and there is no need of taking the man's character, or anybody else's in this House as far as that goes, whatever side they are on. I think we should stick to the issues. If that is the kind of practice we are going to be involved in, well, then, I am glad I am still a rookie, and I will not follow the lead of the superstars.

I would also like to refer to the

hon. Leader's remarks about nothing happening in the House, and nothing happening with this Government since it took office. There are lots of things happening, as my good friends the hon. the Member for Grand Bank and the hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West know.

I think there has been some good work and he has participated in some of it. The various Committees in the House is one positive structure that has been introduced by this Government, where everybody has an input into legislation, for example.

AN HON. MEMBER:
It was proposed by us.

MR. HOGAN:
Well, probably it was proposed by you.

So we follow good example from time to time. But I doubt if anything that sensible would be proposed by Members opposite.

Then he goes on to say that all we are going to be entertained with is housekeeping, there was no concrete, positive legislation.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tell us about Marine Atlantic.

MR. HOGAN:
Well, when Marine Atlantic starts their year-round service, I will see to it that my hon. Friend, Mr. Crosbie, sends a couple of these people invitations. If they want invitations to go on the first trip into Argentia for the year-round service, let me know and I will arrange it.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the housekeeping, I cannot as a rookie refer to what people do in this

House. But if you take this House as a workplace, when new owners or operators go in and they see the mess and the turmoil that the workplace is in, the first thing they have to do is enter into a good housekeeping program; you introduce housekeeping legislation that will cover-up the mistakes and the mismanagement that preceded you into that workplace. That is common practice, as far as I know. I do not think you have to be a rookie for that.

MR. TOBIN:
In what year was it you ran for the PC nomination?

MR. HOGAN:
In 1971, Mr. Speaker. I was misguided. You have to have a lapse of memory, or a lapse of something in order to get involved with that crowd.

Then we heard remarks directed towards a judge of the Supreme Court, 'is it going to be a scam.' As a matter of fact, I think somebody called him toothless. I do not know if they were referring to his dentures or his capability.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Nobody said that.

MR. HOGAN:
Oh, yes, he was called toothless, Mr. Speaker.

I am just quoting what I read in the papers. Everybody across the way say that the investigation is toothless. I would imagine they are referring to the investigator or the assessor.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TOBIN:
He is making a good speech. Do

not be interrupting my hon. friend. It is a good speech. The best one I have heard.

MR. HOGAN:

By pudgy friend from the Burin Peninsula. The rumormonger.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Your old boxing buddy.

MR. HOGAN:

Everybody has to learn how to box, Your Honour, but I do not. I have been there.

Mr. Speaker, one good thing we did this week was we all joined in unanimity to submit our resolution to the House of Commons on the UIC program. I was delighted that Members opposite could see the worthwhile resolution, and that the folly of their ways of doing things was not to be, and that they joined with us in that resolution.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to refer to my own district. Recently we had a big layoff and shutdown in Long Harbour, and I would like to suggest to this House that I think it is incumbent upon us as Members of the Legislature to address such things as the Long Harbour issue, as they are addressing the Fishery issue and the shutdown of plants such as National Sea in St. John's South and other shutdowns. I found this out by going through the process that was started by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition when he was Premier and appointed a Cabinet Committee to deal with the Long Harbour issue. We extended that when we took office, by appointing a Committee made up of senior officials. I think it would be incumbent on any Government, whether it be that side or this side, to put in place

a crisis management plan, for want of a better description, to deal with such situations so that when we do have these unfortunate incidents, something is automatically kicked in and certain things start happening.

I have found out that during this process, which, as I said, was started by hon. members across and carried on by ourselves, that if there are no mechanics already in place it takes months and months of tying together different services that are offered by both levels of Government to try to put them in place to deal with the particular situation. Therefore, I think it is incumbent to put in place a policy. I do not think you can do it in the Legislature, but I think you can, as a matter of policy and procedure, put in place a crisis management plan to deal with it so that UI, rehabilitation and other assistance to communities and to the workplace, can be brought forward.

