



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 14

---

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

***Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush***

The House met at 9:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):  
Order, please!

I am now prepared to rule on the question of privilege raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday evening, the March 27th sitting. I have examined the script of the radio broadcast in question which gave rise to the alleged breach of privilege; I have also reviewed the remarks of the Premier, in Hansard, given in response to the Leader of the Opposition on March 27, and consistent with the Premier's high regard for the office of Speaker and Members with privileges in general, I am satisfied there was no deliberate attempt by the Premier to cast reflections on the Speaker.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition in presenting his point of privilege emphasized that certain inferences could be drawn from the Premier's remarks. In order to be a question of privilege, the comments or words spoken by a Member must actually impinge upon the ability of Members of Parliament to do their job properly. Beauchesne, paragraph 69, page 20, sixth edition.

In summary, then, my examination of the relevant material does not disclose a prima facie case of breach of privilege. Having made that ruling, I point out to hon. Members that in searching all the authorities, I could not find one incident of this ever taking place. I am not saying that reflections were never cast upon the Speaker, I am simply saying the authorities' studies never quoted any such examples.

I remind hon. Members of Beauchesne, paragraph 71, section 1, sixth edition which states: "The Speaker should be protected against reflections on his or her actions..." Maybe this is why there is such a dirth of detail on the matter.

### Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us in the House recognize the important contributions made by Personal Care Homes to the health services of our Province.

The Homes are relatively small in size, thus providing a home-like atmosphere to their largely elderly residents. I am aware that the cost of providing services to these individuals is ever increasing, and I, and the Government, are sensitive to the circumstances of Personal Care Home operators.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the House today that the Government has taken a decision to provide an additional \$800,000 within the current fiscal year to Personal Care Home operators to help enhance the financial viability of these facilities and services.

While the Government would like to be in a position to do more for Personal Care Home operators - in fact, the report done by Touche Ross suggested this could be one of the groups the previous Administration left behind in their increases - the unlimited demands that are placed on the

health care budget and our limited resources prevent us from doing any more at this time. We shall, however, continue to give careful consideration to the financial requirements of these facilities. We will continue to monitor them, Mr. Speaker, over the next months.

This \$800,000 will do much to assist the Personal Care Home operators. For example, for a home which has twenty subsidized beds fully occupied, it will mean an increase in their current year's allocation of \$14,000.

Mr. Speaker, while this allocation is a one-time allocation, as I indicated, we will continue to give ongoing consideration to the requirements of Personal Care Home operators. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is normal for Members who stand in response to Ministerial Statements to thank the Minister for the courtesy of having given them a copy of the statement beforehand. My thanks this morning are somewhat equivocal, because I received two statements two minutes before coming into the House and one of them is four pages long. I am good, but I am not that good; I could hardly have time to read them let alone assess them. It was announced they were coming so they were obviously ready.

However, having said that I cannot be negative about good news and I am pleased that the Minister has been able, in difficult times, to allocate another \$800,000 for the

Personal Care Home operators. The Minister does make reference to the fact that it would have been nice if he could have provided more, but his budget this year was a little difficult. He is aware, I am sure, that Touche Ross did an independent study indicating that a 20 per cent increase was required to bring those operators up to an appropriate level, and this \$800,000 for the Personal Care Home operators certainly will fall far short of that. But any improvement is certainly welcome, because with the demographic situation that we have in Newfoundland, the increasing numbers of people who are requiring care and the pressure that has been placed on our acute care hospitals providing beds for those people, it is certainly something to be encouraged, to have the private operators who have played a very, very important role in the health care system encouraged to do so by making it financially feasible.

Now, there is no way I can tell from the information here what, in fact, the percentage increase was. Not only do I not have a calculator, but there is one critical piece of information missing, the total number of nursing home care beds and the total number of operators. I do not want to be too picky about this. It is good. It is was announced in the Budget.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I remind the hon. Member that she is taking up the time of the Minister now, so could the hon. Member please clue up in ten or fifteen seconds?

MS DUFF:

I thank the Minister for seeing fit to give an \$800,000 increase to the operators and hope that possibly it will not be a one time allocation, but next year we may see fit to raise it a little closer to the 20 per cent recommended.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I should have done this before we got into Statements By Ministers, and I apologize. I was talking to somebody at the time and I was not paying appropriate attention. I wanted to advise the House of some bad news, I am sure all hon. Members will agree. The father of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms Cowan) died this morning, and she has had to leave to go her family home in Ontario. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. Members would want me to ask you to send an expression of our deepest sympathy to Ms Cowan's family on this sad occasion.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all Members on this side. As well, we would like to be associated with the sentiments expressed by the Premier and express our deepest sympathy to the Minister and to the rest of the Members of her family.

MR. SPEAKER:

Statements by Ministers.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have another statement, but I should say to the hon. Member for St. John's East (Ms Duff) that when we were sitting over there, the Pages used to bring the statements across when the Ministers were making them. So things have changed substantially, she at least has got five minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1990 Budget delivered on Thursday, March 15, this Government demonstrated its commitment to enhance the Province's Health Care System.

A total of eight hundred and thirty-four million dollars was allocated to health care in this Province. That was an increase of ten per cent over the allocation for 1989/90.

What I would like to do today, Mr. Speaker, is to outline, in more detail, for the Members of the House and for the people of the Province, exactly where and how some of these funds are being allocated.

I will address the allocation under two separate categories: Hospital and Nursing Home Operations, and Capital Equipment.

Under the first category, Hospital and Nursing Home Operations: With respect to the announcement by Government in the 1990/91 Budget Speech that additional nursing positions would be allocated to hospitals and nursing homes, I am pleased to advise, Mr. Speaker, that a total of thirty-three additional Registered Nursing

positions have been allocated in the following hospitals:

Janeway Child Health Centre, St. John's; General Hospital; St. Clare's Mercy Hospital; Grace General Hospital; Carbonear General Hospital; James Paton Memorial Hospital at Gander; Brookfield Hospital, Mr. Speaker - I believe Your Honour represents that particular District - Central Newfoundland Regional Health Care, Grand Falls; Notre Dame Memorial Hospital, Twillingate; Western Memorial Regional Hospital, Stepehenville - in Corner Brook. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, there is a typographical error here this morning; the Grenfell Regional Health Services, St. Anthony, which will take in the District I am proud to represent and a part of the District up on the Labrador Coast where nurses are badly needed; we still have stations up there which are served by only one nurse, Mr. Speaker, and this is the kind of a health care initiative we are trying to address the problem with it.

Within the Nursing Home sector, an additional thirty-two residential care positions have been allocated to the following homes:

North Haven Manor in Lewisporte is getting extra staff; Interfaith Nursing Home in Corner Brook, Blue Crest Manor in Grand Bank is getting extra positions; Glenbrook Nursing Home in St. John's; the Paddon Nursing Home in Goose Bay; St. Lukes Nursing Home in St. John's; Pentecostal Nursing Home in Clarke's Beach; Bonnews Lodge in Badger's Quay; Harbour Lodge in Carbonear; and the Interfaith Nursing Home, Mr. Speaker, in St. Anthony.

The Department of Health has also

provided additional funding to the General Hospital, Health Sciences Centre, to enhance the Cardiac Surgery Program and open fifteen additional acute care beds. This is in response to an identified need to more fully address the Province's Open Heart Surgery Program and also provide additional tertiary care services.

James Paton Memorial Hospital, Gander, has been provided with the funding to open ten acute care beds. Western Memorial Regional Health Centre in Corner Brook has been provided with the funding to open twelve acute care beds. These additional beds will greatly assist these hospitals in meeting the medical and surgical needs of people requiring hospitalization in those regions. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that these beds are over and above. That is not counting the summer beds of which we will be keeping more open than we have been doing in past years. These are beds which were never in the history of the world have been open before.

At the Central Newfoundland Hospital in Grand Falls, funding has been allocated to increase the number of medical/surgical beds by eighteen. This ties in with in their re-development of services and programs over the past five years, and their ongoing recruitment of specialists. Mr. Speaker, they had not been fully able to address their mandate because they did not have the specialists, but over the past year they have been fortunate enough to recruit the specialists and now we have to fund them so they can perform their mandate.

Carbonear General Hospital,  
Carbonear, Sir Thomas Roddick  
Hospital, Stephenville and

Grenfell Regional Health Services have been allocated funds to commence a Mental Health Program. This is in keeping with the Government's commitment to expand such services throughout the Province. At present, Mental Health Services are available at Labrador City, Goose Bay, Channel/Port aux Basques, Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander, Clarenville, Burin Peninsula and all hospitals in St. John's. This is one area, Mr. Speaker, where we had to pay particular attention, because with all the other things the previous did not get around to doing - I do not want to attribute motives, I just state the facts - that is one area that somehow sort of slipped through the cracks and we are trying to address it as fast as we possibly can.

In Stephenville, at the Sir Thomas Roddick Hospital, funds have been provided to cover the operating costs for new specialists which, Mr. Speaker, the hospital has, for the first time in the history of the world, been successful in recruiting, Mr. Speaker. I think that is good news.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, under the Capital Equipment Budget, I am pleased to advise you, that this Government is committing two million dollars to cost-sharing arrangements with hospitals around the Province for the purchase of high-technology equipment. We have to keep up, Mr. Speaker, with the modern day equipment which is being made available to institutions, and we are not content to allow our technology to fall back into the dark ages; we want to keep right up there with the rest of the

nation, ready for the twenty-first century.

Funds are also being allocated to acquire equipment to operate the additional beds at the Health Sciences Centre which have been designated for the Cardiac Surgery Program. Mr. Speaker, when we open up extra intensive care units and when we open up extra operating rooms, that means that it sets off a chain reaction and we are providing the money to open up the extra beds for that.

As part of the Government's program to provide nursing homes with emergency generators, \$600,000 has been committed to purchase generators for Hoyles-Escasoni and Glenbrook Lodge in this upcoming fiscal year.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as I outlined in my comments on the Budget, most people in the Province recognize that this is a good Budget. A Budget which reflects the Government's strong commitment to the health care needs of the residents of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am not entirely sure why we need this Ministerial Statement this morning since I think people already acknowledge that it was a welcomed addition to the Budget in

Health - a lot of emphasis has been placed in the Budget Speech on Health - and because we are going into the Budget Estimates Committees next week, which is the appropriate time I think for this kind of detail to be discussed. However, I can understand that the Minister is very proud of his Budget and he likes to have the opportunity to say it again and again and again.

We are pleased as an Opposition that the 10 per cent increase in the overall funding for health this year was made possible by Government, because health is very important in the scale of things in the Province. It was, in fact, 3 per cent higher than last year but, then again, last year was the second lowest of the previous seven years. But anything helps.

With respect to the details of the announcement, certainly it is good news that there are to be thirty-three additional registered nursing positions allocated. I think there were thirty-three last year, as well. I believe the study identified a shortfall of something like 139, so I assume that is an ongoing increase that will begin to bring us up to level, because the Nursing Task Force did strongly identify understaffing as one of the very serious problems with the morale of the nursing profession.

Now we have been given the details of the list to which the nursing positions will apply. However, it does not tell us what goes to where. But, from a quick glance, it looks as if they will mostly be allocated to the tertiary and secondary hospitals. I believe that is a good move, because in our current way the health system works right now, acute care

hospitals, particularly the tertiary and secondary hospitals, have people who are really ill and the actual workload of the nurse per patient is far greater than a similar comparison of ten years ago because the people they are dealing with are sicker, and you really do not have much of a break.

It is good news, also, that there will be an additional thirty-two residential care positions in the homes that are listed here. I do not have a lot of time to look and see where the actual needs were identified. I do know that I recently visited the Blue Crest Manor and found the staff there very stressed from the point of view of callbacks, some of them hardly had any time off because they were constantly being called back because there simply was not enough staff.

The additional funding to enhance the Cardiac Surgery Program is excellent news. Very welcomed by the hospital, and I was definitely very pleased to see it.

I do not need to comment on all of this, but on the third page the Capital Equipment Budget of \$2 million to cost-sharing arrangement with hospitals was desperately needed. It is very sad to have seen in the last number of years the needs for high-tech equipment having to be met with a begging bowl approach. The fact that it is cost-shared, of course, does not eliminate that approach, but I think it will be welcomed. I am not sure \$2 million is even close to enough in terms of the actual need, but it is welcomed that there is an additional \$2 million in the Budget this year. I think I will reserve any further comments for the Budget Estimates Committees,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have some more good news from my Department this morning. Last year about this time we were promising a reduction in the ferry rates to bring them in line with the road travel, so I am proud today, Mr. Speaker, to announce the second phase of the three phase reduction of the non-commercial ferry rates on the Province's interprovincial ferry system which will take effect on April 1, 1990.

Rates for vehicles and passengers are being reduced as part of the Government's decision to bring rates in line with the cost of equivalent road travel.

The first rate reduction took place October 1, 1989, and the third and final reduction will take place April 1, 1991. By April 1991 the cost of travelling on intra-provincial ferries will be less than half the 1989 levels. Passenger rates will be approximately one-third of vehicle rates for adults with continuation of appropriate discounts for seniors, students and commuting workers.

For example, the present rate for passenger vehicles, including driver, for a one way crossing on the Bell Island service is \$3.00. As of April 1st., this rate will drop to \$2.50.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I want to thank the Minister for sending me a copy of his statement. Mr. Speaker, as I said the last time the Minister announced the first phase of his rate reductions, I applaud him for trying to do something to eliminate some of the expense for people who live on the islands. I again applaud him for his second phase of reduction. But, Mr. Speaker, I do remind hon. Members and I remind the people of this Province that the Liberal's promise in the last election was not to just eliminate some rates, the Liberal promise in the last election was to make sure that anyone travelling on ferries would not have to pay any more than they would by travelling the same distance by road. This does not meet the requirement yet, and he says here that his final rate reduction is April 1st, 1991. Even at that rate of reduction he will not live up to the Liberal's promise in the last election, and the people, especially those who live on those islands, Mr. Speaker, want the Liberals to live up to their promise. If any of them voted for them, that is why they voted for them.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman he is now exceeding the time of the Minister.



MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to clue up, I congratulate the Minister for this little step. I expect him to live up to the promises he and the Premier made during the last election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before proceeding to Oral Questions I would like to welcome to the Speaker's gallery today on behalf of hon. Members, thirty post-secondary students, accompanied by their instructors Miss Philips and Miss Ackerman, from the Lawrence College here in St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Also, I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly today thirty students from Basic Training for Skills Development from the Avalon Community College here in St. John's, accompanied by their instructor Laurie Tulk.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say how delighted we are to see the Premier here today. We were led to believe he was going to be in Toronto last night, speaking at

\$1,000 a plate dinner or something for the Liberal Party. I do not know where that came from, but we were misinformed so, therefore, unfortunately, we did not develop our questions for the Premier. We thought he was not going to be here.

My question is to the Minister responsible for Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons) and the Minister responsible for Newfoundland Hydro. Mr. Speaker, the question I want to ask first is prefaced by stating the fact that the Hydro rate increase presently being heard by the Public Utilities Board will mean an increase of 4.5 per cent to consumers. That along with the 4.5 per cent already awarded to Newfoundland Light and Power will mean an unbelievable and unacceptable hardship to the people of our Province, amounting to at least a 9 per cent increase this year, and probably a 30 per cent to 40 per cent increase over the next few years, as we all know.

I want to ask the Minister this: Does the Minister agree with the Chairman of Newfoundland Hydro who said that the main reason for this Hydro rate increase is because the Provincial Government has withdrawn the \$32 million subsidy that it pays to Hydro to subsidize electricity to rural areas of the Province? And if he does agree with that statement, when is he going to recommend to his Cabinet colleagues that this increase be rejected or at least reinstate the subsidy?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the Chairman of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. The main reason for this rate request is that the subsidy was cancelled as a budget decision last year, and we are not planning to make any change in that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, this is rather interesting. The Liberal Party when it was in Opposition, particularly our old friend the Minister of Social Services, used to decry increases in electricity rates to consumers. They clamoured to the then Government to stop the increases in those days in order to help the people. I want to ask the Government through the Minister when is this Government going to practice what it preached when it was in Opposition, but specifically let me ask him this question: Would the Minister give the House some indication of what the Government intends to do to alleviate the problem facing low income people, the people on fixed incomes, like senior citizens and others, who will be greatly affected by these dramatic increases in the cost of electricity?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, matters relating to that latter question would probably be more appropriately put to the Minister responsible for that aspect of Social Services rather than to Energy. I am concerned about the energy aspects of the matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to redirect the question to the Minister of Social Services. I repeat the question for the Minister of Social Services. Would the Minister give this House some indication of what Government intends to do to alleviate the problems facing low income people, fixed income people, people like senior citizens and other people who will be greatly affected by the high increases in the cost of electricity?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say to the hon. Member for Grand Falls, and with a little bit of bragging and praise for myself, I do not think he is quite able to do the job in the Opposition I used to do when I was over there asking questions.

