



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 87

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

21 February 1986

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I want to deal with two points of privilege raised in the House yesterday. In the words of the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), and I quote from Hansard: "Now, Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege I want to express in very few words has to do with the fact that the Minister of Consumer Affairs lied to this House." And the hon. President of the Council's point of privilege was in connection with the statement of the hon. member for Port de Grave that the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs lied in this House. An hon. member is not allowed to accuse another hon. member of lying in the House. Both points of privilege can be dealt with by the hon. member for Port de Grave withdrawing that allegation and I now call on him to do so unequivocally. The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, just let me take a moment to explain. It was not my intention-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No. No!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I am calling on the hon. member to withdraw that statement unequivocally.

MR. BARRY:
Will the Speaker also call on members opposite to give the member a chance to say what he wants to say?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is completely out of order. The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to do as I am asked in this House of Assembly, if I am allowed just to say a word on why I intend to do it.

MR. BARRY:
Of course you are allowed. It is not Russia yet. It is not the Philippines. You are allowed!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No! No!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I am not in the habit of calling people liars. The reason I did say that in anger yesterday was -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I am calling on the hon. member to withdraw his remarks unequivocally. Otherwise, I will have to name him.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I want to withdraw the word "liar" and I want to rephrase it.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
What is going on here? What is this?

MR. DAWE:
The rules of the House, with which you are unfamiliar.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member has withdrawn the phrase and the Chair is satisfied with that.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A point of privilege, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
We have, Mr. Speaker, a situation where the Premier has decided to aid and abet the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in an assault on the Auditor General, when last night he got on the public media and he challenged and questioned the competence of the Auditor General. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General, as we have established before, is an officer of the House and he is entitled to be protected by this House. Your Honour should deal with these allegations by the Premier, which were a further assault and brought to a difficult situation the ability of the Auditor General to do the job for which he was appointed. I ask Your Honour to step in to protect the Auditor General.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier to that point of privilege.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege. I did not question the competence of the Auditor General at all, and I said that to the media yesterday clearly and unmistakably. I find it rather ironic that the Leader of the Opposition would get up and accuse me of somehow undermining the competence of an officer of this

House when the very person, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), had to be flung from this House last week because he did just that to Your Honour. So it is rather ironic, the pot calling the kettle black.

Mr. Speaker, I at no time questioned the competence of the Auditor General, and I made that clear to the press yesterday. I did indicate that we had no choice as a government but to say clearly and unmistakably to the world and to the people of Newfoundland, and to the financial community, that we believe - not only believe, we know it to be true - having checked it out with world-renowned experts in the field of borrowing and finances, that the Auditor General had made a number of inaccurate statements in his report which reflected negatively upon the Province and of, course, in that light we had to respond in the way we did.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and speak to the matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:
The natives are restless this morning.

I support the allegations raised by my colleague and friend from Mount Scio, the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier, among other things, said that the Auditor General lacked the resources. Well, that should not be difficult to solve. It is in

the Premier's bailiwick to see that he gets the resources. If he does not have adequate resources to do his job, there is a procedure for giving him the resources through this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the Premier -

MR. DAWE:

There is more money spent in Newfoundland -

MR. SIMMONS:

I listened to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier, last evening, certainly alleged that the Auditor General was acting outside his area of jurisdiction when he made the example about cutting the grass and getting it paid for, etc., etc. He made that allegation, that the Auditor General was operating outside his area of jurisdiction. He certainly implied in his statements, in this House and outside this House, that the Auditor General had performed incompetently.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was always within the right of parliamentarians to question the competence of the officers who serve them, including in this Chamber, but there is a way to do it, and I would urge the Premier not to do it by the backdoor. If he has some reservations about the competence of the Auditor General, if they have decided, as I believe they have, Mr. Speaker, that he must go - they are going to make life rough for him now ever day they can - if they have decided that, let them have the courage of

their convictions and come into this Chamber, in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Administration Act, and do what has to be done to put this issue to a test. The Auditor General is an officer not of the government, of this particular House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned yesterday by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and by the Premier, that they take advice from a number of sources, including the Comptroller General. But we all know that the Comptroller General is in a conflict of interest position, because he is also a servant of the Minister of Finance in one of his two capacities, his capacity as a collector of revenue. So what the Comptroller General has had to say on this situation is completely beside the point, he is in a very severe conflict of interest position. I appeal to the Premier, and the Minister of Finance in particular, if they have concerns about the Auditor General, let us not do it by the backdoor, put down the appropriate motion and let us have a debate in this Chamber. We are the people to whom that gentleman answers, not the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I can indicate a little bit of surprise. The hon. gentleman has gone on on a point of privilege when really trying to inject debate into this House. This is really what the hon. gentleman is doing. Words of members outside the House, by the way, Mr. Speaker, do not constitute items

of breach of privilege. Otherwise, Your Honour would be going through the esoteric exercise every day of reading the paper and listening to and monitoring news bulletins.

The fact of the matter is, it is quite clear, it is crystal clear where this government stands with respect to it. The Minister of Finance and the government have questioned the way in which the Auditor General, in one particular instance, executed his office, or his function, and we stand by that, because we are not going to have, as a result of that particular statement, the credit of this Province impugned in any way. Now, I went over all that yesterday.

The hon. gentleman can twist things all he wants. He gets up and he talks about impugning an officer of this House and then, in the next breath, he gets into the Comptroller General. The fact of the matter is, the Comptroller General and the financial advisors of this Province have all concurred with the government; all expressed the concerns about a matter where the Auditor General has exceeded his authority and has been completely, absolutely and consummately wrong. That is an end to the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to hon. gentlemen there opposite that when this House reconvenes, if they are so concerned about the officers of this House they should show a little bit more concern for the institution of this House, and particularly Your Honour, and not have the kind of circus they are trying to draw into this House, the questioning of Your Honour's own integrity and judgement, as we saw today from the Leader of the

Opposition, and we see by the twisty little words that emit from the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. BARRY:

Just briefly on the matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour rules.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in addition to questioning the competence of the Auditor General, also question whether the Auditor General has the resources to do the job. In other words, to identify how much money they are losing on a yearly basis by their mistakes. Now, if the Auditor General does not have the resources, the Premier should see that he is supplied with the resources to do his job properly, and he should not use the financial restraint that is imposed on the Auditor General as a backdoor way of then attacking the competence of the Auditor General.

The Auditor General, fortunately, had enough resources to identify a problem, and it is not good enough for the Premier, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to then try and pass off that \$5.25 million mistake, and try and develop the red herring, by attacking the Auditor General to detract attention away from their own incompetence and their own bungling in the management of the resources of this Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In the point of privilege there is a very important point that both hon. members brought up which has to be corrected, Mr. Speaker, because it cannot be allowed to stand on the record on this point of privilege, and that is that I said that the Auditor General lacks resources. Now, that is an incorrect statement. I did not say that.

MR. TULK:

Yes, you did.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me explain. I indicated that the Auditor General's department in Newfoundland has twice as much money to do its work than Nova Scotia, which has a larger budget, or New Brunswick which has a larger budget. Then I went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the area

MR. BARRY:

You are trying to backtrack now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I was quiet when the Leader of the Opposition made his points.

MR. BARRY:

You are trying to backtrack now. Come on!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I request silence to finish my submission on the point of privilege.

I went on to say that in the area of financial borrowing, in the Province borrowing, in the New York market, Toronto market, European market, London, or Paris, or Zurich, or in Japan, I did not believe that the Auditor General had the people on staff who were qualified in that field, that he did not have the resources in that field. He has a lot of resources, more resources than Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, but he does not have the resources at his disposal in this field of expertise as the government has in hiring Dominion Ames, or Merrill Lynch, or McLeod, Young and Weir or anybody else, and that is a problem, Mr. Speaker. But to say that the Auditor General does not have a lot of resources for the normal kinds of things that he does for 98 per cent of his report is untrue, because he does. He has more resources than Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, who have larger budgets.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Just a final submission.

MR. BARRY:

The point, Mr. Speaker, is that we know that the Province is out borrowing in the financial markets, we know that the Auditor General has a responsibility to supervise and oversee that borrowing, so if he does not have that staff, why is it that the Premier has -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, how is it that Your Honour jumps up every time there is a sneeze over here and I have to put up with this sort of nonsense from the other side when I am speaking?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. the Leader of the Opposition please sit down.

MR. SIMMONS:

He is sitting down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not want any comment from the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) when I am speaking. If he speaks, I will name him.

I will give the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) a few minutes to conclude his remarks on this point of privilege. It has gone on for a very extended time and I, certainly, have heard nothing so far that indicates there is any possible breach of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour, I am very happy when Your Honour feels that I have gone on long enough to sit down. What I am objecting to is having to try to scream out over thirty-six screaming temper tantrums opposite. That is what I object to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. -

MR. BARRY:

The point I am making is that Your Honour is very quick to jump if there is a sound over here, but lets the rabble bay and bray when we try to sepak over here.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

That is what I am saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now, if this is going to be a Legislature, it is going to be a Legislature where people are going to be treated fairly on both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has a comment to make, I would ask him to make it now.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, yes, and I would ask if Your Honour would enforce silence while I make it.

MR. PATTERSON:

You need a new pamper. Your pampers are wet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

The Auditor General has a responsibility -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I ask hon. members on both sides for silence.

MR. BARRY:
The Auditor General has a responsibility when there is a commitment to obtain funds and when funds are obtained, to ensure that the process is done properly so that there is not a loss to this Province.

The Province is going out into international markets. Mr. Speaker, there are funds held as a result of international borrowings, there are obligations incurred as a result of international borrowings. We have heard the Premier admit that the Auditor General is not given the resources, not given the staff, as he said last night, is not equipped to properly supervise what is going on with respect to these financial borrowings and the question is, Why is the Auditor General not given those resources?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There appears to be a difference of opinion between both sides. There is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We have just witnessed again, because of his petulant nature, the Leader of the Opposition, after Your Honour brought him to order because he was not sitting

down, get up again - he always has to be the one to have the last word, even though he is out of order - and what did the Leader of the Opposition say? Get the Hansard and see what the Leader of the Opposition said. He said nothing which bore upon the point of privilege. Not one syllable did the Leader of the Opposition say that bore upon the point of privilege. All he said was that I said the Auditor General did not have the resources, which I contradicted earlier, and that he has a responsibility to see that things are done properly when we borrow in the borrowing markets of the world. There was nothing bearing upon the point of privilege. The Leader of the Opposition is trying to take this House on his back, and when our side is quiet to allow him to get up, then we are supposed to listen to him because he is so petulant. Now, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition is petulant and is stubborn, that is no reason why we have to give him license to always get up, when he is completely out of order, on a point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, last Fall we saw the Premier, when the legislative programme was half finished, chicken out because he could not take the heat and close the House. We now see, Mr. Speaker, the Premier doing the same thing in this special session. Remember this great historic moment in Newfoundland history, a special

session to pass the Atlantic Accord, and when we started to ask a few penetrating questions as to what was in the Accord, the Premier said, "We are closing her down. We are going back to plan C. We cannot stand the heat. We are getting out."

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
I have not finished my response to the Premier's remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:
I have heard enough on that point of order to rule there is no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
The point of privilege arises out of remarks made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and remarks, I do not know whether they are in Hansard, by the member for Fortune - Hermitage during the time of Your Honour's ruling, shouting at Your Honour, indicating that Your Honour does not keep this side in order and allows this side to interrupt, and casting aspersions -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
He called the Speaker a nut.