I found that the workers in Long Harbour encountered many problems despite the best efforts of both Committees: They ran into great problems in rehabilitating; they ran into great problems in re-entering the trades schools or vocational schools. They found great problems in dealing with their UI program. They found great problems in dealing with moving out of the community. Even though the mechanics were there under legislation, communications were poor. Consequently, there was great suffering and hardship to people who had to pull up their roots, roots that were well-established, roots that were established from having good jobs, by having to go far away to other provinces, and, indeed, to other

parts of this Province. The process, Mr. Speaker, needs greater attention than we have been giving it, greater attention in setting up a plan and procedure that will address this and any other unfortunate set of circumstances that might come up in the future.

Other hon. Members have criticized this Government for their conduct and practices regarding Hibernia. Already we have seen progress report after progress report submitted to this House and tabled, addressing every question that was asked by the other side, and answers given as they were found and as they were sought. It is the same way, Mr. Speaker, with hydro development in Labrador. So I cannot see how hon members can entertain a motion of non-confidence in this Government. They say themselves we have been here seven months. How can you deal with the mess they left in seven months, Mr. Speaker? Your Honour well knows that there is a lot of work to be done in instituting a new government, with new plans and procedures and policies. Indeed, this Government has put us on the path to proper government, and prosperity will come in time. The plans are being laid, Mr. Speaker, and there is nothing Members opposite can do about it. Their scurrilous remarks and attacks on individuals in this House of Assembly will not bring us prosperity or any kind of a good plan to provide good government and employment in the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) boys and girls.

MR. HOGAN:

Mr. Speaker, no. There is no need of being good boys and girls.

There is lots of room to ask questions. The thing that initiated the scurrilous remarks was probably a proper question and certainly it would be addressed by the House. The Premier has addressed it properly by providing a Judge of the Supreme Court to assess the matter and table the report in this House. For the life of me, as a rookie I cannot see anything wrong with that procedure.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He has no authority.

MR. HOGAN:

Well, he has the authority as I understand it. There is a section of The Judge's Act and there is an Order in Council which provides such authority. And I am sure that hon. Members opposite must understand that better than I. I am the rookie, not them. And just because it is a way that was never tried before or undertaken before, does not mean it is the wrong way. We learn something new every day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is a cover-up.

MR. HOGAN:

A cover-up? I doubt it, Mr. Speaker. I doubt it very much. How can it be a cover-up if the report is going to be tabled in the House under the signature of a Judge of the Supreme Court?

I do not know how hon. Members can say that a Judge of the Supreme Court is going to pull off scams and there is going to be a cover-up.

MR. MATTHEWS:

(Inaudible).

MR. HOGAN:

It probably will, next weekend.

Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous to think that a motion of non-confidence could be placed at this time. Why do they not wait for a year or two, until they see the plans -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) confidence is gone.

MR. HOGAN:

I am talking about a non-confidence motion now, I am not talking about your questioning or anything.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the Government of the day is proceeding, and each day, as I said, Minister after Minister is tabling statements of progress.

AN HON. MEMBER:

On what?

MR. HOGAN:

Hibernia, for example. You have a full report, the first time in two years, except at press conferences, that anything was tabled in this House on Hibernia. On November 1, 1989 there was a report tabled in the House by the Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) in a year.

MR. HOGAN:

Except in the press, I said.

MR. SIMMS:

Where do you think the press got it?

MR. HOGAN:

Well, they did not get it in this House, because the House was not

open.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I recall a statement made in the House last spring by the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture concerning the Forest Protection Program. And I remember Members across the House, particularly my friend from Grand Falls, speaking out against the procedure that was going to be undertaken by the hon. Minister.

Again on November 1, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Graham Flight made a statement in the House and hon. Members opposite praised his statement and said indeed he did get rid of all the blackheads, but I do not think he did.

MR. MURPHY:

Clearasil is still over there.

MR. HOGAN:

My hon. friend from St. John's South says he is still over there. No, he is not. He is gone.

This result was achieved despite the presence of a second insect, the blackheaded budworm, Mr. Speaker. I guess he is still around over there somewhere.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we had an up-to-date report on the resource crisis in the fishing industry, prepared by my hon. friend the Minister of Fisheries. It is outlined for them in black and white.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes? What does it say?