Mr. Speaker, the Member makes a very good point. As Minister of Social Services, we are very responsible and responsive to the needs of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador in the amount of money they are receiving for their general income and essential needs, rent, heat and light, food and accommodations. I was very concerned about that when I was in Opposition for almost five years, and we presented questions to the former administration. What I have had to do since becoming Minister of Social Services is take a look at the whole picture centered around

low income people, single parents, widows, and everybody else in the Province. It is something that was put there by the former Administration. They were seventeen years on the Government side of the House and they still did not pay any attention to the low income people of the Province. We now, in a few short months, are taking on a complete review of the needs of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

In fact, I have asked people in my Department to do a complete review of the whole social assistance problem in the Province, not only senior citizens, not only single parents, but all people. The one thing we are going to address is the fact that the amount of money these people are receiving today is not sufficient to provide the essential needs. In due course, in much, much less than seventeen years, we will answer the problems of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, how the world turns. The question I asked the Minister of Social Services was taken directly from Hansard of 1985 and was the exact same question asked by the Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, do you know what his response was when the Minister of that day answered his question? He said, 'boy, oh boy, it is some

hard to get a straight answer.' So I would have to make precisely the same reference. In fact, the answer was so ridiculous and terrible I am going to revert back to my old friend the Minister of Mines and Energy and ask him this final supplementary, which is really a twofold question, if I might ask. Would the Minister of Energy, the Minister responsible for energy - remember that - the Minister responsible for Newfoundland Hydro, would he consult whoever it is responsible, the Minister of Social Services, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, or whomever, but specifically his Cabinet colleagues, and immediately order a study to determine the impact of these high electricity costs on those people on fixed income and devise proposals of assistance for those people, but more specifically would he be prepared today to ask his Cabinet colleagues to order an immediate freeze on electricity rate increases in this Province?

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I have to answer that question. First of all, I want to tell the Member for Grand Falls that not only did I offer to show them how to write questions, they are now taking my questions and asking them directly. So I am very pleased.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

If the Member for Grand Falls had to be listening to the answer I gave, I said that we are very concerned. As to the action we have taken to date, I have asked the people in my Department to take an overall review of what is taking place in the Province as to income and the impact of the cost of living, which includes increased electricity rates, the increase in the cost of food and board and lodging and rental accommodations, board and lodging for single people, a whole review. We have already started to take action. Now if the MHA did not listen or did not understand, then I will repeat it again. The whole review is taking place. We are not saying it will take place, it is already taking place on the impact it is going to have on people's lives, especially senior citizens, low income people, single parents and so on.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, one short supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

We are having an awful job to try to get the Minister of Mines and Energy to his feet. He is sitting too close to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen) I suspect. They must be sharing the same tube of Krazy Glue or something. Can I ask the Minister of Energy to answer the last part of the question I asked of the Minister of Social Services and he so carefully avoided? Would he be prepared to order an immediate freeze on electricity rate increases in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Mines and Energy who is responsible for Hydro. As the Minister is aware, the Abitibi-Price mill at Stephenville receives some 25 per cent of its power from Newfoundland Hydro and will face a \$5 million to \$6 million annual increase if the power costs go up - if there are new increases. In light of the fact that the company received only a 7 per cent return on its capital last year, and this was at a time when the employees reduced the cost at the mill by 10 per cent, thereby setting a world record for absolute efficiency, and even with that reduction the mill only broke a little better than even; and in view of the fact that the Hydro rate increases will have a major effect on the mill, as was stated by the Premier on February 26 when he visited the mill, will the Minister tell the House what plans he has to keep the mill viable and operating, especially at this time of difficult newsprint markets?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Probably the Minister of Forestry is the one who is most concerned about keeping it viable. I am well aware of the implications of energy cost for the mill in Stephenville; I am aware that they are using about one-third of all the power being used by industrial customers on the Island of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. I have had discussions with the company and will have future discussions with the company. We will certainly be monitoring the situation and we want them to continue to be a viable industry in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

In view of the fact that the operation of the mill will be jeopardized by increased Hydro costs which could lead to downtime and closure, and in view of the fact that it has been stated by mill officials that the mills biggest problem are electrical costs, and since the Stephenville mill has kept its prices down and its efficiency up, what is Government doing to ensure that Newfoundland Hydro keeps its costs down, and what is Newfoundland Hydro doing to keep its costs down to its consumers?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

That is exactly what Hydro is doing now as it appears before the PUB for this rate hearing. There is going to be a complete, thorough analysis of all the cost of Hydro related to provision of electricity for the residential customer as well as the industrial

customer as they go through this review to set the rates for the residents.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Would the Minister agree that increases at the mill should be placed over a longer period of time? And what is the Government going to do about this? If they are powerless, they should say so. And how do you keep industry viable with power rates like those which are proposed? And how are you able to attract new industry in this Province in the light of these high power rates?

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the high cost that may be affecting our industries and we are certainly trying to be efficient at Hydro in the production of electricity and to keep the rates at a minimum for all of our customers.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage). I was very surprised yesterday to hear the Member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) ask the Minister

some questions about how water and sewer allocations are going to be done in this Province. I would like to ask the Minister, and I am sure he remembers a couple of years back when we were on the opposite side, I believe the Member for Harbour Grace, took a very active role in his District and decided to determine where water and sewer money was to be spent in a certain community when it was allocated by the Government? And the Members of the Opposition of the day, including the now present Minister, was very angry that a Provincial Minister could interfere in municipal jurisdiction.

MR. TOBIN:

And that was in his own District.

MR. POWER:

And it was in his own District.

But in this letter to Flatrock, which I assume is going to go out to other councils in this Province, how does the Minister explain Provincial interference in municipal matters. When you telegraph a council and tell them if they want water and sewer money they have to set a mil rate and they have to have a Budget that is approved by the Department. Does the Minister see this as direct Provincial interference in municipal matters?

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, we have dialogued all the time with every community in the Province throughout the year,

constant dialogue concerning their budgets, concerning their water and sewer and roads projects, the various phases that they happened to be involved with. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of some twenty communities in the Province most of the debt involved is Provincial debt. The vast percentage of the debt incurred by communities is Provincial dollars.

So indeed we do have a say in the management of their affairs and they welcome that say, as a matter of fact, they welcome the dialogue with our officials. The fact that they can consult with our people whether it be engineers or planners or financial people, accountants and so on, to help them manage their affairs. Because in many, many cases throughout the Province, as the Member knows, we do not have Town Clerks in place, we have part-time Town Clerks in some cases. A lot of the smaller communities cannot afford to have adequate staff. So it is very important that we do help.

I think we should be proud of the fact that municipal affairs and our regional offices do a fine job in assisting the communities throughout the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, just one supplementary to the Minister. He did not answer my question, which was: Does he see the actions of his Department as having direct interference in municipal matters? Sure every council in the Province appreciates the help and assistance from the Municipal Affairs staff, that is what they

are there to do, but when you start setting mil rates for a council and you say you will not get your water and sewer money unless you conform to this mil rate, that is a municipal responsibility, which a Provincial Minister really has no obligation or right in which to be involved, and my supplementary - now, he did not answer my first question, but my supplementary is this: I had a meeting with the Minister some time ago and Water and Sewer money was supposed to be allocated based upon - I cannot remember his exact terminology, but it was based on emergency, critical environmental and health situations. If Flat Rock and some other Councils of this Province were approved money based on drastic urgent needs that they had, are those approvals now to be rescinded if the Councils do not conform to the Minister's directives?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

First of all, to answer your first question. They are free to set any mil rate they wish. We do not determine and dictate a mil rate. In the case of the ten communities which were identified as being critical and that I approached the Government concerning, they were clearly critical situations that in our wisdom in the Department, the regional office and subsequently as the Minister, I recommended to the Government that we would do these ten communities, if they would adjust their financial situation, their revenue, so that the ratio of revenue to assessed values would be in line with the average, only the average for the Province, so these communities were not

approved.

They could only be approved, subject to making the adjustments for which the regional offices were asking to bring them in line with the average for the Province. Very fair. In the case of Flat Rock, the adjustment had to be greater because their ranking, prior to approaching them, their ranking in the original ranking of capital works was low enough that the mil rate had to make the difference. So it seems like a larger mil rate, but the alternative is not to have the capital works.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER:

One final supplementary. The rationale does not seem to make much sense to me. If the situation was critical and urgent then it may be critical and urgent because you could not raise taxes in the community. Maybe they could not afford to do the things that were necessary. But the situation is critical and urgent. And if they are now not going to be done in some communities, is that money taken back from these communities - if they do not conform to the Minister's directive - is that money going to be redistributed to other communities that badly need it?

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

I cannot speak for the Government and how the Government will treat any monies that are not spent on

this particular allocation. I think it is some \$3.5 million. Of the ten communities, I think seven have already agreed to the adjustment in their mil rates.

Now let us assume for a moment that three of them do not agree to make the adjustments, but Government will have to decide. That money will be available. Government may decide then, and I would make a recommendation whether or not we should spend that money elsewhere in the Province. But that is a separate decision apart from the ten communities we are dealing with now.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:  
I would just like to follow up on the supplementary question to the Minister. Can the Minister tell us whether or not he views this as forcing amalgamation upon certain towns and does he not view it as a form of total blackmail?

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:  
The answer is, quite frankly, no. And of the ten communities, if I recollect, I think very few of them are even involved in the amalgamation scenario. It has no connection whatsoever.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, Flatrock is involved in the amalgamation issue and the Forestry Settlement Program, let me say to the Minister.

Let me ask the Minister then, is it his plan, Mr. Speaker, to set a minimum mil rate in this Province for municipalities in order to avail of Government funding?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, that is not the intent of what we are doing with this particular group of communities. It happens that the Government has made a decision that we would like to have communities at least up to the average. It is very difficult to qualify for capital works if you do not have a reasonable mil rate in place, in all fairness, because the financial situation of the community bears on capital works and whether or not they get approved. All we are saying to the community, and I think this may be a clear message this year, is that it is very important that you adjust your finances to at least be reasonable about your tax rates, otherwise it is going to be very difficult to qualify for capital works. We have had complaints from neighbouring communities asking if it is fair to have capital works going into a community that is not charging a reasonable mil rate when they are. I have those complaints coming from communities right now. So is it fair to ask a community to charge a reasonable



mil rate giving the fact that this is mostly provincial money that is going into those communities, mostly it is our debt, is it fair to ask them to be responsible on their side? I think it is.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Minister that he is Minister of Municipal Affairs and not a city councillor in St. John's.

I have a new question for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. Let me ask the Minister -

MS DUFF:

Is that (inaudible) St. John's.

MR. TOBIN:

No, nothing whatsoever but the Minister of Municipal Affairs should be responsible for all municipalities.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

You know nothing about Newfoundland and care less about the rest of Newfoundland. My question is to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. Yesterday the Minister announced that Government was finally going to act on the agreement that was signed between both governments on the construction of the road to Petit Forte and the other operations down there. My question to the Minister - very briefly - is it Government's intention to act on the full agreement, by that I mean the ferry service between Petit

Forte and Southeast Bight as well?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the Member because it is not, 'finally going to act'.

The position we took on the Petit Forte road is that we wanted to investigate the ramifications of this. We have seen the previous Government get involved in bartering away our railway for a transportation system. There was never any question in this Government's mind about the Petit Forte road. The Petit Forte road was always there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

If the Member had been able to read and look at what we have said about the Petit Forte road, we called a contract for -

MR. TOBIN:

There were not enough people down there to build a road.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have protection, please.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

We called a contract last year for seven kilometers of the Petit Forte road at \$2.2 million, which is ongoing, and will be continuing this year. If the Member had read the statement I made in this House in November on the calling of contracts on the ERDA agreement, he would have seen in that, there

was a ten kilometers continuation for the Petit Forte road this year. So there was no question in our minds about 'finally' the Petit Forte road. The Petit Forte road was not the question.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, there is no problem with the road to Petit Forte. The agreement the previous Government signed was the one I had serious concerns about, in that this Province had to take over the operation of a ferry service between Petit Forte and South East Bight. That is going to be a subject of some discussion with the Federal Minister when I meet him, but as it stands right now, there is no problem. We have accepted the intent of the agreement. The only thing is, we are going to be asking the Federal Government to look very closely at the whole intraprovince ferry system in this Province because, again, why should Newfoundland have to barter off everything we have in order to get a transportation system? We do not think this is the way it is going. We intend to talk to the Federal Government further about the operation of this ferry service and the total ferry service in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I point out to hon. Ministers again, just as I do to people asking questions, to get to the answer as quickly as possible. It seems to me the Minister got to the essence of the answer in the last minute or so.

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

MR. A. SNOW:  
Mr. Speaker, my question was to be

to the Minister of Justice, but in his absence I will direct my question to the Minister of Environment and Lands, in light of the fact that it is possibly an environmental question and has an impact on his particular Department.

As he is well aware and this House is aware, the Innu of Labrador have recently filed two actions in the Federal Court of Canada. One was to stop low level flying on the grounds that it interferes with their land, and in the second action the Innu are asking the court to quash the decision of the Minister of Defense to continue low level flying because of insufficient environmental assessments.

My question to the Minister is: does he have any council representing the interests of the people of this Province in these cases? If not, why not?

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, this particular matter is a matter in respect of which the Minister of Justice and myself have been dealing for some months now. Certain native groups in Labrador have taken an application to the Federal Court to obtain an injunction to restrain the flying operations being conducted out of Goose Bay. The Province, as such, has no particular standing or no reason to be heard before the Court because we are not involved in any manner in the operations of the

the base or in the low level flying operations. If the people concerned are entitled to an injunction, it will be on the basis of interference with the people concerned. Now whether the Province appears or does not appear is of no relevance to that issue. It is not related to the issue at all. If the people are entitled to an injunction, presumably the Court will give it. If they are not entitled to an injunction, presumably the Court will so rule. So the Province cannot go and say, well we are concerned about the economic impact on Goose Bay, so not withstanding the rights of these people, because of the economic impact on Goose Bay, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador does not want you to do it. Courts do not operate on that basis. Courts operate on the basis of law and what is right in law. And if the people have a proper foundation for obtaining an injunction to restrain it, then no doubt the Court will make such an order. And if they do not, it does not matter what the Province's concern is about the economy. The Court could not, in my judgement, properly take that into account anyway. So we have decided it would not be proper for us to have council present at the hearing.

MR. A. SNOW:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. A. SNOW:  
Not being of a legal mind such as the Premier, I will not discuss the legalities of it. I brought in the question in light of the fact that the businesses and the people who reside in Happy Valley

- Goose Bay have a direct concern in this; they are afraid this particular action could decimate the local economy of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, and they feel the interests of Happy Valley - Goose Bay should not just be entrusted into the hands of the Department of National Defence - and I direct my question - and that a court order stopping low-level flying, even on a temporary basis, would naturally decimate the local economy in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and virtually bankrupt many local businesses, throw hundreds of people out of work, and that is a concern, or should be a concern of this Government.

While the low-level flying per se may not be an issue, the bankruptcy of many local businesses -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I have been waiting for the question from the hon. Member, and I cannot seem to see it yet. I want to remind hon. Members, in supplementary questions no preamble is permitted, no comment on the answer, that the hon. Member should proceed to get to his question. Even though the Chair has been lenient, I cannot allow a Member to carry on making a speech. So would the hon. Member please get to the question.

MR. A. SNOW:  
Would the Minister agree, in view of the fact of what was stated by the Premier and what I stated, that with court action by the Innu, if they were to win it could have a devastating effect on the local economy in Happy Valley - Goose Bay?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, if there were such a court order, it could have, in my judgement, a significant economic impact on Happy Valley - Goose Bay, and the people of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, the community council, the people concerned or the business groups which are concerned, have every right, if they want to, to apply to the court for standing in order to present their case. And if the court feels it is proper for the court to take it into account, they will do so. But I remind all hon. Members, in case they have forgotten, the native people who live in this Province are citizens of this Province, as well.

Now, the Government of this Province cannot say, 'We want you to ignore the rights and interests of the native groups. We want you to protect only the interests of the business groups in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.' The courts are there, and if the law is being broken, the courts must enforce the law. If the law is wrong, this Legislature has the power to change the law, and if the law is wrong, this Government has the responsibility to bring legislation before the House and ask it to change the law.

But, as the law now stands, the native people who live in this Province have a right to make an application before the court to seek a court order to protect their interests in accord with the law, and this Government will not step in to impede or interfere with that right. We will entrust to the courts the responsibility to enforce the law as it now stands, and if the business people of Goose Bay - and I understand

their concern, I share and sympathize with their concern, but I also understand the concern of the native groups, if the business groups of Happy Valley - Goose Bay feel they are not being properly dealt with in accord with the law, then they have a perfect right to apply for standing before the Federal Court, in this case, and say, 'Look, Mr. Judge, we have a concern here and we ask you to take our concerns into account when you are making that decision.' Now, that is the proper way for courts to function, and it would be most improper for a Government, in respect of this group of citizens, to interfere and make an intervention before a court, and say to the court, 'We want you to favour this group of citizens over that group of citizens. All the Government can and should do is say to the Court, We want you to apply the law. And that is all we will ever do.'

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

Before moving on to the other items I would like to welcome to the gallery today a delegation from the Council of Grand Falls accompanied by their Mayor, Paul Hennessey, their Deputy Mayor, Terry Goodyear, Councillors Sterling Thomas and Glenda Tulk, along with the Town Manager, Mr. Mike Pinsent.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. WALSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount-Scio.

