



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 2

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Monday, 29 April 1985

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. HICKEY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. HICKEY:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of privilege arising out of the weekend issue of The Evening Telegram surrounding a press conference I had respecting the death of Alonzo Corcoran. The reporter who covered the press conference obviously got a very clear message from it. Her account was fairly accurate. She went on in another section of the front page to indicate that I had called a press conference to blame bureaucrats for my being dropped from Cabinet. That is most unkind, unfair, inaccurate, and I am not sure what else, Mr. Speaker. I made no such statement. I went out of my way during that press conference to separate myself and the Premier, whose privilege and prerogative it is to make or break Cabinets, to indicate that there was in no way any connection between the two issues contrary to some rumours which have been prevalent coming to me through phone calls, questions to me by reporters. I do not know how those rumours started. They are insidious, they are unfounded. I really do not know, Mr. Speaker, what the motive is behind them. I want to clear two points, Sir. First of all, I called the press conference out of desperation to clear my name. Any interpretation placed on the account of that press conference indicating that the Director of

Corrections, Mr. Frank Simms, whose name was mentioned, had responsibility directly for the death of that boy is unfounded and false. I at no time said that, indicated that or believed that. In fact, I went out of my way to point out that the gentleman was out of the Province when the tragedy took place. What I did clarify was the fact of some reports and so on, and I was simply confirming and giving credence to what the judge had said in the enquiry. I take nothing back on those things. I did not say, Mr. Speaker, as quoted, that I would kick that gentleman out. I did not use any such term. I said that I had planned, if I stayed in the department, to make sure that the gentleman was not in charge of that programme. That is what I said and only that.

I think it is very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. I cleared the point in terms of my views on being dropped from the Cabinet. I thought that matter was settled. I wish it was settled. The Premier had indicated to me and publicly to reporters that my administration of that department had nothing whatsoever to do with his decision to exclude me from the Cabinet. I do not know if he wants to add anything to that, but certainly, I would appreciate anything that anyone can add to remove this cloud from my head. I administered that department competently, there is plenty evidence to indicate that. I have no responsibility for the death of that boy, I did everything I could and, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bit unfortunate that a reporter could be so irresponsible. I am asking through this hon. House today that that reporter make a complete retraction of her

interpretation. I do not know if it is in her mind, if she dreamt it or whatever else, but it is most unfair and unkind to report falsely on what anybody says. It is a slap in the face to the public service of this Province that a minister would, in fact be so naive or be so devious as to suggest that bureaucrats could have caused his demise or his exclusion from the Cabinet. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that Premiers make Cabinets, that Premiers drop people from Cabinets, and no matter who he might talk to, the ultimate and final decision is his and his alone. I accept that, I have accepted it publicly. I do not know in my wildest dreams how any reporter can suggest that bureaucrats had anything to do with it. I want to disassociate myself with it and I am asking the reporter to make a retraction, an unqualified retraction on the front page with the same prominence that she gave when that statement was made.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I am going to take this matter under advisement to see if there is a prima facie case and will report back to the House later.

ooo

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I have already consulted the official Opposition

about this, but unfortunately the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) was not here at the time.

I move that the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) take the Chair of this hon. House as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

It is moved and seconded that that hon. the member for Terra Nova take the Chair of this House as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. Those in favour, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'nay'.

Carried.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he intends to make a statement to clear the air concerning the newspaper reports and comments that have been made with respect to the absence of the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) from the Cabinet. I would like to say that from my experience in this House, Mr. Speaker, I have seen no incompetence or negligence on the part of the hon. member. I think that he has had a long and honourable career in this House,

and I think that it is unfortunate that there should be any hint that the reason for his absence from Cabinet would be connected with this unfortunate incident at the Whitbourne Boys' Home.

There is, Mr. Speaker, we all know, a concept of ministerial responsibility; however, I think the first item that must be dealt with is clarification, a clearing of the air, and only the Premier can do this with respect to whether the absence of the member for St. John's East Extern has anything to do with the incident at the Boys' Home. I, in fact, do not believe that that is the case.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on the day that I announced the Cabinet I indicated at that press conference - obviously the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) intelligence is not all that good on that press conference - clearly how I felt about the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey). I indicated the long service that he had provided to this hon. House and also to the Cabinet. At no time did I indicate that it had anything to do with competency or incompetency or the like. He has performed his duties well in the various responsibilities that he held while a member of Cabinet as Minister of Social Services and in other portfolios. So the matter was clear right from day one from myself, Mr. Speaker, so I can only reiterate what I said on that day last week when I announced the Cabinet.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

In light of the report which has come from the judicial enquiry and the comments of the judge in that enquiry, and in light of certain statements by the former minister of that department with respect to the appropriateness of having certain individuals in that department in charge of the Whitbourne Boys' Home, does the Premier intend to have any investigation carried out with respect to the effectiveness of the existing bureaucratic structure in the Department of Social Services?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, once again I think the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) has indicated publicly on a number of occasions over the last number of days that the report is presently under study by the government and that we will be making a full statement as to government's position on the report as soon as we can. We will be making a statement on the report whether in fact anything should be done or nothing should be done or whatever. After we have fully assessed the report, the minister then will be taking appropriate steps and we will be informing this hon. House accordingly.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Would the Premier indicate that he regards a response to this report as a matter of some urgency so that it would, we suggest, be appropriate to have a quicker response than sometimes occurs with respect to the normal process of having reports filed and then a response from the department? We now have a situation where there is a cloud hanging over the head of the former minister, there is a cloud hanging over the head of officials in that department, and I would submit to the Premier that it is something that should require direction from him that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) move with every haste to prepare a report to Cabinet and to have a ministerial response to that report. Would the Premier give an undertaking to this House that all due haste will be involved in that review of the report?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that has been done. The day that the report came out the Minister of Social Services and I were in communication and it has been done with all haste. Obviously, I just assumed that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) recognized that we also recognize that it is a very important matter and it is being expedited with all due haste, as quickly as is possible. So in the next few days we will be able to do that. From the day that the report was released the minister has been on top of it. I have been talking to him and we will be moving as fast as is humanly possible on it. It will not be handled in the normal process of government.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

My question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn). Could the new Minister of Education report to this House the status of negotiations with the NTA? Could he also report what contingency plan does the government have in case services are withdrawn by teachers in the Province, whether it will be work to rule or the dropping of extra-curricular activities? Could the minister inform us what contingency plans the government has to make sure that the students will not lose a full year as a result of poor labour relations between the government and the NTA?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, on the second part first, I do not think it would be appropriate to try to answer a hypothetical question, which the second part certainly was, at this stage.

On the first part, we are assessing the proposals right now that both sides have brought forth in recent weeks and very shortly I am sure we will be saying much more about that.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Could the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) inform the House if the government is going back to the negotiating table with the NTA? Also, there is a feeling in this Province because of the involvement of the teachers the NTA union, in the election that there is a vindictiveness on the part of this government, a wish to punish the teachers because of the high political profile they ended up taking in the election. As a result of the lockout in 1982 the government saved approximately \$25 million on the deficit. Seeing our deficit is now \$70 million, because of the high profile the teachers had in the election, is there any vindictiveness on government's part? Will the Minister of Education ensure the NTA that he will fight on their behalf? Will he make sure that the government itself will not use the teachers, and not only the teachers but particularly the students, and make sure that in trying to get at the teachers themselves, the government will not end up punishing the students to balance the books of this government?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should realize that there is no vindictiveness on behalf of either the minister or the government, there never was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

And certainly if we are going to be assessing the present situation, we are fully aware, maybe much more fully aware than the member, of the atmosphere as

it exists out there. I have been very, very close to the situation during the past three years, and certainly before that, as a teacher myself. Consequently we are assessing the situation very, very carefully and hope that in the near future we will be making very positive moves.

MR. HISCOCK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the students in this Province there is a great feeling of anxiety because of the maintenance strikes throughout the Province and on the Avalon Peninsula. The students themselves are extremely concerned about being close now to the end of the academic year. Can the minister state to this House and state to this Province unequivocally that there will be no NTA strike this year? Will the government itself do everything it can, everything in its power to make sure that negotiations are renewed in good faith, and that the students themselves will be reassured that they will not end up losing a year as a result of the bad political climate in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman mentioned the political climate in the Province. Hopefully there is a very good political climate. At least the people of Newfoundland thought they had created a good political climate by putting thirty-six of us back over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

However, I would like to assure the hon. gentleman that once again we will be assessing the situation as it relates not only to the teaching negotiations, but also the relationship with school boards, the disputes that are presently ongoing, etc. We realize that the people who are most concerned at this stage are the students in the schools. We are very concerned about that, especially this time of year. And whatever has to be done in due time will be done hopefully without any adverse affect to the people concerned, and not only the students, because we are also very concerned about the teachers, the parents who are very anxious at this time, and certainly ourselves. We want to put a package together that hopefully will make everybody happy even, including the gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and it concerns a couple of newspaper articles which mentions Dr. Morgantaler seeking permission to operate in the Province. Can the minister tell the House, Mr. Speaker, if he has received an application from Dr. Morgantaler and, if he has, what has been his response to it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Yes. At forty-five minutes to noon on Friday, April 26 of this year, I received a letter over the signature of Dr. Morgantaler. To summarize the letter, he requested that I and my department give him permission to establish a free-standing abortion clinic on the Island of Newfoundland. Number two, that this free-standing abortion clinic would have in place an abortion committee, which according to the law of Canada must be at least prepositioned. And last, he asked me that the services of the physician who will perform the abortions in that clinic be covered by MCP.

He made a few other statements, including that I might send a commission or a delegation to view the abortions done in any of these free-standing clinics in the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and Quebec. He asked for my approval. I gave considerable thought, as you would, to his request. I discussed it with senior members of the Department of Health; I also had members of the Department of Health discuss it with the Department of Justice. I have penned my letter to Dr. Morgantaler and I have told him that I have not approved his request. I have not approved his request because I feel that Sections 251 and 252 of the Criminal Code of Canada covered the requirements of the law of Canada.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). In light of statements made by one of the key people involved in the Morgantaler support groups, and I quote, "We intend to set up in the Province of Newfoundland whether or not we get permission", if that group, Mr. Speaker, decides to take that route, will the Minister of Justice give the House an undertaking that Sections 251 and 252 of the Criminal Code will be enforced to the letter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have no intentions of dealing with hypothetical questions.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries. Over the weekend I was fortunate enough to be in Port de Grave to talk with a number of people there concerning an extremely serious situation that has arisen over the last number of months. It concerns the entire crab industry in the Port de Grave area where over the last number of months there has been a series of foreclosures on the crab boats to the point now where there is a serious question whether there are enough boats left to be able to prosecute the fishery accurately and whether or not there will be enough supply for the plant itself. I understand the minister has had some meetings this morning

on the issue itself. I wonder if he can apprise the House of what the situation is at this point?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to tell the House that I met just before the House began the session this afternoon with a delegation from Port de Grave and the MHA for that district. I have had my officials in the department working on the problem, particularly as it relates to repossessions of loans that are under bank guarantee. I am very pleased to be able to tell the hon. gentleman and the House that we have reached a temporary solution with the bank concerned in that the repossession that was due at twelve o'clock tomorrow night has been delayed at my request to give us time to hopefully put together a solution that will be more permanent.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. CN Marine has made numerous cuts in service to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to allegedly reduce the cost of CN Marine. Many of these changes are unfair and discriminatory and show a complete lack of understanding of the people affected. Originally CN Marine proposed dropping Ramea, Gaultois, Hermitage, English Harbour West, Belleoram, Pool's Cove and Little Bay East from their coastal service. Now CN Marine has decided against not dropping Ramea and Gaultois but has not reinstated Hermitage,

which is vitally important also to the people who live in MacCallum, Franchois and Grey River. Has the minister made any representative to his federal counterpart in Ottawa and what were the results?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, some time ago we made an arrangement with the federal government whereby we would be actively involved in decisions and perhaps have an opportunity to discuss decisions that had an adverse effect on this Province relative to not only CN Marine but also TerraTransport and other federal transport matters that occur in this Province. I would like to assure the hon. gentleman that had we not intervened in that process some time ago the cutbacks envisaged would have been much more severe than they are today.

In relation to the ones most recently announced, we have, through our officials and through a working committee between Transport Canada and the Department of Transportation, voiced our concerns and subsequently a number of the ports were put back on the schedule and hopefully over the next number of weeks we may be successful in re-establishing the Hermitage run. If that is possible, everything that we can do to influence that decision will be done.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo..

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). I want first of all to wish him well in his new portfolio, and this is my first opportunity to do so. My question to him is concerning Mr. Fraser's statement, the federal Minister of Fisheries, that he intends to meet his provincial colleagues in the near future to develop a strategy for the restoration of the Canadian Atlantic salmon resource. Has the federal minister contacted the provincial minister? Just what positions can we expect from the provincial minister, if indeed he has been contacted about that conference or convention, whatever it is? What positions can we expect from him on behalf of the provincial government? Mr. Speaker, I ask him that question because this year we have a proposal from the federal minister to buy back the licences of part-time commercial fishermen in the Province. I would also like to ask him, perhaps as part of his answer, does he agree with that proposal? If so, perhaps he could explain to the House why he does.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me thank the hon. gentleman for his kind words. I look forward to shadow-boxing with him over the next little while. I thank him very sincerely for his remarks.