MR. SIMMONS:
I was being kind at the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Name him. Give him the boots!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman says he was being kind. I want to refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 38, paragraph 117 on the Speaker which reads: "The chief characteristics attached to the office of Speaker in the House of Commons are authority and impartiality. He calls upon members to speak and in debate all speeches are addressed to him. When he rises to preserve order or give a ruling he must always always be heard in silence. No member may rise when the Speaker is standing. Reflections upon the character or actions of Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege. His actions cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form or proceeding except by way of a substantive motion. Confidence in the impartiality of the Speaker is an indispensable condition of the successful working of procedure, and many conventions exist which have as their object, not only to ensure the impartiality of the Speaker but also, to ensure that his impartiality is generally recognized.

"The Presiding Officer, though entitled on all occasions to be treated with the greatest attention and respect by the individual Members, because the power, dignity, and honour of the House are officially embodied in his person, is yet but a servant of the House.

"In order to ensure his complete impartiality, the Speaker cannot be consulted from the floor of the House, etc."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has occurred and what is occurring in this House, and I do not know whether members of this House or the general public realize it, is

a very, very serious situation. There can be and there should be in this House debate and heated debated from time to time on public issues, and there will be things said back and forth about members from time to time, but it is an entirely different situation when we have these kinds of comments made by the Leader of the Opposition - and emitting from the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) at the present time, as well - with respect to the impartiality of Your Honour as Your Honour executes your duties, casting aspersions on Your Honour and casting what can only be determined to be insults on Your Honour.

Although I have not seen it, there are times when the person in the Chair is going to make rulings which are not correct and what have you, but regardless of whether they are correct or whether they are palatable, they are to be accepted by everybody in this House, on both sides of the House, otherwise you have a complete breaking down of this institute of parliament, which is what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I see it in this session of the House, because of two members particularly, and in my own heart I do not feel, the way in which the Leader of the Opposition is tackling this House, whether his jealousy and his feelings should be able to permeate the mood of this House to such an extent that he should be allowed to attack the basic institution, which is the Speaker of this House primarily, which has been handed to us for generations, otherwise, we are just going to get into a beer garden type of atmosphere in this House to the shame and the detriment of the

House itself and the people of this Province.

I think it is very serious, and I think one of the reasons why the House is at the stage it is is because of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's obvious petulance and the way in which he just cannot take orders. But orders and rulings have to come from the Chair and they have to be complied with, Mr. Speaker. I think the two hon. gentlemen owe it to Your Honour to get up and apologize to Your Honour and to the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
All equal time.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentlemen will get equal time. The only time the hon. gentlemen need, Your Honour, is time to get in a few sentences and apologize to the House and the people of Newfoundland for their conduct.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Your Honour, we know you have a difficult job. Your Honour will, himself, know that when there are thirty-six yelling and screaming at Your Honour, it is very easy for Your Honour to unconsciously, at times, permit that yelling and screaming, that mob rule from your left, to, from time to time, Mr. Speaker, cause your perspective to be unconsciously distorted.

Now, Your Honour, if the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was doing his job in controlling those sitting on his side of the House, if, Mr. Speaker, he was not in fact the main instigator of the attack on the integrity of this House and the rules of this House, if we did not have to, every time the Government House Leader stood up, listen to the impugning of our motives, the impugning of motives of this member and other members of this House - as a matter of fact, it has been the entire strategy in the Atlantic Accord debate to make the point that I am jealous. Jealous?

MR. MATTHEWS:

So you are.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Jealous of those 80,000 who were left unemployed by the conduct of members opposite? Is that a performance for me to be jealous about, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, we heard the Government House Leader again, standing on a point of privilege, talking about enforcing the rules of the House, make that same point to impute my motives, that when I perform as Leader of the Opposition, no I am not performing because I think there is an attack on the Auditor General because the Auditor General needs protection, no, no, I am attacking because I have particular motives.

Now, how is it that the Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, is not ruled out of order? How many times do we have to get up and make that point? Is there any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the

House, at times, falls into disarray, when the person who is primarily responsible for assisting Your Honour to keep order with every word that comes out of his mouth is subverting the rules of the House and the order of this House? Is there any wonder?

Now, Your Honour, if I said anything this morning in the heat of debate, in the heat of the moment in trying to make a point while being screamed down, shouted down by members opposite, I withdraw and I withdraw unequivocally, and I acknowledge the difficult job Your Honour has.

But, Your Honour, as Leader of the Opposition I have an historic position, I have an important position and it is a position that requires my protecting the prerogatives of those on this side of the House, and this I will continue to do as long as I am Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of privilege, I think what both the hon. the President of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition said is well taken. I do not want to expand on what either side said. I think we are here to deliberate. My job here is to be as fair as I possibly can and I have always done that and will continue to do so. I know in the heat of debate things are said sometimes which are not really meant. I would like, at this time, to just leave it at that.

At this stage I would like to

welcome to the galleries sixty-seven Grade X students from Eugene Vaters Collegiate with their teachers, Rick Canning and Sid Stacey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to brief hon. members on recent information supplied to me by the Newfoundland Milk Marketing Board.

The Newfoundland dairy industry, over the past three years, has seen a tremendous growth since the formation of the Milk Marketing Board on February, 1983.

During 1983 local milk production totalled 12,953,677 litres. The total production for 1985 was 15,369,871 litres. This shows a very significant increase of 18.5 per cent, Mr. Speaker, in just two years. During 1985, local milk production represented \$10,211,000.00 to the economy of this Province.

Over the past three years consumption of milk in this Province has increased from 42 litres per person to 46 litres per person. We are still far behind the national average, which is now about 102 litres per person.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment here. The Newfoundland Marketing Board, through their own initiative, have started an experimental school milk programme to increase the awareness of milk by our younger people so that consumption might be increased.

There were 49 registered producers when the board was formed in 1983. Today, we have 68 registered producers. There are, as of today, nine new approved producers clearing land and constructing facilities. Two of these producers, who are in Western Newfoundland, will begin shipment of milk in April of this year.

Consumption of reconstituted milk has been reduced by 63 per cent over the past three years. The board looks forward to the eradication of reconstituted milk by the Summer of 1986. This will allow for an additional 300 cows to come into the local dairy production system.

Mr. Speaker, I am very encouraged with these statistics indeed. I feel confident that with the continued sound management of the Newfoundland Milk Marketing Board and the dedication and hard work of our dairy farmers, the dairy industry in this Province will continue to grow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear the minister with his release. I want to thank him for giving us a copy of his release before reading it. I must say, it is a pleasure

dealing with certain ministers and having them stand in the House. I think the minister is one who, by and large, on that side of the House, operates as a gentleman and is courteous in his participation in debate. I know that means he may get the flick out of that caucus, as the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) was indicating.

I would say to the minister, as he probably knows, I have had some dealings with the Newfoundland Milk Marketing Board. I know some of the people who are working there. There is a young man from the minister's own district who is doing a very fine job, I think, in working with the board. We are very pleased to see the thrust of this programme. It is one, I think, where there is room for expansion of production; we can have less reconstituted milk, we can have more of our locally grown product, and we can have more people employed in farming in this Province.

There are a number of things that have to be done, of course, and all is not well, all is not wine and milk with the minister's department. We do have a situation where there are farmers who are feeling they are not getting the assistance from the board they should get, all the farmers are not totally satisfied with the way the Milk Marketing Board is operating, and the other point that should be made is that there is a threat to agricultural land. Particularly around our urban areas there is a threat to agricultural land as urban sprawl encroaches. It is a matter of, on the one hand, preserving our agricultural land and, on the other hand, not forcing the farmer to bear the brunt of that policy which is in place for the benefit

of all Newfoundlanders.

The minister has made some improvements to the agricultural land freeze, but I do not think it has gone far enough yet. I know in his own constituency he has many farmers who are seriously concerned about having a proper agricultural land programme. I would ask the minister to continue to devote his efforts to improving that agricultural land programme so that we can save our agricultural land, but permit the farmer to see the benefit of his life investment, not have the value of his land frozen where he cannot get at it.

I commend the minister on the work that has been done to date in increasing the amount of milk production and I hope we will see more of this in the future.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I guess he has given up, after the questions on the Auditor General.

DR. COLLINS:

He will be right back.

MR. BARRY:

He will be right back?

DR. COLLINS:

Yes.

MR. BARRY:

Well, maybe the Premier can hear me from outside the House. The Auditor General, in his recent

report, indicated that in his opinion the Rural Development Authority was exceeding its statutory authority by granting, under the guise of rural development loans, loans and grants, presumably, making money available to urban areas. Now, I would like to ask the Premier does he accept that approach and does he believe that there is sufficient rural development, that there is enough money now being spent in the rural areas and that the money should be diverted to the urban areas of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to define when a place becomes urban and when it is no longer rural. Take, for example, the town of Gander today. Quite a few of the small businessmen in Gander employ people from Gambo and Bonavista North. Right on the little base that is there, most of the people who work there as labourers and skilled tradesmen come from Bonavista North. Very often you will find that when somebody applies for assistance under the Rural Development Authority, it is difficult for the board to make a decision. Do you use the criteria, for example, that if you have more than 50 per cent from outside Gander that it is rural? I mean, is Gander rural or is Gander urban? Portugal Cove, in the hon. member's district, is that in Metropolitan St. John's and therefore should not qualify for a rural development loan?

So it is a question of the definition of rural and in Newfoundland that is accentuated, as we all know, by the nature of

the Province, and so it is extremely difficult. But if we see that it is going to create jobs and some of those jobs are going to be not only in Gander but in Glenwood or Appleton or in Clarke's Head or Phillips Head or in Gambo or Dark Cove, well, then, obviously the board approves the application. So it is a grey area, it is not a black and white area, and that is what the Auditor General is talking about.

Perhaps we should have a definition of urban and rural, but I think it would be very difficult to get. So what the board does in its wisdom and its discretion, is try to be as fair as it can in the loaning of money for job creation. We would not want to automatically and categorically outlaw a small business in Grand Falls or Botwood, if that is to be considered urban, or Gander, from getting access to some of these funds if, in fact, some of their activity is going to be outside Gander in the pursuit of their business, number one, and, number two, they would be hiring people who are not all from that so-called urban area.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, again we saw the Premier embarking on a speech in response to a short question.

Now, I would like to ask the Premier whether he would answer the question which is, is there enough money being spent in rural areas? If there is sufficient money to follow the intent of the

act and to create employment in the rural communities, then, I am sure, nobody would question any excess money being spent in urban areas to create other jobs to attract people from the rural areas. The policy of the act is to put the money in rural communities, and the Auditor General says loans were issued to applicants for use in other than rural areas. Does the Premier agree with this? Is there enough money to put the jobs in the rural areas?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, if that is the Auditor General's opinion, he has determined in his own mind what he considers urban and what he considers rural. That might not be what the Rural Development Authority considers to be rural and urban, number one. Number two, in cases where there are applications from what the Auditor General considers to be urban areas, I would say they are by far the minority and might be 5 per cent or 10 per cent of the applications which are approved. Ninety per cent or ninety five per cent of the applications under the Rural Development Authority go to rural Newfoundland in the sense that it is not Gander, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Stephenville, perhaps even Botwood and those larger centers, but where do you draw the line? Marystown, Burin or Harbour Grace, is that rural or is that urban? It is a question of how you want to define urban and rural? I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that in by far the majority of cases, and I would hazard a guess of up to 90 per cent or 95 per cent of the applications approved, under the

Rural Development Authority go to very small communities and small businesses in rural Newfoundland, outside the major centers.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Is the Premier aware that one of the criteria employed for distributing money under the Rural Development Act as stated by the - it is only a joke to say that this is a departmental response - Minister of Finance is the source of the raw material, the origin of the raw material? On page 97 of this report he says this is one factor. Now, applying that criteria, all the money could be deposited right here, next door to Confederation Building, or downtown Water Street. Now, does the Premier accept that as a legitimate criteria to be applied in deciding where the money is spent?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is theory again. That is all theory again, that is not what happens in practice. Let me give the Leader of the Opposition a good example: In the industrial area or the commercial area, whatever you want to call it, of Gander, for example, where they have a lot of those small businesses along the Gander Bay Highway, where the roads come out there, you could have a gentleman or a businessman

there who has a saw mill. Now, he does not get his saw logs from the town of Gander, he gets his saw logs from down on the Gander Bay Road, where there is a forest access road put in with government money and so on. Now, that is a good question. The business is in Gander and now this gentleman is not going to qualify because Gander is urban, even though he gets all his logs from down on the Gander Bay Road, and even though, perhaps, he employs in that sawmill, the people who cut the saw logs, people from Gander Bay; some of the people who are going to be operating the sawmill are from Gander Bay. Now, does that person qualify for a rural development loan?