MR. WALSH:

Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Rules and Procedures of this House have been meeting for the past number of months and are now in a position to send the report we have prepared back to our respective caucuses. Under the mandate given to the Committee by the House, we were to report with a final report before the end of March. We have had an opportunity to visit a number of Legislatures across Canada, in particular those which have had changes made in the last six to twelve months. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that most of our work has been completed and now we would like to send that report back to the respective caucuses, on behalf of the Committee I request this morning an extension in the Committee's mandate to the end of April.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. the Opposition House Leader would permit, I think it was this time last week, back about a week ago, that hon. Members of the House gave their report on the broadcasting of the House and the Chair was assigned with establishing the guidelines. I can advise the House now that these guidelines have been established, the guidelines for broadcasting. I am telling hon. Members that I am waiting for a little feedback from a couple of other people, but, as far as I know, everything is just about finalized and maybe later in the day we will make the official statement. I think the understanding was that when this was done, broadcasting would start on Monday. Thank you.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of the procedure to tell you the truth, but to follow-up on the report of the the Chairman of the Committee on Standing Orders, Rules and Procedures, or whatever, he has made a request for an extension to the time allocated for that Committee to present its final report, which was due on the 31st of March. As a Member of the Committee, along with my colleague, the Member for Port au Port, we are in agreement with the request.

Perhaps it is simply a matter of asking if there is an agreement for extension, say, to April 30, one month. We might need that length of time. If it is simply a matter of asking for agreement, we agree.

MR. SPEAKER:

For the point of clarification, we are probably on a point of order here.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The request is that we allow an extension. I think the Committee has been doing some good work. I have not seen what they have done but my information is that they have made tremendous progress and they are going to have a Report which would suggest significant changes to make our procedures more efficient.

I would suggest that we simply say to the Committee that we will extend their life but that the Report be done as quickly as possible without putting another time limit that they may have to

extend. If the Committee wants a time limit, we are quite in accordance with that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is an agreement between two hon. Members, I cannot say it is disagreement. The point of information is set.

Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask leave of the House, this is not really in answer to a question - but questions have been raised.

I had intended to have a statement prepared for this morning and I did not have the time to do it but it may be of interest. I would ask the leave of the hon. Members of the House to indicate what Government intends to do with respect to certain questions that have been raised primarily outside, but some inside this House as well, with respect to the Labrador subsidy changes in the Budget. Rather than make an announcement outside the House I would sooner tell the House first. So if I have leave for just a couple of minutes I would like to tell the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The request by the Premier is that we revert back to Statements by Ministers.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, we have no problem with that. We would be prepared to listen to what he has to say.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, the Government has received some strong representations by groups in Labrador outside the House with respect to the Budgetary decisions the Government has taken on the question of Labrador travel subsidies, and a number of questions have also been raised in this House.

As of this moment, my view of it and the view of the Government is that the decisions were the correct decisions. However, we do not claim to be the depositary of all knowledge and wisdom, so the Government has agreed to establish a Committee consisting of the President of the Council, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, the Minister of Environment and Lands and the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, and have asked them to review all aspects of it, take into account the representations that have been made by people respecting the matter. Take into account, as well, Mr. Speaker, the special allowances and the Northern allowance and the tax deductibility and all of those factors. If the decision the Government has taken is sound, it will be continued, but we have established a Committee to at least provide an opportunity for the people who have been concerned to make whatever representations they wish. So that Committee will be asked to take the action

immediately.

## Petitions

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

MR. A. SNOW:

I am pleased to see that the Government is reacting to the pressure from the people of Labrador. The Members of this House, on both sides, I am sure have raised this issue concerning the removal of the subsidy programs, the two programs, that had been in place for a number of years. It is something that is very necessary to the people of Labrador and I want to ensure that both programs will be reviewed, the Labrador Air Subsidy Program and also the Sport Program under the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

I also would like to know when this would be reviewed and when can the people of Labrador expect to see a firm response to their concerns in the fact that we have already seen cancellations of sporting events within Labrador due to the block funding method of financing for the sports that occur over this school year, if you will, so it is very urgent that it be dealt with immediately. The people of Labrador are very concerned.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The last item I called, I believe, prior to giving the Premier leave to go back to Statements by Ministers, was Answers to Questions for which Notice has been given.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition I would like to present to the hon. House signed by in excess of 200 people from my District, from the Marystown - Jean de Baie area. It was delivered to my office yesterday. The prayer of the petition, and the Minister of Forestry will be familiar with this, by the way: we the undersigned hereby petition the Department of Forestry to undertake the upgrading of the Garnish Pond forest access road in order to facilitate reasonable access to the forest area for the harvest of firewood and mill logs, both domestic and commercial. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry, as I understand it, had already met with the Deputy Mayor and another councillor from Marystown to discuss this road, back some months ago. I am sure the Minister of Forestry knows what I am talking about.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a road consisting of, I am not sure of the distance but it is probably a couple of miles, that goes in behind Marystown into an area that is used by people who harvest the wood for firewood and certainly for the mill log operations that are in the Marystown area. As most people know with the unemployment rate that now exists on the Burin Peninsula, probably one of the worst times it has been in recent memory, there are a lot of people who reverted back to cutting their own firewood. There

are also a number of people in the area who cut the firewood and sell it to try and make ends meet. They have been hampered in their resolve, Mr. Speaker, to harvest the wood to make a living, through accessing this forest. The loggers in the area are also having difficulty getting to it. As a matter of fact I believe at this point in time the road is basically impassable. I know that the Minister of Forestry in his meeting - if I could get the attention of the Minister of Forestry, Mr. Speaker - I know that in these meetings with the delegation he expressed his desire to try and help and to do whatever he could and he assured them that in this year's Budget he would find the necessary funds to upgrade the road to the extent that it would be possible for the people harvesting that area. As I said it is important for several reasons to the people and to the areas that use it, but now where it has become impassable it is tremendously difficult for people to operate in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has had the opportunity yet to deal with this in terms of being able to advise me today as to how much money has been available. But I am sure the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, being an honourable gentleman as he is, will honour the commitment that he made to have that road upgraded. I sincerely hope he is in a position today, when he gets up to address this petition, to inform me how much money has been allocated in the Budget, when tenders can be called and when people can again be able to harvest the wood in that area.

The Minister and I, have discussed this as well and he was extremely genuine in his concerns for the area and this gives me every indication that we will be able to honour the petition of these 209 people. I know I speak for all the people from the various towns and the surrounding area whose names are not on the petition, of the support they lend to the people who signed the petition, basically people whose families harvest wood in the area. They would like to see the petition honoured. I would now present this petition to the Page and ask him to deliver it to the appropriate Department and I sincerely hope the Minister, the very genuine, honest, sincere Minister, who has made a commitment, and I am sure that he will be keeping that commitment. As a matter of fact, I am sure that because of the type of individual he is, he will probably be announcing immediately how much money has been allocated for that project.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry.

MR. FLIGHT:

The plea of the Member: I probably would do exactly what he is suggesting, announce it today. I want to say that I recall the meeting to which the hon. Member refers. It was very interesting meeting the people of his constituency who were very concerned people and had, in their opinion or in my opinion for that matter, a very sincere concern. I can only tell the Member at this point in time that all access roads and the funding thereof is under consideration right now, but I must draw this to his attention, because I can understand if his constituents suggested to him that



I might have made a firm commitment as such. I did not, but what I did do, is, committed myself to look at their proposal, to make sure that I did everything in my power to find the funds to do the road, but I did not make a commitment that we would, indeed, do the road. The Member knows that, but I did commit myself to it because the concerns were very real and the Member will also know, having served in Government himself, that priority for access roads is by and large to access pulp wood operations or logging operations. As in every other Department and for every other purpose, we find ourselves under ever increasing financial restraints and I have a little less money this year to apply to access roads than I had last year or probably the Minister had the year before. But I can assure the hon. Member that the application from his constituents for some upgrading on that particular road that lets them access their supply of firewood, will get every consideration, and I would hope that maybe we will be able to find some way to upgrade the road. When? I can only tell the Member that at this point in time we are finalizing our woods access roads for this year, and very shortly, I will know where we are.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Give us a date.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Well, I do not intend to let the Member pin me down like that Mr. Speaker, but however, in due course the Member will know. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to rise in this House today to support my colleague, the Member for Burin - Placentia in this petition from the residents of his District.

Mr. Speaker, I was listening to my colleague very intently there as he presented, and very ably presented, the concerns of residents of his District about this forest access road which is very necessary for the people who live in that area, Mr. Speaker. There are a lot of people over the past ten years who have switched from oil and electricity to wood heated homes, Mr. Speaker. If anybody knows the Burin Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, we know there is not a great deal of wood in a lot of areas in the Burin Peninsula. And the areas that do have forest access roads, Mr. Speaker, are very important to all the people who need this fuel for their homes.

One of the main reasons they are going to need it moreso in the future is the fact that the Government of the day has taken away subsidies from the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, Mr. Speaker. They have increased the electrical rates or intend to increase the electrical rates by putting 1.5 per cent payroll tax on both Newfoundland Hydro and Newfoundland Light and Power, Mr. Speaker. And the electrical rates in this Province are going to skyrocket by some 30 per cent in the next three years, I understand, and probably more than that before the hon. Members are finished increasing the electrical rates. That makes it extremely important that these forest access roads, especially for people who are using these to access fuel for their fires, be upgraded, Mr. Speaker, and kept in very good

shape because there is going to be a desperate need in the next three or four years for every bit of wood that a person can possibly get their hands on to burn in their fires, Mr. Speaker, because they will not be able to use electricity any more to heat their homes because the rates are going to skyrocket so much that we will not be able to afford to turn on our electric heaters any more, Mr. Speaker.

But I did spend some time in the Department of Forestry, Mr. Speaker, and I do realize the problem that the Minister has with funding for access roads. It was always a problem for the Minister of Forestry to convince the rest of his colleagues that this is a very important aspect of the forest industry, Mr. Speaker, because it is no good if we have all kinds of woods that people cannot access. And the trees will just stand there until they get so old they will fall down and they will be no use to anyone, Mr. Speaker, and they would actually be a fire hazard if we do not go in and harvest these woods.

Mr. Speaker, I know the predicament that the hon. Minister is in. But I do think the people who did meet with him at least understood there is a commitment from him to do this road. Now I guess people hear what they want to hear and I find it very hard to believe that the Minister would give such a strong commitment that he would actually get the road done at a certain date. But knowing that Minister, Mr. Speaker, it is possible because he certainly does try very hard to accommodate people when they come to see him.

MR. FLIGHT:

Right on!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

And anyone who does have problems in this Province in the forest industry or in the agricultural industry, I would recommend that they go and talk to the Minister because he does give commitments sometimes that probably he would wish he had not given. But he does try to accommodate and I will give him credit for that, Mr. Speaker.

But it is important for his sake that the rest of the Ministers in the Cabinet realize that the forest access roads are extremely important to his Department and that funding for that always seems to be cut back. When I was Minister we managed to keep the funding at an even rate. But I notice the Cabinet of the day does not support their Minister, Mr. Speaker, they keep cutting back on forest access roads and cutting back on forest access roads and it is not the Minister's fault it is the rest of the vultures in the Government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I remind the hon. gentleman his time is up.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Oh, that is too bad, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition, Mr. Speaker, signed by eighty-eight residents of the Community of Rigolet.

Mr. Speaker, if any hon. gentleman wants to look at the petition I presented yesterday he will find that every name there is legitimate. On this one here, every name is legitimate. And, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I noticed the Minister of Health said that I solicit the names on a petition. Mr. Speaker, I will not disagree.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I am proud I did solicit petitions along the Labrador Coast. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have many more. Only just yesterday there was a request again for petitions on the cuts and subsidies for sports and culture groups.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am some glad that the Premier - I am off the petition a little bit - but I am some glad that the Premier made a statement earlier. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Premier read my letter. The Premier read the letter that I sent to him yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and he knew he had to get a Committee together as fast as he could.

MR. MURPHY:  
You wrote the letter, did you?

MR. WARREN:  
Yes, that is right, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask my hon. colleague from St. John's South (Mr. Murphy) would he kindly just be quiet.

Mr. Speaker the prayer of the petition is naturally, as it was yesterday, asking for proper health care and an enquiry into health care along the Labrador coast and in Labrador generally.

Mr. Speaker, that petition is signed by eighty-eight residents in the community of Rigolet and I say to the Minister of health instead of getting up and being too political why does he not go back over his records of a patient, only about a month and a half ago, it was in Rigolet and the Grenfell Regional Health Services -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

MR. MURPHY:  
Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains presented a letter to the Premier, I think Mansard will show that we do not have it yet, stating that the Town Council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay had written a letter for him to convey to the Premier. This morning he just stated that he wrote the letter. So I think the hon. Member is really misleading the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
I am sure I would not mislead the House. Furthermore I should table the letter I wrote to the Premier yesterday. The hon. gentleman can have it. It is under my signature, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I said I met with the town council.

Let me go back to my petition. I am glad in one way that the Minister of Health is not there because it may give the Member for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque) a

chance to respond to the petition. I would think that the Member for Eagle River should respond to this petition because he is concerned about health care along the Labrador Coast. I say to my colleagues opposite give the hon. Gentleman the opportunity to respond to a petition which is so vital to him as well as it is to me. I support this petition and I ask that it be related to the Department to which it refers.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

MR. DUMARESQUE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly take pleasure in supporting the petition from the hon. Member. Labrador, and the North Coast of Labrador certainly has some glaring statistics when it comes to health care and the state of well-being in the communities. There is unusually high statistics when it comes to suicide and other very, very drastic measures that people have to take because they certainly have conditions to live under and measures to deal with that a lot of people in this House do not realize. We have to, at all times, put ourselves beyond politics and be able to look towards the well-being of the individuals and because he is out of sight he should never be out of mind.

I do not think though, in all fairness, that this Government has demonstrated anything but a contribution to the state of the people in all parts of this Province including the people of Labrador. I am sure we will see, as a result of the reorganization of the Grenfell Regional Health

Services, that there will be a real dedication to health care along the North Coast of Labrador as well as in the South Coast and the Great Northern Peninsula.

I am sure, as the Minister announced today, there are real contributions being made to the improvement of health care throughout this Province. I am sure over the next number of months the people in Rigolet, the people in Torngat Mountains will also receive the benefit of these measures. I am sure all hon. Members, although we need to continually raise this and make them more aware of what is happening to our native people and the people along the Coast of Labrador, I am sure there is total concurrence in this House to the dedication and the improvement of health care in Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to have a few words to say on this petition so ably presented by my colleague, the Member for Torngat Mountains, and supported by the Member for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque). I have to say right at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that there is something about that hon. Member that impresses me. The hon. Member for Eagle River seems to be a Member who has the genuine interests of his constituents at heart.

But the other impressive thing, Mr. Speaker, unlike a lot of other Members who occupy the back benches in particular, he is not afraid to stand up and speak out, even though it might be a

criticism of the Government, or an attack on the Government or whatever. I suspect he did the same thing with respect to the elimination of the Travel Subsidy Programs by the Government. I suspect he had a word with the Premier. In fact, I am certain of it. Rather than the influence of the Minister who represents Labrador in the Cabinet, I say it was more the influence of the Member for Eagle River, along with the influence of the Members for Menihek and Torngat Mountains, which brought about this sudden change in the Government's heart today.

Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see Members support this petition. I would draw to the attention of the Government, of course, the fact that the petition, as alluded to by my colleague, says - and I want to read just this paragraph: "The people of - in this case it is Rigolet - are concerned with the Health care presently available through Grenfell Regional Health Services. Concerns have been expressed that patients are not receiving proper Health care, wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that the hon. House be pleased to take immediate steps to support a public inquiry into Health in Labrador. And the Member for Eagle River, who sits on the Government's side, has now indicated in support of this petition that he is calling on the Government as well for a public inquiry into the Health care situation on the coast of Labrador, and we are delighted to have support from the Government side of the House.

Now, I also want to commend the Member for Torngat Mountains, in the minute or whatever it is I

have left, on the initiative he has taken. There was some indication that the Member had done something wrong here, that he had written to communities and asked them to petition and that sort of thing. What the Member did in the letter he wrote, accompanying the petition, is say this is a major issue and has been for twenty-odd years, since he has been involved with the people of Labrador. There have been improvements, but there are more that could be made. And he said: 'Enclosed is the wording of a petition I would be honoured to present to the House of Assembly.' He simply asked the people, if they were prepared to petition, to send it to him and he would be happy to present it on their behalf.

In the case of Rigolet, Mr. Speaker, they responded overwhelmingly with eighty-eight people, about 70 per cent of the voters in the town of Rigolet. I commend the Member for his initiative, I commend the Member for Eagle River for supporting the petition, and, therefore, call on the Government to respond to the petition in a positive way in light of that support from their own caucus for a public inquiry into the Health care needs on the coast of Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern, the Chair just might make a comment. This is the appropriate place to do it, and it is picking up on a point made by the hon. Opposition House Leader when he said that the Government Member supported the petition. I believe it is a clear understanding of the House, and I believe the hon. Opposition House Leader would

agree, that when anybody is speaking to a petition they ought to be supporting it, although there have been times when probably in the House it has been a little bit dicey when they have. But the clear understanding is that a person rising to speak to a petition ought to support the petition.