MR. HOGAN:

Well, do you want me to read it out for you? You all heard it. It says, Mr. Speaker, 'The Fishing Industry is facing a very serious crisis.' You recognize it. You

say you do not recognize anything. 'This crisis is caused primarily by an enormous reduction in the amount of fish available to the Newfoundland Fishing Industry.' Do you want me to go on? I can read it all for you.

A lack of non-confidence, Mr. Speaker? How can a non-confidence motion be considered by Members on that side when everything and anything that is being done by this Government is being tabled in this House of Assembly for the information and education - if they can be educated - of Members opposite?

MR. RIDEOUT:
What is being done.

MR. WARREN:
Read them. Read them. The Minister of Mines and Energy, at the end of October, gave an update on negotiations with Ontario and Quebec. Well, there was one detail that you fellows overlooked, and that was Ontario.

MR. SIMMS:
What was that?

MR. MURPHY:
Oh, yes, still waiting for an answer.

MR. WARREN:
Still waiting for an answer, Mr. Speaker. Here is a great marketplace for our power, that offered on a couple of occasions to enter into negotiations to discuss the market. Mr. Speaker, day after day Ministers rise and report on the practices of this Government.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Cover-up.

MR. HOGAN:

There are lots of them here, no cover-up.

MR. MATTHEWS:
What did you do with the employment program?

MR. HOGAN:
Mr. Speaker, the Employment program was dropped.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. HOGAN:
That will come in time. The hon. the Minister will come up with it. Do not worry about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
When? When?

MR. HOGAN:
It is coming, after good planning and preparation. It is not going to be a band-aid solution, as was often offered by Members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:
I had some discussions with my hon. friend, the Member from Grand Falls, about the employment program.

MR. MATTHEWS:
You scrapped that.

MR. HOGAN:
We had to because it was being abused. It was scrapped, Mr. Speaker, because it was doing more harm than good, and it was given out on patronage basis. And hiring practices is another thing. Mr. Speaker, the employment program, hiring practices, everything is in order in this Government, everything. My hon. friend from the West Coast, Port au Port, he addresses

criticisms at the hon. Minister about hiring practices, and misleads this House in thinking that this Government hired some executive Member of the Liberal Association, when, in fact, long after he was hired, Mr. Speaker, he saw what a good Government he was working for and he then went out and sought a position on the Liberal Executive. Under the former Government, Mr. Speaker, he probably was not allowed to exercise his free will.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) forbid him to do it. Now, that will tell you (inaudible) the rookies.

MR. HOGAN:

Oh, the rookie knew it, the rookie knew it. The legislation might have been in place, Mr. Speaker, but they still were not allowed to practice their beliefs, and my good Friend was one of the worst perpetrators.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HOGAN:

That is right.

Then we go on today - further criticism on Hibernia. Again the Minister of Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons) rose to his feet and gave an update on it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Time is up.

MR. HOGAN:

Mr. Speaker, is my time up?

MR. SPEAKER:

No.

MR. MURPHY:

No, no. Ignore him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HOGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would not take the hon. Member's leave if it was the last thing on earth.

Mr. Speaker, if you read in the -

MR. SIMMS:

Tell us about Meech Lake.

MR. HOGAN:

Meech Lake. Ask the Premier, he is the expert on Meech Lake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:

Ask the hon. the Premier about Meech Lake. He is the expert on constitutional law. To us lay people you have your so-called legal experts over there, as good as they are or as bad as they are, and they do not even know what he is talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They cut Newfoundland's throat.

MR. HOGAN:

They cannot understand it. But when he tells this House about Meech Lake at least he knows what he is talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HOGAN:

And, Mr. Speaker, I will leave Meech Lake to the Premier, as I would leave the fisheries to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rideout), or agriculture and forestry to the hon. the Member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms). I am not going to be like other Members of the House opposite, who profess to be experts on everything. I am

just going to address those subjects that are of interest to myself and of interest to my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, if I could get back to Argentina. The hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has expressed an interest in Argentina. Argentina in the coming days, will make the headlines and Argentina will come along with development, despite Hibernia. We are not going to, in my District, Mr. Speaker, put all our eggs into Hibernia, we never did listen to all the lies that were presented by our predecessors in Government about what Hibernia was going to do for Argentina. We made other plans and those plans are rolling along, Mr. Speaker, and development will take place in Argentina, and the year round service, Mr. Speaker, based on what the local people put into it, and not what Members Opposite or Members on this side of the House put into the search for year round service at Argentina. The local input and the constructive suggestions of the local people will prevail, Mr. Speaker, and we will get year round service into Argentina.