The theory that the Leader of the Opposition just advanced just does not work in practice. The majority of the loans -

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am trying to answer the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier is going on at untold lengths. It is the last Question Period, and the Premier is going to bolt the doors of the House and run away. I would just like to say that if the Premier keeps up his policies there is no question that Gander will be a rural area, if he continues his policy on Air Canada.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am trying to answer what the Leader of the Opposition has asked. It is an interesting question: where do you draw the line between rural and urban. It is the Liberal Government, in Ottawa, which was determining whether Gander is rural or urban, because they took 300 or 400 jobs, EPA, and sent them to Halifax. That is the problem in Gander.

But the point of order is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to answer a question which is in a very grey area of government policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must rule there is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, lest there be any doubt, I think it is understood in Gander who drove Harry Steele out of Newfoundland. It was nobody on the Liberal side of the House. It was not a Liberal Premier who refused to meet with him.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed when the Premier was answering one of the supplementaries from the Leader of the Opposition that he again took a mild flick at the Auditor

General when he talked about, "Well, that is his opinion." Now, I would like to get back to -

MR. TOBIN:

Do not be talking about audits, boy.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Of all people to be talking about audits.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, there they are again. Can you not keep control in this place?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are you chastising the Speaker again.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I am.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier dismisses the Auditor General once again. I would just like to know from the Premier, because in former times, when Mr. Moores was Premier here and Mr. Smallwood was Premier, there was a certain respect by the leader of the administration for an officer of the House who had a legitimately mandated function to perform. Sometimes the administration will not agree with his opinion but, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have to allow that gentleman to do his job. I wonder would the Premier indicate where the administration is coming from on this particular issue? Is it their intention, notwithstanding the fact they may disagree with his opinion at times, and that is understandable,

to allow this gentleman to perform his function or are they going to run him into the ground?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General is performing his function. He has issued his report and it has been tabled here in the House. And we have issued, at the same time, with the Auditor General's Report, departmental responses and our arguments back on points that he has made. As Premier of the Province, yea, as a citizen of Newfoundland, if the Auditor General or the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) says something that I do not agree with, I have the right and, yea, the obligation to point out the other side of the argument, to point out the other side of the issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the member for Fortune - Hermitage is accusing the government of trying to muzzle the Auditor General, I say what is the member for Fortune - Hermitage trying to do with me and members on this side who want to express a point of view different than the Auditor General's? Is he trying to muzzle us, Mr. Speaker?

On the business of rural development I say to you, and I say any reasonable Newfoundlander would agree with me, that on the question of rural versus urban, the Auditor General is splitting hairs. We know of an example, when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was on the government side of the House, where there

were loans made to Marystown. Is Marystown urban? I would think, the way the Auditor General is speaking, that Marystown is urban and the gentleman in Marystown should not have gotten his loan approved. So where do you draw the line? We all know that that is a grey area, we all understand that.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is not the question I asked.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The question you asked! Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question, which was this: I have the right to disagree with the Auditor General in the same way as the Auditor General has a right to disagree with me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would normally ask this question of the Minister of Health (Dr Twomey) because it does concern health care, but I think the matter is now sufficiently serious to direct it to the head of the administration, the Premier. Now, that government's fiscal restraints have pretty well brought health care service to its knees in this Province, where we have hundreds of people waiting to get in hospital, desperately in need of health care and are unable to get that care because of staff cuts and cutbacks in hospitals, is the Premier willing to admit that maybe the time has now come to review the health care service in the Province with a view to freeing up the necessary money to ensure that the people of Newfoundland do get the type of

health care they deserve?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first off, the preamble the hon. member for Twillingate made is really an erroneous statement. The increase in the budget for the Department of Health since 1979, since I became Premier until today, has been over 100 per cent. There has been an increase of more than 100 per cent in the budget of the Department of Health from 1979 until 1985. Now, if that demonstrates that we are somehow restraining, when we increased the budget of the Department of Health by over 100 per cent, then I would like to know what restraint is all about. To me it does not seem right at all.

It is 25 per cent of the budget now. One out of every four dollars out of the Government of Newfoundland goes to health services. But that is not to say that we do not need to do more. We are building new hospitals; we have built a new clinic in Whitbourne, we built a new hospital in Port aux Basques, a new clinic in Forteau, a new hospital in Clarenville, and a new hospital in Burin. That is hospitals in general. We are trying to do what we can.

On the question of nursing care and senior citizens homes, there is a problem in the sense that the ongoing input of money through CMHC, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, or the Department of Health, has not been as great as in previous years. But we are still building new homes, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue to do so.

Talking about having a study on health care, we had a study on health care, Mr. Speaker. We had a royal commission on health care costs and what did that royal commission show? The royal commission said, "You can freeze the budgets of the hospitals in St. John's at the present level for three years." And the Hospital Association came in at the last minute and said, "Ho, ho, ho, before you do that let us have another kick at the cat. We want to prove to you that you really cannot do this." But when they came into the royal commission to prove it, they could not prove it. So the hospital budgets were frozen in the St. John's hospitals for a three year period and they are getting along quite well.

At the same time, as more money has to be put into the health care system, we must ensure that every dollar that we are spending is being spent efficiently. Because, Mr. Speaker, there were instances in the last few years where, in the last two weeks before the fiscal year was over, some hospital boards had a surplus and at the last minute, in the last week or two, threw that money at something so that they could tell government they had all their money spent.

So you have to be careful, when you are talking about health care systems, to make sure that the taxpayer is getting the value for the dollar. At the same time, we do recognize that in certain components of health care more money has to be spent.

MR. W. CARTER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for

Twillingate, a supplementary.

MR. W. CARTER:
The Premier obviously has his head stuck in the sand, because there are people actually dying while waiting to get into hospital. And whether or not the budget is increased by 100 per cent -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, the Premier says the budget has been increased by 100 per cent in the past so many years. It is obvious that it probably should have increased by 500 per cent, because the service has deteriorated to almost its lowest point since Confederation. I repeat my question, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that people are seriously in need of hospitalization - we have cases which, I am sure, will come forward here today - will the Premier undertake an immediate review of hospital care in this Province with a view to making more funds available? It does not matter that there has been a 100 per cent increase, obviously there should have been more. Will he undertake a review to make the necessary funds available to ensure that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians get the kind of hospital care and treatment they deserve and need?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I do not know where the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has come from. On the one hand the Liberal Party is saying we are

borrowing too much so we cannot borrow any more, we are being very, very crazy in borrowing so much, and on the other hand they are saying, "Increase the hospital budgets by 500 per cent rather than 100 per cent." Now, if we cannot borrow any more, where are we going to get that extra 400 per cent? It has either got to come from increasing taxes -

MR. FLIGHT:

Stop wasting. Stop wasting.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is not enough waste there to do it, and everybody knows that. The Auditor General will tell you that over the last three or four years there has been no wastage in the system. He has said it over and over again, 'There is no wastage.' To put a 400 per cent increase in the budget would mean \$2 billion or \$3 billion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

What about the \$500,000 for your office?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Who is abusing the rules of the House now? The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was accusing us of speaking up when somebody else was on their feet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Premier has asked for silence.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to answer the member for Twillingate, who wants a 400 per cent increase in the hospital budget. It is now around \$500 million. So he wants it to go up - what? That is \$2 billion - to about \$2 billion. He does not want us to borrow any more because his party is against borrowing. Now, where are we going to get the money? The only place we can get the money is to increase taxes. So we have to put up sales tax or income tax or gas tax or some other form of tax to raise some money, or we have got to take it out of other areas. Now, where does he want us to take it from? Does he want us to take it from Education? Does he want us to take it from Rural Development? Where is the member for Twillingate going to come up with that \$2 billion to get that health budget up ever higher?

The member for Twillingate cannot have it both ways. He cannot get up and say we are crazy for borrowing so much and then turn around and say we have to have \$2 billion more for Health without increasing taxes, without taking it from any other department or without borrowing. That is an irresponsible kind of attitude for the member for Twillingate to take.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

The Premier is grasping for straws. I said that if the budget has increased by 100 per cent in the past so many years, obviously, judging by the quality of service today, it should have increased by 500 per cent, maybe. Mr. Speaker,

the point I was making is that the Health service has deteriorated and that if it takes more money to bring it back to an acceptable standard, then the Premier's job is to get the money, Mr. Speaker, maybe cut out some of the waste. Maybe the \$50 million ivory tower next door was not necessary. Maybe the Premier's office renovations were not necessary. Maybe the money wasted on the sculptures in the building was not necessary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let us just look at those three areas the member for Twillingate mentioned. Let us get down to it, if he wants to get down to it. The building next door is saving the government money, because we will be able to pay it off in ten years and have no rent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I must be hitting a nervous strain over there. They have gone crazy again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is completely incorrect. We are saving money by building that building. That is why we built it. Otherwise, we would have an ongoing cost for the next twenty or thirty years, on rent, of a couple of million dollars a year. We will be able to pay off that building and save money. That is a fact. That can be proven and has been proven. So that is no place to get the money.

He talks about my office, \$400,000 or \$500,000. How many hospitals is \$400,000 or \$500,000 going to build? One hospital costs, how much? The hospital at Port aux Basques cost about \$15 million. The member for Twillingate is talking about \$1.5 billion - \$2 billion, and he is going to try to get it by not doing what we did over here. That would cost more money.

Then he attacks art. We are supposed to forget all about culture now, then. So we will eliminate culture. He is attacking the artists. He does not want any art work, which gives jobs to Newfoundlanders. One per cent of the capital cost of all public buildings goes to art so that we have artists working. We have created more jobs in the art field in the last three or four years than any other government in our history. So if he wants to eliminate all the artists, I do not think that is an acceptable alternative. Because the amount of money that is going in there, again, is only \$400,000 or \$500,000 a year, still not enough to build a half hospital or a quarter hospital.

So the alternatives that the member for Twillingate is giving would not build one quarter of a new hospital, therefore, I can only say that his question is politically motivated and has no substance in fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I would like to ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, while he is making his speech which has no substance to it at all, if he is aware that there are 1,100 people on the waiting list at the Grace Hospital, 375 on the waiting list for the Gynecology Department? One of my constituents called me last evening and told me that she has been on the waiting list for six weeks to have some serious surgery done and was informed by her doctor that she is going to be on the waiting list for at least another two months. Meanwhile, the Premier is saying that our health services are in good hands? Will he answer that question?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The wealthiest Province in Canada has hospitals where there are waiting lists. Now, you tell me, if the wealthiest Province in Canada has hospitals with waiting lists, what can the poorest Province in Canada do, not have waiting lists?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Finance. In the last couple of days, we have heard a very unseemly row between himself and the rest of government and the

Auditor General. What we seem to have is a situation where the Auditor General says our debts are not correctly recorded, while the Minister of Finance says they are correctly recorded. Obviously, both statements cannot be correct at the same time, so I want to ask the Minister of Finance how we can get that question resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a sensible question on this issue, at last, a sensible question from the other side of the House, and obviously there is a sensible answer to it. That question is already resolved. If the hon. member will read the Public Accounts he will see the Auditor's Report in the front of the Public Accounts, signed by one J. McGrath, which says, "I certify that these accounts present fairly and squarely" - or something of that order - "the financial affairs of this Province under the accepted accounting procedures." That is signed by him. Now, in addition to the Auditor General saying that our Public Accounts are correct, we have consulted, because there was some question raised in a later inconsistent report by the same gentleman - I have difficulty understanding myself how he can speak one way out of this side of his mouth and another way out of the other side of his mouth, because it is all there.