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order.

Since Your Honour has raised this interesting question, I have always had doubts in my mind whether or not that is a fact, because our rules, as I recall, say that to speak to a petition you must contain yourself to the number of petitioners and the prayer of the petition. I think it has been, quite frankly, probably a fallacy that if you speak to a petition you necessarily speak in support of it. I am not quite certain. Maybe Your Honour may want to research it a little and maybe give us a better understanding of where it is. I think that is something that has happened perhaps in precedent, or somebody flew it out and said you have to speak to a petition. But I think you will find in your research, Your Honour, a ruling by Mr. Speaker Russell during his days in the Chair where he ruled, in fact, to a point of order, I believe from the former Member for LaPoile, Mr. Neary, who made the argument that you had to speak in favour of it. Mr. Russell, I think, ruled that you did not have to speak in favour, but you must

speak to the petition. It might be interesting to have a look at it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Just to clarify the point. The Chair wanted to raise it and will, in due time, study it and report to the House.

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

Today I am presenting a petition, and why I am presenting it today is because the Bill that was introduced and died on the Order Paper, Bill 53, is to be re-introduced as Bill 25 and the Minister has clearly stated that the Bill will have some changes. Why we are presenting this petition today, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps to have some influence on the changes which will come about in Bill 25.

For the record, I would like to read the prayer of the petition. It is a petition to the House of Assembly. 'To the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland in Legislative Session convened: The petition of the undersigned residents of St. John's East Extern, we are concerned that the Government has given notice of Bill 25 which has the same title as Bill 53 introduced in the Legislature in the fall of 1989; and

Section 7 (2) of the former Bill

53 gave new powers to the Cabinet to override the public right-of-way around ponds, lakes and next to rivers; and

Those provisions of the former Bill 53 were unacceptable to many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, including the undersigned.

Wherefore your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to ensure that the new Bill 25 does not contain the clause which was numbered 7 (2) in the former Bill 53 and that the new Bill state specifically that Cabinet does not have the power to take away the public right-of-way to our lakes, ponds and rivers, and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.'

Mr. Speaker, this petition is only signed by a few names, but why we presented it and why we did not go out and just ask for a petition to be signed by thousands of names, I just did not have the time, Mr. Speaker. I attended at least two meetings.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You did not ask them to send that in, did you.

MR. PARSONS:

No, I did not ask them to send it in. I did sign it as one of the people who has an involvement in it; I certainly would want to have input in it. I remind the House that I did attend two of those meetings and, I must say, and I said last night and I will repeat every time I get to my feet, that Committee did an excellent job. Why even last night, when it was in a different arena, a different subject - Meech Lake - we again went back to the public hearings bit.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

I do not mind those hon. Members on the other side. They are always trying to interfere with a person when he is speaking, but it does not matter to me. If they have something to say I would not mind getting up to support their petition or whatever. I am sure a lot of your your constituents would certainly like to see each and every one of you get up and support this petition.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that excites me, I want to make clear to the House, is that while the Committee was holding public hearings, the Premier himself stated and I query this, I find it really unusual that the Premier made a statement while the public hearings were in progress, saying -

MR. EFFORD:  
(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

Now, the Minister of Social Services does not like it, but he did interfere with the process and the Premier said, and I quote: I cannot verbatim, but -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would remind hon. Members that in presenting a petition - I would ask the hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern to please take his place momentarily.

A petition is only five minutes and I would ask hon. Members to please refrain from interfering and give the hon. Member silence while he is presenting his petition.

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

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

You have to quieten them down somehow.

Mr. Speaker, again I say the Premier interferred with that process, because while the Legislative Committee was holding hearings the Premier was on the airwaves saying that 7(2) would again be reintroduced.

That is precedent setting, to say the least.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That has nothing to do with it.

MR. PARSONS:

It certainly has to do with the petition.

You were told to be quiet by the Speaker, so be quiet. Go back and tell your constituents that you do not agree with what I am doing here.

Mr. Speaker, again I reiterate what I said previously, in my opening remarks. I hope by presenting this petition today we will have some influence on Cabinet, and, in particular, on the Minister of Environment and Lands. Again, Mr. Speaker, I think this should be unanimous. As the Committee held hearings across the Island -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would remind the hon. gentleman that his time has elapsed.

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I will clue up by saying when the Committee held meetings across the Island, I do not think they met one dissenter. With that said, Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have a few words to say on this petition, Mr. Speaker. I guess it is more recognizable as a petition on Bill 53, but since the new Session of the House started, it is now Bill 55.

MR. SPEAKER:

Bill 25.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Bill 25, is it? Okay, Bill 25, Mr. Speaker. I must say, when the Committee hearing was held on Bill 53 last year I happened to be fortunate enough to be around the building and I came up to see what was in the New Crown Lands Act which was to be discussed. As it was being explained, the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island raised the issue of the ten meter reservation around ponds, and the clause in the new act which gave the Cabinet permission to give that ten meters or grant that ten meters to private owners.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a drastic change in what the lifestyle of Newfoundlanders has been since the time we came here. To my knowledge, there is only one pond in this Province to which people do not have access to the ten meter limit around it, and that one pond, I know, is Murray's Pond. I do not know if there is another.



AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Which one?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Virginia Lake.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Oh, yes, Virginia Lake might be another one. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

But I know the private club at Murray's Pond, the fish pond, is not accessible to the Newfoundland public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that happened to all ponds, rivers and lakes in this Province, I think it would be absolutely disastrous to the outdoor way of life that most Newfoundlanders appreciate and expect. They feel it is their right to have access to these ponds and rivers, Mr. Speaker.

I did note with some interest that when the Premier was trying to justify the reason for doing this, the reason that Cabinet might some time have to give or grant this ten meter access, he said we might need it to build roads or bridges some time in the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whichever of his public servants told him to use that as an excuse should be fired, should be fired right on the spot, because the Premier knows or the Premier should know, but certainly public servants should know, that the Government owns the land now. They do not need to grant it for roads. They do not need to grant it for bridges. It is their road. It is their land now, they can use it for what they like. So I do not know what the Premier was saying. I guess he was just trying to confuse the people of

the Province again and try to get away with his little stunt, Mr. Speaker, and start giving out this ten meters to some people, which begs the question: Why is this being done? The outfitters say they do not want it; the vast majority of Newfoundlanders, even those who own cabins on these ponds, say they do not want it, they were not looking for this.

Mr. Speaker, the question is, as far as we are concerned, who are the people who are requesting the Premier to give them a grant to this ten meters of land between the high water mark and the private land around ponds? We can only speculate as to who is looking for it, Mr. Speaker. I will not speculate here on who might be requesting these pieces of land from the Premier. It is not ordinary Newfoundlanders, that I know. There is nobody in the District of Kilbride who ever came to me and asked me if they could have a grant to the ten meters of land, Mr. Speaker, between the high water mark of ponds and their own private lots. There are no private landowners or cabin owners from Districts on this side of the House who have come to us in any great numbers requesting that they be granted this ten metres of land between the high water mark and the private boundaries of their land.

I would like to know from the Premier or the Minister of Environment and Lands, if he is allowed to speak on this, why would Cabinet or the Premier want the right to grant these ten metres of land to anyone in the Province, Mr. Speaker? If there is a special circumstance -

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

That is too bad, Mr. Speaker. I am sure we might hear a few more of these petitions before that Bill is passed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. WALSH:

Mr. Speaker, to the petition.

There is no question that the public hearing process started by this Government is something we have wanted to see for years, but the Government of the day would not permit the hearing process this Government has introduced to allow people to have input into a Bill that is before the House.

I can assure hon. Members on the other side that the rights of Newfoundlanders will be well protected by this Government. Whether it is Bill 53, Bill 25, Bill 29 or Bill 104, the rights and the needs of Newfoundlanders will be protected by this Government by the mere fact that we have introduced the hearing process which was something the hon. gentlemen on the other side never heard of. Fairness and balance and public hearings only touch their lips when their derrieres touch the seats on the Opposition side of the House.

Allow me to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people on this side of the House will guarantee that the rights of Newfoundlanders will be protected on this Bill or any other Bill brought into this hon. House.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Motion 12, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 12. I believe the hon. the Member for Kilbride adjourned the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am informed by the Table that the hon. the Member for Kilbride has eight minutes left.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad we only have thirty minutes to speak on this Bill.

This resolution concerning Meech Lake is probably one of the most important resolutions we are going to speak about in this House in our time, Mr. Speaker.

We are making decisions here in this House of Assembly which will affect all parts of Canada, and certainly the future of Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly the future of the children of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker. I still contend that although people have opinions of what Meech Lake is, whether they are for it or against it, most of them are not familiar with the details of the Meech Lake Accord, and they are definitely not familiar with the alternate proposal presented by the Premier of this Province.

I believe, and I will keep debating this if I can, Mr. Speaker, as long as is necessary, until this Government decides that the people of this Province deserve public hearings both on

the resolution to support the Meech Lake approval, which we have already given, and on the alternative proposal which has been presented by the Premier.

Most people think the Premier's alternative proposal does not declare or set up a type of a distinct society for the province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, the basic thing the Premier's proposal does is set up a revised Senate, a duplicate Senate - three forms, an English Senate, a French Senate and a super Senate. I do not know what the super Senate is supposed to do, but I do know the English Senate and the French Senate, which is a type of a distinct society, the French part of the Senate, will have veto powers over anything that the rest of us want to do. That in itself is part of a distinct society; it gives special powers to Quebec. One thing that really irritates me when we are talking about Meech Lake is people who discuss it saying there should be no distinct society, Quebec should not be a distinct society.

Mr. Speaker, I say we all agree that each of us have a distinctness in this Confederation. People in Kilbride have a distinctness from people in St. John's, I believe. But is there a degree of distinctness throughout this Country? Are Western Canadians exactly the same as Newfoundlanders? No, I would not say they were.

When I visited Western Canada, a lot of the people I met in that province seemed to me to relate more to the Northwestern States, in the American society. They seemed to be that type of people. When I was in the portfolio of Rural Development, I met mostly

the farmers and the cowboys, so I guess that is what gave me the impression that they were more closely linked to the Northwestern or Prairie States, in the United States, than they were to the Maritime and Atlantic region of this country, Mr. Speaker.

There are certain degrees of being distinct, whether we want to know it or not, Mr. Speaker, and if Quebec is not a different degree of distinctness, if that can be said, I do not know what is. We have a province where a vast, vast majority of that province speak a different language than the majority of Canadians. If that is not more distinct than even Newfoundland is from Alberta, I do not know what is. The law the Quebec justice system is based on, Mr. Speaker, is from the French law.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are listening.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been listening. I have been listening to this debate, by the way, since the Constitution was patriated by Pierre Trudeau over the wishes of Quebec, and one of the reasons why we are in this predicament now is because of the arrogance of a former Liberal Federal Government and Pierre Trudeau, who did not listen to any of the wishes of Meech Lake.

I only have a couple of minutes left and I want to make a couple of comments. I guess it is only natural that all of us who have a feeling one way or the other on this debate tend to look for references that agree with our argument. I do not think that happens in all debates. As a person, I am obviously not a

lawyer. I am a surveyor by profession. I have never graduated from university, so I am certainly not an academic. I have worked all my life, mostly with my hands and sometimes doing a bit of mathematics, but, what I am going to have to do and what most Canadians are going to have to do in this debate, people who cannot understand the fine points of it, we are going to have to look at who are supporting the Meech Lake Accord and who are against it.

That will be for people who want to give it enough consideration and that, probably will be, their final consideration. Mr. Speaker, when this was debated in this House before, that is what was in my mind and that was how I was going to debate it. What I saw were, ten premiers and a Prime Minister who went, after three years discussion on this, to a place called Meech Lake, I actually had to go to see what Meech Lake was, when I was in Ontario. It is not a bad spot, there were a lot of people swimming there, but I never got close enough to see the - Mr. Speaker, I only have one minute, I cannot get side-tracked now. But what we are going to have to do is decide who is supporting this Meech Lake Accord and who is not. From all the information when we debated this before, we had ten Premiers representing every political party in this country, NDP, PC, and Liberal. We had a Prime Minister of our Country, who sat in on this and approved it. After the dust settled for a little while, we had the Leader of the Opposition in our Federal Parliament who supported it, we had the Leader of the NDP in our Federal Party who supported it and all major political leaders at the time supporting this Meech Lake

Agreement in this House. When the debate started before our Premier came on the scene, we had an interim Leader of the Opposition and a Leader who was being deposed, I guess, Justice Barry now, who supported the Meech Lake Accord. All of these people and the Opposition, the hon. Member for Port de Grave, at the time, supported it, I cannot say the hon. Member for Gander, as I do not know. Most of the Cabinet over there, Mr. Speaker, were toeing the party line at the time and supported the Meech Lake Accord. Maybe they were delighted that the Premier came on the scene, that they stuck the knife in their former Leader and got a new fellow, I do not know. Maybe that is the reason they got him, but they did support it. The difference now is, we are told that eleven people went into a back room and came out with these connived changes to our Constitution. Mr. Speaker, this started in 1980, the discussion on the changes to our Constitution. In 1982, Quebec was left out of the discussion. In 1986, the year before Meech Lake meetings, there were discussions on Meech Lake, it was not contrived by eleven people in secret.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
This booklet here it is one of the reasons I am going to make up my mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, could I have a minute

just to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I guess I was making my points pretty strong, Mr. Speaker, they are afraid to hear the argument. Mr. Speaker, I will have the opportunity to speak on this debate again, unless, the heavy handed emperor of this Province tells me that I cannot speak on behalf of my constituents and he tries to shove his Resolution down the throats of the people of this Province, the same as he has done with the amalgamation and other issues in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

MR. MURPHY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a privilege for me to have an opportunity to rise on such an important issue as the Meech Lake Accord. I have listened attentively as I do day in and day out in this hon. House to all the speakers who have made presentations on the Meech Lake Accord. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that I was exceptionally impressed by the nature of those who stood so far and made their presentations. They did it with heart and meaning, all hon. Members. The difficulty is, Mr. Speaker, is that half of them lacked content.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

But we are with (inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

I would suggest to the hon. Member for Kilbride, as I mentioned to the hon. Member for St. John's East, and I complimented her when she stood and spoke the other night, she made her point and her opinion, though I totally disagree with it, she did it without pointing a finger or building her speech on the backs of anybody on this side, which is unusual for friends opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

However, in saying congratulations, I think I would be remiss this morning, Mr. Speaker, if I did not say sincere congratulations to the hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West, who I think has been elected to this House three times and has fought diligently, right from day one, to have a road link between the main artery on the Burin Peninsula and his constituents in Petit Forte.

Now what is really good about all this, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) fought long and hard, and what is pleasing about the whole thing is that a Liberal Government were the ones who delivered that road to the hon. Member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that today is an extremely historic day and I would like to read into Hansard why. A hundred and eighty-odd years ago, this very day, Mr. Speaker, the Crown colony

of Newfoundland was given the property known as Labrador, in 1809. So it is a very unique day. It took 120 some odd years later for the Privy Council to ratify that Labrador was part of the Province of Newfoundland. At that particular time I think it was the Dominion of Newfoundland or whatever. However I would congratulate the hon. Members from Labrador because it is a historic day for them as it is a historic day for all Members.

Now let me talk about how I feel as the Member for St. John's South in respect to the Meech Lake Accord. This country is 126 years old, I think, or 127 years old this year and I would suggest to you that we all agree that Canada is a very progressive nation and we have lived without a constitution for that long and arduous period of time.

But I would like to speak specifically about the effort made in 1982 by the Prime Minister of the day the hon. Pierre Elliot Trudeau. Before he started his First Minister's meeting when he brought all of the First Ministers of this nation together to deal with the constitution he was defeated before he started. Because facing the Prime Minister of the day at that time was the Premier of the Province of Quebec, Mr. Levesque, who was elected by the people of that province on a separatist platform. Not only that, that obstacle being almost totally insurmountable, because the mandate of Mr. Levesque was to come to the First Ministers Conference and denounce and deny and disrupt anything and everything that had to do with a constitution for this country.

Now not only that but there were a

couple of younger Premiers, a couple of upstarts, one was Premier Peckford, who I felt proud at that particular time to be the representative of Newfoundland, because I thought the man was full -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You did, did you?

MR. MURPHY:  
Yes, I did to be quite honest with you, I do not mind being honest.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:  
But that was all right because I felt that he had the best interest of this Province at heart. And that very gentleman got there and he made the case for this Province. He was not abused and he was not reminded - he was not reminded by the Prime Minister of the day, Mr. Speaker - how lucky he was in 1949 to be part of this country. That shot was not fired across his bow. And the Prime Minister listened to the Premier of the Province, and as the debate went on you could see it start to come together. And word has it that the Premier, had to get the nine Provinces, because they knew that Quebec was not going to secede at that time and sign any Constitution. Because after all Mr. Laveques did have a mandate to disrupt and not to see Canada enshrine its Constitution. And the difficulty of bringing that Constitution home faced the Prime Minister of the day.