And, Mr. Speaker, year round service into Argentina will help build up other industries in Argentina that are just waiting and knocking at the door to get in there. Argentina, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. the Member, my pudgy friend, was played down by Members Opposite. They never even listed to their own Member. They never listened to their hon. colleague.

MR. TOBIN:

I always supported Argentina, buddy.

MR. HOGAN:

And no matter what my hon. friend and predecessor in the seat for Placentia put forward to Members Opposite, they never did listen to him about Argentina, they always treated it as a joke. And, Mr. Speaker, that is why Argentina never got the fair break, never got the development and it was never bought forward, because it was these Members Opposite who always kept it down, including my friend, no matter what he says about supporting it, he might have been a lone voice in the wilderness. The rest of them did not.

MR. TOBIN:

The Minister of Transportation will not support it either, did you hear him today?

MR. HOGAN:

And, Mr. Speaker, a motion or a resolution of non-confidence in this Government is misplaced. We can stand here all day, Mr. Speaker, statement after statement, outlining the work that has been carried out by this Government to date, and I am dumbfounded by how the super stars and the experienced people across on the other side can even table a resolution of non-confidence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to comments from my friend, and I consider him a friend, from Argentina.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You interrupted him.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I did interrupt him and he can interrupt me if he wants to.

But I have to say that I am a little bit disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Placentia would stand up here today and not support, actually I am surprised that he would not support the non-confidence vote in that Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

And his constituents are going to be surprised that he would not support the non-confidence vote in the Government.

What had the Government done, Mr. Speaker? Anyone see CBC Television, and I do not usually watch that, but I happened to be looking at it a few weeks ago and what happened, Mr. Speaker, there was one Ryder truck and two U-Haul trucks backed into three houses, Mr. Speaker, in the hon. Member's District, packing up their luggage, the little children bidding good-bye to their friends, and a Government, Mr. Speaker, not having done one thing to help the people that have been affected by Long Harbour. They have turned their backs on them and they have watched them packing their luggage in the trucks, and they have watched them board the ferries, Mr. Speaker, and they have watched them settle in Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, is the Member from Placentia going to tell me that the people who were in that truck would give a vote of confidence to this Government. Not on your life.

Are you going to tell me, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Argentic area, if they saw the Minister of Transportation today shirk his responsibility, to swivel around, and turn his back on Argentic. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador that has been elected to govern this Province, today, Mr. Speaker, not only show the people of Argentic, and by the way we did not ask them to support Argentic, or Port aux Basques or anything else, we asked the Minister, Mr. Speaker, today if they had made a presentation to the study group looking at a year-round service for Argentic. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that is a Government worth its salt.

MR. MURPHY:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Listen to the old weener from St. John's South. Marystown got the (inaudible) Crosbie should be ashamed of himself because St. John's needed it. The old weener, sookie baby, cry baby.

Now, let me get back Mr. Speaker to the old weener. I will deal with him after. Let me say Mr. Speaker to the Member for Argentic, I will challenge the Member for Port aux Basques (Mr. Ramsay), no, let me take Argentic first. I will issue a challenge to the Member for Placentia to stand in this House tomorrow and ask the Minister of Transportation the questions that I asked him today. I challenge the Member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from St. John's South the old weener. And, Mr. Speaker, we talk about

this, we talk about Members and all that. The Member for Placentia, Mr. Speaker, like myself, for years have been talking about the golden triangle: Placentia, Argentia, Marystown and Come By Chance. Where is the development now, Mr. Speaker? Where is the development of that golden triangle? Where is it going to take place? Where is the concrete platform going to be constructed now? I think I heard the Minister of Energy saying that it looked like it was going to be in Trinity Bay. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is that going to do to Argentia? I will tell you something. I know the Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) as well as anyone else in this House knows him, Mr. Speaker, and some day soon -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:
He represents his constituents. Some day soon he will stand in this House, Mr. Speaker, and he will tell everyone of them what he thinks of them. And, when he starts to tell them, Mr. Speaker, they had better listen.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He will be Hulk Hogan, then.