We have been in contact with the federal minister and it is my understanding that there is a meeting scheduled in Ottawa on May 22 between the federal minister and his Atlantic counterparts to discuss in more detail the Salmon Policy Management Plan that he

announced a few days ago. With regard to the other part of the question, how do I feel about the management plan that was proposed by the federal minister, Mr. Speaker, just let me say that I suppose if I had my own way and were able to influence things the way that I want them, I would try to bring about some changes in the plan as it was announced. But having said that, I think we must also remember, Mr. Speaker, that the salmon resource in Atlantic Canada faces some very serious problems and some very hard and difficult decisions have to be made. While we might not like and agree with all of the proposals that are contained in the management plan for 1985, we are of the opinion that something had to be done. Our first concern as a department, of course, and as a government will be to try to minimize any effect on full-time fishermen, people who are earning their living in a full-time manner from the fishery. The latest initiative affects people of a part-time nature and there has been a generous buy-back plan announced and, while we would like to discuss it before it becomes final if that is possible, we must realize also that the first concern of the Fishermen's Union and the Department of Fisheries provincially is with full-time fishermen. We will have to address their concerns first and then try to be as fair as we can to those people who were earning part of their living from the salmon fishery. So that in a very cursory way, not having had a chance to be on top of this very long, is sort of the way we feel about it right now.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the minister had indicated that he agrees and he does not agree, and there are certain changes, he says, that he would like to bring about in that salmon management plan. I wonder if, as part of the supplementary answer, he could tell us what changes he would like to bring about in that plan? I would also like to ask him is he aware of the fact that the United States has also asked Canada to stop catching some of the fish that they say is United States fish which we are now intercepting before they reach certain rivers? I would like to ask him is he going to agree with the federal minister that that may have to be the case as well and what effect that will have on the Newfoundland commercial salmon fishery as well as the Newfoundland sports fishery? What representation will he be making to the federal minister in that regard? First of all, Mr. Speaker, could we have the changes that he would like to see in this year's salmon management plan? Then he could explain how it relates to the United States request?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously if you look at the situation in Newfoundland, Newfoundland came out of this management plan announcement in a much stronger position than did other Atlantic provinces. And that is as it should be because most of the catch that is caught in Newfoundland can legitimately be said to be salmon returning to

Newfoundland rivers to spawn. When I indicate that perhaps there might be some grounds for some changes, there are certain part-time fishermen who derive a fair amount of their part-time income from salmon fishing. There may be other who are perhaps over the age of retirement or just getting the salmon to eat or something of that nature who would not be as seriously affected by this buy-back programme as are some other people. So there are perhaps some variations within the management plan that we could discuss and I intend to do that. On the matter of the US proposal, I am aware that the United States government have made representation to the Government of Canada. Their basic premise is that the Fall salmon fishery in Newfoundland is a concern of theirs because a lot of those salmon migrate back to US rivers. That is still in the discussion stage, as I understand it, between the Canadian government and the American government. No decision has been taken that I am aware of, but again it is a matter that I will ensure will be on the agenda when we meet with Mr. Fraser and the rest of our Atlantic colleagues on 22 May.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas):
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, the federal minister, Mr. Fraser, in his statement seems to be totally concerned about conservation. Yet his department, this year in the salmon sports fishery, will be allowing fishermen to catch as many fish as they want up to the point where they decide to keep two. It seem

to me that the minister coming from outport Newfoundland, and the minister probably being a salmon fisherman himself, I do not know, probably knows as well as I do that -

MR. BARRY:
He is not a very good one.

MR. TULK:
Well, he may or may not be - probably knows as well as anybody else that once you play out a salmon and once you bring it ashore it is very little likelihood of its survival, yet the minister is allowing people to go in and catch as many fish as they want until the fishermen decide which two to keep. Does the minister agree with that concept of the federal Fisheries Minister?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all just because the hon. gentleman says something that is true does not necessarily make it true. And the fact of the matter is that, yes, I have fished salmon legally and I enjoy it. The expert advice does not go along with what the hon. gentleman is saying nor does my own experience go along with what he is saying. The fact of the matter is that there is a very low mortality rate on salmon that are played with a rod compared to the salmon that are caught in the commercial nets. So the hon. gentleman is wrong in his premise, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know what else can be said about it. Like I said, not because he says something is true it is a fact.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I recognize that if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) catches a salmon he catches them legally. My final supplementary to the minister is this. Last year we saw a reduction in the salmon fishing season for commercial fishermen, there was a voluntary buy-back, and this year there is a mandatory buy-back from part-time fishermen, yet the federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Fraser) is allowing a two week extension - I think the minister will agree that that is probably going to be the case - on the sports salmon fishery. Nobody is certain yet whether it is going to be one week at the beginning and one at the end, or two at the end, or two at the beginning. Mr. Speaker, we on this side are not against conservation, but it seems to me that what we are leaning towards here is a total ban on the commercial salmon fishery for fishermen and yet we are allowing the sports fishery to blossom. Does the minister agree with that statement and, if so, what will he do about it?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, Mr. Speaker, the minister does not agree with that statement. I think the evidence has been such, over the last few years anyway, that both levels of government, in all of the provinces and in Ottawa, are very concerned and are trying to make every effort to ensure that there is a resource there, that it is protected and that it will have an opportunity

to grow and prosper so it can be expanded. The facts do not indicate the premise of the hon. gentleman's question. Recreational salmon fishing has some pluses to it as well as some minuses, that is an area we will be discussing, but certainly his premise that the commercial salmon fishery seems to be up for grabs at the mercy of the recreational fishery is not so and the facts just do not bear it out.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) but he has wandered off somewhere, I think, so in his place I will put the question to the hon. the Premier.

This question relates to the E.P.A. situation in Gander and the E.P.A. move from Gander. At the present time there are a number of rumblings about the situation not being as it should be and so on, and because of this I would ask the Premier if he would please table in this House copies of all agreements between the Province and Eastern Provincial Airways relating to any moneys or guarantees given by the Government of the Province to Eastern Provincial Airways.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No problem, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if the hon. member is aware that all of the guarantees and agreements between E.P.A. and the

Government of Newfoundland have expired and for some time ago, so there are no existing agreements that the hon. member could get his hands on which he could use as a lever against E.P.A. in the moves that they have made at Gander. This whole matter was assessed when the move occurred and all of the agreements and guarantees - financial levers - and so on, and other guarantees that were in place, or agreements between the Government of Newfoundland and E.P.A. have expired. There was one non-binding legal agreement where the Chairman then, I guess, the Chief Executive Officer or President of E.P.A., Mr. Steele, I think had written the Minister of Transportation in the Fall of that previous year and indicated that they would do nothing until we had been consulted and they would show us the studies which proved that they had to move from Gander to Halifax. That agreement was broken by E.P.A. and the President and C.E.O. because they did not consult with us and never did provide us with the studies which we requested and which they had promised in writing to give us.

Over the next while we will have to get together those agreements. There is no problem with tabling them. There were a whole series of agreements going back to the Smallwood administration and through the Moores administration, all of which have expired as of now.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
The hon. the Premier stated that there is nothing now current and

so on between E.P.A. or C.P. Air and the provincial government relating to loan guarantees and so on. My supplementary question is, Sir, what amounts of money were actually repaid to the Newfoundland Government in light of any loans or moneys that had been given to E.P.A. in the past by these previous administrations? What amounts were actually paid back to the provincial government and under what circumstances?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
This has been checked out through Justice and so on, and all the agreement were kept and the money paid back. But I will have to get the information for the hon. gentleman as to the exact amount under each agreement and under each guarantee. I will get that information over the next while or see that the information is provided to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Eleventh Annual Report of The Newfoundland Liquor Corporation for the year ending 31 March 1984.

Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of interim supply to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977", and, Mr. Speaker, I give further notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Collective Bargaining) Act, 1973".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by approximately 561 people from various parts of the Province. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is pretty consistent. It is protesting the high cost of hydro rates in the Province. I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, to support this petition. At the same time I want to congratulate the New Lab group - the ladies from Flatrock - for the initiatives taken by them in the

past few months on behalf of people in the Province who are obviously, Mr. Speaker, hurting very badly from the high cost of electricity rates.

I, Mr. Speaker, am not satisfied that the government has done all it can to correct this situation. I think the solution offered, for example, by the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Dinn) that the electricity rates be spread over a twelve month period or at least over a longer period is not worthy of the gentleman involved. In my view is not much better than an insult to the intelligence of the Newfoundland people who are hurting so badly because of the high cost of electricity rates.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious, I think every member of this House and certainly every Newfoundlander that owns a home or is responsible for a house realizes very well that something must be done to put an end to the escalating cost of electricity in this Province. It is getting to a point now, Mr. Speaker - and I came up against this in an election campaign which just ended - where young couples have to make a decision whether they will pay the light bill this month or buy food in sufficient quantities for their family. I think that is a very serious matter. Young families today, Mr. Speaker, are unable to buy the things that they need for their children and themselves because of the high cost of electricity, or at least one of the reasons being the very high cost of power rates in this Province.

I think the government has been derelict in its responsible. I think more could have been done and should have been done. And I

repeat the solution offered by the gentleman opposite, I believe it was the Minister of Energy (Mr. Dinn) or it might have been the minister at that time, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), to spread the electricity rates over an extended period is simply a case of trying to blindfold the devil in the dark. It is taking the old ostrich approach - sticking their heads in the sand while the people of Newfoundland are sweating it out trying to make ends meet and get enough food for their tables with which to feed their families. Meanwhile, the power company rates have been escalating to a point where in many cases it boils down to a decision whether the families involved will pay the light bill - and they dare not because if they do not pay it their lights are cut off - or whether they will be able to buy sufficient food for their families.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition, Sir. I support it wholeheartedly. I think something must be done. I repeat the action taken to date by the present government is certainly not adequate. In fact, to suggest that it is all right to pay these rates, but over a longer period, in my view, is insulting and does nothing at all to help alleviate what in this Province has become a very serious and a very critical problem.

Mr. Speaker, I again support the petition and beg leave to present it and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! A point of order

has been raised.

MR. J. CARTER:
Is the prayer of the petition applicable to this House?

MR. W. CARTER:
The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. "We, the undersigned, people of the community of Baine Harbour, do protest the increase in electricity rates and give our support to the committee acting in this regard."

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, that matter is now being taken care of.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members in this House can support that petition. We will be interested in hearing from the minister responsible for electricity, whichever minister that might be. Is it Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) or is it still the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Marshall)?

AN HON. MEMBER:
It is really immaterial.

MR. BARRY:
There has been so many Cabinet shuffles, it is pretty hard to find out. We know that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is all powerful. We assume that he has still been kept on this onerous task. We think it is about time we had a full-time minister involved with the matter of electricity. I think that the consumers in this Province are concerned enough. I think we have seen enough hardship caused over the past Winter and indeed in

previous years by the ever escalating cost of electricity that we do want to make sure that the minister from St. John's East is not overburdened with the heavy burdens that he has been carrying. We would like to hear whether he feels he still has the energy and the enthusiasm to give this particular aspect of his non-portfolio the attention which it deserves.

We, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, agree with government on one point and that is that in the long term the only way we are going to see stable cost power is by having an intertie or an interconnection from the Labrador portion of the Province to the Island. We are pleased to see the statement by government that there apparently is a new initiative forthcoming for negotiations with the Government of Quebec. We would ask the Premier and we would ask the minister not to wait too long. We understand that there is a deadline. The clock is ticking. There is a deadline on when we have to take another decision in this Province as to our next source of electricity. Holyrood is going to be at capacity pretty soon. Cat Arm, the Upper Salmon, Bay d'Espoir and other hydro sites will be going flat out and will not be able to meet the need. I would hope that we will within the time we have to make that decision, see some negotiated arrangement so that we can foresee by 1990 Labrador power being available, not just in Labrador, but in other parts of the Province where it will be necessary to have hydro electric power if we are going to keep our electricity rates down.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the ladies from Flatrock, the New Lab

Action Committee and others, I believe in the course of the debate over the last several months made it clear that there are very serious concerns with respect to a lack of confidence in the Public Utilities Board. There was a commitment to have a consumer representative for that board. I have not seen anything in the course of the election. I might have missed it. But I do not believe there has been any action taken on that front yet. We would ask the minister when will we see the consumer representative being appointed to the Public Utilities Board? We would like to ask the minister whether they have again given any thought to possibly have an enquiry into all aspects of the generation and distribution of electricity, an enquiry that would involve members of the general public. We would support such an enquiry. We think it would go a long way to assuring the general public, the ordinary man and woman in Newfoundland, that everything that can possibly be done, will be done in order to make sure, until we get power from Labrador, that the costs to the consumer in this Provinces are kept down.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I can say, first of all, that the government is just as concerned as any other citizen in this Province and the hon. gentlemen there opposite, with respect to the cost of electricity rates in this Province. I say it is very easy to get up in this House and present a petition and just heap criticism but I did not hear any realistic solutions emanating from the other side.

This minister has had just as much trouble really as his predecessor has in trying to wrestle and keep electrical rates down but the only difference is that I kept at it and I will continue to keep at it. Hopefully, we can come up with some solution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the high electricity rates in this Province, there are several points to be made. The high electricity rates, first of all, are not electricity rates as such. They relate to the high cost of oil. Unfortunately this Winter it was very, very difficult because we had the very low run off as a result of the mild Summer last year. There was not as much hydro power as before. We had that aggravated by the type of Winter that we have gone through.

As far as the solution is concerned -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Are we subsidizing rates now?

MR. MARSHALL:

As the Premier points out, we are subsidizing rates. That is a solution that some people proposed from time to time - more money should be put in. But we are already subsidizing in this Province to the tune of \$25 million a year for electricity rates through the power distribution district. So the fact of the matter is the money has to come from somewhere when you pay for electricity. It either comes from taxes, or it has to come from the consumer. We have struck a balance whereby \$25 million from the general revenue of this Province goes towards electrical rates and with the state of the economy in this Province this is as much as we can

afford. It comes from the pocket of the people anyway. So wherever it comes from it must come from the pockets of the people.