But the word is that sometime early in the morning in the kitchen of one of the rooms in Ottawa - maybe some of the Members Opposite, maybe the Member for Mount Pearl was there at the time

- I remember Senator Ottenheimer, who at that time I think was the Minister of Justice, sitting at the right hand of the Premier and helping him. Maybe the Member for Mount Pearl was there throwing in his two cents worth and trying to get the most and the best that they could for the people of this Province. And somebody said that over a cup of coffee, the Premier of this Province dropped an idea on another chap - his name will come to me in a second - I think he was one of the lieutenants of Mr. Trudeau, I think his name was Chretien. I want everybody in the House to remember that name. It will be extremely significant in the next four or five years. I would suggest to you, extremely significant, Mr. Speaker.

And from that particular conversation over that cup of tea, apparently the thoughts and ideas of the Premier of this Province in concurrence with this Lieutenant from Trudeau's Cabinet, Chretien, went back to the Prime Minister, and before the day was out we had nine signatures on that document. A tremendous effort, a Liberal effort. A Liberal effort, Mr. Speaker.

Then the Members Opposite want this Government and the Premier to hold public hearings. This they would like to have prior to this resolution that has been put forward by the Premier, been voted on in the House, and they want to go gallivanting all over Newfoundland and Labrador for public hearings. They did not gallivant prior to 1982 with public hearings. They trusted the Premier of the day then, as they trusted the Premier of the day in 1985-86 when the Meech Accord was coming together. There were no public hearings - no thought of

public hearings when the previous Premier of this Province went shuffling off to the First Minister's conference and in a back room somewhere with nine other Premiers and the First Minister of this nation signed an intent to bring a Constitution down around our ears.

And then they came back, Mr. Speaker, the First Ministers came back and the ratification date for this wonderful document known as the Meech Lake Accord - it will go down in history like the Magna Charta - this wonderful document that was brought back. And the twenty-third day of June 1990 was to be enshrined.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the position of the Premier of this Province has been marked in every newspaper, spoken about on every television station from the western end of Victoria Island to Flatrock. And we know that that document now is faulted and faulted extremely. There is no possible way that this Province could sign or should sign the Meech Lake Accord, and we have to change Newfoundland's position and let the people of Canada know there is nothing in this Accord that would make this Province, ever, a have Province.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose in all fairness we have to understand that Quebec as a Province in this country would be extremely foolish not to accept or want Meech to be a reality. It is favoured, it is flawed and favoured for the Province of Quebec. Now many times the Premier of this Province and my colleagues and the Ministers of this Government have stood in this place and other places and adamantly spoke about the fact that we are friends,

neighbors of the great and wonderful Province of Quebec. We totally respect their linguistic rights, we totally respect all the other rights that befall that Province. And at no time did the Premier of this Province or anyone in this Government ever say anything different. We have been explicit about the redneck attitude that have tried to tie themselves to our stand on Meech Lake. We have adamantly and the Premier has adamantly disassociated himself from any sense of bigotry or any sense of pick on Quebec. And we want to say it over, and over, and over again.

But it is extremely difficult, Mr. Speaker, for the people of this Province, this Government, the hon. Members opposite, when the Premier of the Province of Quebec stands in front of television cameras and tells Canada and Newfoundland specifically and the world in general, that 51 per cent of the dollars that flow into this Province come from Ottawa. Not only that, but 67 per cent of the 51 per cent comes from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. How ungrateful we are not to rush to Ottawa and sign the Meech Lake Accord.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an issue here that exceeds far and beyond the ramifications that have been whispered by friends opposite and other people, 'What a chance Mr. Wells is taking with the future of this Province. All he has to do is be a good little boy, fall in line, and maybe like Lazarus we will get some of the crumbs that fall off the Ottawa table.' But the Premier said, 'no.' By himself he said, 'no.' With the support of this caucus he said, 'no.' And he will continue

to say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

What transpired then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. First Minister, old Irish eyes, and I love Irish eyes, with a name Murphy why would I not. He sits and he concocts. He gets close to his friend from New Brunswick and he whispers to him 'Premier McKenna the Federal Government would probably be a lot nicer to you as time goes on if you stand in your place and be a little nicer, a little more accepting and bring in, not a parallel, but some kind of a companion document.' Then Senator Murray got this in his hip pocket and he jumped on a plane and he rushed down and said, 'maybe we can get Wells on side. Filmon is out there and maybe he will come on side. We can get Filmon and McKenna and we will isolate that fellow Wells. He is painting himself in a corner, and he said, 'Now we have them,' because he said, Wells said, 'If he was by himself he would not stand in the way of the Meech Accord.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

I never said any such thing.

Now the Prime Minister came on TV, Mr. Speaker, and took fifteen minutes of prime time television from the nation of taxpayers dollars and cents and said absolutely nothing. But he tried to warm up, to generate some interest, but he got fooled by his own, the very people who put him in. The hon. MPs from Quebec had a caucus meeting and terrified the Prime Minister of the country and



told him do not dare accept Mr. McKenna's little parallel or we are history we are gone. Some of them were so radical they said, we are gone, we are going to leave. And what did he do, he realized that could not swing. Now the hon. Members opposite had gotten up behind the McKenna proposal and said to the hon. the Premier, what is wrong with you, you will not even accept or listen to your colleague from the Province of New Brunswick. Then right in the middle of trying to push McKenna's thoughts and ideas upon us, the Prime Minister does a turnaround and Bourassa does a turnaround and tells McKenna to get lost. And now his little companion agreement is no longer acceptable to the MPs in Quebec who are part and parcel of the Mulroney Government. So now they are in no-man's land. Back alone again. Mr. Filmon now understands where he is. He has to stand against the Meech Accord. Mr. McKenna now has obviously had second thoughts about his position.

Let us for the record, Mr. Speaker, have a look at this flawed document and see what has taken place with the Premiers of the provinces across this great nation. It is only a week and a half ago that the Premier of the province of B.C. Mr. Vander Zalm, expressed his concern about the Senate and said under no circumstances could he support Meech. He would support Meech, but he certainly wanted the flawed end of the Senate changed.

The neighbour of B.C happens to be the great province of Alberta, a very much 'have' province, no sales tax, a great place in which to live, a heritage fund that exceeds billions of dollars, a great place, and there are

thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders working in that environment and we are very thankful for it. But the Premier of that province, a Tory premier, what does he do? In defiance, trying to deliver a message to the Prime Minister of the country, turns around and holds an election for a Senator.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Exactly.

MR. MURPHY:

Holds an election for a Senator. So a little nudge from Alberta that he does not agree, he indicates that there are flaws.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He got elected (inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

Yes. And who got elected is right, Mr. Speaker, a reformer! A reformer got elected. Saskatchewan has to support it because every time the wind blows long and hard and the gravel ends up in Manitoba, then the Federal Government pumps out a billion dollars, so they have no alternative but to stand fast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

And hope, and hope. Now Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, their position is quite clear. It is very similar to the hon. the Premier and the caucus in this Government. They do not want any part of this flawed document for the sake of a document. And Ontario, the neighbour of Manitoba, because Ontario is so big, so massive, so productive, they know they have the numbers and the strength within the present Accord to veto and not get hurt within it.

Quebec's position is obviously very clear. They are the benefactors of Meech.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:  
Sure. The same as it was in the referendum. They are the benefactors. New Brunswick; We know where New Brunswick is. New Brunswick does not support the Meech Lake Accord. Mr Ghiz, is in a very difficult spot, he is in a very difficult spot because, for the first time in the history of that beautiful little province, the Garden of the Gulf, had the chance to be umbilically tied on to Canada, so he is very nervous about this billion dollar bridge which would make him part, fixed, held on in the umbilical sense, held on by the great nation of Canada. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, he lost 1500 jobs in the Base and he was nudged and grugged a little bit that, that will be looked after. Now the premier of the province of Nova Scotia; it is very difficult to know where he is. As a matter of fact, my understanding is that there are times when, out of the side of his face, nudges Newfoundland to stand fast, be against - I do not know. These are things I hear. So if you come across the whole nation you will see that not one single, solitary province does not have some kind of a problem with the Meech Lake Accord. Mr. Speaker, we have heard our friends opposite do the comparison on the single greatest nation in the world, the United States of America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No way. Canada, Canada.

MR. MURPHY:  
Two hundred and sixty million

people living on less than half the land mass of this country has protected this country through trial and tribulation, cold war and hot war, okay, and now Canada has an opportunity to bring a sound, sensible, logical constitution into place. Not this frayed document that has been shuffled along in front of our noses. We changed our minds, the Premier said no. This caucus' Government said no. That document is full of holes which are big enough to drive trucks through, and we have explained that across this country. The Premier has explained it across this country and I do not need to tell the Members opposite what the response of the people of this nation have been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:  
In the last Federal elections there was a great charge, a great new concept that was going to bring Canada into the future and it was called Free Trade - Free Trade. And you know, the hon. Members opposite said, the only reason there were any Liberals ever elected in that particular election is because we went about battering at the people, telling them that they would lose their Old Age Security, lose their Family Allowance and would lose all the social packages that had been so long and strongly built, by whom, Mr. Speaker, by Liberal Governments, over the years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:  
We were not about to crumble under that foolishness, and let me inform the hon. Members opposite,

as you look down among the colleagues here -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Federal Liberals (inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

and look down at the Meech Lake Accord, I can assure you that all of these gentlemen had read the Meech Lake Accord. The trouble with the Free Trade Agreement is that the Minister who was presenting it did not have time to read it. He never had time to read it. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce never had time, and we will find out, we will find out, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

The only blessing about the Free Trade Document, in the difference with the Meech Lake Accord, is that either nation, can, within six months notice tear it up. Thank God for that, because already, we can see what is happening in that particular document. We see the multinational companies, the Brewing industry starting to fold and fall, we see the big multinational food companies in the United States starting to pull back from Canada, where there is cheaper labour in the United States they can get that tin of soup, or tin of beans or whatever into Canada without tariff, pulling away canadian jobs. Surely heavens we do not think for one second that we outfoxed our friends in the South with the Free Trade Agreement. No we certainly did not.

MR. PARSONS:

The anti-confederate that I was, I changed my mind. The Premier

could change his also.

MR. MURPHY:

We have heard the argument about the Senate, Mr. Speaker. There is one single place where this Province would have a chance, and that is if we had a voice that was as loud and as long as any other province within this country, but because of our size, because of where we sit and our ability to function as a Province and our opportunities, we are not close to the markets, we are here in the middle of the ocean, so dependent on a fishery that has been destroyed, it has been torn apart and sundered by the hon. Members colleagues in Ottawa. Taking that into consideration, Mr. Speaker, and taking where we are in this Dominion of Canada, you know -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order please!

MR. MURPHY:

You had seventeen years to bring it to proof, you did not do it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Say 'By leave' say 'By Leave' -  
To clue up, to clue up.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. Member to finish his remarks quickly.

MR. MURPHY:

I would like to thank the hon. Members opposite, but the thing that is most disturbing, what I think really grabs on and makes us all feel very saddened is not only this flawed document, but the approach that will be taken - and remember I said that, Mr. Speaker

- this day, by their friends and colleagues in Ottawa, when they surge in the next month and a half and pull every trick in the book to isolate the Premier of this Province and this Government as nation-breakers! Now remember, Mr. Speaker, remember what I said. They will spend millions and millions of dollars, remember, 130 million dollars was offered the Atlantic Provinces in the crisis that now is in front of us, 130, the same dollar amount that Mr. Wilson found in his Budget to explain to Canadians, the GST - 130 Million dollars.

Now you be the judge and let the people of this Province be the judge. Is that fairness and balance? No, Mr. Speaker. We know where fairness and balance is - over here, Sir!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. Member, I would like to, on behalf of all hon. Members welcome to the House, thirty Girl Guide Cadets and Rangers from all across the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Listen and learn now. You come here to learn.

MR. WARREN:

I think, Mr. Speaker, we have two stands here, they are available

for any Member to use, and I would prefer to use just one, because if all hon. gentlemen would listen to my speech today you will see that I am very concerned about our country. I was in this House, on March 17th, when the debate opened on the Meech Lake Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I say to my hon. colleague opposite, people can come into this House and leave when they feel like coming and leaving, it is understandable that people have other things to do. However, I want to be serious in the half an hour that I have. I have listened since 1988, March 17th, when the former Premier introduced the Resolution in this House and it carried on until July 7th, with thirty-nine different speeches. Although I realize what I am going to say can be twisted for partisan politics, I am not doing this to give my colleagues on the other side of the House any ammunition. I am not doing this in order to deviate from our Party's policy. I think there are certain issues where, whether it is a problem for you or not, you have to speak out because there are certain issues that go beyond caucus solidarity, go beyond Cabinet solidarity. Issues that are fundamental to this Province and this nation as the Meech Lake Accord. Issues on which every Member should be heard clearly, every Member should speak out, honestly, and every Member should put the Province and the country before the party and before his or her personal ambitions. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is not going to create a problem for any particular Leader or any particular party. But it is a

plan and as long as I am in this House and I will be in this House for some time, I do not know whether I will be running in the next election, I do not know whether I will be here in the next three or four weeks. I do not know whether I will be here in three years time, when the Premier decides to call the election. However, if I do not run, or if I do not contest the District of Torngat Mountains and if I am only here for a short time, I think I have an obligation, an obligation to the people whom I represent. I have an obligation to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. If you are elected to this Legislature you should not be afraid to express views, whether they are your own, or whether they are those in which you believe in, and I repeat, whether they are your own views or the views of others which you believe are right. I have to say Mr. Speaker, that I have not been persuaded on the position which I am mentioning now.

My former colleague who just spoke, the Member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy), spoke about our fisheries being all problems with Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why the Government Members are against the Meech Lake Accord, if that is the problem.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns and issues raised in the Meech Lake Accord was giving the Province more control over the fisheries. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the Government does not want more control over the fisheries. The Meech Lake Accord does address more control for the Province over the fishery. That is one of the reasons, just one, but a fairly important one why I

support the Meech Lake Accord. That is one of the main reasons why I support the Meech Lake Accord. Because I believe it will be useful. It will be helpful to have fisheries jurisdiction in front of the ten Canadian Premiers and the Prime Minister of the Country when they sit down to discuss constitutional matters relating to the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I support the Meech Lake Accord.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on by saying the Members in this House other than the Member from Exploits (Mr. Grimes), the Member from Exploits is the only person who now is objecting to the Province having more control over the fishery. The hon. Member is the only person now trying to interrupt me in my speech.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:  
He is interrupting my speech. Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman that is why I support the Meech Lake Accord because it will give the Province better control over our fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I say this much, fifty-one Members of this House agree with the Province having more control over the fisheries other than the Member for Exploits.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Listen boys, listen will you.

MR. WARREN:  
- I came into this House of

Assembly in 1979. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago I came into the Cabinet as a strong believer in a strong central Government.

MR. KELLAND:

You went out of it also.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is true, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Member for Naskaupi said I went out. Yes I did, Mr. Speaker. But at least I did more when I was in Cabinet than he has done.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say to Members of this House, some of their views will change. Naturally, when you get into Cabinet your views do change. I automatically thought before that, and I guess all colleagues on that side will when they go into Cabinet first, believe that your are always going to get the ear of your Federal Cabinet Minister. Well this was not the case. This has not been the case. I am sure will not be the case in the future. They have other things to do and not always will you get the ear of the Cabinet Ministers. But I still believe in a strong central government.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes you feel when you are in Cabinet and dealing with Cabinet Ministers in Ottawa, that is the only way to get their attention even though it is a matter of little significance.

Mr. Speaker, the position one takes on the Meech Lake Accord and on the Constitution generally depends upon what one believes about Federal-Provincial relations, about the role of the provincial governments, about the relationship of the provincial government to the federal government and it reflects the

person's views on the Canadian and Newfoundland society generally.

Mr. Speaker, let me say before I get into my other remarks that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have suffered. They sure have. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they sure have. Everything I have said with respect to Labrador in the last ten or eleven years in this Legislature, and everything I said about the people of Labrador and the problems that would result, whether it would be in health care, whether it would be in social services -

AN HON. MEMBER:

No problems.

MR. WARREN:

- whether it would be in fisheries, and for the last ten and a half years that I have spoken in this House I have always expressed concerns of how Labrador has been treated as second class citizens by government. And I use the word government plural, I am talking about the Government in Ottawa as well as the Government or the Governments of Newfoundland during the past forty-odd years.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is his time up?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about since Confederation.

MR. TOBIN:

Stick to your speech and forget about them.

MR. WARREN:

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that both sides of this House have to consider where they go in communicating their position within this Province -

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you reading that speech?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am reading that speech and I will table it afterwards if the hon. gentlemen would like me to.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, that -

MR. TOBIN:

The Premier must be all ready for the weekend.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I say to my hon. colleague that if he wants to challenge what I am reading he has the right to do so through the ordinary means. But I would suggest to the hon. gentleman -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

- if he cannot keep quiet. If he cannot hold that little tongue that is inside his mouth why does he not move outside altogether.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my view of Confederation, my view of the relationship of Newfoundland and Labrador with the rest of Canada is not greatly different from that of many people of this Province. In fact, my view is not much different from the people in this Legislature. I believe that a greater degree of decentralization is better than the situation we had before the Meech Lake Accord.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a greater need for decentralization. To a certain extent we have some decentralization as a result of the Meech Lake debate over the last two years. We have more provisions now for negotiating between the Government of Canada and the Province. They have to negotiate on certain items now which they did not have to negotiate before.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have yet adequate control over our marine resources.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I guess we do not.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said 'I guess we do not.' Now if the hon. gentleman had been listening fifteen minutes ago, the hon. colleague from St. John's South condemned the Federal Government because they have too much control on our fishery.