MR. TOBIN:
No, he is a friend of mine. The only thing is I am surprised and disappointed. I just got off the phone talking to the radio station about the Argentia fiasco, myself and my colleague for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn), and you know something, I may have to go back again and tell the people of Placentia that their Member would not vote for a non-confidence in this Government, and I do not think they would be very happy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Placentia Bay. He represents the East Side and I am on the West Side and I am not sure that there is a better pair to represent Placentia Bay than myself and my colleague.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
When are you going to give him a hug?

MR. TOBIN:
He is my friend, Mr. Speaker. Now, who is not my friend? Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment and Lands, and you might not believe this, but one time when I was on the council in Marystown, I had the opportunity to nominate and to campaign and work for the Member for President of the Federation of Municipalities, and he lost it by one vote, the same as the old Member for St. John's South won by. He lost it by one vote.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:
Yes he did. And you did not support him by the way. You supported the other fellow. Mr. Speaker, I believe he would have won except that the member for Placentia went around the whole day and said, he is no good. Do not vote for him he said.

MR. PARSONS:
He was right and you were wrong.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I see the Member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Crane) coming in. The phone calls we are getting are from people in his district, they cannot get a hold of him.

MR. TOBIN:

They cannot get a hold of the Member for Harbour Grace. The phone never stops ringing. You should start representing your constituents because we have a list. The list is there somewhere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Table it. Table it.

MR. TOBIN:

Why should you not vote for non-confidence in this Government? Would the people of St. Lawrence and Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, vote for confidence in this Government after they -the President of Treasury Board says yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

Would they vote, Mr. Speaker, for confidence in this Government? Would the students at University? A 10 per cent hike in tuition, the highest ever. I sit here and I look at the educators on that side, Mr. Speaker. I look at the Minister of Employment and Labour, and the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister sat in Cabinet when this Budget was being prepared. She was there, Mr. Speaker, when they put the blocks to the students of this Province and she supported it because if she did not she would not be in Cabinet today. So, the former President of the NTA, and the former, former President of the NTA who was going to run for us before the last election, now what happened?

They came in here and they joined the group, Mr. Speaker, that socked it to the students of this Province.

And not just to the students, it is to their parents, Mr. Speaker. It is to their parents, the few that are left working in Newfoundland, they socked it to them. In seven months they have done more destruction, Mr. Speaker, than anyone can believe.

Now Mr. Speaker. Would the people of Bell Island, Mr. Speaker, vote - would the people of Bell Island, where they stole, where the Government stole the second ferry, denied it to them, Mr. Speaker, and the Member stood by and supported the decision to deny the second ferry to the people of Bell Island, and he ought to be ashamed of himself, Mr. Speaker. He had betrayed his constituents, he had betrayed his constituents, Mr. Speaker, he had betrayed his constituents, Mr. Speaker, like you would not believe. And I can tell you that the thirty votes that he won by, Mr. Speaker, are going to be gone.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Order!

MR. TOBIN:

Gone already? He will never be back in the House of Assembly again, Mr. Speaker. No matter how hard he tries to get in Cabinet, and no matter by what means he tries.

Now Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Transportation. Where is he to? The Minister of Transportation. I am sure that I remember and my colleague from Grand Bank, and my colleague from St. Mary's the Capes, and all the rest of us that were tuned into the local radio station. We remember the election campaign, and we remember the paid advertisements by the Member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. When our Government is in, when we are

elected to Government - that is what he said - when we are elected to be the Government, I can assure you that the decision will be reversed, and the Hydro station will remain, and its employees will remain in Bay d'Espoir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not something that he said, that is something that he spent money to say. It is on tape, we have got the tape. I think my colleague from Grand Bank got the tapes. Now, Mr. Speaker, the old weener is at it again. Mr. Speaker, he paid money to go out and tell the people that he was going to do it. He got in and what did he do - he turned his back on them Mr. Speaker - and are you going to tell me that they would not vote for non-confidence in that Minister, the people of Bay d'Espoir?