Just let me read out what the hon. member says: "In accordance with section 62 of the Financial Administration Act, 1973, I have examined the statement of assets and liabilities of the Province of

Newfoundland as at 31 March 1985, the Consolidated Revenue Fund statement of receipts and payments, the statement of changes in financial position and the summary of revenue, expenditure and related revenue by department for the year then ended. My examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests and other procedures as I considered necessary in the circumstances.

"In my opinion, these financial statements present fairly the financial position of the Province as of 31 March 1985 and its receipts and payments, changes in financial position and the summary of revenue, expenditure and related revenue by department for the year then ended in accordance with the accounting policies described in Note 1 to the financial statements applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year. I further report that, in my opinion" -

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

The Auditor General's Report has been tabled and the minister is taking up Question Period reading the it. There are supposed to be short answers, Mr. Speaker, during Question Period, not lengthy speeches. The minister is engaged in a lengthy dissertation.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the questions and answers should be as brief as possible. From what I can judge, this statement is just

about finished.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, you are quite correct, because there is only one more sentence to state. It says: "I further report that, in my opinion, proper books of account have been kept by the Province and that the financial statements of the Province are in agreement with these books of account. Signed, J.D. McGrath, C.A., Auditor General, St. John's, Newfoundland, December 16, 1985." That was two months before he submitted the report to me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, we consulted the Comptroller General of the Province, i.e. a servant of this House, and he confirmed, yes, the statements there, including those regarding our debt are perfectly correct. Also, I raised the question with one of the largest financial houses in Canada, McLeod, Young, Weir Limited of Toronto, whom we engage, as do other provinces to advise them on their borrowing programmes, in particular, and asked them to pass their opinion on it and they completely validate the way we are doing our work in this regard and the way we are presenting it in our public accounts.

So, all I can say, is that the facts have already been stated. There is something right, what I just said, but there is something wrong in another report and I have already reported that to the House.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

We still have a problem. As I understand it, the Public Accounts Committee will be examining this report in a couple of months and will be passing its judgement on it. It seems to me still, notwithstanding the standard disclaimer at the front, that we have a very substantial difference of fact by the Auditor General by saying this is a misstatement and government's statement.

It seems to me that there has been opportunity for government to reiterate its statement and the Auditor General to reiterate his statement so that we are not talking about a difference of opinion in terms of reconciling it. In other words, somebody is wrong here. It is of such a serious nature, my question to him is this: If the Public Accounts Committee upholds the government's position, are we then in the we must dismiss the Auditor General? And, if the reverse occurs and the Public Accounts Committee upholds the Auditor General, should the minister not feel that he is in a position where he would have to resign his position as Finance Minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I first must disagree with the hon. member when he says, 'this is just a standard thing', as though it is of no importance. This is an official document of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador on behalf of nearly 600,000 people and it is signed by an appointed officer of this House, who, if he does not believe what is written in here, I would be appalled, I would be totally appalled. So to dismiss this as

just a standard statement, I have to reject that, I am afraid.

Now, in regard to the other matter the hon. member is right in that the Auditor General puts in a report on the accounts. We have, for quite a number of years, drawn to the attention of the House of Assembly, and the people of this Province, areas where we do not think the report accords with the facts. Usually, that is called Observations by Departments on the Auditor General's Report - some phrase like that is what it is called. In addition to that, because of the extremely serious nature of the report in a few regards this year, I felt that to accentuate what those departmental observations were I had to make a special statement to make sure that everyone understood that there were a number of very, very damaging - damaging to the Province that is, not to the government particularly, but damaging to the Province reputation-was - statements in the Auditor General's Report which could not be allowed to stand for one minute without being challenged.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that should end the matter until the PAC has judged on the thing and they bring back a report to the House. And we should wait for that. Unfortunately, that did not occur because there were statements made by the Auditor General himself in regard to his report which I think were unfortunate. There were then statements made by the Opposition which had to be counted, and I think those Opposition statements were the most unfortunate. So the issue has gone on. I say it should lie at rest now until the PAC has come in with a report, and when that report comes in, it will

be judged by this House as it always is. To say what should happen or should not happen after that is totally hypothetical and I am certainly not going to get into it.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Question has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
I believe, Mr. Speaker, watching closely the events this morning with as impartial an eye as I could possibly muster, I owe the Speaker an absolutely abject apology. I watched the Premier with his very brief answers kept under control by the Speaker. I watched the minister then in his absolutely brief, concise, under-one-minute answers. I watched with disgust yesterday, the gentleman for Port de Grave go on and on and on for two sentences before making a point and I watched the Premier only get five or seven minutes this morning to make his point of order, poor fellow! Of course, Mr. Speaker, I apologize. Anybody can judge the fairness of what has gone on today, anybody.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I have no intention of responding

to the sarcastic statements made by the hon. gentleman but, I hope the press can see from the statements emitting from the hon. gentleman why we have problems in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of privilege, I do not want to expand on the sarcasm of the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons).

MR. HISCOCK:
Who said it was sarcasm?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would like to assure him that I will deal with matters here according to our Standing Orders and rules.

MR. SIMMONS:
When?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member knows he is completely out of order with his comment. When I am speaking, he will just keep quiet or he will be thrown out of the Chamber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Notices of Motion

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the

following resolution:

WHEREAS many oil companies in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador have lessened the burden on consumers by reducing the price of their petroleum products;

AND WHEREAS all companies in Central and Coastal Labrador have decided not to reduce their prices;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House unanimously request that those oil companies in Labrador show compassion to the consumers who are already paying the highest price in Province by taking similar action in reducing their prices.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

Petitions

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition on behalf of more than sixty residences of Victoria Cove, Rogers Cove, Carmanville, Clarke's Head, Port Albert, Davidsville, Aspen Cove, Ladle Cove, Gander Bay South, Wing's Point and the surrounding areas. This petition, Mr. Speaker, is to the government and is eventually to be brought to the attention of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) concerning the road situation in Gander Bay and thence to Gander.

The petitioners point out that for

a number of years they have been commuting to Gander as that is their place of employment. They point out that the road conditions that they have had to experience during the Winter have lately become deplorable. They attribute this perhaps to cutbacks in service in the last couple of years in our road network and I would suggest as well, Mr. Speaker, the conditions probably have to do with the fact that there is no secondary roads agreement yet.

The road conditions they refer to, Mr. Speaker, have to do with the lack of proper sanding and salting and the lack of proper snow clearing facilities in this particular area. They point to the fact that the salaries of the employees of the Department of Transportation have been frozen over the past couple of years and salaries have been reduced. They point out that this causes personal financial problems, along with a morale problem. Mr. Speaker, using the wage freeze, they point to the fact that this creates a morale problem within the Department of Transportation in that area.

This morale problem results in these people quite often during the Winter losing half a day's pay here, half a day's pay there, simply because the roads are not handled quickly enough or well enough. In this area some of the hills are rather steep. If there is freezing rain and so on and if they have to wait a couple of days to be able to get up that hill, then, of course, they have to lose the corresponding day's pay. These people travel in car pools. It is not a matter of a lot of vehicles, and I am sure that the Minister of Transportation (Mr.

Dawe) knows this, it is a matter of some vehicles but all of them full coming into Gander and getting stuck at the bottom of hills and so on.

They refer to the mechanisms within the Department of Transportation where a truck goes out along this road and all of a sudden 40 kilometers, 50 kilometers and 60 kilometers from the depot, the truck runs out of salt and then it has to go back and spend two or three hours before it can get back and refill with another load. They point out that perhaps this can be alleviated by better organization within the Department of Transportation and by having supplies scattered at strategic locations throughout the area.

I feel for these residents, Mr. Speaker. I am introducing this particular petition because the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is unavoidably out of the Province for today and could not present this particular petition but, it does relate directly to Gander and people who come into Gander to work. I understand there are about 600 or 700 who do that every day.

When you have a community like Gander, which is a development area and draws on the labour force from outside, you have to pay particular attention to the fact that these people who drive to work to a growth centre like this should have special consideration so as to make sure that during the Winter a method of transportation is available to them. The only method of transportation is by car and apparently these roads are not being kept up satisfactorily. They are losing work and so on. This effects not only their pay

cheque but, I might point out Mr. Speaker, it also effects their businesses and so on that they work with in the Town of Gander.

So I strongly support the petition on behalf of the residents of these communities. I am sure that it will be passed on to the Minister of Transportation for appropriate action. I sincerely hope that he has the interest and the resources to try to correct this. I would suggest to him that perhaps if he can ensure that he has a secondary roads agreement signed it would go a long way towards ensuring that a lot of roads and a lot of conditions all throughout the Province will be alleviated as quickly as possible.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand in support of that petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We saw the Premier over the last number of elections hold out the promise of prosperity once we had a Conservative Government elected in Ottawa. That has now been the case for about a year and a half I think. The Premier has had the opportunity to inflict prosperity, to assist the new Conservative Federal Government to inflict prosperity on this Province, and still, in this day and age, we have people putting up with the hardship and the inconvenience that this petition indicates.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in fully supporting the petition on behalf of these citizens and taxpayers of this Province. We ask government to do something to assist them as quickly as possible.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

There have already been two speakers. Is this a new petition?

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Yes.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure today to present a petition on behalf of the residents of the Harmon Complex in Stephenville who are opposing the latest rental increases that have come into effect in February month and that will come into effect in August month. Over the last three or four years they have been faced with rental increases of up to eighty-odd per cent and it has been done in a very quick and, I believe, in unfortunate manner, without the proper consultation being done or the without taking into account the low incomes of some of the people there.

They are not making an unreasonable request to this government. They are telling you, if you are going to increase the rents, do it in a reasonable manner. I wonder if that word is in the dictionary of the present administration. Reasonable manner is not a \$65 or \$70 increase in one shot to people who are on a fixed income. Reasonable manner would, maybe, be over a number of months or a number of years to increase the rents to a market level which you feel is fine. A reasonable level is not to, in one shot, put people out of their

places or have them move from the apartments that they are living in now.

As far as I am concerned, there have been a number of moves lately that cannot justify the rental increases. One of the reasons given for the increases was the high maintenance cost in Stephenville. Just recently we had three layoffs at the maintenance shop in Stephenville which take care of all these apartments. The minister says that this is because a report by the Western Appeals Board has recommended that and that is not so. The report recommended changes be made in maintenance and it recommended a number of new maintenance procedures that would cut costs. Instead, the only option that this government takes is to cut jobs out of Stephenville, which I am against.

Another thing is that the service to the Harmon tenants is now downgraded. As a matter of fact, I visited the place where the workers now have to work and they have been cut in half in their space to work. So, the effective maintenance is not going to be there anymore. As a matter of fact, I would say the maintenance costs are going to go up instead of down and the residents again could be faced with increases in their rents because of the inadequacy of this government in dealing with the problem.

I have a report here by the union in Stephenville who work in NLHC. They presented this to NLHC two months ago. They have in here a number of cost-cutting measures that could be implemented. They have not even had a letter of response back from the provincial government and it could cut costs

and save the department there over \$300,000 or \$400,000. They have not even gotten a response!