Because of the aggravated Winter last year, we took a measure which we thought would ease the immediate burden and spread the cost over a period of time. We believe that was a good decision despite what the hon. gentlemen there opposite say, with respect to a short-term solution, although it is certainly not a long-term solution.

With respect to the long-term solution, this has already been identified and realized. If hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to stand up and really respond to this in an appropriate manner, in a direct manner, and really in an intellectually honest manner, what they would be required to do when they got up and spoke would be to realize that the long-term solution has to be through hydro generation because what is putting the rates up is not the electricity generation but it is the oil that is used to generate it.

We are working on that, as the Throne Speech indicated. There is a glimmer of light, anyway, that we are exploring. We hope to bring this about. I mean to me it is a matter of great concern to everyone. I think we have to muse over the past few years that the reason why the people of this Province find themselves in the position today, and particularly over this Winter when the cost of electricity was aggravated by the weather conditions and other factors that I have mentioned, is that had we been able to get and to secure, and had we not given away the Upper Churchill way, way

back, we would have been able to enjoy electricity rates -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If we had a deal on water like we had on oil we would not be in this situation today.

MR. MARSHALL:

If we had a deal on water like we have got on oil, but the hon. gentlemen there opposite better not hold their breath because we are going to investigate that as well. But the fact of the matter is, with respect to the way in which the whole hydro policy of this Province has been handled over the years we would today be enjoying electrical rates incommensurately less than what we have had to pay today. What we are trying to do is to secure those rights so that we can assure to the people of this Province at least a stable rate of electricity which does not have to depend upon the vagaries of the oil market.

So that is the response I am making to the petition. I say that the hon. gentlemen there opposite are not alone in their concern with respect to the matter but as far as the government is concerned as opposed to the hon. gentlemen there opposite, instead of heaping criticism what we are trying to do is to determine a solution.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I rise to present a petition that is similar to the one that has previously been presented. The prayer is slightly different.

It says, "We, the concerned citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador, do hereby petition the

Premier, Cabinet and members of the House of Assembly to reduce the high electricity rates presently being charged and to eliminate the demand rate charged by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited."

I would like to speak to it for a few minutes. The way I read the prayer is it is asking for action on the part of the provincial government in order to do something to lower the electricity rates. At the risk of alienating everybody I know and hold dear to me for the rest of my life I have to say, to a certain degree, I agree with the last speaker, the minister who is responsible for electricity, that it is not just a case of subsidizing the rates. It is not just a case of just saying that the money should be put behind people who have high electricity rates because, in essence, all we are doing is we are taxing others or borrowing the money and it is really just transferring the problem from one group of individuals with high electricity rates to another.

I would, however, like to portion a bit more blame on the present administration and previous PC administrations back to the middle 1970s for not having pursued any kind of constructive programme in order to get Labrador power onstream. It seems to me that what we have had is the whole Labrador power situation turned into a political football. We have had an almost irresponsible insistence in the past that Quebec Hydro rip up the power contract that it signed back in the 1960s and then start afresh. I think it is refreshing to see in the Throne Speech that a slightly different tack is being taken now. The contract must be admitted. It is

there. It has stood the test of time. We are not in a position, where we should have been about eight or ten years ago, to negotiate with the Province of Quebec in order to get things done. I think there is a significant amount of blame there. The people who are paying these high electricity rates should know that we are now paying for the political football that has been kicked around for the last six or seven years by this administration.

That is a sterile approach to take at this point so I want to go on to some of the more positive aspects that I think should be emphasized in achieving what is being asked for in this petition. I think there are a number of things that can be done in the short-term by this administration. I think it was accurately pointed out it is not the cost of electricity that is the problem. It is the cost of oil because the electricity that is really nailing us is made by oil. Therefore, we should try to reduce the amount of electricity consumed so as to turn off most of the oil-generated electricity we have which this Winter has been the main source of the problem. I think we have a number of available sources that we can turn to, more specifically wood. We have a tremendous amount of hardwood in this Province that can be used to heat homes and if we could find some meaningful programme to encourage people to switch to wood usage I think that would help. I think we need something like the old federal programme (COSP) - the Canadian Oil Substitution Programme - and the CHIP programme, but in this case directed towards reducing the consumption of electricity. I

think we should look seriously at encouraging people to reinsulate homes that are currently burning electricity in order to be in a position to burn less electricity in the future because I think that that is where our major problem lies. At the same time there are a lot of very small scale hydro electric possibilities and other ways of generating electricity in this Province that could be accessed where private individuals could put sources on line if they could sell the electricity to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro or to Newfoundland Light and Power, either one. Currently, as I understand it in this Province, that would be illegal. There is no law demanding that the power utility buy this electricity as there is in the United States and as there is in Prince Edward Island.

Finally, the last thing I would like to support being put forward by this group is the request that we have an enquiry into what has been done. I, along with many other people, have heard rumours about mismanagement in Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. We have heard rumours about contracts for buying oil at very high rates. I and a lot of other people would like to have some answers to that. So I think that the petition is well worth supporting and I think there are a number of things the provincial government should do. I would like to see them make some positive moves other than a subsidy programme which I think would be wrong.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition presented by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) but I was rather surprised when the member said that he agreed with the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and stated that basically you cannot transfer the bill from one group in society to other groups, that the bill needs to be paid. The end result, Mr. Speaker, - and coming from the NDP I am rather surprised - the end result is that there are people in our society who cannot afford to pay bills. There are people on social assistance. There is also the working poor. Those are the groups of people in society that need government help in subsidization. I was reading the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation report: Eighty million dollars worth of sales last year. The profit going to this Province is unbelievable. Maybe that is one of the ways that we can subsidize the working poor and subsidize those who need help until we finally have more water so that we do not have to have oil-generated power. As I said, if we spread it over the society as a whole, a couple of cents on each of the spirits and beer in this Province could be a solution, Mr. Speaker.

There are groups in society that do need help and, as I said, I was a bit surprised by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) saying that you should not transfer the bill to another. You should, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reason why government is there in the first place, to help those who need help.

The other thing I would point out, Mr. Speaker, long before this became a critical problem on the Island part of Province with fuel adjustments added on, Labrador and other rural areas of our Province have been paying the highest kinds of electricity rates all along because of diesel powered generating plants that are using diesel fuel to generate electricity. Of course, what the government, which sets the rules for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, says is the more electricity you consume under diesel power the higher your bill is. So people in Ramea, Fogo, St. Brendan's, on the South Coast, and along all of the Labrador Coast, Mr. Speaker, have been paying extremely high electricity rates in the past and they doublely pay because now, with this fuel adjustment that is being charged on Holyrood, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro ended up saying you are not only paying for the increase of electricity, what you are actually paying now, Mr. Speaker, is the extra cost of oil. They have now added that onto the diesel fuel also in Labrador so they are not only paying twice, as the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) said, they are now paying three times the amount that needs to be paid. That has to be addressed, Mr. Speaker. We should have one rate of electricity in this Province.

Now that I am talking on electricity and supporting the petition, I agree, and I think everybody agrees, there should be an enquiry into the cost of electricity and into how Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro is run. There should be a consumer on the Public Utilities Board and I cannot think or recommend anybody better for the position

than the former member of the House of Assembly for LaPoile, Mr. Neary. I recommend him for that position.

Getting back to Labrador, Mr. Speaker, we still have in this Province communities like Norman Bay and Pinsent Arm that are without electricity. We can blame it on the Upper Churchill contract or we can blame Mr. Moores for nationalizing Churchill Falls in the first place, but the fact remains these communities do not have electricity or the other basic amenities of life. Students still have to study by oil lamp, women still have to wash clothes on a scrubbing board, they have no refrigerators to keep frozen foods and all of that contributes for them to the high cost of living. That does not seem to daunt the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall). Maybe it is due to the fact that the Minister of Energy comes from a background that is not used to the working poor, not used to having to struggle for a living, wondering where the next pay cheque is coming from. Maybe that is why he does not identify with the problems here and maybe that is why the solution was to spread the electricity bill over twelve months - like Marie Antoinette saying, 'Let them eat cake.'

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition. I have to say that Norman Bay and Pinsent Arm do need electricity. There should be one rate for electricity in this Province and, as for subsidization, I would say to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) as well as to the Minister of Energy, yes, we subsidize it for \$25 million now, but there are still other people out there who require subsidizing, Mr. Speaker.

As well, it was not good enough for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), as he did in the election, to tell the social workers to tell people to sign over their child tax credit to the department.

Mr. Speaker, we should not go back into the past, we must look to the future. The Smallwood years are over, the Moores years are over and we are now into the post-Atlantic Accord era. We would hope the Minister of Energy will enter into that era and make sure that some of the wealth trickles down to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador in the near future, that they do not have to wait until the year 1990 or 2000.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would be very surprised at what this hon. gentleman is used to. One can become acclimatized to anything, and listening to speeches such as the hon. gentleman just made in supporting this petition would try anyone's patience.

Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for the hon. gentleman there opposite and the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to talk about simplistic solutions to this problem. There are no simplistic solutions to this problem. Whether the hon. gentleman likes it or not, the root of the problem can be traced to that particular contract because, having given away the Upper Churchill resources

to the Province of Quebec, it has become incommensurately difficult for us to negotiate with Quebec on any other basis. It has become virtually impossible. And, while the hon. gentleman might like to see the Upper Churchill contract disappear, as I am sure all Newfoundlanders would, and its effect, I am afraid it will not, and anyone carrying on any negotiations whatsoever with the Province of Quebec in relation to this would fully and completely realize it. It is too bad that we did not attack that problem at the time in the same way that we have attacked the offshore problem, because we would have had a much more ready means to have a resolution of the situation at the present time.

MR. HISCOCK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, two petitions have been presented and residents of this Province are asking for solutions, they are not asking for history lessons, they are not asking to go back into the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

I would hope when the minister addresses the prayer of the petition he will support it. We can talk about nationalization of the Upper Churchill by Mr. Moores or whatever, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province are finding it extremely difficult to meet their electricity bills and they do not want a lecture on history, they

want solutions, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Whether the hon. gentleman likes it or not, history, what happened in the past, has an effect on the present.

Now, although the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) proposed very simplistic solutions, he was much more sensible, I would submit, than the hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). It is very easy to make such simplistic statements as 'We are now in a position to negotiate with Quebec and we ought to have done so ages ago.' The hon. gentleman should know, again from history, from what has transpired, that, unfortunately, before now Quebec did not want to negotiate. All Quebec wanted was a regurgitation of the Upper Churchill contract, which we could not, would not, and will never agree with. His simplistic solutions about switching to wood and the chip process, if the hon. gentleman would consider the efforts made by this government in this area they have been considerable. We have the Gander hospital, we have Newfoundland Hardwoods in Clarendville and we have other projects underway which are utilizing the chip programme, and certainly we will do all that we can within our resources to try to support that particular programme. The same applies to the reinsulation of houses. The small hydro projects, I do not know where those small hydro projects are. We are told that

most of the projects, on the Island of Newfoundland anyway, that can be tapped for an environmental purpose have already been tapped.

The thing that we have to do in order to get hydro power with its dependable, constant price, is to attempt to get access to the Lower and Upper Churchill. And I say to the hon. gentleman, it is easy to talk about mismanagement in Hydro, but you cannot conduct inquiries on every single rumour. I mean, if we conducted an inquiry on every single rumour that we hear, the entire budget would be diverted to the expenses of inquiries. With respect to Hydro, we have made it subject to the Public Utilities Board, we have indicated that we are going to appoint a consumer representative on the Public Utilities Board, we have provided access to the Newfoundland Federation of Municipalities to be effective in their representations to this board, to be able to dissect and analyze all of the management of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. So you just cannot get up and make statements that there are rumours of mismanagement. If anyone can present concrete facts that there has been mismanagement in Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, except, you know, for political statements made by the hon. gentleman, if you are not playing politics, if anyone can show that there has been direct mismanagement by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, this government and this minister would be very interested to hear about it and we would certainly look into it.

So, as I say, with respect to this petition and the other, Mr. Speaker, we are just as concerned about hydro rates as anyone in

this Province. The solution is not simple. We are bound, really, by the mistakes of history, because what happened in the past affects us in the present. We are trying to unravel the present situation respecting hydro power in this Province. It is going to be harder than the offshore agreement because we have to unravel mistakes that have already been made, but I have no doubt that we will in the long run be successful in that and we will make every effort to see to see if it can be brought about.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the House of Assembly assembled, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of sixty people in the community of McCallum.

The prayer of the petition reads as follows: "We, the undersigned people of McCallum, protest a proposed schedule by CN for the South Coast. If this proposal goes into effect it will be devastating to our community as far as transportation is concerned. We have no ferry service here and our main link to the road is by CN boat to Hermitage. The fact is, Hermitage is our only link. For the community of McCallum, all our doctor and dental services are in Hermitage, which is twelve miles from McCallum, about one hour on the CN boat. Harbour Breton, which is the port that we would have to disembark at, is about thirty miles, three hours travelling, from McCallum. It

does not make sense to us for CN to pass Hermitage with passengers who will need to get off at Hermitage. If a person has to see a doctor in Hermitage, he will have to go to Harbour Breton by CN boat, travel back to Hermitage by taxi costing approximately \$50, and then go back to Harbour Breton by taxi, costing another \$50 plus a motel bill before catching the boat back. Our doctor for this community is in Hermitage and anyone here has to be referred by the doctor before seeing another. Therefore we think, in fact we request that you should change your proposed schedule to include Hermitage as a port of call."