That is right. That is on my list too, Mr. Speaker, school tax. What about the advertisements, Mr. Speaker, what about the advertisements that were taken out by Members' opposite in the local newspapers, on the school tax. What about it. Where is the reversal on the school tax that was going to die. I remember when the Minister of Health was over here, and did he ever lash into the school tax. He was going to do it Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing this election wants is an exercise in hypocrisy to see what has happened.

MR. DECKER:

What about the hospital in Marystown?

MR. TOBIN:

What was that? There is neither hospital in Marystown I would like to inform you. Now, Mr. Speaker,

that is what he knows about the Province, there is neither hospital in Marystown!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

We have got a Minister of Health who is talking about a hospital in Marystown. There is neither one there bye!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Now Mr. Speaker, that is how knowledgeable he is about the Province. And not only does he lack the knowledge of geography, Mr. Speaker, he also lacks the knowledge of his Department.

I am going to get to amalgamation, do not worry about that.

Mr. Speaker, he is going to close the hospital in Marystown - the list goes on about what they have backed off on, Mr. Speaker.

Amalgamation? Yes. I have got to wait for amalgamation. I got to be in the right frame of mind for that, but I will say one thing, Mr. Speaker, I will say one thing, that in my district today - Mr. Speaker, listen, I tell the hon. gentleman every time I ran I was elected - and he ran every time and was elected once. So now who knows what they are talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my former colleague from Placentia would not mind me saying what I am going to say. But between the former Member for Placentia and the

present Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan), they have been defeated seventeen times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

And you are batting 100.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I am batting 100. Yes. Well no I cannot bring in council, because he was elected to council. I meant in the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about amalgamation?

MR. TOBIN:

Amalgamation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about Meech Lake.

MR. TOBIN:

Ah, Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk about Meech Lake.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch - time is slipping by - on my District for a few moments. And I want to say and I want to be very, very serious about this, that in Marystown today, Mr. Speaker, the Marystown shipyard is at the lowest peak that it has ever been since the late 1960s.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last week there was a firm from Ontario down in Marystown on the Burin Peninsula, trying to recruit the former employees of the Marystown shipyard. That is very, very difficult for us. It is extremely difficult, Mr. Speaker, for my colleague for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and myself, and for our Leader (Mr. Rideout), because it was back a few years ago that our Leader today, who was then the

Minister of Fisheries, negotiated a contract for a subsidy to build trawlers. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was at the same time that the First Ministers Conference took place, because I was in Vancouver with the then Premier, when our leader negotiated a contract.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last year the Government of Newfoundland turned its back on the Burin Peninsula like no Government has ever done in the history of this Province. FPI wanted to build a trawler.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

I was in then too. FPI wanted to build a trawler, Mr. Speaker. What happened, Mr. Speaker? The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador decided -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

- not to give a subsidy, that was negotiated, cost-shared 50/50 between two Governments, would not, Mr. Speaker, and the sad part about that is that they have put jobs in Norway, the Government have put jobs in Norway, Mr. Speaker, and do you know what is going to happen? There is close to \$5 million in that Ocean Industries Agreement that was the vehicle for delivering the funds that is going back to Ottawa. The Newfoundlanders in Marystown and on the Burin Peninsula will be unemployed.

MR. WALSH:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Now listen, Mr. Speaker, a man who

supported the scuttling of a ferry for his constituents and cancelled work at the Marystown shipyard - old snitch, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Gut snitch!

MR. TOBIN:
What?

MR. MATTHEWS:
Gut snitch.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, the man who did in his own constituents, the man who did in Marystown, and a man who will never be elected to anything again in this Province, should stay quiet.

Mr. Speaker, there are people unemployed in Marystown today while the Province sends back almost \$5 million to Ottawa, that agreement expires within the next few months.

MR. WALSH:
The union took poor advice.

MR. TOBIN:
What did he say about the union? Ah, Mr. Speaker, what did he say about the union. Say it. What are you saying about the unions?