That really puzzles me. On one hand, you are increasing the rents because of the high maintenance costs. You have the union who are working there and know the problems and they present to you solutions to help solve the problems but you do not even want to listen to it. Then you go ahead and knock off three or four jobs.

I would really like to know what the overall strategy is with the office in Stephenville. There are a lot of people out there who would like to know. There are over 200 names on this petition and the request is not unreasonable. They are wondering what is going to happen over the next few years because the measures that they have seen take place so far are not good for the future of the Harmon Complex in Stephenville. I am proud to present this petition on behalf of the Harmon residents. There are over 200 names on this petition and there are more coming into to me every day. I am very proud to present it. I think these concerns the minister and the NLHC should take into account and they should come up with an overall strategy that will see the continued improved existence of an NLHC in Stephenville as it pertains to the Harmon Complex, which has been in existence for over thirty years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition from Harmon Complex in Stephenville with its 200 signatures. They are quite right. What they are asking the government is reasonable. If they are going to increase rent on the properties that they are occupying, then it should be done in a reasonable fashion. In the last two or three years they have seen their rent increased up to 89 per cent. They have also seen the buildings they are living in not properly maintained. Now they are told one of the reasons why it was increased over the past two or three years up to 89 per cent was for further maintenance but now we find out that the government, through cost-saving factors, are laying off maintenance people. The letters that came in from the union recommending how savings could be done government continues to ignore.

The Harmon Complex in Stephenville is only the tip of the iceberg with the housing problem in this Province because of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. It is in shambles, it is in a mess, and there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that we are seeing the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) having to repossess boats and we are seeing now the Minister of Housing (Mr. Dinn), because of the economic factors with jobs and low income people in these houses, having to move them out. They now have to go back from half decent housing and move into shacks or deteriorated houses that were rejected. They end up getting rural remote housing because of financial problems. They have

been ejected from these and have to go back to their old places or you see doubling up of families, or you see the Mayor of St. John's saying the housing shortage is going to come here.

One of the things that the Minister of Housing has to do and has to address with Newfoundland and Labrador Housing in these apartments, as is the case with the Harmon Complex, and also Newfoundland and Labrador remote housing, is tie the rent to income. It is tied to the income that you made the year before. We know in this Province we have a lot of seasonal employees, particularly loggers, miners, and fishermen. When there is a really, really good year fishing, Mr. Speaker, you can have an excellent year and, as a result of that, your UIC is extremely high. Then you have a house from Newfoundland and Labrador Housing and your rent is evaluated on it but, the evaluation and payments do not come into effect until the following year. So you start paying on what you made the previous the year, Mr. Speaker, and then you find out there was a disastrous fishery two years in a row. You find out that you have low UIC, and what does Newfoundland and Labrador Housing do? They still want you to maintain paying at a level which you made the year which was an excellent year.

I have examples, Mr. Speaker, in my own district. I am working on two now where Newfoundland and Labrador Housing are evicting people in the middle of the Winter from their houses and telling them to go back into a house that was condemned by them, that has no water and sewerage and no electricity. They have fallen

into arrears because of the problems I outlined with regard to income being evaluated on the income of the year before but they have to pay it with low income this year.

The member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) is quite correct in pointing out, at the Harmon Complex as well as other apartment complexes and housing in this Province, low income people in this Province are hurting. What the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is doing is trying to fix these up at the expense of these people instead of doing what also should have been done to the schools. We have seen the former Minister of Education (Ms Verge) allow the schools to deteriorate to such a condition that now they are a national and provincial disgrace.

We have seen this government completely ignore the Harmon Complex over the years and other housing complexes in the Province and now they need upgrading. As a result of that, they are putting the burden on the low income people in those units and are saying to them, "You have had a rate increase in February. You have another one coming in August and you have another one coming in November." In three to four years, if I am correct, there have been about six or seven rate increases, up to 89 per cent. When the Premier says that the health costs of this Province has gone up 100 per cent, well here is an example, Mr. Speaker, that low income people's cost of housing have shot up 89 per cent. What we are developing is this great programme of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing is a situation where we say it is a benefit to the people and they get in there.

Then they put the screws to them and they have to go out on the street or go back into old housing units. It is absolutely ridiculous what this government is doing to the people!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Stephenville for presenting his petition today to the House of Assembly. The fact of the matter is that the petition relates to economic rental units. I will deal with the hon. member for the district of Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) and his remarks as well.

With respect to the Stephenville Complex and the rents at the Stephenville Complex, what we are talking about here are economic rental units, not units for the poor but units for people who can afford normal rents. In the Stephenville Complex, over the past three or four years consistently, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has lost money with respect to those units. So during the last rate increases, even though the corporation was losing money on the Stephenville economic rental units, the -

MR. FUREY:

(Inaudible) point of order.

MR. DINN:

This is speaking to the petition and I request the hon. member stop breaking the rules of the House and interrupting while another speaker is speaking.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has consistently lost money on the economic rental units at Stephenville. As a result of that, they are forced, as a corporation, to break even on economic rental units. They are not units for poor people. They are economic rental units for people who can afford to pay the rents so the costs for operating are paid for by the tenants. They have never ever done that and as a result the people of Newfoundland have subsidized the people in the economic rental units at Stephenville.

With respect to people on a fixed income, if they can afford the economic rental units, they go into the economic rental units, if they cannot -

MR. FUREY:

If they can afford them (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member continues to break the rules but, he is a rookie in the House and I can understand that. We will send him over a book of 126 rules. He will read them before the House opens the next time and live within the rules of the House.

In the economic rental units, Mr. Speaker, we have continually lost money. The rents are being increased so that they break even. During the last rate

increase, the tenancies board, which the people have a right to appeal to and we put in place, recommended that there were too many maintenance staff on staff out at Stephenville -

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Just for clarification, did that report recommend the laying off of workers in Stephenville to improve the maintenance of the Harmon Complex?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the Tenancies Board recommended that there were too many maintenance people on staff for the number of economic rental units as compared to the maintenance staff in other areas for equivalent numbers of units. So, Mr. Speaker, they had to declare four positions redundant. Now the hon. member cannot have it both ways. Does he want the poor people of Stephenville to pay, in their taxes, monies to people who should be able to afford to pay the rent in economic rental units? If there are people at the Complex in economic rental units who cannot afford the rent, there are units out there for poorer people. These units are done on a federal - provincial programme that has been in place since 1974. In these units people pay rent on the basis of their income, which is 25 per cent of their income.

If people are on social services, Mr. Speaker, and live within social housing, then the Minister of Social Services pays the rent in under social housing. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wants, through his petition, the government of this Province to collect taxes and pay to the people who are living in the economic rental units at Stephenville, yet there are people who should be able to afford the economic rentals in there, as said by the Tenancies Board.

Mr. Speaker, if the rental increase this year is too much, as proposed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, the tenants at Harmon, as well as the tenants at Pleasantville, at Churchill Square and throughout the Province who are living in economic rental units, have the right to appeal to that Tenancies Board. If they deem that the rental increase is too high then, Mr. Speaker, they will be told to roll back those rentals.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Just a point of clarification before you finish your comments.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member is out of order. The hon. minister, who is speaking, has five minutes to reply and you are cutting into his time.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I will permit the hon. gentleman to ask a question during my time period because I think he is really interested in what is happening out in the Harmon Complex. I can provide him with the information outside the House but if he wants to know it in here, I will be perfectly happy to supply him with that information.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Has the minister seen a brief that was presented to NLHC over two months ago concerning cost cutting measures that could be instituted at NLHC in Stephenville? Has he seen the brief and, if he did, could he comment on it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time has now elapsed, unless he has leave to continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the important point here is that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing has economic rental units at Stephenville. Those economic rental units are costing the taxpayers of this Province up to, I believe, \$1,179,000 over the past year or so. It is not proper for the government of the Province to subsidize the people in the economic rental units.

The Tenancies Board, who are deemed to be those people put in place to judge that, have recommended that some of the maintenance staff be laid off. We have looked into that situation and found that four people were indeed not required and these positions were made redundant. Mr. Speaker, those people who did become redundant are eligible for all the severance and all the rest of the pay and entitlements that they should get under the redundancy programme. Mr. Speaker, that should answer the hon. gentleman's questions with respect to the economic rental units at Harmon. I will be delighted to take his petition and reply to him formally through other correspondence.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Since the Premier is not here, I would like to put this to the Government House Leader. Mr. Speaker, there was extensive discussion of this on a number of occasions before. There have also been briefs presented by various individuals. It is really a matter of when can we expect to see the Premier live up to his election commitment to see that the proceedings of the House are televised and that the electronic media generally, are given access.

We have an occasion now where students who are in the St. John's area can come in if they want to and view the proceedings of their elected representatives in the House of Assembly. I am happy to

see some of my own constituents around today and some former constituents but, people in rural Newfoundland, by and large, are prejudiced and at a disadvantage in that it is only with great expense and inconvenience that they are able to come in and get direct access and a direct viewing of the House.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, that it would improve the decorum of the House if we had proceedings televised. I do not think we would see the -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I think the hon. member is making a speech now.

MR. BARRY:
I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, basically the point is that we on this side of the House support the concept of bringing the electronic media, on a full-time basis, into the House of Assembly. We would like to know whether government has yet taken a position and whether, for the new session that starts on March 18, they might have the electronic media there for the complete session.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I think that is a very wide, wide issue and I will not comment specifically on it except to say that one of the prerequisites obviously, to any consideration of this would be respect by members of this House for the procedures of the House, which the hon.

gentleman has not shown by getting up on a point of order and injecting himself into it, and respect for Your Honour and a respect for the institutions. I think that would be a first prerequisite.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition just directed a question about televising the House which actually was not a point of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order on the statement made earlier by the Premier which, in effect, said that building the addition to the Confederation Building at a cost of \$40 million was a savings to this Province of some \$2.2 million. I want to clarify, Mr. Speaker, that in borrowing that \$40 million -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member if he would state his point of order. What he was going on with was not a point of order.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the point I was trying to make was that the money was not saved by the Province because of the rental at \$2.2 million. In borrowing the \$40 million to build the complex at eleven per cent interest -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Again, I must draw attention. The hon. member is making a statement. There is no question of a point of order there.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Surely, the people of this Province are entitled to not have, as members opposite have been referring to the Auditor General, falsehoods stated with respect to the management of the taxpayers' dollar. If the interest on that investment is more than \$4 million a year at ten per cent, than obviously that is more than they would have been paying in their rent, if they were paying \$3 million or less. They are actually losing money, according to any simple calculation. Can the Government House Leader clarify this or do we accept that there is misleading information now being fed to the people of this Province and the House of Assembly?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this type of conduct is indicative of how hon. gentlemen opposite, in accordance with the way in which they are conducting their affairs, could bring the proceedings of this House to a standstill, by getting up on points that are not points

of order. There are certain times here for asking questions and there is a routine order of the day. The petitions are over. We are now into the ordinary business of the day.

The hon. gentlemen are completely abusing the time of this House and infringing on the privileges of the House. I have no intention of responding to those questions. There is a question period and a time and place for that type of thing. Members can get up and say, 'A point of order,' and then conduct a debate, infringe on the privileges of the House and prevent an orderly treatment of the public business if they wish, and that is what hon. gentlemen really are doing.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have heard enough on that point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Marshall's puppet.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a time for the hon. member to ask that question.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is not a question.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I am speaking. Would the hon. member please keep quiet? This is not the time. The item that we are now calling is Orders of the Day.

MR. BAKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have not done this very often. I have heard members opposite get up on points of order quite often during my short stay in this House. I have heard them point out that it is quite sensible and in order to get up on a point of order to point out that there is some inaccurate information being provided to the House and at the first opportunity it should be corrected. Mr. Speaker, I have heard this done many times by gentlemen on the opposite side, many times, and never once has there ever been a suggestion by anybody that this is against the rules of the House, that this is not allowed in this House and that this is a subversion of the rules of the House. Never once have I heard that mentioned when hon. members opposite get up and bring up similar points of order.