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a petition about roads, really, and I think all the people in Newfoundland are entitled, constitutionally, to roads. CN Marine provides this service on the South Coast of Newfoundland for the communities of McCallum, Francois and Grey River. Two years ago CN tried to implement the same schedule but the then government in Ottawa saw the suffering that was going to be caused to the people of those communities had the thing been put in force.

MR. TULK:

Was that a Liberal government?

MR. GILBERT:

I believe it was, yes. With that in mind, they had some moves made to get the schedule changed and it was made acceptable to the people concerned. And in view of the human suffering and the economic loss that is going to be suffered by the people in the affected communities, I support this petition and ask that the petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the

department concerned.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in support of this petition on behalf of the people in the community of McCallum. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, this is not the only community nor is it only the South Coast that is going to suffer because of the CN cutbacks. We have the same problem in Labrador where CN cutbacks are planned. What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that we are seeing the federal Minister of Transportation (Mr. Mazankowski) reinstating railway routes, VIA Rail routes, in mainland Canada. I was just out to Alberta there last weekend, Mr. Speaker, they are reinstating a branch line up through Jasper. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we have not seen reinstatement of some of these runs by CN boats that are being cut back? Is it possibly because we have a government that has been bending over backwards to avoid putting any pressure on the Government of Canada? Is it because members opposite have had their silence purchased as a condition of getting the Atlantic Accord, Mr. Speaker? In addition to the condition that they not have oil and gas refined in Newfoundland and Labrador, was another condition that they be silent as people in our rural communities have their transportation services cut back by the actions of that federal government? I ask members

opposite to get up on their feet and support this petition. I ask the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), who should know all about CN cutbacks, to get up and support that petition put forward by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). Let us not see fighting for the sake of fighting, but some good, firm representation through the Government of Canada transmitted by members opposite and by the Premier. What has happened? Has the telex machine on the eighth floor broken down completely since the federal election?

Mr. Speaker, it is a squeaky wheel that gets the grease and we need a little more squeaking from members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I rise at this point and I want to refer to the rules of order because I am not sure whether it is correct or not for me to rise at this time. I understand in the rules of order that the speakers on a petition are limited to two, one allegedly from each side of the House. I am just wondering, is that a limitation or anything in this case?

MR. BARRY:
A hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
No, because if you rule that I am on this side of the House, then in

this case if I rise to speak I could be ruled out of order as not being from the other side of the House. I just want to know how that rule should be interpreted.

MR. BARRY:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we would object to any declaratory statements being obtained from the Chair by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). We do not believe that that is the way that matters such as the entitlement of the member to speak on a petition should be established. The member should get up and start speaking if he wants to speak on a petition. And if there are procedural difficulties, these can be dealt with either within Committees of this House or in discussions by members behind the Chair. I think it has been made clear, Mr. Speaker, that we in the official Opposition bend over backwards to permit the member for Menihek to get his two cents worth in in the course of debate, but we will object to any statements being given by Your Honour on hypothetical questions from the member for Menihek.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, our Standing Orders do indicate that there is one speaker from each side on a petition.

MR. FENWICK:
That is quite clear. But the question is what happens if I were to rise to speak as the third one, as I am now? Well I will speak now and then someone can raise a

point of order and we can get a ruling on it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We can do it by leave.

MR. FENWICK:

The confusion exists, I think primarily because we have not done this too often. We are not use to having a third party in the House. I would prefer to have a ruling one way or the other but if not I would be glad to speak to the petition. If somebody wants to rule me out of order they can go ahead and do that. Besides I am tired of having the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) supporting me and acting as though he is my keeper in various matters. He has done it before, he has done it in debates and so on, and I wish he would keep his patronizing remarks away from these comments. I can look after myself. Admittedly it is somewhat Byzantine, the rules of the House, but I would prefer to do it on my own.

I, too, would like to say a few things about the lack of initiative or the lack of resistance on the part of our government in terms of these kinds of cutbacks.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I am not quite clear what the member is speaking on. Are you speaking on the petition?

MR. FENWICK:

Yes. I would like to suggest that we have had a very disquieting situation occur here in the last six or eight months since I have been involved with the House and that is that we have continued to get these cutbacks again and

again, as the ones that we have in McCallum, as we have seen consistently, for example, in Labrador West with our television station, and yet we are getting almost nothing in terms of resistance from this provincial government. If there was a Liberal government or an NDP government in Ottawa, I am sure we would hear continuous and vociferous comments coming forward as a result of all of this. But what we are getting is just passive acceptance of all of these cuts. I am wondering when the government on the other side will actually take its responsibility to the people seriously and stop pandering to the Mulroney government in Ottawa and take a little bit of initiative in terms of resistings these cuts. It has happened in terms of the television station in Labrador West, which has now been effectively shut down except for a little bit of local feeding, it is the same kind of cut that occurred with CN, and I think it is about time that our government stood up and started resisting these cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

This petition is from my own constituency and, surprisingly enough, it is about electricity as well. It is signed by 1,226 people from the town of Wabush and I will read the prayer of the petition: "Whereas Wabush Mines, the electrical utility in the Town of Wabush is negotiating with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro concerning a possible takeover of the power utility; and whereas the Food Prices Review Committee show

that food prices are at least 20 per cent higher in Labrador West than on the Island; and whereas the cost of transportation, especially air travel, further pushes up the cost of living; and whereas Labrador West is one of the few communities in the Province that benefits from Churchill Falls power - and I can tell you that it does - and whereas moderate electricity rates is one of the few Northern benefits remaining to residents of Wabush; and whereas electrical rates will increase drastically if Hydro takes over the utility, judging by their mismanagement in the past, therefore we, the undersigned, petition the Provincial Government to instruct its power utility not to take over the power distribution in Wabush and to use its best efforts to encourage the Public Utilities Commission to force Wabush Mines to upgrade its present distribution network."

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the petition I would like to say it is a very real concern in my district. As you may know, and as I will inform the House and the people of the Province, at present Wabush Mines operates the power utility in the Town of Wabush, as the Iron Ore Company of Canada operates it in Labrador City. We are extremely fortunate in being able to use Churchill Falls power and, as a result, our electricity rates are much lower than they are in the rest of the Province, for which the people of Western Labrador are extremely grateful.

But in the past number of months there have been attempts on the part of Wabush Mines to pass over its responsibilities to operate the electrical utility to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

They are indicating to the people of Labrador West and to all and sundry that they wish to absolve themselves of their responsibility with the power utility. We wish to resist that, because we have seen what has happened in the last six months or eight months on the Island portion of the Province, and, of course, we have seen the situation that has been allowed to develop on the coast of Labrador. The fortunate thing that we have in Labrador West is that the large local in Wabush has been able to negotiate with its employer, who is also the power utility, to keep the power utility rates down to a reasonable level.

As I said before, the cost of living in Labrador West, as in most of Labrador, is extremely high, much higher than it is in a lot of other areas in the Province. The low rate on hydro electricity is one of the very few benefits that is left to the people of Labrador West in order to compensate for these extra costs, and they ask that this petition be tabled here, that it be sent to the appropriate minister and that we get enough support in order to keep this from happening.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Address in Reply.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start off my few remarks in the Address

in Reply by first thanking the constituents of Mount Scio-Bell Island for putting me back as a member of this hon. House. I have taken on certain new portions of the area, Mr. Speaker, in the newly defined riding. The riding now takes in Bell Island as well as the full communities of Portugal Cove and St. Philips where originally there were only a portion of those communities. As well, I had passed over to me by the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) - and I thank him - St. Thomas/Paradise.

MR. BUTT:

They are good people.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, they are good people. They showed they have a lot of good sense during the recent election, and I thank them. They were prepared to vote for me even though my wife, who was my campaign manager, told me that at times people figured she was running the Holy Ghost, because I think they did a calculation and they figured that because of the demands of being around the Province generally I had spent ten hours campaigning in the district, including time in transportation. I want to assure my constituents that I will be spending more time than that in the riding over the next several years.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain very real and acute issues relating to the district of Mount Scio-Bell Island, particularly the Bell Island portion. On the mainland portion of the district the needs are not as obvious, are not as unique, are not as different from those which prevail in many parts of the Avalon Peninsula area. We have the unduly high level of unemployment

within the district of Mount Scio-Bell Island as in other districts. We have people in Portugal Cove, St. Philips, St. Thomas and Paradise needing better access to jobs. I get many telephone calls from constituents, particularly those who feel that they are not getting a fair break in terms of construction work that may be taking place in the area, and they feel that there is not a sufficient number of residents of the communities being employed on the jobs that take place. I will be speaking with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) from time to time on this type of problem, and I am sure that we will get a good hearing from the minister. I know that a former philosophy of his has been changed since the election; I notice a much more moderate approach by him. I do not think I heard him say at all while the election was ongoing that if you voted Liberal you would not get your roads paved.

MR. DAWE:

I never said that. I never said that before or after the election.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, very good. I will be very happy to hear the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) explain how he has been misinterpreted and maligned. I am very glad to see the statesmanlike approach that is being taken by him. I hope that this continues and prevails throughout the next several years of the last term of office of members opposite, because it is good to go out on a statesmanlike basis. I would hope that we will see the same statesmanlike approach being taken by the Premier as we now see indicated by the Minister of Transportation.

Apparently the leopard -

MR. DAWE:

I got my crowd on my own, I did not have to go to Bingo.

MR. BARRY:

Bingo? I do not think I went to Bingo.

MR. DAWE:

You did! You absolutely did!

MR. BARRY:

Oh, I am sorry! I have to correct that, Mr. Speaker. I had the very real pleasure of being able to meet several hundred people on a very quick bombing run through St. Andrew's, in the Codroy Valley, as we were moving from St. George's. I believe we had meetings on the Port au Port Peninsula that morning, then we went to the Town of Stephenville Crossing, in the district of St. George's, and then we went down to the Codroy Valley on our way down to Burgeo where we had an enormously successful rally for the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), who is now left.

But in the course of that trip from Stephenville Crossing to Burgeo I did take the opportunity of dropping in at a Bingo game in St. Andrew's and had a chance to shake the hands of several hundred people, Mr. Speaker, who would have otherwise taken several days to meet, they were all congregated together waiting for their bingo. The minister is correct, we did not dare interrupt the Bingo game, we knew that we would do that at our peril.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the residents of the Codroy Valley show much more class than the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), and they would never pound on their bingo tables and ask the Leader of the Opposition to

leave. They were very hospitable, they showed me every courtesy, but from my few years of political experience I knew there was one short way of losing every vote in that hall and that was to stay one minute after the drum started to turn. So I got out of their very quickly, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the drum started to turn.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that we have this statesmanlike approach and I am sure that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and other ministers are going to be sensitive to the needs of constituents of Mount Scio-Bell Island and other districts on this side of the House. We point out that there are real needs in these areas, and I would like to mention the unique needs of Bell Island. We have a situation there, and again it is an area that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) will have to take an interest in. Before the election, in fact, I received a letter signed by Mr. George Parsons on behalf of the Bell Island Commuter's Committee. The heading of the letter is, 'Bell Islanders want a fair shake', and they point out, Mr. Speaker, that Bell Island is in somewhat of a unique position, I would say even more unique than the people of Fogo Island, because at least there, I would say, the largest percentage of the people on Fogo Island are working on Fogo Island. We know how crucial a proper ferry service is for the people of Fogo Island. Well, I would say it is even more crucial for the people of Bell Island where we have such a large number of commuters working in St. John's or in the St. John's Metropolitan area. Mr. Speaker, there are very serious problems created when the ice comes in the tickle and there

is a lot of uncertainty as to whether or not an individual from Bell Island is going to get to work that day. And, in fact, there is an unhealthy situation starting to prevail where employers apparently are becoming reluctant to hire people from Bell Island because they are concerned about the possible irregularity of attendance at work. Now what a large number of people do from Bell Island is put up in these temporary hostels which government sets up out at Torbay when the ice is in. If the ferry cannot get across, there are people who will stay at the hostel, the rec centre. But, Mr. Speaker, the real answer in terms of giving people living on Bell Island a fair chance to make sure they have permanent employment, to make sure that they do not lose their jobs because of irregularity of attendance, to make sure they are not discriminated against in hiring because employers are concerned as to whether or not they will be in regular attendance at their job, the real answer, Mr. Speaker, is better ferry facilities, a ferry with better icebreaking capability. We see a fine new ferry going out to Fogo Island. Is it out there yet?

MR. TULK:

No, not yet.

MR. BARRY:

They are afraid to bring her out until the ice goes because they do not want to test the icebreaker in the ice, they want to wait and test her in open water.

MR. TULK:

He wants to go down for a trip.

MR. BARRY:

I am sure we will both get an invitation when they christen the

motor vessel Beaton Tulk. I am sure we will get an invitation to go down on the M.V. Beaton Tulk. I cannot think of a better name, the man who delivered that icebreaker. And obviously the people of Fogo showed they understand that it was the member because they put him back with a fine majority this time around. Now, we need the same type of ferry service, Mr. Speaker, for Bell Island and I cannot think of a better place to have it built than down in Marystown. I am sure the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) will be on his feet supporting us in our fight to get better ferry services for Bell Island. There is also, Mr. Speaker, the point made that when the ice is in there are air services provided, generally by helicopter, but these are fairly expensive. It was \$20.00 per trip this past Winter for residents and that gets expensive for the three mile flight back and forth from Portugal Cove, on a daily basis.