Now the Meech Lake Accord, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, but the hon. gentleman does not believe.

And, Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 35, I move, seconded by the Member for Grand Falls that this Resolution be referred to a special select committee of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Question. Question.

MR. WARREN:  
Question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
Question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
All in favor?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Against?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
'Nay'.

MR. WARREN:  
Count.

MR. SIMMS:  
Carried.

MR. WARREN:  
Carried.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Carried.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The 'ayes' have it.

MR. PARSONS:  
Carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Carried, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:  
Carried (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Carried, carried, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Carried, carried, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN:  
No, it is too late.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:  
It is carried, Mr. Speaker. It is  
too late.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Carried, Mr. Speaker, it is too  
late.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, as I understand it  
the hon. the Member was in the  
midst of giving his speech. If  
the hon. Member is finished giving  
his speech, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. PARSONS:  
Carried, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:  
- we certainly have speakers on  
this side who are willing to speak  
on this particular amendment to  
this particular resolution.

So if the hon. Member has sat down  
and you finished recognizing him,  
Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to  
recognize the next speaker on this  
side?

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, to that point of  
order.

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



MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, what has just happened is that the Government has been caught with its parliamentary pants down. That is what has transpired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

And I am certain Your Honour saw it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Nonsense - we are waiting to speak in the debate.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 35, as my friend from Torngat so accurately quoted, a motion is in order at any time especially when a Member is speaking in debate he can move a motion, and 'A motion to refer a Bill, resolution or any question to the Committee of the Whole or any standing or special committee shall preclude all amendments of the main questions.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, that motion was made. It is not debatable. And the question was called.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Division.

MR. SIMMS:

There were nine on that side of the House.

Nobody rose for Division. Nobody rose for Division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh! oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Nobody rose for Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, nobody rose for Division. The rules require when the vote is called it is a voice vote. The voice vote carried from this side of the House, number one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

The voice vote carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

The second point, Mr. Speaker, the rules clearly say, that if Members want a Division there must be three Members rise in their place. Nobody rose in their place to call for a Division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

So, Mr. Speaker, we saw the motion carried. Clearly saw and heard this motion carried.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The press saw it too.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

And the press gallery saw it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour that you have - I am not sure if Your Honour called the result of the motion or not I could not quite hear because of the noise and because of the delaying tactic of the Minister of Development, who simply stood up

on a point of order to try to get some Members into the House. That is what they were trying to do.

But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, the motion was passed. I would submit if Your Honour consults with the Clerks at the Table he will find the motion is nondebatable. The question was called. The question was put. The majority were on this side of the House at the time. The motion was, therefore, passed. I would ask Your Honour to rule so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

Order, please! Is the hon. Minister speaking to that point of order?

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Members are so embarrassed by this original motion that they had to amend the motion because they are so embarrassed where they find themselves in this debate on this particular motion! Now nobody on this side - Mr. Speaker, you can hardly hear yourself, let alone a motion -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

You cannot even hear yourself in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:  
Now, we on this side, understood, the hon. Member for Torngat, notwithstanding his specious little tricks, was in the midst of debating the Amendment to the motion that we had placed on the order paper. Now Your Honour knows he was in the midst of giving his speech. All we saw from this particular side, was the hon. Member surrendering his right to continue to speak, he sat down, Your Honour! - when he takes his seat, Your Honour. He told us this was an important speech, he told us he would like us to listen to him, which we did in silence, then all of a sudden he took his seat. When that Member takes his seat, Your Honour, the onus is upon us to have a speaker rise from this side of the House, and the next speaker was the Member for Waterford - Kenmount, the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, he rose in his place, Your Honour, to begin his section of the debate on the Amendment to the original motion. We ask that Your Honour now recognize the Member for Waterford - Kenmount, and to put aside the specious little games and tricks and carry on with the debate, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Development's argument is so weak, it is irrelevant. It has nothing to do with the Member speaking in this speech. The

Member is entitled to move the motion while speaking in debate, so I do not know what he is arguing about, but the real point of the matter is, that, Your Honour, quite correctly, put the question, asked the House if it was ready for the question and put the question, and the motion was carried by a voice vote on this side, no doubt about it, because the numbers were not over there, clearly! No.1. And I repeat, -

AN. HON. MEMBER:  
Nobody requested Division.

AN. HON. MEMBER:  
The 'ayes' had it.

AN. HON. MEMBER:  
Nobody asked for Division.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:  
And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the rules say, if Members want a division, at least three Members must rise. No Members rose in this House to call for division. That is the rule.

AN. HON. MEMBER:  
He said the 'ayes' had it.

MR. SIMMS:  
So clearly, the vote was carried, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask Your Honour, to order the motion carried as it was done so, in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Mount. Scio - Bell Island.

MR. WALSH:  
Being a new Member, I am trying to find out and follow as best as I can. Reference was made to some standing orders with regard to

divisions and so on, I wonder, could they be quoted so that at least I would have an opportunity to follow the proceedings as best I can in this learning procedure.

MR. TOBIN:  
You should have been in the House.

AN. HON. MEMBER:  
The media saw them. The media saw them.

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

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, that is not even worthy of comment. The Member who just asked for the elaboration on how a Division vote is taken happens to be the Chairman of the Committee in this House who is studying our rules and procedures. That makes me a bit nervous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
If he looks at his Index at the back of the Standing Orders, page 40 will show the method of Division voting is covered under Standing Orders 82, and 83. He could easily read it for himself. But that is not for him to decide. It is up to His Honour\* to decide.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The Chair will recess for a moment to check to see if the procedure has been breached.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The Chair would like to inform the House at this point in time that it is going to require a little more time to have the matter researched and checked out. We would like to determine the wishes of the House now that it is close to the hour of twelve, should we stop the clock or will we adjourn until Monday?

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains has adjourned the debate.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I would be willing to stop the clock but are we going to hear submissions to this.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Submissions (inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:  
Submissions have not been presented.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
We have no problem either way. It is whatever Your Honour wishes. If he feels it is going to require a considerable amount of time, perhaps over the weekend, to consider the matter.

MR. TOBIN:  
Bring the tape recorder into the House.

MR. SIMMS:

We would be quite prepared to allow Your Honour the time he needs. If he feels that he is going to require a considerable amount of time -

MR. TOBIN:  
Why does he not bring a tape recorder into the House?

MR. SIMMS:  
- then obviously the thing to do would be to adjourn. But if Your Honour feels that he is only going to be a few more minutes or something along those lines, then fine stop the clock.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The reason I asked that is it seems to me to be a fairly straightforward question to be decided. Standing Order 35, 'A motion to refer a Bill, resolution or any question to the Committee of the Whole ...' and so on 'shall preclude all amendment of...'.  
That particular Standing Order says that when there is a motion made to refer a Bill, that precludes the amendments. So that is the purpose of that particular Standing Order, Mr. Speaker.

The relevant Standing Order, of course, is Standing Order 33, or one of the relevant Standing Orders there are a number of others, deals with a question under debate and what can be done. Standing Order 33, "When a question is under debate no question is received unless" and here is the list, Mr. Speaker, "to amend it;" that was not done,-

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Speaker, he is out of order.

MR. BAKER:

- "to postpone it to a day certain;" that was not done,-

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

- "for the previous question;" that was not done, "for reading the orders of the day;"

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. BAKER:

- that was not done, "for proceeding to another order;" that was not done, "to adjourn the debate; or for the adjournment of the House." Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair has asked for the concurrence of the House to either stop the clock at twelve or to adjourn until Monday?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Stop the clock.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Adjourn until Monday.

MR. SPEAKER:

Maybe we could recess for about fifteen minutes and if we, in that period of time can reach a conclusion, we will come back.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

In the time that we have had

available to us we have researched this fairly widely. I have reviewed the tapes of the debate. And I quote as follows:

'Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 35 I move, seconded by the Member for Grand Falls, that this resolution be referred to a special select committee of the House.'

In my opinion, the motion was properly made under Standing Order 35. We have checked with the House of Commons in Ottawa on this point and have determined that they interpret Standing Order 33 as including Standing Order 35. However, I must also point out that when the Member referred in his motion to this resolution, he must mean the amendment and not the main resolution.

I, therefore, rule that the motion has been to refer the amendment, moved by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, to a committee of the House and that the motion has been carried. The main resolution remains before the House.

PREMIER WELLS:

Division, Mr. Speaker.

On Division. On Division.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order.

PREMIER WELLS:

On Division until -

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order first.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is alright you will have your point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The Chair would like to inform the House, at this point in time, that it is going to require a little more time to have the matter researched and checked out. We want to determine the wishes of the House now that it is close to the hour of 12:00 noon. Should we stop the clock or adjourn until Monday?

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains has adjourned the debate.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I would be willing to stop the clock, but are we going to hear submissions to this?

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
We have no problem either way, it is whatever Your Honour wishes. If he feels it is going to require a considerable amount of time, perhaps over the weekend, to consider the matter, we would be quite prepared to allow Your Honour the time he needs. If he feels he is going to require a considerable amount of time, then obviously, the thing to do would be to adjourn.

If Your Honour feels it is only going to be a few more minutes, or something along those lines then, fine, we will stop the clock.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The reason I asked that is that it seems to be to be a fairly straight-forward question to decide. Standing Order 35, "A motion to refer a Bill, resolution or any question to the Committee of the Whole" and so on, "shall preclude all amendment". That particular Standing Order says that when there is a motion made to refer a Bill, that precludes the amendments. So that is the purpose of that particular Standing Order, Mr. Speaker.

The relevant Standing Order, of course, is Standing Order 33, or one of the relevant Standing Orders, there are a number of others. Standing Order 33 deals with when a question is under debate and what can be done: "When a question is under debate no question is received" -- and here is the list, Mr. Speaker -- "unless to amend it;" that was not done; "to postpone it to a day certain;" that was not done; "for the previous question;" that was not done; "for reading the orders of the day;" that was not done; "for proceeding to another order;" that was not done; "to adjourn the debate, or for the adjournment of the House", Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The Chair has asked for the concurrence of the House to either stop the clock at 12:00 noon or to adjourn until Monday.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Stop the clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, maybe we could recess for about fifteen minutes and if, in that period of time, we can reach a conclusion, then we will come back.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

In the time we have had available to us, we have researched this fairly widely. I have reviewed the tapes of the debate and I quote as follows:

"Mr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 35 I move, seconded by the Member for Grand Falls, that this resolution be referred to a special select committee of the House."

In my opinion, the motion was properly made under Standing Order 35. We have checked with the House of Commons in Ottawa on this point and have determined that they interpret Standing Order No. 33 as including Standing Order 35. However, I must also point out that when the Member referred in his motion to this resolution, he must mean the amendment, not the main resolution.

I therefore rule that the motion has been to refer the amendment moved by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition yesterday to a Committee of the House and that the motion has been carried. The main resolution remains before the House.

PREMIER WELLS:

On Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to appear to be questioning your ruling in any way, shape or form, but I think it is an important matter and perhaps precedent setting. I mean clearly the intention as in the wording of the motion put by the Member for Torngat Mountains said that this resolution, not amendment, this resolution be referred to a select committee of the House. I would argue very strenuously that obviously we are debating the resolution and happen to be debating it at the stage -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, no! Oh, no!

MR. SIMMS:

- We are debating the resolution under amendment. The resolution is the resolution before the House. Mr. Speaker, I really would ask Your Honour to reconsider this matter seriously and perhaps take some time over the weekend to do a bit more research because I do not want to challenge Your Honour's ruling but, in my view, that is not an acceptable ruling in that sense.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

To that point, Mr. Speaker, what the Opposition House Leader is

saying is totally incorrect.

A motion is put before the House and then the motion is amended and the debate is on the amendment. Then, if there is a subamendment to the amendment, the debate is on the subamendment and so on.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:  
The only time the motion comes back to the House is in the process at the end where the amendment has been dealt with and then the motion as stated, or as amended, is dealt with. So the only time you deal with a motion as amended is after the amendment itself has been specifically dealt with.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt at all that our debate, as has been pointed out many times to me by Members opposite, our debate that we have been carrying on is a debate on the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:  
I think Your Honour is absolutely correct.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes, Mr Speaker. I would submit that what the House Leader has just said is really not relevant. You are talking about what stage we are in debate. But the fact of the matter is, the motion moved by the Member for Torngat Mountains was to refer the resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit

the only ones in the world who have seen or heard what has happened in the last hour in this House of Assembly, and Members opposite in particular, are the only ones in the world who would ever think that the motion was made to refer the amendment. That is so unreasonable that it is not even sensible. The wording is that the resolution be referred to the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
There is only one resolution.

MR. SIMMS:  
There is only one resolution before the House and the way in the debate, the place we are in the debate, is simply on an amendment to the resolution. But it is the resolution that we are debating.

Mr. Speaker, the motion was that the resolution be referred. Your Honour ruled the motion was in order and properly put. I would submit very strongly that the motion was carried. The government was caught with its pants down, did not have enough interest in the resolution obviously to have enough people here in the House to carry it and they lost it. That is the bottom line.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I can shout, rant and rave myself to. However, I choose not to. We are talking here about the rules of procedure and the case I



believe, Mr. Speaker, is quite simple. The conclusion that we are debating the amendment to the resolution is absolutely certain, Mr. Speaker.

Also, when you are debating the amendment to a resolution your comments and the debate is on that amendment, anything outside the amendment is improper.

I think at this point in time all I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, is that your ruling was absolutely correct in terms of what happened to the amendment and the fact that we were debating the amendment. The amendment is a resolution or a matter before the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Shameful.

MR. BAKER:  
The amendment is a resolution or a matter before the House and that was the only thing we were considering at the time.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to make one further submission. Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader has been arguing that the motion made by my friend, the Member for Torngat Mountains, was to refer the amendment. That is essentially what he is arguing, to refer the amendment, while he is arguing that that ruling was correct. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is so outlandish it is not even funny. May I ask Your Honour to consider this fact. When Orders of the Day were called at approximately a quarter to eleven or whenever it

was today, Orders of the Day were announced by the Government House Leader. What Order was called?

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Motion 12.

MR. SIMMS:  
Order 12, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:  
Right on. Right!

MR. SIMMS:  
'The hon. the Premier to move Whereas by a resolution etc. etc., etc.' Mr. Speaker, that was the Order that was called. We are debating the resolution, it happened to be in an amendment stage, but, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see for the life of me how anybody could argue strenuously that the motion that was made by the Member for Torngat Mountains was to refer the amendment. We are on the resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Exactly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) a farce.

MR. DOYLE:  
A total farce.

MR. BAKER:  
Foolish. Mr. Speaker, Motion 12 was called and that was the Order of the Day. In order to get to that we have to deal with an amendment that was made by the Leader of the Opposition, and the debate at that point goes back to where it ended the previous day,

which was debate on the amendment as put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

So, Mr. Speaker, we accept that ruling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the intent of the motion by the Member for Torngat Mountains was clearly understood by everybody who was in this House and everybody who was in the galleries. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HEARN:

(Inaudible) parliamentary world.

MR. SIMMS:

Just let me put this question, Mr. Speaker, on this issue.

MR. HEARN:

(Inaudible) constitutional lawyer.

MR. SIMMS:

I have the transcript from today's proceedings. The motion was put by the Member for Torngat Mountains that the resolution be referred.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Resolution be deferred. Resolution! Resolution, not amendment. And, Mr. Speaker, the procedure clearly shows that as you went through it you asked if we were ready for the question: those in favour, and those against. And your own words 'The ayes have it'. Clearly the ayes have it. And clearly the ayes won the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. SIMMS:

So now the question is if it is the resolution or the amendment. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe for one moment that anybody believes that we were moving a motion to refer the amendment to a select committee. Now, who in their right mind believes that?

MR. TOBIN:

He did not say the amendment, he said the resolution.

MS DUFF:

He said from the beginning (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

And this ruling, Mr. Speaker, I really am concerned that the ruling may, I might say, may have been taken perhaps too hastily, and that is why I suggested at 12:00 o'clock that the Speaker might wish to adjourn until Monday to give it further consideration and further research. Because I believe that it is a very dangerous ruling and a very dangerous precedent that has been set here.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No question.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
No, I do not wish to challenge the Speaker's ruling. We are not on that line.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

The Chair has heard a considerable amount of discussion on this point of order. There is no point of order. The matter the hon. Member has raised is not a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Division! Division!

MR. PARSONS:  
A division on what?

PREMIER WELLS:  
A division on the motion. It was ruled a voice vote, we now want a division on the voice vote.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Do not be so foolish. It is over and done with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

MR. FUREY:  
We would like to have a division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. WINDSOR:  
(Inaudible) one we had last week, that is not the division I want.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
(Inaudible) Canada and they cannot even follow their own rules.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, in all votes in this House and in any other House I know of, there is a process that is gone through; there is a voice vote first of all, and Mr. Speaker makes a judgement in terms of the voice vote and the loudness of the voice vote and so on, and then there is a process of division. Your Honour has ruled the motion as put by the Member, I believe it was for Torngat Mountains, to refer the amendment to the Committee was acceptable and Your Honour has ruled on a voice vote 'the Ayes have it.' Mr. Speaker, there was a lot of confusion after that and a couple of Members called for a division. We are now calling for a division on that vote, now that that matter has been settled.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. BAKER:  
That motion, in fact, asked that the amendment be referred to the Committee and on the voice vote the Ayes have it. We are asking now for a division.