Mr. Speaker, I was concerned this morning when the statement was made by the Premier that by spending \$40 to \$50 million on the building that, in fact, we were saving money. This is the last sitting of this session and this is the point that goes on record in this session. We cannot question it next day in Question Period. It sits on the record until we open a new session next time.

Mr. Speaker, I was very concerned. This, it seems to me, is a piece of information that I understand to be not correct. If in fact \$40 to \$50 million, even at 10 per cent, were financed over ten years, and the ten-year figure was used by the Premier and the fact that it would save money over ten years, then that would mean a cost of \$4.5 million per year and it seems to me -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must interrupt the hon. member. He maybe correct or he may not be. That is beside the point. It is not a point of order.

o o o

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a matter of privilege. It is one of several I have raised this week, I acknowledge, and I raise this one in the same spirit that I raised the others.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I watched this week, Mr. Speaker, and I have seen the few rights that we have being taken away from us altogether. Mr. Speaker, I was sent here by some people to represent them and I cannot do it if we do not observe the ordinary conventions that are applicable in other Houses in the British Parliamentary system.

I have watched today the gentleman for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) and I watched him yesterday and I have watched, on the other hand, the Premier today being allowed to go on for five minutes and not once in that five-minute period, Mr. Speaker, did the Chair ask the Premier to get to his point of order. Indeed, at no time did he state a point of order or was he invited to do so by the Chair. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not fair play, I say to you. It is not fair play and it is particularly not fair when the gentleman from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), a

relatively new member in this House but, at the same time, a man who can look after himself - he does not need me or anybody else to defend him but, I use him as an example only - it is not fair, particularly when the Chair is jumping down his throat before he gets his first sentence out. I submit to you that he had a good point of order, if he was ever given a chance to make it yesterday or if he was given a chance to make it today. The man has been sent here by some people. He is being harassed not only by members opposite, he is being harassed by the Chair. I mean it is shameful what is going on here, Mr. Speaker, he is being harassed by the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is this -

DR. COLLINS:

Harassed by the Chair, now what a statement.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, harassed by the Chair.

MR. PEACH:

Questioning the Chair again.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes.

MR. PEACH:

As usual.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes.

Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege - and what I am doing, Mr. Speaker, I have never done in my twelve and a half years in politics, I feel very strongly about this, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

There you go, how about the order now, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must say to the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) that he is accusing the Chair of harassing an individual and I will have to insist that he withdraw that.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I was in the process of explaining a matter of privilege. One of the last remaining conventions that we have not thrown out yet is that a member can state his matter of privilege. I am trying to do that, Sir, and I was about to say it but I asked for the protection of the Chair because we were getting your chorus over on that side of the House trying to direct you again. I want some silence because I have an important point. I realize what I am doing is a serious matter and I am doing it for a serious reason, at least from my vantage point.

In my twelve and a half or thirteen years at this I have seen various Speakers in a couple of different houses of parliament and I have never done what I am doing now. I have never done this before. I am doing it because I believe it very strongly. I have watched this thing last Spring, during the Fall and now again and I told myself perhaps it was only the heat of the moment on my part or perhaps it was only a matter that I had an unfair and an overload of bias that did not allow me to see properly and clearly what was going on here. I allow for all those possibilities, Mr. Speaker, but, in addition, I

submit that any fair-minded observer of the scene in the past two days alone, without going back any further, although I invite them to do that too, but just watching what has gone on in this Chamber in the last two days, any fair-minded impartial observer, and Mr. Speaker, I say to you that I have made it my business to do a little informal poll of some people who have been sitting in the galleries the last couple of days, and the feedback I am getting is quite interesting and buttresses the position that I am stating here right now, Mr. Speaker, that, however consciously or unconsciously, these matters are being done. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you as two examples, that the Premier this morning got much preferred treatment from the Chair in being allowed to make his point of order than did the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) either today or yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I do not ask you to take my word for that. Sir, before making a ruling on the matter of privilege I am raising, I invite you to look at Hansard and I suggest that you just use a ruler and measure the length of the interventions in each case before there is any interruption from the Chair. I submit to you that in the case of the gentleman from Port de Grave you will not need a very long ruler.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly about this. The matter of privilege on which I am rising is that the rules are not being applied fairly in this Chamber and until they are applied fairly or, to say it differently, as long as they continue to be applied unfairly, my privileges as a member of this House are being breached. If the

Speaker finds, after due consideration, that I have a claim to privilege, I am prepared to put down the appropriate motion which, of course, is only one motion, a motion that the Speaker be censured for his actions.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will respond to it briefly. I think it is quite obvious from the proceedings today, as is the perception, I think, of anyone listening to it, the hon. gentleman has been on this course all morning and I think it is very, very unfortunate. I think what he has wanted and has been bent upon since he came in this morning was to get named and obviously a statement of that nature by the hon. gentleman cannot go unchallenged.

There were statements that were made today that I got up on a point of privilege about and I could have brought it to a head then, at that particular time, but obviously you do not want people to be expelled from the House. I think it is a very sad thing in the Province of Newfoundland that members are now getting expelled from this Assembly and somehow or other the press, the public, even the Assembly and everybody is almost getting immune to it.

One of the biggest problems we have, Mr. Speaker, in this House is the threatened complete breakdown of the authority in the House. The authority of Your Honour can only be upheld with the good will of both sides and

everybody upholding the authority of Your Honour. I really feel the position of the hon. gentleman is most unfortunate. Look, the way in which parliamentary procedure operates is if the hon. gentleman feels that somebody is transgressing the rules in anyway, by long answers, short answers or what have you - I am not going to get into what the hon. gentleman has said because that is irrelevant to the issue - I would just point out that it is competent of any member of this House to get up on a point of order and have Your Honour rule on it. It is not competent, Mr. Speaker, for a member of this House to get up and say that Your Honour has to be the policeman and get up and sit this one down, unless there is a complete, absolute and obvious infringement of the rule being perpetrated.

One rule is there and one rule is sacrosanct, Mr. Speaker, and that is the fact that Your Honour's impartiality is to be observed. I regret very much what the hon. gentleman is doing. I would think that it would be better if the hon. gentleman reflected upon it and withdrew those statements. Your Honour, Your Honour's authority cannot be challenged in this particular and deliberate way which really threatens the whole operations of this particular House. It is quite obvious what has happened today and what it is in the process of happening. I regret it but, I think I regret ever more that this type of action has to be taken and, apparently, is now an accepted mode. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did it the other day and now the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). It becomes accepted instead of meeting the criticism and the

criticism of the public and the disapprobation of public and, indeed, the condemnation of the public of this kind of conduct from any elected member on either side of the House who questions Your Honour's ruling.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that Your Honour is put into this sort of position however, if I could just briefly refer back to my earlier remarks this morning on a similar motion. The reason Your Honour finds himself in this difficult position is because of the person who has the primary responsibility to protect Your Honour and to protect the Rules of the House, namely, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). He is the person who has set the tone for this Assembly and for this special session from the first moment that he opened his mouth in debate. If anybody has any questions or any challenge to that statement, I invite them to go back and pick up the minister's speech, read it, analyze it and look at the abuse, in total breach of the Rules of the House, imputing motives, attacking the character and reputation of everybody on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, is there any wonder that there are difficulties in keeping order when the person responsible for assisting Your Honour is the one who is most at fault. If I had heard the minister get up and make one small admission that he might have been excessive in his comments, that some of his comments heaping abuse

and attacking our character, dignity and integrity, were made in the heat of debate, Mr. Speaker, there might be some hope for getting this House back on the rails. Mr. Speaker, while the Government House Leader sets himself up as the policeman and the criminal, there is going to be very great difficulty in keeping a decorous House in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to hear the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) explain how his conduct in spewing venom across the floor of this Assembly, how that conduct can be reconciled with these mealy-mouth statements that we just heard coming from him a few moments ago. How does he reconcile his conduct and the tone that he set in a first day of debate, Mr. Speaker? I can tell you I have had difficulty in keeping members here in their seats to have as much accomplished as we have had in the course of the last several weeks. Again, I challenge anybody to read the debates from this side of the House and read the debates from the other side and see the tone that was followed by each and every member, taking their leave from the Government House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Each and every member on the government side, instead of debating the benefits to the Province of oil, instead of being concerned about the environment, what we saw, Mr. Speaker, was venom; what we saw were personal attacks on this side of the House. Now members ask why it is that there are problems in keeping order. Mr. Speaker, there is no wonder after the tone that they

set under the leadership of the Government House Leader and the Premier. It is the Premier's strategy and not just the Government House Leader. The Premier and the Government House Leader decided what tone they want. Members opposite followed it, but, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be intimidated, we are not going to be muzzled and we are going to speak out for the people of this Province on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I have heard enough on that point of privilege. No prima facie case of breach of privilege has been established. I would, however, like to make a few points. The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) mentioned about excessive time on one side or the other. He is entitled to his views and his opinion but, he made a very serious accusation against me, that I was harassing a member or members. I ask him now to withdraw that without equivocation.

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that you did not take what I regard as the most serious parliamentary matter I have ever raised -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. SIMMONS:

- under advisement to look at the issue. I respect very much the office of Speaker. I have no

respect for those who abuse the office of Speaker, whether that abuser sits in the Chair of the Speaker or elsewhere in the Chamber. I think it needs to be said also that it is difficult at times in this House to make it understood that what you are doing is talking about a person's performance rather than a person's integrity. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) made reference to that a moment ago when we have seen a constant barrage of assaults on people's integrity, dignity and motives.

My experience in the House of Commons and here under five or six other Speakers always was, Mr. Speaker, that whenever a member's integrity was impugned, the Speaker immediately intervened, immediately got up, without any request or any initiative from any others in the Chamber, as soon as the person's integrity is impugned, the Speaker gets up. That has not happened in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. That is not because, in my view, you lack any integrity. I am not talking about your integrity, Sir. I have the greatest respect for you as an individual. What I have said this morning and what I stand by is that I believe your performance has been less than fair and I believe that, Sir, with everything that is in me. I want you to understand that there are no personal aspersions being cast on you as an individual. I like you very much. I believe you know that. You have always dealt very kindly and as a gentleman with me and I can say so for most members on the other side of the House but, that is not the issue. When we get to the point where we begin construing everything in personal terms, then this whole process is going to break down. However, my

personal admiration for people should not prevent me, Mr. Speaker, from taking exception to the way in which they perform their duties at times and I have used that prerogative this morning.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I listened with great care to what the hon. member has had to say but I have asked him to withdraw the accusation that I was harrassing a member. I call on him now to do so.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I guess once again it is a case of might is right and you have it in your prerogative with that majority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. SIMMONS:
So, Mr. Speaker, while I believe deeply in my observation, I realize that it is not parliamentary to say it if the Speaker says I cannot say it. So, since it is unparliamentary, I withdraw it.

Orders of the Day

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue my debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

I have not called Orders of the Day yet.

MR. BARRY:

The Speaker called Orders of the Day.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, he called Orders of the day and the process follows that the Government House Leader calls which order it is. Mr. Speaker, I have been tempted today to call an order other than Bill No. 59 because it is obvious His Honour is coming in at twelve-thirty and the hon. gentleman wants to be the last speaker. I could do it but, I am not going to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Order 22, Bill No. 59.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The debate was adjourned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader has done everything else. We would not be the slightest bit surprised for him to withdraw the Atlantic Accord rather than give us the opportunity to debate its inadequacies. The last day, in the brief remarks that I had, I pointed out that in my maiden speech in 1972, I think I was the first member of this House to raise the necessity of Newfoundland having control over

the management of that great resource and having the right to share in the revenue from that resource.