One answer, Mr. Speaker, of course, is to see that more jobs are being provided on Bell Island itself. Now, I was delighted to see the beginnings of a co-operative movement on Bell Island this year. That is the real way that people are going to see progress and improvement, by the community getting together and getting a grass-roots movement to do what has to be done to see jobs created. I was very interested, and I am sure it was only a coincidence that it happened during the course of the election campaign and the member of the Conservative Party running as my opponent in the election was the one to make the announcement, but I was very pleased to see that in response to a letter I wrote on behalf of the rural development

association, which was trying to get a fish processing license for Bell Island, we had a statement from the then Minister of Fisheries that this fish processing license would be provided for Bell Island. I do not see the minister here now, he is out in the corridor having a chat, but I would like to, and I will have the opportunity, I am sure, of receiving assurance that the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the new Minister of Fisheries, is going to follow through with that election promise of a fish processing license for Bell Island, that promise that coincidentally came in the middle of an election and that coincidentally was given to my opponent to release. I am sure that the Minister of Fisheries is going to make sure that that fish processing license is there on Bell Island, available to that plant to make sure that we do have additional jobs created on the Island itself for the men and women there who have shown through sheer determination, sheer will power, sheer pluck, that they will make a living without being resettled, without being relocated. They are there to stay on Bell Island.

During the election, Mr. Speaker, I happened to be over there on a Sunday when they had a hockey tournament and they had a group of fifteen or sixteen young men come down from Peterborough, Ontario, I think it was, and they had been up there for a goodly number of years - they went away just after the mine closed. I said, 'Well, you have been there now a good number of years, you must be all settled away and just want to come back to Bell Island for a visit, you have no intention of coming back permanently.' They would have

none of that, no Sir! As soon as there are jobs available back in Newfoundland these people are back, and they made it quite clear to me.

MR. POWER:

I did some campaigning on Bell Island

MR. BARRY:

The Minister for Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) did some campaigning on Bell Island. Well, I want to thank the minister. I want to thank the minister for all the assistance that he gave me. I know that he was not campaigning against me. We go back too far to have the minister campaigning against me on Bell Island.

MR. TOBIN:

Did you campaign in Ferryland?

MR. BARRY:

Unfortunately I did not get a chance to campaign in Ferryland but I will the next time.

Mr. Speaker, moving from my district of Mount Scio-Bell Island to the Province generally we all know that we have a very serious unemployment problem. Now, we have, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the fishing industry, an attempt by government, I believe, to move on as though the problem of the fishing industry had been dealt with. We heard in the Throne Speech words to the effect, 'Now that we have the offshore Accord and everything alright with offshore oil, and now that we have the restructuring of the fishing industry, and the implication that now everything is alright with the fishing industry, now, the government says, we can move on to Labrador hydro'.

[Mr. Speaker, Greening takes the Chair.]

MR. BARRY:

Before I go any further, I want to congratulate Your Honour and welcome you. I am sure that you are going to make a very fine Deputy Speaker and we wish you all the best in the course of your career there.

MR. TULK:

He is going to find it hard work.

MR. BARRY:

But, Mr. Speaker, we do not think that the members opposite, the government, the Premier should move on so quickly, as though it were only Labrador hydro power that remains to be dealt with as a problem. Let us not pass over the fishing industry that quickly, please! We still have very serious problems in the fishing industry. The Liberal Party put forth a policy, an all-fish-plants-open policy for this Province, and during the election I wrote Mr. Vic Young, the President of Fishery Products, Chairman of Fishery Products International. Now, I know it was only coincidence, but I did not get a response from him until after the election. I know he is a busy man, it just a coincidence, but anyhow I got a response back from one of his assistants. I asked specifically what was planned with respect to the various fish plants, the plants at Fermeuse, Charleston, St. Lawrence, and there were others, but they have only responded with respect to these three. Now, I know the minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) is delighted to know that Fishery Products International intends to operate the Fermeuse plant if a buyer has not been found before

the season starts in 1985.

I have a letter here from Fishery Products International saying that their shareholders have agreed that it would be appropriate for Fishery Products International to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that Fermeuse operates in 1985. They have received three serious proposals for the purchase of that plant, Mr. Speaker, but because of the fast approaching inshore groundfish season it may not be possible to have a sale concluded and the corporation is making the commitment to keep that plant operating. Well, I am happy to see that.

Now, the same thing is true with respect to St. Lawrence. I am sure the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) will be glad to hear this, that Fishery Products International states that it intends to operate St. Lawrence as an inshore plant for twelve weeks in 1985, and that it is expecting to hear that it is open for at least twelve weeks. We all want to see it open longer than that.

Mr. Speaker, we are informed as well that the Corporation is going to be meeting with the town to consider an application by an independent operator which we would hope would see a longer period of operation and, Mr. Speaker, we know that this will relieve the anxiety of the people of St. Lawrence to a certain extent. Now, Mr. Speaker with respect to the plant at Charleston I do not have the same degree of assurance. I am disappointed the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) is not in his seat but I am sure he is somewhere in the building - maybe he is having his chat with the Premier now.

MR. TULK:

The Premier is probably trying to punish him.

MR. BARRY:

No, no, I would hope not.

MR. CALLAN:

I just saw his car leave the lot. He is gone now.

MR. BARRY:

The member has had to move out but I will have to speak with the member, because while the corporation mentions that several parties have expressed serious interest and the corporation remains somewhat optimistic that a sale to an independent operator can be completed prior to the beginning of the 1985 inshore season, what the corporation says here is, 'Should a sale not be concluded prior to this season, it is our intention to pursue a new selling effort well in advance of the 1985 season.'

MR. TULK:

I think he means is 1986, really.

MR. BARRY:

It may be, because they do not have much time in advance of the '85 season, even in Charleston.

MR. TULK:

So it must be 1986.

MR. BARRY:

What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is we do not have the commitment there for Charleston, that if they do not sell it that they will go in and operate it. We will have to get clarification. Maybe the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) might take a note and let us know, and let the people of Charleston know, what is planned for that plant in the event that a purchaser is not found in time to

see the plant operating during the 1985 season.

MR. TULK:

He does not even know where it is.

MR. BARRY:

So I mention these three items, these three communities, but there are many others where we have uncertainty. We have a problem at Gaultois, where although there is a commitment that the plant will be kept open, it is going to be kept open now on a part-time basis. And the mayor and other people in the community have indicated that it seems that the average wage of people working in the plant at Gaultois will be something less than \$7,000. Some say it will be even less than \$5,000, during the course of the year.

Now, just to say that the plant is going to be open for six months does not help very much if it is a sporadic, part-time operation during those six months, as it obviously will be, if this is all the money people are going to make. People cannot survive on that type of income. I think the poverty level right now in Newfoundland is \$16,800 for a family of four. Fish plant workers earning between \$5,000 and \$7,000 are going to be well below that poverty level. Even if there are two in the family working, they are going to be below the poverty level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. I mention these points just to establish that there is a lot of work to be done in terms of developing proper policies for our fishing industry, in terms of ensuring that maximum employment is obtained from the fishing industry.

The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) raised the matter of the part-time salmon licences. Now, we all know that we want to see permanent jobs, good-paying jobs supplied for our full-time fishermen, whether they be salmon fishermen, lobster fishermen, or fish fishermen. But, Mr. Speaker, those people who are going to lose the advantage of a part-time salmon licence, while they are being offered compensation, when it comes to looking at the requirement of a permanent job, and in some cases these individuals use the part-time salmon licence to supplement an income which is based upon, to a certain extent, working in the woods, doing some logging and, Mr. Speaker, it may also involve for a period certain construction work, what we are now seeing is the removal for 24,000 Newfoundlanders this very significant portion of their income and we have a lifestyle that will therefore be changed.

Mr. Speaker, will they then be able to make a living for their families from these other areas in which they have been employed? If this money from salmon is now gone, will they be able to survive by working in the woods or by working in the construction industry on a seasonal basis?

Mr. Speaker, this type of change in our fisheries policy is being made in the background of threatened changes to the Unemployment Insurance Programme, and we have seen the certain hint, the certain indication that there is going to be an increase in the number of stamps that are going to be required before a person becomes entitled to unemployment insurance. Now, we are going to have to wait until we see the

federal budget, but we hope that members opposite will be looking at what the Government of Canada is proposing. And if they have any indications, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the planned policy for unemployment insurance, I hope that they are going to fight with every ounce of energy they have to make sure that there are not cutbacks and that it is not made more difficult for people to qualify until there are jobs provided. Because if people are cut off the unemployment insurance programme, and if the jobs are not there, then all that is happening is they are going to be tossed in the lap of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett).

Mr. Speaker, there is still an unhealthy emphasis on offshore oil and gas in the Throne Speech. As I mentioned, one message that came through from this election is that the men and women of this Province want to see their government concentrate on all sectors of the economy. We cannot afford to lose one job in any sector, whether it be agricultural, forestry, mining, fishing, or wherever. All our traditional renewable resource industries must be developed in particular. We must nurture them. We must nudge them along. We must assist them as much as we can. All too often we have seen over the past several years members opposite throw up their hands and say we cannot do anything until we get an oil agreement. Now there is an oil agreement and our farmers and our loggers and our fishermen and our miners and our people in municipalities are looking for their water and sewer services, people requiring hospitalization are waiting for hospital beds and students in overcrowded classrooms are going to be looking to

government. The excuse is not going to be there any longer that we are waiting for our oil agreement. Government is going to have to produce. The excuse is not going to be there any longer that we cannot get along with the government in Ottawa because it is a government of a different political stripe. No more excuses, Mr. Speaker. The time has come for action from members opposite. The electorate of this Province is going to be looking with great interest now. Now that a mandate to create jobs has been given, people are going to be looking with great interest to see how well the members opposite fulfill that mandate. The new Minister for Labour and Manpower (Mr. Blanchard) while we have high expectations of him in his portfolio -

MR. DAWE:

It is no longer Labour and Manpower, it is Labour.

MR. BARRY:

Where is Manpower? Is it now Charles Power?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is like watching one of these shell games in terms of moving. You put the pea under the three shells and then you move the shells and you have to try and guess where the pea is. It is the same way now trying to figure out where is the responsibility. The Premier figures that if he can keep moving the responsibility for Manpower around under the shell of each department fast enough that we will not be able to point our finger and hold a minister responsible. We now know where the finger must be pointed. Mr.

Speaker, I can understand why this change had to be made but it is going to be interesting to see the extent to which the Minister responsible for Career Development (Mr. Power) is going to be able to tie in his theoretical and philosophical recommendations for higher education with the very practical and real needs of day-to-day society in Newfoundland and Labrador. I know the minister made it a point when his department was first created of clarifying with the university that he was not just going to be a manpower training minister. The minister is going to have to take responsibility for both aspects of the ministry. We know he will make a very sincere effort to do that, but the government, all members opposite, Mr. Speaker, will have a responsibility to maintain an emphasis upon the need for creating enough jobs to keep up with the ever increasing labour force in this Province.

I see still in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, too much emphasis, an unhealthy emphasis upon the offshore as the panacea, as the solution to all the unemployment problems of this Province. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. We are disappointed that we have not seen policies put forth with respect to development, with respect to agriculture, with respect to forestry, Mr. Speaker, with respect to our renewable resource industries generally, and with respect to secondary processing that would show the people of this Province that there is a real commitment, now that the election is over, to create jobs. The mandate has been given, a mandate to create jobs, and I must say that the government receiving that mandate has failed miserably in living up to the expectations

created by this document. It has a nice glossy cover - a fine looking piece of art work. It must have been done by the same companies that were doing the advertising during the election. Mr. Speaker, it is not a bad effort for a cover but the cover is the best part of it, because the contents are very, very empty. There is a lot of reliance on the offshore. What are we going to get from the offshore? Mr. Speaker, we still have not been told what is going to come.

I am sorry if we are keeping the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) awake, barely. We know that as the days go on it is going to be harder and harder to do that. For all members on all sides of this House, one of the greatest challenges is going to be whether they can keep the member for St. John's North awake during the course of debate.

Mr. Speaker, we still have not been told what we can expect from offshore oil and gas. That is a very carefully kept secret. The number of jobs, where these jobs are going to be, when these jobs are going to be and what kinds of jobs there are going to be, all of this has been hidden. The clock is ticking and it is coming on to May 15. On May 15 Mobil is going to file an Environmental Impact Statement. It is not really a new one. I think they are pretending it is going to be a new one, but it is really going to be an updated one. We are going to be very interested in seeing the numbers that will be set out there with respect to jobs. We know that there are some 60,000 men and women unemployed. Are there going to be 60,000 created, whether it be from the construction of concrete platforms, which would be

temporary jobs, or otherwise? Somehow, Mr. Speaker, I doubt that we are going to see numbers revealed in that report that are going to solve our unemployment problem.

Now what else is being proposed on the unemployment front? We have a Royal Commission on Unemployment, Mr. Speaker, which we were proposing to disband. Had we formed the government, we would have had the new ideas, we would have had the new approaches, we would have had the new energy, and enthusiasm, and imagination, and we would not need a Royal Commission on Unemployment. However, the royal commission is there now and if members opposite are still admitting they still do not have any ideas with respect to how to deal with unemployment, then I suppose we are going to have to cooperate with that royal commission as best we can. It is going to be spending \$1 million of taxpayers' money and members of this House on all sides will, therefore, have to do the best they can to assist that royal commission in its work. I will do that and the official Opposition will do what it can to assist this royal commission in its work.