MR. FUREY:  
Getting clarification.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must say I cannot believe my ears. I do not know if the Government knows what it is up to over there or not. I mean, clearly the procedure in our House has been that when the Question is put a division must be called for immediately, and it has not been done in this instance. There was no division called for. In fact, there was an intervening action, a point of order. But after the vote was put and the Speaker declared that the motion was carried, the aye's have it, that is the process and time for a division to be called. That was an hour ago, Mr. Speaker. This is absolutely ridiculous to be suggesting that a division can be called an hour later. And when the Minister of Development got up on a point of order, did he argue the question of division? No, he argued the question of admissibility of the motion. So, I mean, this is highly irregular and I cannot believe my ears when I hear the Member now getting up and calling for a division an hour later. How silly is it at all?

MR. DOYLE:  
You are rigging the House, boy.

MR. SIMMS:  
And it is the practice in our House that three Members have to

rise. No Member rose over there, Mr. Speaker. Nobody rose. That is the practice in our House. Beauchesne, from the House of Commons procedures say five or more Members must rise, in our House it is three. But let me submit this to you, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour, in fact, already ruled, as I believe, when he came in here first that the motion had carried and everything like that, and he was giving us a -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) voice.

MR. SIMMS:  
Well, it carried.

MR. DOYLE:  
We were arguing that a moment ago.

MR. SIMMS:  
It carried. The motion had carried.

MR. DOYLE:  
Now you are on the same (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
Beauchesne, page 172, paragraph 558, says, "An old rule of Parliament reads: 'That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House.'" Now, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what transpired in this House an hour ago, and it is highly irregular to allow a division vote to occur at this time. I would submit to Your Honour that would be totally out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House

Leader,

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The proceeding, as I understand it, is that the motion was made. There was a voice vote and Your Honour gave a ruling on the voice vote. There was a point of order, and, at the same time, several Members stood, among them the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, they did not. No, they did not.

MR. BAKER:

The Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island and the Member for Waterford - Kenmount.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was not even in the House. He was not even in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

This is terrible! This is terrible!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the intervening activity was a point of order brought up by the hon. the Member for St. Barbe, a point of order. In as far as the rules of this House are concerned, immediately the clock was stopped. As far as the rules of this House are concerned, it is still 12:00.

MR. FUREY:

That is right.

MR. BAKER:

The clock was stopped at 12:00 -

MR. FUREY:

(Inaudible) an hour later.

MR. BAKER:

- so that the intervening motion could be dealt with -

MR. WINDSOR:

The question was called at 11:30 not 12:00.

MR. BAKER:

- and the ruling could be made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the ruling is made that on the voice vote the aye's have it and we are, once again, Mr. Speaker, calling for a division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

On that point of order the Chair would like to make certain as to the correct procedure, so I will recess for a few minutes.

MR. TOBIN:

Adjourn the House, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Give it up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Adjourn the House until Monday.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

On the matter raised by the hon. the Government House Leader as it pertains to the division, in my opinion the appropriate time for calling for a division on the motion of the Member for Torngat Mountains was immediately after the holding of the voice vote. I did not see three Members standing on the Government side. In the meantime, Members raised a point of order on proceedings and I

dealt with that matter. In my opinion, it is no longer appropriate to hold a division on this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
The (inaudible) was for clarification.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:  
In view of the fact that the proceedings were in such a state of disorder at the time, and in view of the fact -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
You were not even here. You were not here!

MR. BAKER:  
The shouting and yelling - I was out there being talked to by a member of the press and I could hear the state of disorder.

MR. HEARN:  
You were (inaudible). You are obviously (inaudible) the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Do not be lying.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, in light of that and in light of the fact that I recognize the fact that Your Honour may have been looking the other way at the shouting and disorder and so on on that side of the House, and that the call for a

division was superceded by the Member for St. Barbe who wanted a clarification on the voice vote, Mr. Speaker, in my view that is not an intervening proceeding. On those basis I would like to challenge Your Honour's ruling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. DOYLE:  
You are sacrificing your own Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the occasion go by without saying that I find this action by the Government side of the House to be deplorable. Absolutely deplorable!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:  
A sacrificial lamb.

MR. SIMMS:  
Here is this righteous and holier-than-thou Premier who advocates democracy day in and day out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
It is shocking! Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:  
- who is now doing something in this House that has never occurred before - to my knowledge, never occurred before.

MR. DOYLE:  
Not in our eleven years.

MR. SIMMS:

The point about it is, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately for you I say to you Your Honour, that if this challenge made by Members on that side of the House is successful, if Members Opposite vote to oppose Your Honour's ruling, then Your Honour has no choice but to remove himself from the seat occupied by him now, the Speaker's seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. SIMMS:

I, unfortunately, have to make that point, and I believe democracy and parliamentary practices will show that. If the Speaker does not have the support of the majority in the House of Assembly through a vote, then, unfortunately, His Honour is going to have to consider his position there. Not only consider it, I mean, obviously it goes without saying that Your Honour will have to resign the seat, and I think that is a sad commentary on the whole proceedings here today.

MR. DOYLE:

(Inaudible) sacrificial lamb.

MR. SIMMS:

This whole thing has been a farce, right from 11:30, thanks to the actions of Members opposite. Everybody in the world saw what happened and knows what the true story and the full story is, and it will come out, I can assure him.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Premier does not like losing (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Because the Premier could not get a division vote an hour and a half ago, ruled by the Speaker, the

person with the authority in this House, that it is not in order to have a division vote, he is now prepared to sacrifice one of his own Members and I think that is a tragedy and a shameful act on the part of the Government.

MR. DOYLE:

The Speaker belongs to the (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to address the point of order for a moment. The point is without merit. There have been numerous challenges to rulings of the Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

Some made by the Members opposite in the past.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) the Speaker get (inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:

What occurred, I am told, I was in my office meeting with the negotiating team on Hibernia, as a matter of fact - Members opposite, in their drive to upset the order or the conduct of this order of business and prevent proper debate on it, will do anything to upset it. Now I am told, and Your Honour was in the Chair so Your Honour will be in a good position to judge the facts, but I am operating on these assumption of facts, that the Member for Torngat Mountains was in the process of speaking, the Minister of

Municipal and Provincial Affairs was waiting his turn to speak, when, all of a sudden, out of the blue, the Member for Torngat Mountains made his motion, whatever the motion was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER WELLS:  
Exactly the same thing as you just heard, Mr. Speaker, was occurring then. The Members on this side of the House had no idea that Your Honour had even called for a vote because there was such a roar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:  
It is more like a barnyard.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
That is a lie.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

MR. WARREN:  
Holy, holy, holy lawyers.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You are re-enacting it now.

PREMIER WELLS:  
See what I mean, Mr. Speaker? Members on this side of the House had no idea that Your Honour had even called for a vote. This is what I am told.

MR. WINDSOR:  
You were not there. You do not know what you are talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Whose fault is that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:  
Do you see, Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about? This is the kind of mess there was in the House at the time. Your Honour called, and it appears from the tape recording that Your Honour put a question and asked, 'Those in favour aye, contrary nay, and immediately that occurred the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs was on his feet to speak, because he thought the Member had sat down.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He was not.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Another lie.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You were not even here. You do not know what went on.

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

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, I really do not need to say much more. They are proving me correct in every effort they make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
You are wrong! You are wrong!

PREMIER WELLS:  
When it was clear that he was not going to speak, the Minister of Development, who was in the House at the time, stood on a point of order to challenge Your Honour's ruling that there was a voice vote and questioned that a voice vote



had even taken place, and everything flowed from that. So there was not time to request division. There was not time to request division because there was no -

MR. SIMMS:  
There was time.

MR. DOYLE:  
(Inaudible) irrelevant.

PREMIER WELLS:  
What was questioned, Your Honour, was whether or not there had even been a valid voice vote. Members on this side were of the view that there had not been, and that was the purpose of the question.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
It was all over then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:  
Now on that point of order, we have spoken. Your Honour has ruled and we are moving that Your Honour's ruling be challenged and reversed and that division take place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:  
And it is for that reason, Your Honour, not any expression -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) on here, you are fired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:  
- of lack of confidence in Your

Honour, and Your Honour can make your own decision as to what you may or may not wish to do as a result of the challenge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) up to yourself.

PREMIER WELLS:  
But I say to Your Honour in taking that into account, do not think there is any lack of confidence by the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No? No?

MR. WARREN:  
You had better watch out, if that is how you are going to be treated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:  
- Government in Your Honour's ruling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Shameful! Shameful!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points I want to make in response to what the Premier has said just to prove how utterly false his argument has been on this

particular point. First of all, he tries to make people believe, now who in the name of heavens he expects to believe him I do not know, but he tries to make people believe that Members opposite did not know there was a vote, did not know what was going on.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Then they should not be here.

MR. SIMMS:

Let me say this, then. One reason why they did not know what was going on was because they only had eleven Members over there to begin with. We had the majority.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Right.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are wrong.

MR. SIMMS:

But, number two, if you will read the transcript, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker says: 'Are you ready for the question? All in favour.' Some Members: 'Aye'. 'Against', says, Mr. Speaker: Some Hon. Members: 'Nay'. So somebody knew what was going on. Do not try to camouflage what has transpired here today by making some weak, flimsy argument.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier says, Yes, here have been challenges to the Speaker's ruling. And yes, there have been challenges, Mr. Speaker, to the Speaker's ruling. But there have not been challenges to the Speaker's ruling that have been upheld by the majority of the Members in the House; they have always been supported by the Government Members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will wait until the Assistant Deputy Speaker gives Your Honour some more advice, I guess. I did not want to interrupt.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) the fellow behind the door down there.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of more points only. One is he tries to argue in a flimsy sort of a way there was not time to call a division. Well, is that not rather interesting? There was plenty of time to call a point of order, which the hon. the Minister of Development did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, what has transpired here today is nothing short of a farce. Nothing short of a farce.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. DOYLE:

Flimsy.

MR. SIMMS:

The Government is using its influence to manipulate what is transpiring here today and I do not mind saying it. It is seen by everybody in the galleries and everybody in this House, Mr. Speaker. He accused the Member for Torngat Mountains of using some conniving way of moving a motion. Mr. Speaker, the motion that was moved by the Member for Torngat Mountains was perfectly in order. In fact, Your Honour ruled it was in order. The argument we had was about what it contained.

MS DUFF:  
Nobody (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
So he ruled it was in order. I had advice from the Clerks at the table yesterday that such a motion was in order. And, in fact, the motion earlier with respect to division Your Honour ruled in favour of. Now, Mr. Speaker, I plead with the Members opposite, this is a serious matter and one of your own colleagues has been held up as sacrificial lamb. I am saying that to you and that is a fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR:  
(Inaudible) and you lost.

MR. SIMMS:  
That is a fact. I am telling you.

MR. DOYLE:  
This has never happened before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:  
I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what has transpired is very unfortunate.

I would suggest to Members opposite that they seriously consider this matter before they support this motion to challenge the Speaker's ruling. He is one of your own. He has to sit in that House, he has to sit in that Chair day after day and expect to have the confidence of this House.

MR. DOYLE:  
He is one of yours.

MR. SIMMS:  
And if you use parliamentary

procedure and parliamentary practices and traditions, if a Speaker's ruling is challenged and he loses his ruling by the majority of Members in the House, then he has lost the confidence of the House. That is the parliamentary tradition, I say to hon. Members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I submit the arguments put forth by the Premier and the Government House Leader are very, very flimsy. Obviously, they must take us all for fools, because everybody in this House, everybody in the gallery, everybody in the press gallery saw what transpired here today; the Government lost its majority, lost a vote on a motion that is so consequential to them and important to them, but they did not have enough people here to even carry it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOYLE:  
They are sacrificing the Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. DOYLE:  
We are lucky it was not the Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:  
I say, Mr. Speaker, that what we have seen is nothing short of a shameful act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. REID:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Carbonear.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Stand up for your buddy. That is it.

MR. REID:

He is my buddy, too, and I do not mind standing up for him, and I will continue to stand up for him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, it was just yesterday afternoon, if I recall, that one of my hon. colleagues on the other side of this House asked the Speaker to speak louder because he could not hear the Speaker. I am finding it very difficult down in this end of the House to actually hear the Speaker on times, especially when there is noise in the House. I will honestly and sincerely say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I did not hear you this afternoon. I did not hear you; I did not vote; I sat here because I did not know what was going on because of the fact that I could not hear what was going on. And quite often, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) all this.

MR. REID:

- in this House, being a new Member, I do not necessarily know the procedure all the time. Quite often in this House hon. Members on both this side of the House and on that side of the House have asked you, Sir, as well as the Speaker to speak louder. And yesterday afternoon the Speaker moved his microphone up his lapel so that we could hear down in this section of the House what the man was saying.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not by any means challenging your ruling, but I will say to you, Sir, that I can honestly say in front of my colleagues on both sides of this House that I did not know what the question was when you posed the question this afternoon. Thank you.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - the Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, should I say to you that ignorance is no excuse. If the Member is not around the House long enough to know what is going on, then maybe he should be like the rest of them, and be out of here where the rest of them were.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Let me also submit to you that when the Member moved, it was our Member who was speaking and we were listening, so if he could not hear, it was because of noise down in his own corner. So that is certainly not the fault of the Speaker, or us.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right on! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. HEARN:

The vote was called. Everyone in the House voted for it. It just happened that there were more on this side than on that side. The Acting House Leader, who did not know what was going on either apparently, stood up on a point of

order, not on division. What we saw happen after that is a complete and utter charade. I have not been in the House a tremendous amount of time, but I have been here eight years and I have never seen nor heard of such a charade in all my life, and if this is the type of manipulation that can take part in what we talk about as the great democratic society we have and the tremendous parliamentary system we have in Canada, then we are making a pure farce of it here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

We have a House Leader who comes in and in evidence to the Speaker which affected his ruling, or he tried to manipulate the Speaker's ruling, which he did not, on the last point, he actually got up and quoted untruths to this House, to the Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR:

That is right.

MR. WARREN:

Now.

MR. WINDSOR:

So did the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Who?

MR. WINDSOR:

You.

PREMIER WELLS:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

Yes, you.

MR. HEARN:

Yes, you.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did he say?

MR. HEARN:

Two things: He said there were three Members who stood and they did not - he was not here, number one, and he did not know what was going on, as nobody else knew what was going on. Nobody stood except the Minister of Development who stood on the point of order. Consequently, the House Leader should not try to influence the Speaker by telling lies in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

And finally what they have done - it is bad enough to deceive the House, it is bad enough to manipulate the whole process by using people, running back and forth trying to manipulate what is going on behind the scenes to make a farce of the whole parliamentary system, but then when they lose, because the Speaker being a man of principle stood up and made the right decision, they make him a sacrificial lamb and this is unforgivable, Mr. Speaker, and I submit they have absolutely no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like Your Honour's permission to set this in its proper perspective. The Opposition Member who just spoke made a number of accusations which I do not really want to deal with. I would just like to point out that their purpose in this

instance is to get the attention of the press. I suggest they are doing that, and so they are doing a good job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
- set this in perspective. What has happened here today, and I sat in Opposition for four years and I know exactly what has happened here today. I know exactly.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) very shortly.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, what goes on in this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:  
- is not a game although there are games attached. The process is one of debate and examination -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER:  
I will get you.

MR. BAKER:  
- and associated with that debate and examination there are some little games that can be played. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all very fine, and their delaying tactics and everything else, that is all very fine, however, ultimately the

function of a vote, the purpose of a vote in the House is to sample the feelings of the House, of the Members -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. BAKER:  
Just listen now.

- of the Members who are in the House at the time. The sampling or the feeling of the Members in the House at the time is taken on a voice vote. All right? Now, then, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour judges; he does not do a count of the House, that is a special process whereby the bells are rung, the Members are called in and so on. He does not do a count of the House, he does what is called a voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of that voice vote, and Mr. Speaker at that point asks the question: Are hon. Members ready for the vote, or ready for the question? And Mr. Speaker, makes sure that Members in the House are ready for the question. Now, Mr. Speaker, to be totally and absolutely honest here what happened today was -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. BAKER:  
Yes. Now we are getting to the games, okay. The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - the Capes already admitted, just a moment ago -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Playing games.

MR. BAKER:  
- that there were Members on this side who did not know what was going on and to be -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No he did not.

MR. BAKER:  
— honest they did not, Mr. Speaker. They did not know a vote was being taken. They did not know what was going on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
And here is where, Mr. Speaker, we have to distinguish between the procedure and the process of the House as to the games that are attached to that process and procedure. There is a time to distinguish between the two.