MR. WALSH:
They took poor advice.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, we know exactly how the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Walsh), feels about unions in this Province. And I will not stand by, Mr. Speaker, and take lightly his condemnation of the shipyard union. They are a very dedicated group of individuals, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
They are working for the membership. Unlike the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island who betrayed his constituents. They are working for their membership and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he should not be abusing the union, a good union, an example for any union in this Province and, Sir, they will not take it lightly when I tell them the way you treated them today. Oh, Mr. Speaker! What knowledge he would have about unions and what concern he would have for union membership - it boggles the mind, Mr. Speaker, to hear that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries just left.

What is going on in the fisheries today? One thing we know after today, Mr. Speaker, is that this Government does not have a plan for the fisheries. There is no plan, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries threw up his hands and blamed it on the Feds, 'It is a Federal responsibility.' Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, are the responsibility of this Government, as well, and we do not take that lightly.

We can talk about first year university, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Again.

MR. TOBIN:
Yes, we got ours. We spent the money last year, when my colleague was Minister of Career Development. We spent the money and built the school, and now we have the facilities operating.

Did they not back-track on the one going into Labrador? Where is the second university, Mr. Speaker? Where is the one for Windsor - Buchans and the Grand Falls area? When is it going to be announced?

AN HON. MEMBER:

When are you going to sit down?

MR. TOBIN:

When I do sit down I will not ween.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

What about the Economic Recovery Team? How many jobs have they created, Mr. Speaker? They have created a few jobs, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fifty.

MR. TOBIN:

No, they have more than that.

How many drivers are there for those trucks that bring people to the mainland? How ever many there are to move people out, that is how many jobs they have created. They have scuttled this Province, Mr. Speaker.

What about recreational capital grants?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bring the Newfoundlanders home.

MR. TOBIN:

We will get the Minister on that after. But I am asking the Minister, what about the arenas that were supposed to be built?

MS VERGE:

What about fairness and balance?

MR. TOBIN:

Fairness and balance, that is the

theme. What happened to the arena for Fortune - Hermitage district. There was an arena promised for the Fortune - Hermitage district, I believe, the Connaigre Peninsula, money allocated, and the cheque never sent out; Fogo, Mr. Speaker, was another place. Where was the third place?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bonavista North.

MR. TOBIN:

Bonavista North, that is it, Mr. Speaker. Fogo Island, Bonavista North, and the Connaigre Peninsula, that Government took the money, kept the money, and would not send it out, and denied these people the right to a recreational program.

Mr. Speaker, I do not blame it on the Minister responsible. I do not think that he had much to do with it. I think it is people in the Cabinet like the Minister of Health, the Minister of Forestry, I think they are the people, Mr. Speaker, who want to deny the youth of this Province the right to adequate recreation facilities. The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, old jumping jack, the Minister of Finance, the man who nevers sits down in this House, he is always up. He was in Japan the other day, did a good job too with negotiations. No, Mr. Speaker, he got through and he got back, a good job.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education - I have to say this - I say it because I believe it, I think the Minister of Education is one of the most sincere individuals that I have ever met in my life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

However?

MR. TOBIN:

No, Mr. Speaker, there is no however to that. I put the Minister of Education on a par with the President of Treasury Board. And I can tell the hon. Minister of Forestry that is pretty high above him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Carbonear is not in his seat, but I wish he was, because I was reading an article in The Compass. No, I will leave that alone, he is not here and it is not right to say it.

Mr. Speaker, what about the water and sewer corporation. Where is that to? Where is that water and sewer corporation? I wonder is it amalgamated? Is it amalgamated, Mr. Speaker, the water and sewer corporation?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ask the hon. Member for Deer Park.

MR. TOBIN:

That is not worthy of comment, it is just his mentality showing.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for seven years and I have had a lot of jabbering back and forth, Mr. Speaker, and there were times I was shouting across the House when I should not have been. But, nobody can ever say, Mr. Speaker, that I ever went after anybody personally. Let me say something to the old king of amalgamation, the king of contradictions, Mr. Speaker, the man who said something one day, the Premier changed it the next, and then he changed his position.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Let me see it.