Many of the new members here have excellent ideas. Many of them received ideas from their constituents during the election as to what might be done in order to deal with the problem of unemployment and they are going to be delighted to make that information available to the royal commission from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to a good working session during this Session of the House. One of the things that concerns me and has concerned me for a number of years

in the course of debate has to do with when we get down to considering the estimates. In the past couple of years, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing that the estimates committees are not receiving coverage by the press. Now, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is a waste of time for members, whether they be Opposition members or government members, to sit down in a committee in public, open session and go through the estimates of any department if the press is not there. We can do it by letter, we can do it by correspondence, Mr. Speaker, but the whole purpose of having the debate on the estimates is to give the men and women of this Province an opportunity to know what has been going on in each department of government since the last accounting was provided.

The Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) will be getting together with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to discuss whether there is any way, and we will ask the press just what can be done, to help them in their scheduling. They have their financial limitations, they have their own problems in terms of the numbers of reporters they have and so on. If the reporters are not there, Mr. Speaker, maybe we can only have one estimate committee going at any particular time. Maybe that is the only way that we can see proper debate on the estimates. Because if you have two or three committees going at the same time, if the press does not have the people power to cover those committees, then it is a waste of time when coverage is not being provided by the media.

So, Mr. Speaker, after the budget, or in the days leading up to delivery of the budget, which we

hope will be coming down in the not too distant future - the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) does not seem too energetic or too active yet; he is pretty laid back there. He does not seem to be toiling under any great burden. He does not seem to be getting into that twitchy state of agitation which Ministers of Finance usually get into in the week or so before they have their budget finalized.

MR. TULK:

He has gone past twitching.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, maybe he is in a catatonic state right now. Maybe that fourth revision to his deficit got him completely numbed. He is totally numbed and we can say whatever we want to say and we are not going to get any rises out of him whatsoever.

In the days leading up to the budget being brought down, we will have to give some consideration, Mr. Speaker, as to how we can make sure there is an opportunity for the general public of this Province to remain aware of what is going on when the estimates are being debated. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the whole process becomes a bit meaningless.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize I have a few more minutes but there are members on this side of the House who are very keen and eager to participate in this debate and I had my opportunity on opening day as well, so I am not going to take all of my time today although I think it has just about expired. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we will give every minister opposite an opportunity to show that he or she will be bringing in good policies, good

recommendations, good programmes for the people of this Province. We will support, we will not oppose for the sake of opposing, we will not obstruct, but, Mr. Speaker, we will vigorously oppose any policies, programmes, strategies that are brought down by members opposite that are going to be harmful to the people of this Province. We look forward to good debate, Mr. Speaker, and again we wish you all the best in fulfilling your duties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. minister, I would like to say I have looked into the question of breach of privilege that was raised by the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey). As we all know, it is a very serious matter to raise a point of privilege and it is a very serious matter to deal with. The role of the Speaker is purely to determine if a prima facie case has been established. I have looked into various precedents in this matter and I find that the hon. member took the opportunity of clarifying his position and that no prima facie case exists.

The hon. the Minister of Career Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say, even before I make my opening comments, all the last session of the Legislature we heard that foolish nonsense over there about some kind of strange struggle for

leadership and the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is back at it again this session. Let him be firmly convinced that this election, if nothing else, established who is the real leader in this Province, who is going to be the Premier, who is going to lead the government. There is no question that there are no concerns about the leadership over here. If they have a problem then they should solve their problem with leadership, but it is certainly not on this side of the House.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) would tell us whether he would not admit that his chances for the leadership have been vastly improved because of the electoral situation in Grand Falls, and now, next to the member for Mount Pearl, that he would have to follow probably second in line in the putative leadership hierarchy?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Just let me say to that point of order, although you have already ruled on it, my job opportunities are greater because of the situation in Grand Falls because I am an expert on by-elections and controverted elections, so my job opportunities may be increased but my leadership is certainly not.

MR. TULK:

We know that but do you?

MR. POWER:

Every time someone on this side of the House stands to speak, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) questions leadership and I had hoped that this term in the House of Assembly is going to be a little bit different from last, but obviously it is not going to be all that different. But I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I, like other members who have already spoken, congratulate you on being appointed Speaker. It is certainly a very significant position for you to hold and I, as others in the House, express great faith in your ability to do that.

I would like also, of course, to congratulate all members of the House of Assembly who have been elected. I have been here now just about ten years. Sometime later on this year my tenth anniversary of being a member of the House of Assembly will be here. I know how difficult it is to get elected and to stay elected.

MR. TULK:

What date is that so we can send you a card?

MR. POWER:

On September 16, 1975 I was first elected.

MS. VERGE:

Are you having a party?

MR. POWER:

Yes, in Ferryland we have a party for almost anything and there will certainly be a party for that.

In congratulating members, I also particularly want to congratulate the two new members, one from Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford), who

moved the Address in Reply and did such an excellent job, and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), who I thought did such an excellent job. He spoke more sense in ten minutes than the last member for LaPoile did in several sessions of the Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

I have to say the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) is a very substantial improvement.

I would like also at this time, Mr. Speaker, to take another minute to congratulate all the new members of Cabinet who have been appointed recently. I am sure the others will forgive me if I congratulate particularly a long-standing political ally of mine from Renews, one of my very first supporters when I ran in 1975, who is now the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn).

MR. TULK:

That was his first mistake, supporting you.

MR. POWER:

Well, he was a supporter of mine long before that and certainly during the election in 1975 he was a very strong supporter of mine. I notice during this election he has the highest majority, I think, of any member elected to the House of Assembly, which just goes to show that I taught him very well!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Having campaigned for him in the district of St. Mary's - The Capes this time 'round. Sometime when, I guess, the universe unfolds as

it should and I am in the twilight of my career, twenty years or so from now, maybe the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) can come down and campaign in Ferryland for a little bit.

I want to congratulate, of course, the Deputy Speaker, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), whose appointment was announced today. Again, Sir, we express great faith in your abilities to do the job very well.

Mr. Speaker, I guess before I go on to my comments about the Throne Speech, and in particular about some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), I also think it would be opportune at this time - and I thought earlier today maybe one of the members of the Opposition might have done it - to rise and express condolences to the Murray family. Miles Murray, who died recently, was the member for Ferryland for fourteen years. He was a district court judge, he was a war veteran. I think there is a procedure, Mr. Speaker, in the House that usually somebody from the Opposition rises and, with some kind of concurrence then, the Speaker can send a letter of condolence, in this case, to the Murray family and I am sure there would be unanimous consent to send it to the family of such a fine, distinguished representative of the district of Ferryland and in recognition of the other things he represented in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say about the Throne Speech that the Throne Speech is about jobs, it is about job creation, it is about

solving the most difficult problem that we have in this Province, which is unemployment, not just that of young people but maybe particularly so for them, but certainly for all persons in this Province who are unemployed. That is what the Throne Speech talks about, it is what the Throne Speech describes, but it is what seems to have again bypassed the members in the Opposition. If I listen to the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), he talks about the old times, old agreements and old ways. What we have in this Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is a way to try and straighten out a very historic, traditional problem that we have had in Newfoundland, certainly since my time in politics and long before that.

MR. TULK:

And we heard it in the last Throne Speech, and the one before that, and the one before that.

MR. POWER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this Throne Speech, like many Throne Speeches, is a continuation. They are not a beginning and an end unto themselves. A Throne Speech is a pattern and a plan of attack that a government has. The plan of attack does not change every year. You do not change your strategies just because you have an election or are going to have one. You do not change your kind of attack every year or so. You have more than a one year plan. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, in our case we have that. The Throne Speech that we have here today, albeit it has a fair amount of history in it, but the history is in the beginning. The reassessment or re-evaluation of some of the things that we have

put in place over the last few years makes up the latter part of the Throne Speech, when it talks about things like the Department of Career Development, when it talks about job opportunities and when it talks about education. That could not be done in the latter stages of a Throne Speech unless, first of all, we had laid down some kind of a firm footing upon which to build.

And, Mr. Speaker, that firm footing is there in very, very obvious terms. It is there on the very first page when we talk about the Atlantic Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:
The Atlantic Accord, which some persons on the opposite side did not own up to that it actually existed or happened until after the election, but after the election, I noticed in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) comments the other day, that he mentioned bringing in amendments to the Atlantic Accord that we signed. So the Atlantic Accord is there. Mr. Speaker, what is in that Atlantic Accord gives us a firm footing, a firm foundation upon which to build new industry in Newfoundland. Now anyone who knows Newfoundland knows the problems that we have in the fishery, the problems that we have had in forestry, which have been overcome to a large degree, the tourism industry, the mining industry and what we have here, the Atlantic Accord, is a firm foundation based in history on which we can build a very sound future in those industries.

When you look at the Atlantic Accord, you can talk about the

joint management that we have. Now what does joint management mean to a place like Newfoundland? Why could we not have joint management before? Why could we never get from the Federal Liberal Government any kind of a concurrence or an agreement that we were capable of running that resource and that we were capable of having input? We just could not get it because I think in the back of their minds they had an oldtime Canadian attitude that some people in Newfoundland really were not capable of doing a certain job.

MR. CALLAN:
Do you believe that?

MR. BARRY:
Do you believe A New Direction for Canada?

MR. POWER:
I did not know what else to believe for many years in trying to deal with the Federal Liberal Government on the issues in my own department in dealing with it from a provincial ministerial point of view. I did not know what to believe. I could not figure it out as I think any reasonable, logical, sane, sensible, person should be able to figure out any problem. I could not ascertain why the Federal Liberal Government treated us as they did. I could not understand it, except in the back of some people's minds they were afraid to give us control of this big natural resource because they were afraid through some kind of strange way we would waste it away, we would destroy it, we would not use its full benefit for Canadians.

MR. HISCOCK:
What about the National Training Act?

MR. POWER:

I will mention later on in my comments on Career Development some of the things we are doing because that is the kind of thing that was implemented in training acts and in many ways which almost makes ones believe that somebody thought up there that we were not capable of doing certain things.

The Atlantic Accord has joint management, equal say on a board to run that offshore, to give us control of that resource, and revenue as if it were on land. Why would not, why could not, why was it never possible for us to get revenue rights exactly as if that resource were on land from the Federal Liberal Party? Why would they not give it to us? Now the Provincial Liberal Party is saying we will amend that to give you more strength and more clout and more power to collect revenue. I am saying that the resource that we have out there is now controlable for us, taxable by us because we as a Provincial Conservative Party had an agreement with a Federal Conservative Party.

The equalization phase-out: A very important firm footing based in history and without it we could not be able to do the things we wish to do in the Throne Speech that goes into the year ahead. The future aspects you could not do. If we had signed an Atlantic Accord that did not have a phaseout of equalization, then we simply would be behind the eight ball for many, many years, and you would have a Throne Speech that said little or nothing or could do little or nothing. Because of the way the agreement is structured, because we do have equalization grants coming in on one hand and we will have revenues from

offshore coming in on the other, it means that we have an extra pocket of money to do something with which is all very important in the future plans of this administration.

When it comes to the mode of development that we are going to have which is directly job oriented, why do we want concrete platforms rather than steel platforms? There is only one reason. There is not any complicated formula involved. It is the fact that in a concrete platform there are more jobs involved than there are in steel platforms. We want those concrete platforms built here in Newfoundland so the jobs remain here in Newfoundland.

So when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) says we are not mentioning jobs, this Throne Speech is not related to employment, then he is not being factual because it is there.

MR. BARRY:

What about the environment?

MR. POWER:

Well, the problems of environment relating to the offshore are there whether you use concrete or steel. I mean, that does not go away just because you use one mode of development or not. So in one case you can get more jobs.

The development fund of \$300 million, which I will talk about when it comes, as the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) mentions talking about the training act, and talking about your education and things you want to do, where is the \$300 million development fund going to be used? A very large chunk of it is going to be used to accomplish the objectives

of this Throne Speech which are to further educate and do research and development so that we will have educational training that fits in with future needs, not past needs. That \$300 million is going to enable us to do that in this Throne Speech. The fact that this agreement, the Atlantic Accord, which is a firm foundation, is going to be put into the Constitution of Canada provided we can get the agreement with the other provinces, and we think we can, is a very significant step. We could never get that from the Federal Liberals because, again, they did not want to cement something into the legislation of Canada and Newfoundland and at the same time then be able to say somewhere down the road, well, maybe these guys in Newfoundland do not really know what they are doing, we may have to change some of that. The new agreement, besides what is there factually, also shows a certain trust and a certain understanding for Newfoundlanders.

The fact that the social legislation of Newfoundland will apply as it relates to the offshore is a very, very significant factor. The fact is our law, as it relates to the Island of Newfoundland and its residents, is now going to be in place for the offshore as well. The fact that we are going to have legislation, as outlined in this speech, introduced into the Legislature of Newfoundland and Labrador and also introduced in the House of Commons, is a significant point. It cannot be glossed over, it cannot be passed over or put aside as being not important, but without that legislative kind of assurances that you have that things cannot be changed without your

concurrence, that is a very important factor. We are going to have that put into the legislatures of Canada and Newfoundland and it is a very important point.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about this Throne Speech and we talk about the things that we would like to do for the next ten years in Newfoundland, starting with this year, this new era, if somebody wants to call it that, and you can put all of the titles you like on it, but it cannot be denied that a new era is about us, that things are going to be different. Now some persons in the Opposition might hope that things get worse, because by a worsening of the economy of Newfoundland then they can come over to this side of the Legislature.

Now obviously we are not going to be in favour of having things get worse, Mr. Speaker. As you know, we are very adamant that things are going to get better in Newfoundland, and this is a plan, a basic plan, a framework for future years so that we can do certain things in Newfoundland.

MR. DOYLE:

So that you guys can get a job when you are finished here.