Mr. Speaker, I want to claim our right to have a division, to take a vote on that issue, as is normal. There is a voice vote, then if there is a call for division, then the bells ring for ten minutes, I believe; the bells are rung and a ten minute period elapses before Members come back in, or whatever happens, and then the division is taken and the names are taken, it is a standing vote. That procedure is allowed for in the rules, and simply all I have done is ask for the right to access that procedure, especially in light of the fact that nobody knew what was going on at the time the vote was taken, that there was so much confusion in the House that Members did not even recognize the vote was being taken.

MR. HEWLETT:  
No, but they said 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
They said 'nay'.

MR. BAKER:  
And, Mr. Speaker, because of an immediate point of order to clarify whether in fact there was a vote or not, that means there was no understanding that a vote had been taken and, therefore, we now, immediately after that has been settled, as soon as is possible, we asked for a division. Mr. Speaker, it is all very simple, and I would suggest to Members opposite that the games have been played and now is the time to get back to what this House is meant for, which is not a game.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have never heard such foolishness in all my life as what just came out of the mouth of the Government House Leader. I say to the Government House Leader, quite sincerely, that this is not a game that is being played, Mr. Speaker, this is a proper parliamentary procedural activity permitted under the rules. The rights of Members are to be protected. The right of the Member for Torngat Mountains to move a motion has to be protected. That is in the rules. It is not a game. And I resent the Government House Leader suggesting it is a game. It is not a game. It is proper

parliamentary practice and procedure.

MR. HEARN:  
Precedent.

MR. SIMMS:  
What is unusual is the insistence of the Premier that they challenge the ruling of the Speaker, one of his own Members. He is so hell-bent and determined not to have public hearings we have been asking for on his resolution that he is prepared to sacrifice one of his own Members, who occupies the Speaker's Chair, and that is shameful and deplorable.

Mr. Speaker, I will just say this: We did not agree, if you will recall, with Your Honour's ruling; the first ruling that he brought in we did not agree with; we did not like the ruling, and I said so. But I also said I was not prepared to challenge His Honour's ruling because he is the authority in this House and I respect it; we respect the authority of the Speaker in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to Members opposite that because they did not like his second ruling, they should at least have the finesse to get up and say to the House we do not like your ruling either, Mr. Speaker, but we do respect the authority of the Chair. And when the Speaker puts the motion on the challenge put forth by the Members opposite to their own Member, the question he puts is: Shall the authority of the Chair be upheld?

PREMIER WELLS:

The ruling of the Chair.

MR. SIMMS:  
Shall the authority of the Chair be upheld?

PREMIER WELLS:  
The ruling. Ruling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No! No!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MS DUFF:  
(Inaudible) challenging the authority.

MR. SIMMS:  
Now we hear the Premier, who wants to be Speaker as well as everything else, interpret all the rules. Mr. Speaker, that is the quote that is put. Now, I am sure the Premier said it loud enough, he is hoping the Speaker will make sure he uses the word ruling.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Ruling (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, the ultimate decision the Government has taken, lead by the Premier, in challenging this ruling is showing disrespect for the authority of the Chair, though he cannot argue that one. And that is exactly what has transpired.

Mr. Speaker, I say to Your Honour that we will support the ruling of the Chair, we will respect the authority of the Chair if, indeed, Your Honour agrees -

MR. DOYLE:  
Some people down there will, also.

MR. SIMMS:  
- that this challenge will be



accepted.

MR. HEARN:

You will see who your friends are now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Shall the ruling of the Speaker be upheld?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yea.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SIMMS:

Division, Mr. Speaker.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, three people came in after the Bar was up.

MR. WINDSOR:

The Bar was up, Mr. Speaker, before (inaudible) down here came in.

MR. DOYLE:

Three people came in when the Bar was up.

MR. SIMMS:

You are not allowed to come in after the Bar is up.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour:

Mr. Hewlett, Mr. Hearn, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Simms, Mr. R. Aylward, Mr. N. Windsor, Mr. Tobin, Mr. A. Snow, Mrs Duff, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Warren, Mr. Power, Mr. Hynes.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against:

The hon. the Premier (Mr. Wells), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford), the hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation (Mr. Gilbert), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Kelland), Mr. Hogan, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Crane, the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Baker), the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey), the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker), Mr. Walsh, Mr. Noel, Mr. Gover, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Flight), the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), Mr. Grimes, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Kitchen), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons), Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dumaresque, Mr. Short.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

I cannot hear, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MADAM CLERK:

Mr. Speaker, (inaudible) twenty-three against, thirteen for.

MR. SPEAKER:

The 'nays' have it. The Speaker's ruling has been overturned.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, on Division,  
concerning the motion of the  
Member for Torngat Mountains.

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

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

MR. SIMMS:  
To a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
No point of order can be  
entertained when a Division is  
being called.

MR. SIMMS:  
You are not in the middle of a  
Division, and Your Honour has not  
called a Division.

PREMIER WELLS:  
A Division is called.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I will make my point  
anyway, even though there is no  
point of order. We will not be  
staying in the House for this  
Division because it is such a  
farce.

MR. WINDSOR:  
The Government is taking it on  
their backs. A bunch of hooligans  
is what they are.

MR. DOYLE:  
Noriega.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Dictator.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
The man who (inaudible) all Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! Order, please!  
Division on the motion put by the

hon. the Member for Torngat  
Mountains:

All those in favour:

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No. Wait now.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, you have to allow ten  
minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Okay. Sorry about that.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Call in the Members.

### Division

MR. SPEAKER:  
Are we ready for Division?

PREMIER WELLS:  
May we have the motion read now,  
Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:  
We are voting on the motion by the  
hon. the Member for Torngat  
Mountains: "Under Standing Order  
35, I move, seconded by the Member  
for Grand Falls, that this  
resolution be referred to a  
Special Select Committee of the  
House."

All those in favour of the  
resolution:

MR. SPEAKER:  
Against:

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Nay.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the  
Minister of Fisheries (Mr.  
Carter), the hon. the Minister of  
Social Services (Mr. Efford), the  
hon. the Minister of Works,

Services and Transportation (Mr. Gilbert), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Kelland), Mr. Hogan, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ramsay, Mr. Crane, the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Baker), the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey), the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker), Mr. Walsh, Mr. Noel, Mr. Gover, Mr. Barrett, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Flight), the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), Mr. Grimes, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Dr. Gibbons), Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dumaresque, Mr. Short.

MADAM CLERK:

Mr. Speaker, the result of the count is twenty-five against, zero for.

MR. SPEAKER:

The 'nays' have it.

The motion is defeated.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of -

AN HON. MEMBER:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I now rise to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It has been moved that this House do now adjourn.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, that is just disgraceful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

What a farce! What an absolute farce. What are you trying to do?

MR. WINDSOR:

This is not a Parliament, a dictator is running it.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I have rights (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER:

Name them.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs was recognized at the time. He was the first Member standing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was not, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

The Minister adjourned the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs adjourned the debate, as I understand it?

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes.

MR. POWER:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for fifteen years and I have never seen anything as disgraceful as what has gone on in this House today.

I want to raise a point of privilege, and I will move the appropriate motion when this point of privilege is dealt with.

I want the Speaker of this House, the Deputy Speaker of this House and the Deputy Chairman of Committees to appear before the Bar of this House to explain what happened here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that may never have happened before. I am not a parliamentary expert, and I cannot quote Beauchesne, but I can tell you the difference between right and wrong when I see it, and what has gone on here today is wrong.

Speakers and the Speaker's office are meant to be impartial. If they are not impartial, democracy does not work, it then becomes just a mug's game, a numbers game - thirty-one beats twenty-one all the time. That is not what democracy is about or how it should function.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

In impartiality, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you adjourned this House, or you went into recess a little while ago to consider a point of order raised by the Opposition, or the Government House Leader or the Opposition House Leader, I do not really remember and I do not really care. All I know is you recessed this House to go out and get further information, to make sure you had all the facts, to get some advice, but while you were out the other Speakers, the other Members of the Speaker's Office, especially the Deputy Chairman of Committees, I think, I believe, and I will believe until someone comes before the Bar of this House and tells me differently, the Deputy Chairman of Committees received a submission, while this House was in recess, from one side of the argument and not the other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

If this House is in recess to discuss a point of order, or a point of privilege or anything else, then when it is in recess the Members of the Speaker's Office, the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Chairman of Committees, are not to take submission from one side and not the other.

Now, I know, I saw with my own eyes -

AN HON. MEMBER:

We were in a state of (inaudible) here.

MR. POWER:

Now, I have listened to the other side, and it may not be blatant lies but it is definitely a great exaggeration of what really happened here, when we did a voice

vote which was accepted, approved by the majority of Members in the House at the time. Now it is being changed; the record will show it was changed.

But I will guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that I saw the Deputy Chairman of Committees deal with the Government House Leader. I saw him come to the Government House Leader just a few moments ago, take something from his desk and go out. Now, if that is impartiality.... Did the Premier speak with the Speaker of this House while the House was in recess to discuss a point of order?

MR. WARREN:  
Shame! Shame!

MR. POWER:  
All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, and in any democracy in the world, we only have rights if the Chair is going to be impartial.

MR. WINDSOR:  
It must be seen to be impartial.

MR. POWER:  
And be seen to be impartial. The Government Members have just decided they did not accept part of the order you made, a ruling you made which they did not like.

I am saying a whole lot of things have gone on here today that I as the Member for Ferryland did not like, it was not parliamentary. And if this is the way this Session of the Legislature is going to go on, then we might as well give it up, close it up, and give it to the thirty-one Members and let them do what they like.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, not many more despicable statements than we have just heard have been mentioned in this House in the past. No such thing ever occurred. No such thing ever occurred. Now that they have lost, they have to find some way -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) to the Speaker?

PREMIER WELLS:  
No, I did not speak to the Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Yes you did. Stop lying.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) right there in the corner (inaudible).

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

PREMIER WELLS:  
I did not. The Member was standing there. I said nothing to him about what was happening. He said nothing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No! No!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) over there behind the curtain.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, it is not truth they want, it is noise. Mr. Speaker,

if somebody would care to stop and think logically for a moment, terrific influence that the Government may have had if anything ever happened when Your Honour ruled against the Government's position, really terrific! That is really impressive! They will say anything they can to try to cast aspersions on us. Everybody was here in the House. The Member who is the Deputy Chairman of Committees is a Member who is sitting there now on this side of the House, and, to the best of my knowledge, he never had anything to do with the Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was going from your common room to the Speaker's Office.

PREMIER WELLS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will have to let the hon. gentleman speak for himself - not to my knowledge. If he did, he was not taking any submissions from me and, so far as I know, not taking any submissions from the President, and to suggest so is reprehensible, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour, of course, knows the real truth, because Your Honour would be on the other side. So Your Honour would know the real truth. And it is a rather peculiar situation to suggest that it was influenced and Your Honour ruled against it, to say the least.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that point of privilege that has been raised by my colleague, the Member for Ferryland.

I take great exception, Mr. Speaker, to sitting in this House and listening to the Premier stand in his place and tell us that the Member for Bellevue, the Deputy Chairman of Committees, was not involved in that ruling.

I stood, Mr. Premier, with the Deputy Chairman up in Hansard's room when he, I, and the President of Treasury Board were listening to the tapes. I listened, saw, heard the Deputy Chairman of Committees discuss the tape. I heard the Deputy Chairman of Committees make reference to whose voice was on the tape, taking notes all along, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I did.

I stand here, Mr. Speaker, to tell the truth of what happened. And I can say, without any fear of contradiction, that the Member for Bellevue, the Deputy Chairman of Committees, was indeed involved in the discussion. Can the Member for Bellevue stand in this House, Mr. Speaker, and say he was never in the Speaker's Office? Can the President of Treasury Board say he never discussed anything with the Member for Bellevue regarding what took place?

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber is a place where we debate. This Chamber is a place where we must respect the truth. And there is nobody, no matter what the person thinks of himself or herself, there is nobody in this Chamber who is above the Chair. There is nobody above the rules of the House. Everybody has to show respect to all Members, and honesty is something that has to

always be part of the debate and discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I support the point of principle put forth by my colleague for Ferryland. I think what has happened today is extremely serious. And I sympathize with the position you find yourself in even now, Sir, to know that you have lost the confidence of the House, to know that your own colleagues, with the exception of one, whom I will always admire, stood and voted that nonconfidence in you, Sir.

What has happened here today, Mr. Speaker, is something no Member should take any pride in. The bottom line is that democracy was working, there was a vote taken, the Government lost the vote and, Mr. Speaker, what happened? The Government was not satisfied with that, they placed you in a situation where you have lost the confidence of the House; they have placed their colleagues in the situation where they voted to fire you from that position you hold, all except one of those who were in the House. And the Member for Bellevue, the Deputy Chairman of Committees, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, despite what the Premier says, no matter what the Premier says, the Deputy Chairman was involved. I was with him when he was involved, Mr. Speaker, in what took place in terms of the tapes that were listened to in the Hansard office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, just very briefly. My name was mentioned a couple of times or my position, and I thought I should respond to them.

MR. TOBIN:

You were there with him. You were there with him.

MR. BAKER:

Yes. I did understand from a number of people that there were individuals who had gone upstairs to Hansard to listen to tapes and so on, and I believe the Deputy Chairman of Committees may have indicated that to me. You are right there. I then went upstairs to see. At the time I went upstairs, nobody was there listening to tapes when I went in. I was later informed by somebody else that Members of the Opposition and the press were listening to tapes and so on, and I was very concerned about it because that is against what should happen in this House. We cannot have everybody going and listening to tapes. What we do is we wait until the transcripts are available and then they are distributed. So, that was my concern at that point. I believe another incident was mentioned, about something being taken off my desk by somebody.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible) Barrett.

MR. BAKER:

I had a letter belonging to one of the Executive Assistants. I was out of the House at the time and the Executive Assistant asked the person who was next to him to go in and get it for him, and it happened to be he came in and brought it out to him. The reason I know is that I just came out through the door when the

Executive Assistant was taking the paper, and we had a discussion about what was on the paper and so on, because there was something I was supposed to read. Now, I do not know if that was the incident the hon. Member was referring to. It may have been, or he may have seen something else that I have no knowledge of.

Mr. Speaker, the crux of the point of privilege is that somehow there was some skullduggery going on and somehow I was involved, and the Premier was involved, and the Deputy Chairman of Committees was involved and so on - there was some skullduggery going on. Mr. Speaker, there was no skullduggery going on. The only submission I made to Your Honour this course had to do with standing order 33 which Your Honour has now ruled on - by the way, the ruling went against us. So my submission obviously did not have a very great effect. That is the only submission I know of that I made to Your Honour or any other Honour.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that because allegations have been made back and forth as to comings and goings and I have responded to my part in it, what is happening here is simply a difference of opinion between two hon. Members. Some claim that I did something and I am honestly telling you I did not do something. Mr. Speaker, it is simply a dispute between two hon. Members. There is no point of privilege.

MR. HEARN:  
A very short submission, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:  
I would just say to Your Honour that the point of privilege which I support requested that the Members of the Speaker's office be brought here so that we could hear the truth. Your Honour already knows that we have not heard the truth today from the hon. gentleman who just made a submission, and consequently I suggest to you that the point of privilege which has been raised is a legitimate one and we should adhere to it.

MR. BARRETT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Bellevue.

MR. BARRETT:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise because I am accused in this House today of misconduct. At no time did I discuss the ruling in question with the Premier. A matter of fact, the discussion I had with the Premier was, I think, something on Meech Lake, which I discuss quite often with the Premier. I am a Member of the Caucus and I guess I can come to the common room. But I did not discuss the ruling at any time with the Premier or anybody on this side of the House. Therefore, what they have been saying is ill-founded.

MR. TOBIN:  
What about with the President of Treasury Board?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Bellevue.

MR. BARRETT:  
Mr. Speaker, the President of Treasury Board, one of the



Executive Assistants said there is a letter on -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Sit down! Sit down!

MR. BARRETT:  
The letter was on his desk and the Executive Assistant -

MR. TOBIN:  
I talked to you upstairs. Let us face it.

MR. BARRETT:  
I was up getting information for the Deputy Speaker and the Speaker, as is my right.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You said you were not involved in it.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

On the matter raised by the Member for Ferryland on a point of privilege, the Chair will give it due consideration and report to the House on Monday.

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

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Just one further matter I would like to deal with, and it is the matter of the Chair recognizing the Minister of Municipal Affairs to adjourn the debate on the amendment we were debating. I would ask Your Honour if he would check with the Clerks at the table to see whether or not the Member for Torngat Mountains is not

entitled to continue his speaking time, because the motion that was made during debate, as far as I can gather, was not an amendment it was a motion. If he had made an amendment he would have lost his speaking time, but it was a motion, perfectly legitimate under the rules as ruled by Your Honour. But my understanding is that a Member would not lose his speaking time as a result of that. So I do not want a ruling on it now, but I would like to raise it with Your Honour.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
He did adjourn the debate, but whether he is allowed to is the question, I guess. We would like to ask Your Honour if he would check and give us a ruling on Monday.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, we are agreeable to that, checking the tapes and seeing who (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker, I want to advise Members of the House that the Estimates Committee Meetings on Monday will be at 10:00 a.m. in the House of Assembly. Government Services Committee will be examining the Department of Works, Services and Transportation, and at night, at 7:00 in the Colonial Building, the Social Service Committee will be examining the Department of Health.

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.

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