MR. TOBIN:

I do not have it, Mr. Speaker. I have a file folder collection of all the contradictions in my office. If the hon. Member ever wants to write a book, I will certainly share it with him because he could sell it. He is going to force amalgamation and he is not going to force amalgamation. Then the Premier the other day, the king of the line, said the Government will not force amalgamation. He repeated it three times, the Government will not force amalgamation, but the House of Assembly may. I can tell him that there is nobody on this side who will be part of forcing amalgamation, therefore it is the Government who is going to force amalgamation. Do not swindle around, Mr. Speaker, with these little words.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did he say over there. What was it?

MR. TOBIN:

I do not know what I said. Sleaze around with the old words because they have to be above board and they have to take a position, because we want to know over the coming days and over the coming weeks, Mr. Speaker. I hope we are here until Christmas. We should be. We will be here until Boxing Day and I will have dinner with my friend for Placentia. We want to know more about the amalgamation issue. It is very, very serious. There are towns in this Province that do not know where they are going, what they are doing, or how they are going to get there. They have unanimously, 100 per cent, rejected amalgamation and yet the Minister and the Government continues, Mr. Speaker, to insist that they have to have these public hearings. Down in my

colleagues district in Green Bay they are going to amalgamate three islands.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We can move them, too.

MR. TOBIN:

I just heard what I was afraid of, 'We will move them.' Resettlement is well in the line under the disguise of amalgamation. Let me tell the Member, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province will not be moved, will never be moved. Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the debate and I will have more to say tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. Members so desire we could stop the clock at five, then I could give the ruling on the point of privilege today, rather than wait until tomorrow. So hon. Members would agree? On the point of privilege that the hon. The House Leader presented today to the effect that the Premier misled the House, and that this resulted in Members having their privileges breached. I have, after consideration of all of the references and the points presented by both side, by the House Leader of the Government and the Opposition House Leader, I have made a decision. I have ruled that no prima facie case existed in this particular case and I have used two chief main sources for reaching this conclusion. The first one is Maingot, page 205, and the second of the last paragraph on page 205 of Maingot, it says "To allege that a Member has misled the House is a matter of order rather than privilege and is not unparliamentary, whether or not it

is qualified by the adjective "unintentional" or "inadvertently". To allege that a Member has deliberately misled the House is also a matter of "order" and is indeed unparliamentary. However, deliberately misleading statements may be treated as a contempt. In the Canadian House of Commons, however, Members attempt to get such matters before the House on a "question of privilege", when there is merely an allegation of contempt, rather than an admitted matter, and that is what makes it more serious when a Member admits that that particular Member misled the House, and in the absence of admission, I also quote for Members Beauchesne, page 151 and paragraph 494, "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that statements by Members respecting themselves and particularly within their own knowledge must be accepted. It is not unparliamentary temperately to criticise statements made by Members as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. On rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident", and that is possibly where we are today. But I rule that no prime facie case of privilege has existed, or was established, I should say.

Thank you.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, before adjournment I would like to point out that tomorrow we will be dealing with a couple of more second readings, I talked to the Opposition House

Leader about this. There is a Supply Bill that is involved here, Supplementary Supply. So we will be debating that. And if there is time left we will come back to the Address in Reply.

Also I would like to make note of the point that on tomorrow I intend to name The Elections and Privileges Committee because some day, perhaps, there may be some cause for such a Committee to meet. Maybe some day a motion of privilege on the part of the Opposition House Leader will, in fact, be a motion of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow, and that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, if I may?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Just before the motion is acted upon I appreciate the gentle way in which he stuck the knife in. He did a very gentle job of it, I thought, with respect to the Elections and Privileges Committee. In fact, it very well could have been one needed today - it is possible. The Speaker had to take several hours to consider the one that I placed today.

May I offer to the House the following information. You will recall that we made an agreement some time in the past with respect to Private Member's Days, and that on the Monday when it is whoever's turn, we should advise the Members of the House which motion we will be debating. Since it is our turn this week, we want to advise

Members of the House that we will be debating Motion No. 22, which appeared on the Order Paper of Wednesday, June 28 - that is the quickest way I can refer to it. But just for your edification it is a motion put forward by the Member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Langdon), dealing with the establishment of a Select Committee of the House to address the issue of student aid. So if educators on the other side and educators on this side would like to prepare themselves, we should be able to have an interesting debate on Wednesday. Teachers' pensions will be the one following.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 2:00 p.m.