MR. POWER:

But again the criticism comes up today, as it did in all of the last session of the Legislature, that all this government cared about was oil and gas, that was all we had on our minds, that we did not care about anything else. There was lots of gas around, definitely, and there still is some around, most exemplarily in the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that

we have on many, many occasions in this Province been able to demonstrate in very factual terms, as we did during the election campaign, much to the chagrin of many members opposite having been in Carmanville and other places, and make people realize that this government had done some very substantial things in the area of the fishery. The fact is that we have restructured FPI. The fact is that company has cost tremendous amounts of money, but from the point of view of fisheries management this government has demonstrated in the most difficult of times, partly because of recession within Newfoundland and Canada and the world, partly because of fish stocks, partially because of markets, that we have been able to manage the fishery and maintain the employment of many thousands upon thousands of Newfoundlanders in the fishery. Now how have we done that?

MR. TULK:

That is right. You have solved all the problems in Newfoundland.

MR. POWER:

No. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we have in this Throne Speech a plan of attack that we are going to carry out. A plan of attack is based upon certain factual things that we had done. One is the Atlantic Accord which gives us control of the offshore resource, gives us revenue, gives us the wherewithal to do certain things. Another plank of the history of how to develop Newfoundland and make it better is to have a firm foundation in the fishery. Now we have tried to do that every way possible. We have restructured FPI, one of the biggest fish companies in the world now. In Newfoundland there were five or six bankrupt companies. What would have

happened if FPI had not become a restructured fisheries company? What would have happened? What would have happened? You would have - how many? - 7,000 or 8,000 more Newfoundlanders unemployed. But they maintained their employment because the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland were willing to put up some money to make sure that those jobs were maintained.

MR. TULK:

You were forced into it d d d d d d d did not want to do it.

MR. POWER:

Of course we did not want to do it. We did not want to do it, of course. There is no joke in that. I mean, the fact is we did not want to get involved in a restructured fishing company, but we take our responsibility to the fishery just the same as we take our responsibility to oil and gas. We have a responsibility to the citizens of Newfoundland who are working in the fishery. We have in the fishery, through the \$30 million or \$40 million that we have now put into FPI, maintained the jobs of 7,000 or 8,000 Newfoundlanders. Now somebody thinks that that is not a firm foundation upon which to build, but I say it is. I say in the district that I represent, and in the districts around many parts of inshore Newfoundland where the fishery is very prominent, that the \$20-odd million that we put into that fishery is a plank upon which now we can build. Without that plank we could do the things that this Throne Speech wishes to do. So we have got our Atlantic Accord in oil and gas, we have our restructured offshore fish companies, we are stabilizing and maintaining, as well as we possibly can, the inshore fishery

of Newfoundland.

Now there is no way that I can control, or this government or the new Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) can control the fact that the caplin market is not going to be as good in Japan this year as it was last year. Those are things that are not under our control. If the squid comes in or does not come in is not something that the Minister of Fisheries can manipulate. But at the same time we have to be able to do the things that we ourselves control and when it came down to having a bunch of about thirty-odd inshore fish companies that were going bankrupt, what did the Government of Newfoundland do? Did they allow another 3,000 or 4,000 people to become employed? No, we did not. Because we have a commitment to the fishery and our point-blank commitment was \$20-odd million of taxpayers' money was put into government guarantees so that those fish companies could stay in business and buy fish from fishermen and employ plant workers. That is a firm footing which was there before this Throne Speech was written and it is part of what we want to do.

MR. TULK:

What a leader. You won your election.

MR. POWER:

We have the same problem, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has not changed. So when it comes down to having a valuable restructured fishery the Government of Newfoundland has to have, amongst other things, co-operation from the Government of Canada, and we also have to have co-operation from the union members and the workers in that industry. And workers have co-operated, they

have signed an agreement so that there is going to be stability while government can supply stability for the things that we control for the next three or four years.

Again, Mr. Speaker, some of the things we have done for the fishery include the Resource Short Plant Programme to make sure that the biggest problem we have had in the inshore fishery in Newfoundland in the last five or six years is prevented - a shortage of supply, because the species has simply not been available either through licences or because of different factors the species have not come into shore and the catch has not been there.

The Resource Short Plant Programme, done co-operatively between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, is a means to stabilize in a financial way many of those small fish companies which exist and continue to exist only because of government guarantees. If the Government of Newfoundland at the end of May this year, or at the end of April, was to remove its guarantees in most of those small inshore plants guess what would happen? They would all go bankrupt almost on the very same day. They cannot operate without government money and unless they get more fish they cannot become profitable and viable. And that is what the Resource Short Plant Programme is for and it is what we are doing.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in other areas we are doing things with the fishery as well as we can. The Aquaculture Programme which we brought in in the last three or four years is different, it is

novel, it has not been done in Newfoundland before. It is going to work because a lot of persons have made a commitment to it, and I will venture to make a guess that ten years from now there will be thousands of people in Newfoundland, as there are now in Norway and other parts of the world, working in aquaculture. And they will be here because the Newfoundland Government, through its research and development, through the Department of Development, and through the Department of Fisheries, were willing to take a chance, they were willing to experiment and were willing to put another firm plank in a foundation upon which we can build. It has to be done, and it is going to be done. As much as some members of the Opposition think it should not happen or it could not happen or it would not happen, it is going to happen because we have firm, sensible, well-thought out management policies for our fishery.

Mr. Speaker, another area we are involved in is the Upper Churchill. Today, with the petitions and all the other parts about cheap electricity showed the members of the Opposition tried to buy their way into this Legislature. Some were successful and some were not, but it is certainly fair to say that the members of the Opposition, some who were elected, some who were not, tried to buy their way into this Legislature. They tried to buy the taxpayers off with free electricity rates, freezing electricity, student programmes, the whole range of buying votes.

You try to say that we intimidate people to vote for government members. You people do exactly

the same and much worse when you go out and try and deceive the public of Newfoundland into saying there is some magic formula and that I, because I am a Liberal, and I, because I am a Liberal who might be elected to the government side, am going to find some way to pay your light bill for you, or a large chunk of it. You simply cannot do it. It is false, it is misleading, it is not accurate. If you consume electricity, then somebody has to pay for it and you either pay for it directly or you pay for it through the tax base of the Province. There is no difference. It cannot be avoided. You cannot run away from it.

There is only one way to get cheaper electricity into the Island part of the Province and that is through the Labrador section. There is no other way to do it, Mr. Speaker, and for anyone to pretend that there is, if they are not being dishonest then certainly they are not being very accurate or aware of what the cost of electricity really is, and that is exactly what it is. We are going to make some very substantial initiatives through the Government of Canada, through the Government of Quebec and ourselves, to try and find a way to develop the resources in Labrador for us to get a fair return on Upper Churchill and to get access to more power so that we can then do something for the consumers of Newfoundland which is honest, which is real, which is meaningful, and which, in effect, does actually allow you to get electricity at a cheaper rate. That is the only way to do it, Mr. Speaker.

So on oil and gas, on fisheries, on hydro, we have a meaningful,

well-thought out plan. When it comes to forestry, the problems of forestry over the last four or five years have been very substantial. The problems in Corner Brook, where the member and other members of that general area and I worked so hard to make sure that there was a stable industry in Corner Brook: Why is Corner Brook stabilized today? It is not stabilized because Bowater closed the doors and left, it is stabilized because the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland co-operated to put in place a programme to allow a buyer to take over Corner Brook. That is why you have a new operator there called Kruger, that is why you have people there who are still working. If we had not done that, if we had not been responsible then, sure, we could have turned our backs. We could have taken our \$30 million or \$40 million that we offered to Bowater and they turned down, they did not want to stay here, we could have turned our backs and said, "Oh, Bowater does not want this so we will not stay. We will close up Corner Brook." But we did not do it. We have a sound, rational plan for forest management in this Province.

Now there are certain things you cannot control. We have a rational plan for forest management in this Province, the best forest management plan in any part of Atlantic Canada. It is an extremely sound plan. The member for Gander (Mr. Baker) will get up and he will say, as he used to say before, and I assume he still has the same principles that he had then, the same ideas, he will say, "Spend \$60 million or \$70 million on silviculture, have forest mill workers, have plant workers, have the whole kit and caboodle," but

when a little old budworm comes in from the Mainland, let the budworm have the trees and everybody else will starve. That was his principle before, no spray programmes, no protection, just allow the forest to take its natural course and all that would mean would be basically where you would have another 3,000 or 4,000 persons in Newfoundland unemployed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since my time is running down, I do want to spend some moments because, as I say, we have laid down, through the management of the Peckford Administration in particular, a very, very sound management scheme for the resources of this Province. Starting with oil and gas, you can go to fisheries, you can go to forestry, you can go to mining, we have a plan in place. Now, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do with the money that we derive? In my department in particular, and the Atlantic Accord is a good indication of where our plans are, where the things that we want to do are most important, in the Atlantic Accord there are \$300 million -

MR. TULK:

What are you going to do?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish you could stop that fellow from Fogo. There are \$300 million put in a development fund, \$225 from the Government of Canada in a grant, not a loan -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. POWER:

- like the Liberals wanted to do, like the Liberals offered to Nova Scotia, like the Liberals offered us, not a loan, a \$225 million grant. It is this

administration's principle, one of its policies, one of the underlying parts of this document, where someone says there is no future, is to take a very large share of that \$300 million and put it into education and training. Now why would we want to do that, Mr. Speaker? Why would we want to get involved in education and training in a place like Newfoundland?

MR. TULK:

We hope you have found out.

MR. POWER:

Well, I have found out.

MR. TULK:

Good.

MR. POWER:

And I have found out in a very unfortunate way. Sometimes when you visit some of our schools, our vocational schools, when you visit certain parts of the university and you see tremendous amounts of money that are spent, Mr. Speaker, but what is the end result? The end result is another class of carpentry graduates, another class of clerk typists, and those are not the kind of occupations that we need in Newfoundland. If we are going to get the benefits of offshore - there must be some, albeit many of you think that there are going to be very little - but if there are going to be benefits from the offshore, benefits in other resource based industries, if there are going to be long-term benefits, there is only one way to get those benefits and that is through education and training. The youth of this Province, contrary to any popular belief that anyone else might have, contrary to what the Newfoundland Teachers' Association

might say during an election, the youth of this Province, from this government's point of view, are our greatest asset and they are the asset that we have protected and we are now going to develop as much as we can. And not do it by short-term programmes, we do it by doing things which are proper. The Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies is going to have access to well over \$100 million in the next four to five years to improve the educational infrastructure in this Province. Things that we can do with this money, Mr. Speaker, range from changing the curriculum of clerk typing as a course, since it is not really what is now required in the offices of this Province or anywhere else in the world, to changing the curriculum in welding courses, and changing the curriculum as it relates to hi-tech jobs. In changing curriculum we are going to then give our youth a very substantial opportunity at getting jobs not only within this Province but anywhere else in Canada and in the world. We are having a look at reorganizing the administration of the vocational school system, which we will be announcing, I guess, somewhere in the near future - some major changes with the administration of the vocational school method. Those plans are there for the youth and that is the only reason they are there and that is the only reason they will stay there, because for youth we have to do a very substantial amount of things. One is to educate them properly and to give them job opportunities. Another very strong platform in the programme that we are going to have in this new Department of Career Development is to make sure that every single, solitary person who wants access to education has

access to education in rural Newfoundland and not necessarily just in St. John's. We are going to bring those programmes out to the people of Newfoundland where they belong and, Mr. Speaker, we are going to make that education the very best in the world. In September of this year we will open up, the good Premier and I and some others who have made tremendous effort and taken some risks, I guess, in putting government programmes of this type in place, we are going to open up a \$44 million - just across the way, and you can see it if you turn around - new Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology. It is going to be a first class, world class, kind of educational facility. We have plans in place already to build more facilities like that to improve the ones that we have, to change the curriculum so that when the students of this Province leave post-secondary and are educated they are going to be educated as well as any other students in the world. And we are going to do it, Mr. Speaker, because now we have some money through the Atlantic Accord. We always had the will and we always had the thought process to put the programmes in place, but we lacked, many times, the money. And now that we have the money, and now that some other of our industries are beginning to stabilize, we have the wearwithal to go out and do that. And I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that that development fund that we have, the things that we are going to do in education and training, the programme that we signed with Flora MacDonald's department gave us \$15 million. Two months after she called back and said, 'Look, I am sorry, we made a mistake with our formula. You really did not get \$15 million you are getting

\$16 million.' They called us and said, 'Here is an additional \$1 million for training.' Now there are parts of that training programme, as the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) asked me earlier, which are not great, but we have agreement that we are going to be able to change those parts of the Canadian Training Agreement so that they suit Newfoundland, so that Newfoundlanders, where job opportunities are different than they are in other places, can train students for those job opportunities right here in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, just let me say in concluding, because I know that my time is up, that I am very proud of this Throne Speech. It is a Throne Speech which outlines a course of action for the future based upon a very sound past. Albeit it is a very recent past of the Atlantic Accord, Fisheries management, Forestry management, but without that past you cannot have a stable and secure and prosperous future. And I look forward to this new era, this new era in training and education so that we can make Newfoundland a better place to be.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas):
The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
I hope I can provide a little

change of pace for the hon. members present. Being the first of the new members to speak in this Address in Reply, I would like, Sir, to congratulate you on your appointment. I am sure that you can be a lot of help to new members in their breaking-in period which I hope for your sake will not be too long. I would be remiss, I suppose, if I did not thank the voters of my own riding, my own district, for their tremendous show of confidence. It is probably more than a show of confidence for me but it is also, I think, a message to the people on the other side. If you remember, back in 1968 Gander district was the first one to send a message to a government who had outlived its usefulness and that message should be imprinted in the minds of the people opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the people opposite on their election victory both individually and severally. I would like to congratulate them on getting the 48 per cent of the vote of the people who voted. That is really good - not quite half but almost half of the vote, and I am sure they are very proud of that accomplishment. And perhaps that may be another message to them as well, Mr. Speaker, as they proceed with the business of government.