The Government House Leader at the time, Mr. Speaker, had set himself out another objective. Despite the fact that he and members opposite have gotten up and challenged my right to talk about the Atlantic Accord and offshore oil and gas, the Government House Leader was specializing in something else. It was called the Conflict of Interest Regulations. As I mentioned the last day, when my contribution to the Province in those early years are measured against the monument to the Government House Leader, the Conflict of Interest Regulations, it brings back to mind the poem that I am sure the students in the gallery are familiar with:

"My name is Ozymandias, king of kings:/ Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!" I think that we do not have to go too far into the future to have people looking at the works of the Government House Leader in despair. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to have, and I am prepared to briefly review it today, my input and my involvement in the development of offshore oil and gas policy for this Province compared against any member of this House and any member of the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker. I will not despair when that comparison is carried out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate, before I get carried away in oratorical debate, to just set out directly what the position

of the Liberal Party and the official Opposition is with respect to the Atlantic Accord. I have taken the trouble to put this in writing so that there will be no misinterpretation of my remarks and I have issued copies of these extracts. If anybody asks if I am reading, yes, I am reading from some very carefully prepared notes so that there will be no misunderstanding and nothing overlooked. I will be continuing my debate in a free-flowing fashion afterwards but, let us understand the principle of the Atlantic Accord legislation is that Newfoundland negotiate an offshore petroleum deal with the Government of Canada in order to be able to participate in the management of the offshore resource and to share in the benefits of offshore development. The official Opposition supports that principle and will be voting in favour of it at second reading stage.

However, the Accord, in its detail, is a seriously flawed document and a seriously flawed agreement. In that respect, it could be compared to the Churchill Falls agreement. A very serious flaw existed in that agreement which we are still living with, Mr. Speaker, and we will have to live with for a number of years in the future. We are trying to make sure that the flaws in the Atlantic Accord agreement are removed here, while we still can, before they are enshrined in legislation and possibly even the constitution, which may mean we have to live with these flaws forever. These flaws are contained in certain clauses which the Opposition cannot support and which we will be seeking to amend. If the amendments are made, we will be supporting the

legislation at third reading also.

If the present administration votes down our amendment, as they can - they have a majority in this House - we will have to consider whether the high level of unemployment and the present stagnant economy forces us to accept a quarter of a loaf rather than none. We hope, however, that the Premier listens to reason and that we are not faced with requiring Newfoundlanders to lose the major long term benefits from yet another resource in order to obtain some short term construction jobs. The Premier has admitted that the original draft of the Accord is flawed in the way we pointed out, in the way it deals with refining in this Province. He has admitted, Mr. Speaker, that the original draft was flawed and he tried, after we raised the point and brought the clause to his attention, to correct it but, Mr. Speaker, his proposed amendment does not remove that flaw as the questions that I will set out in a moment will show.

I want this known, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal party will, upon forming the government after the next election -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

- be seeking amendments of the Accord in the event that our proposals for improvement are not accepted now. The following are some of the questions we have concerning the Atlantic Accord and the answers which must be reached by anyone other than those blinded by slavish partisan adherence to the Premier's rhetoric. In other

words, they would have to be answered in the way that I will suggest by anyone other than members sitting on the opposite side of the House.

The first question is does Newfoundland get ownership of offshore petroleum resources? Answer: No. After the Premier's administration lost the offshore case, Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Crosbie reneged on their earlier promise to give Newfoundland ownership regardless of the result of the case. They changed their offer from ownership to joint management and revenue sharing. The Premier, having gone to the Supreme Court too soon and lost -

MR. TOBIN:

You advised him.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I want protection and I want no interruption.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we please have silence while the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is speaking?

MR. BARRY:

The Premier, having gone to the Supreme Court too soon and lost, had no further bargaining power and dropped the request for ownership. So, we do not get the ownership that I stood in this House and made my maiden speech on in 1972 and said that we had to seek but, the Premier blew that.

Question number two is does the Accord give Newfoundland the same rights with respect to offshore resources as though they were on land? Remember now, the Government House Leader has stood in this House and said "yes" to

that. Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no. The Accord does not treat petroleum resources offshore Newfoundland as though they were on land because Newfoundland is not recognized as having ownership. It will not, for example, be able to hold back production as Alberta was able to do if the federal government sets a price for oil that is lower than Newfoundland thinks is fair.

Let us all think back now. We can recall not too long ago, I was looking at reports last night, that in Canada, while the world price was thirty-five dollars a barrel, the Canadian price was fifteen. In other words, there was twenty dollars a barrel lost to the Province that was selling the oil but given to the benefit of the consumers in the consuming provinces. Peter Lougheed did not think that that was fair and he said, "I am not going to sell my oil for twenty dollars less than I can get on the world market," and he turned the taps. He did not turn them off, Mr. Speaker. He was too shrewd for that. He knew that in Alberta, as in Newfoundland, people recognized the national interest and they do not accept a radical intemperate approach to this sort of thing, as we have seen too often from the Premier. "No, he said, I will just turn the screw tightly. I will not completely turn off the oil. I will reduce the amount of oil that I will sell for that price."

If the same thing happened today, Newfoundland, in order to get the attention of the federal government to get a fairer price, would not be able to do that. There is no right given for Newfoundland to curtail production

in this Atlantic Accord. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, if for no other, we cannot say that we are in the same position as though the oil resources were on land.

Question number three: Does the Accord give Newfoundland an equal say in other major decisions apart from oil prices? Not for the next five years and perhaps never, except, and we give credit and recognition where credit is due, for the decision on the mode of development. Even here the Province is subject to arbitration. The federal government is given the final say over other fundamental decisions as long as Canada does not have self-sufficiency and security of supply. Despite the fact that the federal government declared in 1984 that Canada has reached the point of self-sufficiency and security of supply, the Premier now, in the Accord, has agreed that offshore petroleum resources will be managed for the next five years as though that point had not been reached.

I do not know if Your Honour got that. In other words, even though black is black, it has been deemed to be white in this agreement. Even though Canada is self secure, even though Canada is self-sufficient and has security of supply in petroleum since 1984, the Premier has agreed to play the game as though Canada did not have self-sufficiency and security of supply. He said, "We are prepared to admit there is an artificial situation today and for the next five years in order to pass over control to the federal government." That is the little device and the little technique they are using behind the scenes to pass over control to the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, item number four: Does the Accord give Newfoundland the best revenue-sharing scheme? Answer: No.

MR. TOBIN:

Better than you wanted in the Nova Scotia agreement.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, I will talk about the Nova Scotia agreement in a minute. I have a few comments by the Government House Leader on the Nova Scotia agreement that will be very appropriate in a minute here.

Question number four: Does the Accord give Newfoundland the best revenue sharing scheme? No. Mr. Mulroney, by giving back to the oil companies the 25 per cent Petro-Canada back-in and, by promising them there will be no participation by governments, has prevented Newfoundland from continuing with the mix of taxes, royalties and participation that the Peckford administration previously agreed would best ensure maximum revenue for the Province.

Now, am I making this up? Am I the only person in the Province who believes this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, yes.

MR. TOBIN:

You are capable of making up anything.

MR. BARRY:

Obviously, members opposite have not read, Mr. Speaker, The Challenge of Oil by Dr. House at the University.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Rex made this up.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask for quiet please.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is debating please?

MR. BARRY:

Could I have a glass of water from one of the Pages please?

MR. MATTHEWS:

You have had more than water this morning.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the protection of the Chair in being permitted to deliver this important speech in silence.

Mr. Speaker, I have a quote here from The Challenge of Oil by Dr. J.D. House, who has been appointed a Royal Commissioner by this administration. Obviously, they are recognizing that he must know a little bit about what he is talking. Now listen to this: "The Province would have been more firmly in control under the 1977 regulations than it is under the Atlantic Accord," page 309. Under the regulations that I drafted, the Province would have been more firmly in control. That is what Dr. House says. The next comment, "By far, the most important weakness is state participation." I have got to get copies of this to the press, by the way, because they may have read the book but, they may have forgotten it. It has been some time ago, last Fall, since it was released. "By far, the most important weakness," he says, "is state participation" and this is on page 309 of The Challenge of Oil by Dr. House.

He says, "The 1977 regulations provided for the Newfoundland Petroleum Board to take an undivided forty per cent interest in every lease. This participation was to provide both a major source of revenue and, more importantly, a direct say by the Province of Newfoundland through forty per cent representation on any management or operating committee relating to the lease area." Listen to what he says, Mr. Speaker, "Although radical for North America, such a participation agreement is now standard practice in the offshore industry internationally. Participation," he says, "has been all but abandoned in the Atlantic Accord."

It is not only I, Mr. Speaker, who recognizes that this is a weakness in the Atlantic Accord. Let me quote the words of the Premier himself back on January 25, 1982:

MR. FLIGHT:

This is a sellout and a giveaway.

MR. BARRY:

"Through direct participation in the resource development process, the corporation," that is the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation, "is designed to help the Province achieve a fair share of revenues, jobs and industrial benefits, while operating in a manner which is sensitive to local needs." Mr. Speaker, how much revenue do you think would come through that? "Under the Provinces regulations" said the Premier, "more than half of the income to government from Hibernia will come through the participation of the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation." Now, Mr. Mulroney -

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, since the Leader of the Opposition took his place in this House to speak in this debate this morning he has been referring to notes. I ask Your Honour to have him follow procedure and table the reports that he is referring to.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would love to! I have already distributed them to the press. I will get copies for everybody here and I will table them when I finish my debate. I will be happy to! I want them enshrined in history! I want to be able to use them as stakes to drive through the heart of the member opposite every time he gets up to speak in the debate!

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the only stakes that were every drove through a heart in the district of Burin - Placentia West were drove through the Leader of the Opposition's heart in the election of 1975.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, after that savage

repartee I am not sure if I may be able to complete my speech. May I have a moment to compose myself? That witty, devastating assault has left me shaken. If I could just have a brief moment here. No, I think I am all right. I think I might manage.

Mr. Speaker, let me continue. We are talking about his best revenue scheme. Instead of deciding upon and legislating the appropriate fiscal regime, as Newfoundland's Royal Commission on Mining decided some years ago was better than ad hoc arrangements as far as taxes were concerned, project by project, and as we decided in the Mining and Mineral Rights Act 1975 where, if Your Honour looks, you will see that there are certain taxes set out in the legislation, not just by regulation, in the legislation, instead of that, both the federal and the provincial administrations are now permitting Mobil to negotiate the fiscal regime for Hibernia at a time when falling oil prices put the company in a very strong bargaining position.

Is it not ironic, you know, the Premier refuses to settle when he could have gotten a settlement, when he might have had some bargaining power, before he lost the Supreme Court of Canada case and, I suppose it is legitimate to say, before the arse dropped out of the oil market - that is a good Anglo Saxon term - before prices sank, Mr. Speaker, to the level they are today, the Premier could have been in negotiating. Now all Mobil has to do is come in and say, "Well, boy, Heavens, you know, \$15 a barrel oil or less. I do not know, Mr. Premier, we are going to need some help here, by Heavens you are going to have to cut back on your taxes there, you

are going to have to cut back on your royalties. I do not know, boy, you are going to have to give us subsidies for building these oil rigs."

What a mess he has himself in! What a mess just because he did not know how to complete a deal and he did not know how to negotiate a settlement. He had to go out and lose the court case. He had to go out and wait until his back was against the wall and then have Brian Mulroney come in and tell him, "No, you cannot have participation. Do not be so silly, participation. Go away! Be a good boy! Here is what you can have! We will set out what you can have! You cannot have what is going to give you 50 per cent of your revenues. Go away! Go away Brian! Go away Brian Secundus!"