Now, I am a new member. I am a novice. I really do not know what is going on around here right now. I have only been here one day and gone through formalities. I am a tyro at this, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to need a fair amount of help. But there is something else about being a new member and coming into the House and that is an impression that you get ahead of time, an impression,

first of all, for instance, of Cabinet ministers. During the election I saw the lists coming out of the hon. minister of, and the hon. minister of, and I counted them up, Mr. Speaker, and there were twenty of them, and I kind of shivered a little bit and I said, 'What are we facing? What am I going to be facing in the House? A lot of these honourables, twenty of them.' And I come in here, Mr. Speaker, on opening day and see, not twenty, but twenty-two. And it is kind of a frightening experience to look across there and see all twenty-two of these honourables facing me. It is an overwhelming experience, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, I understand they had to put one of the honourables in the backbenches to try to keep in touch with a few people back there who expected to be honourables.

My experience with Cabinet ministers goes back a few years, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps my awe-struck attitude with regards to them goes back to these experiences. I remember the first up-close experience I had with one of the Cabinet ministers was during the spray programme for the spruce budworm when there was an accident and a plane had to dump a full load of spray somewhere on the forests. I was quite concerned about this, knowing what this kind of thing can do and knowing of other spills that had been kind of hidden and cleaned up in a hurry, where people had to dig up the soil, carry it away and everything else, all the tremendous panic the people were in and I was a bit concerned about that until I heard the then Minister of Forestry was coming out to Gander. So, Mr. Speaker, I went to the hangar where the plane

was going to land and pull up and so on. I was there waiting with a couple of other people and the plane pulled up in front of the place, one of the hangers, and out jumped who I thought was one of my high school students. He had a pair of jeans on and sports shirt, looked quite young, a very young looking gentleman, nice looking and somebody nudged me and said, 'That is the Minister of Forestry.' Right away I sort of jumped back and I said, 'Boy, he must have something special.' What happened over the next couple of hours kind of confirmed this, Mr. Speaker, and kind of set my image of Cabinet ministers. He got aboard one of two helicopters. Now, remember, a plane load of stuff, matacil plus a variety of other things, had been dumped somewhere out in the wilderness and the Minister of Forestry was going to go out and have a look at the situation. Mr. Speaker, when Cabinet Ministers go out and have a look at the situation, you know that things are in good hands. So the Minister of Forestry jumped in one of the helicopters along with two or three other people, and I was trying to get on one of the helicopters but too many other people had come along with them. According to reports the two helicopters flew towards the area where the load was supposed to have been dumped - nobody every really discovered where, I understand - then circled around, came back and the Minister of Forestry makes the pronouncement that he had been out and looked at the situation and everything was well under control. So I put my mind at rest at that stage, Mr. Speaker, and I said these Cabinet Ministers must be endowed with a kind of a special power that the rest of us do not have and maybe

that is why I feel so apprehensive looking at these Cabinet ministers.

My second experience up close to a real live Cabinet minister was three years ago, just a couple of years after that, and I happened to get my hands in some way a document that was supposed to be secret.

MR. TULK:
A leak.

MR. BAKER:
A veritable leak.

I got my hands on one of those documents and at the time we were concerned about the industrial park in Gander and so on, and this document said that Cabinet by Order in Council had taken control of industrial land in the Province where they had some kind of input and this was done in secret and never made public. After a couple of months of trying to tell people about this, nobody would believe me so I went and I blew the whole thing. I gave it to the newspapers, Mr. Speaker, in my naivete and inexperience, I made a public splash on it. Well, not very long after that I hear the whirr of helicopter blades again and I got a phone call. I was at school teaching and the then Minister of Development, who since has been demoted, wanted to talk to the Gander Town Council and I had to come. So I did, trembling, Mr. Speaker, again. The Minister of Development was upset and he went up one side of the council and down the other, called me aside and did the same thing to me and gave me a little fatherly chat about leaking documents.

MR. BARRY:
Was that the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor)?

MR. BAKER:

The suntanned member for Mount Pearl.

I was kind of taken aback. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was so taken aback by the whole thing that I immediately got out of politics altogether.

These are two experiences with Cabinet ministers. I will tell you about another one a little later, maybe.

This experience with Cabinet ministers gave me a preconceived notion. There are a lot of other things that have gone on in my life in the last couple of years that have given me preconceived notions. Some of them I do not even believe, I cannot believe are true. I have heard stories, Mr. Speaker, from people concerning treatment of Opposition members by government members because the people who voted for me, believe it or not, voted for me to sit in Opposition. Rather strange. I kept telling them, 'maybe not'. They voted for me to sit in Opposition and told me about the treatment accorded Opposition members and the fact that Opposition members were kind of ignored, they were over on the other side and they were not really listened to. 'There will be things that will be done to impede the workings of an Opposition member and Opposition members cannot get anything and so on.' I have been told all that. I cannot really believe that all that is true. After all, government is government of the whole Province and I cannot really believe that is true. It is probably only coincidental, Mr. Speaker, that it has been a month since the election and I still do not have an office or anything.

That is probably only coincidental, Sir, and I do not believe that Opposition members are treated with a little less respect than government members.

I have heard about money going to districts of one political party only and again I am not so sure that is true. I have heard reports of highways money going mostly in one district and so on. I have heard reports of government members each being given \$500,000 to put into roads in their districts. I suppose I will find out at some time in the future if these things are true or not but right now I cannot really believe them. Maybe it is only coincidental, Mr. Speaker, that in Gander district where everything is paved there is one little section of road that is now being paved for the third time I think in four years, one lot laid down over the other. Maybe that is only coincidental.

I also heard that government members, all of them, get extra money for a variety of things and that these things are not open to us. I know that is not true because I understand there are a couple of members on the other side who are not getting any extra money and I know that particular thing is not true. I have heard an awful lot about the Premier of the Province and some of the benefits that the Premier partakes of. I have been told, for instance, of the the private dining room and chef. That cannot be true. I know of other premiers that brown bag it and bring their lunch to work. That cannot be true of the Premier of our Province, we are so poor off. I have heard about the Premier getting his groceries bought and so on. That cannot be true,

because obviously the other ministers would require the same kind of treatment. The Premier is the First Minister, but the other ministers would require the same kind of treatment. I know that it does not happen to them, so I know that that is not true.

I have heard of a propaganda network, what has been called a propaganda network, where Cabinet ministers turn out yards and yards of press releases that go to every single newsman in the Province through a little machine. I have heard about that, Mr. Speaker. I have seen it. I have actually examined the yards and yards of press releases coming out every day. I have heard it cost \$6 million or something. But I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a propaganda network, but is something that is open to all members of this hon. House. I will find out if we can avail of the same opportunity as the members opposite.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I know that these things cannot be true simply because in this Province we have a watchdog on government. We have the People's Paper, we have the television networks and, Mr. Speaker, for sure they would never, never let a government get away with things like that, so I know they cannot be true.

My preconceived notions are also shaped in another way, not only by what I have heard people say - that I cannot verify and do not know if they are true or not - they have been shaped by what I have seen happening in the last couple of years. I come from Gander, a vibrant community that has a lot of individuals who are very, very skilled and capable, and I have been following and

involved in a number of issues in that particular town over the last few years. Some of my notions were formed there as well. There is something that tells me that somewhere, with a lot of what is going on, that the greatest obstacle to progress in the town that I come from has been this government. I have not been part of it until now but, Mr. Speaker, what I have seen points to that.

Members opposite will, some of them at least, and I notice that there are a fair number in their seats right now, some of them will remember the Lakeside Homes issue where a committee for years had been working to plan for nursing care units to be added on to a senior citizen home and had been told by the appropriate government department that these nursing care units were needed. Applications were in and the need was visibly demonstrated. Then they were told, 'Yes, your plans are good. How about writing them up and how about writing up a plan for my department in the handling of nursing care units and homes of this nature?' The committee did this and they worked hard and diligently on this and presented their plans. Then we were told that there would be a study period and, after that study period, then we would be ready to proceed with Lakeside Home extension. And after the study period, then the list of priorities was published and, after being told that we would be near the top of the priorities, we find that we are in the second or third year or some time.

That is all right, too, because I suppose the government had its own priorities and had certain other things promised as well, so we could understand that. But then

when our year came we were told, no, we still had to wait a bit longer and that the units were not available through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. And we went after the units from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and we got them committed and still this government said, 'No, not until you can get a commitment for some more units: And we had to go back and try again. It seems as if, on every turn, from the point of view of the community of Gander we were being stymied in our development.

There is another long story to be told about the industrial park, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that a number of members opposite know this issue quite well, and I do not really have time to go into it in this Throne Speech debate.

The EPA pull-out in Gander. You know, at a certain point money was committed by this government, or guarantees or whatever were committed by this government to the tune of, I think, \$15 million in a couple of instances to EPA to help it survive. This was a Newfoundland company. One of the conditions as far as I know, and this is why I am trying to get some information from the Premier and I am sure he will give it to me, one of the conditions, we have been told, is the company retain its headquarters in Gander. And at a certain point, when this company was taken over, the owner wanted to be released of his obligations and somehow was released of his obligations. The plan was always there to move. This is the impression, Mr. Speaker, that I have of that particular issue. The Premier shakes his head and makes a comment. I am sure that he will come up with documentation that

proves or disproves that position.

Another issue that does not pertain to the Town of Gander itself but to Glenwood, in the great Bowater-Kruger thing there was all kinds of concern expressed about the loss of jobs in Corner Brook. But, Mr. Speaker, the Town of Glenwood was devastated. This was the employer in the Town of Glenwood. It seems to us in this area that it was an example of, I was going to say the squeaky wheel getting the grease, but an example of priorities that were arranged and we felt that the Town of Glenwood was kind of ignored in the whole process. We have some other issues ongoing, Mr. Speaker, that I do not have time to get into.

But we have a lot of positive things going for us. I think that through the individuals involved in the Town of Gander we have managed to make a lot of progress. We have our industrial park, and soon we will be trying to fill that industrial park up, to try to alleviate some of the tremendous unemployment. People do not think of Gander in terms of unemployment. There is a very high rate of unemployment in Gander, and we hope to try and cure some of our problem over the next few years through this industrial park.

Mr. Speaker, just about every weekend during the year Gander is full of people from other parts of the Province and so on attending conventions. That is another thing that the town has going for it. I understand the facilities are going to be expanded through some government money as well as through some private money and we welcome that kind of thing. Gander is a service centre for

80,000 people, and that is another positive factor. But the greatest thing that Gander has going for it is the active citizens groups and the very active and energetic town council that it has. As a matter of fact, it was put to me during the election that the Town of Gander does not need an MHA because it has such a good council and action committees and so on. Of course, I did not really agree with that but it has been put to me several times.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet really gotten around to the Speech from the Throne. I have taken great liberties. In the Speech from the Throne, some things have already been pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), some of the positive things and some of the negative things, but one thing that I found missing, Mr. Speaker, which was quite obvious in a lot of other Throne Speeches; people have been saying that this Throne Speech is a regurgitation of a lot of the previous ones and in a lot of cases it was, but in this one way, I missed the fed bashing that was in the last few Throne Speeches. I really missed it.

I have had experience with fed bashing, you know, I have had experience with fed bashing and it was not too long ago when I had thought that the Premier of the Province was being a little bit too rough on the Federal Liberal ministers, so I invited one of them to Gander - not myself, I was responsible for the council inviting one of them to Gander. It was the Minister of National Defence, and National Defence, of course, has been a very low priority item from the point of view of the federal government for Newfoundland. We have the

smallest per capita expenditure of all the provinces, even in spite of our strategic location.

Anyway, the Minister of National Defence was invited down and I talked to him ahead of time and said, "Now, there are some things we would like to have," and went over them and one of them was base status and the other had to do with some other items of national defence. So he agreed to come down and we had a dinner for him and he was introduced and he gave a speech and so on. In his speech he never mentioned one single thing about anything to do with Gander or national defence in Gander. His position was simply that he was holding the line. Things would stay as they are, and it was a nice trip and he was glad to meet us. My duty was to thank him afterwards. I was supposed to thank him because I was of the same political stripe as he was. So all of a sudden the thought crossed my mind, the Premier of the Province loves this fed bashing, maybe I should try it. And, Mr. Speaker, I went up one side of the minister and down the other, I even bashed him over the head a few times. And people were shocked in the audience - there were about 100 or 150 people there or something - they were kind of shocked and the minister was taken aback, he was expecting it in Newfoundland but not expecting it from me, and he left and I am not quite sure what his attitude was but, Mr. Speaker, a short time after that there was a change in ministers and we got base status for CFB Gander. So there are some things to be said, I suppose, for fed bashing. The only thing is that my conclusion is that really there are no areas of conflict because obviously the attitude has been that where there are

conflicts that they should be open conflicts. When these conflicts are at the point of not being resolved, then the conflict should be open and, Mr. Speaker, the conclusion that I can reach is that there are no conflicts.

However, upon reading government documents and so on I find that there are some areas where perhaps there should be a little bit of fed bashing on the part of this provincial government.

MR. MARSHALL:

I wonder would the hon. gentleman like to adjourn the debate and start off again tomorrow.

MR. BAKER:

Yes.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 30, 1985 at 3:00 p.m.