We have to understand, Mr. Speaker, that we have a Tory Government in Ottawa and they are Tory in the bluest sense of the word. They are Tory in that they are interested in helping big business. They are interested in helping the big oil companies and Mr. Mulroney did that. He took our 25 per cent, that little 25 per cent interest we had, he went down to New York and he said, "Here, I am giving it back to you." That same day, I do not know but it was the same minute Mulroney was doing that in the United States, we asked a question in the House of Assembly to the Premier, "Mr. Premier, what is the Government of Canada doing with respect to participation in the 25 per cent?" The Premier that same day said, "We are trying to contact the Prime Minister's Office to find out." That moment he was down in New York at a dinner for the oil companies

giving it back to them. Now that is consultation and co-operation! That is what we call consultation and co-operation between two Tory Governments.

But hear this, changes already made to the federal oil tax system already see Canada with the most generous fiscal regime in the world for oil companies. They are better off under the Canadian tax system than oil companies operating in any country anywhere in the world. These changes that have already been made and announced by Mr. Mulroney and Ms. Carney have already cost this Province hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenue from any Hibernia production. The Premier should not permit any further erosion of these revenues.

Here is a dandy coming up now. Fifth question, "Does the Accord provide for maximum jobs from offshore developments staying in Newfoundland?" Answer, "No, no, no. Ten trillion times no." A terrible flaw in the Accord. The Come By Chance refinery or a new refinery replacing it will have the right to call upon petroleum from a development offshore Newfoundland but only after then existing sales contracts have been honoured. That is in Section 41 (2), if anybody wants to look at it.

It is alleged that customary contracts are only of short duration. Remember Ms Carney looking over at Mr. Marshall there when she was down a few days ago to sign an agreement? She took a quick look at him and asked "Is that right Bill?" He said, "That is right, it is only thirty, sixty, ninety days."

The Minister of Consumer Affairs

(Mr. Russell) comes in the other day and talks about Newfoundland Hydro which has got a one-year contract to buy oil. Well, if it is intended that it is only going to be subject to a maximum of a ninety-day contract, let us have this time limit set up in the Atlantic Accord. It is not there now. Let us have that agreement amended so that it refers to only short-term contracts coming before Newfoundland's right.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have to recognize that the needs of other petroleum processing facilities in Newfoundland will only be met after the demand of industrial facilities in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and PEI have been satisfied. Present excess capacity in the petrochemical industry means that it will be a very long time indeed before Newfoundland will see a local petrochemical industry if the Accord provisions are not changed. A clause is needed to permit the provincial government to set as a condition of development that production will only be permitted if there is a designated amount of refining and processing in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, am I the only person who feels this way? I refer to comments in a report prepared by the Government House Leader, the very person who is asking us to vote for this clause in this Accord. It is dated August, 1982, prepared by the Petroleum Directorate under the minister. Listen to this: "The promotion of the downstream industrial potential of offshore oil and gas production depends on a number of

inter-related factors, from future market conditions in the work refining and petrochemical industries, to the existence of a preference in the supply of feedstock for local users. The general implications of these factors is that downstream development in Newfoundland," that is refining and processing, "will be undertaken under highly competitive conditions," - you had better believe it - "and that control of the availability and price of feedstock from the offshore will be the critical tool in encouraging local development. This is certainly the case in Alberta where provincial control of natural gas feedstock has to be used to build a world scale petrochemical industry."

So I was not hallucinating! This is the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate and the man who introduced that legislation. Now, listen to what he says about the same clause. Remember they have admitted the clause that is in the Accord is the same one that is in the Nova Scotia agreement. What was he saying about the clause in the Nova Scotia agreement before Mr. Mulroney jammed it down his throat? Listen to this one: "Ambiguity exists in determining whether the concept of existing industrial facilities would include a moth-balled refinery such as Come By Chance and whether only industrial facilities existing as of the signing of the agreement or, such facilities as exist from time to time, will be given preference under this clause." That is the flaw they have already admitted and they have tried to amend but, they did not go far enough. They tried to clear it up. But now, listen to

this: "However, what is clear is that under the agreement new Nova Scotia-based industrial buyers," they underlined the new and they underlined this, "will not be given access to offshore production unless such feedstock is excess to feedstock required to meet the demand of presently existing industrial capacity in Eastern Canada." It is the same wording. The minister goes on, and this is lovely, the minister says, "This means that unlike Alberta, which can use its oil and gas resources to start new industries which can compete with existing refineries in Ontario and Quebec, Nova Scotia can only hope that more oil and gas is found off its coast than Ontario and Quebec will need. Now, listen to this last sentence. "This is hardly consistent with a commitment to using the resource to promote local economic development."

MR. BAKER:

What is he supporting now?

MR. FLIGHT:

How does the Deputy Speaker feel about that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked for silence. We ask for silence on both sides of the House, please.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, by the time the next election rolls around, these words will be engraved on the foreheads of every member opposite. Every Newfoundlander will be throwing these words back in their teeth if they do not listen to the

amendments and support the amendments of that clause that will be put forth by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and members of this House.

MR. TOBIN:

What did you say? Do you want me to read what you said?

MR. FLIGHT:

Never mind. It is what is said now that is important.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I do not back off anything that I have said on this. I do not take back a word, Mr. Speaker. I only wish that they had left in my regulations what they took out, what they gutted, because Mr. Mulroney rammed it down their throats.

Mr. Speaker, if you think it is only myself and the Government House Leader who are hallucinating, let me refer you to that same Dr. House, Royal Commissioner House, and his book *The Challenge Of Oil*, at pages 309 and 311. "A second weakness, he says, "is uncertainty about the implications of the Accord for a downstream processing industry, refining and petrochemicals for the Province. Under a section on regional security of supply, the Accord gives first priority for end-use consumption and industrial feedstock to capacity already in place within Newfoundland."

He says, "It is unclear whether the moth-balled Come By Chance refinery is counted as part of existing capacity." He says, "If not, refineries in other parts of Eastern Canada would have first call on Hibernia crude. This

would make the prospects for Newfoundland to process its new raw material into finished products rather remote for the foreseeable future."

Listen to this: "Contrary to the Peckford rhetoric, Newfoundlanders would still be hewers of wood, if rather richer ones." Now that is the Premier's own Royal Commissioner who is setting this out. That is the same man that the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), who was courteous enough to give me some of his research, and it is the same man that, as that member pointed out, stated, Mr. Speaker, that -

MR. TOBIN:

Remember about the (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence please on both sides of the House.

MR. FUREY:

Name the gopher.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to have some silence.

MR. FLIGHT:

Tell us about when a demonstration met the bus.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, name him would you please, name him fast. I am not sure if Your Honour has the names for rodents of that nature but if you can find the name, would you name him. I think gopher would be close enough, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like your protection.

Let us just think back. If, Mr. Speaker, the Premier had proceeded and had gotten an agreement, which he could have, in late 1981 - 1982, do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of that project has doubled since then? The figures, Mr. Speaker, are contained in the reports and particularly one report, the Economics of the Hibernia Development which, as minister, I had prepared. We regularly published reports to inform the people of this Province, unlike the present policy, Mr. Speaker, which is to try and keep the people in the dark.

Mr. Speaker, those reports show that in the early 1980's the Hibernia fixed platform could be put in place for approximately \$2.7 billion, I think, for a 500 million barrel field.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now it is four -

MR. BARRY:

Oh no, it is almost 500 million but that is before you add in interest during construction and amortization of the debt. So, commentators are saying and Mobil in indicating that it is now going to cost between \$5 billion and \$6 billion to build the Hibernia development. You see, Mr. Speaker, again this makes it more difficult for the Premier to get a proper deal with Mobil. It makes it more difficult for the people of this Province to get benefits because it is costing us an extra \$2 billion to \$3 billion that we could have for those hospital beds to get your constituents into hospital. We could have that for our schools and housing, Mr. Speaker, that \$2.5 billion to \$3 billion the Premier has cost this Province by his delay is lost to

us.

Members opposite have been going around talking about the history of this as though it were the greatest thing since sliced bread. It is wearing somewhat thin now as we see by their eagerness. Has it ever happened in the history of the Canadian Parliament I wonder that we had an agreement of this magnitude introduced in a special session and then had the government cave in and want to scurry out of the House as quickly as they could without going through and passing it?

MR. FLIGHT:

Never. Never.

MR. BARRY:

When I was growing up out in Brigus, as it started to get a little dark, Mr. Speaker, there was a -

MR. TOBIN:

What happened to Red Island?

MR. BARRY:

I would like a little quiet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Could we have silence on both sides of the House please?

MR. BARRY:

As it started to get a little dark, there was a game that you would play. It was called hoist your tails and run, Mr. Speaker, which meant that one person would put his hand over his eyes or her hand over her eyes and count to a certain figure and everybody would just disperse in all directions and hide. Then the object was to try and ferret out the people. That is what we have here. The government has decided to play

that game, hoist your tails and run. They did it last Fall when the House was open after we had at it for a couple of weeks. They could not take it anymore. They left all kinds of the debris of legislation on the floor of the House in their haste to get out and now, after calling the House together at a great cost to the taxpayer, a special session to enshrine this historic document, after two weeks of hard-hitting questions, Mr. Speaker, it is hoist your tails and run again. Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, they can run but, they cannot hide.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence in the Chamber?

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the gopher tag team match is in operation again but that sort of high level debate I think probably goes over the heads of the ordinary Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker. The rhetoric is too high flown and it is too statesmanlike, Mr. Speaker. The members have put too much research into those comments.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to briefly talk a little bit about the history of this, particularly Mr. Speaker, the Joe Clark letter. I would like to tell a little anecdote about how we got the Joe Clark letter because that is what this Accord is supposed to

be based on. It is not really because if Joe Clark had continued in power I am sure he would have been more fair to the Province than Mr. Mulroney has been.

Mr. Speaker, I went up with the Premier to Ottawa and we had a meeting with John Crosbie and we met with Joe Clark.

MR. TOBIN:

You are the only fellow that -

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could have silence please.

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have silence please while the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is speaking.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not just saying this for a joke. I want him shut up!

MR. FUREY:

He is gone.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I went up to Ottawa with the Premier. We took some officials along. We went into a meeting on Parliament Hill with Joe Clark and John Crosbie. They had some federal officials around. This is just after Mr. Clark's election. Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier would agree that we were somewhat surprised to find that probably our greatest opponent in that room was not Joe Clark and his federal bureaucrats but, John Crosbie, who had taken it upon himself to fight for the interests of Canada. Maybe a Devil's advocate, I do not know, but, by heavens, he talked us down for about an hour and a half. The meeting was about to break up in disarray with no agreement, Mr.

Speaker, and the Premier said, "What do we do? What do we do?" The Premier may recall this and I have to give him credit because he picked up on it pretty fast.

I sent him a note and I said, "If they will not give us a written agreement, for heaven sake, get a public joint statement after the meeting." The Premier did. He said to Mr. Clark, "Listen, the people of this country and my Province are looking at this meeting. They expect something when we walk out. I want something to give them. For heavens sake, we have to, at least, have a joint statement that you accept the fact that we have to have a substantial degree of control and a fair share of revenue."

Joe Clark said, "That sounds reasonable," and was prepared to do it. From the time we got up from the table until we got outside that room, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clark had been literally carried away by his bureaucrats. When the Premier got outside the door to go to the press for the joint statement, no Mr. Clark. He had disappeared. "Now," says the Premier, "what do we do?" I said, "Premier, go down and make the statement anyhow," and that is what he did. He went down on the steps of the Parliament Building and he stated what was in the Joe Clark letter which had not been received. I have to give the Premier credit for that. I will take a little bit of credit for being involved in the thing but I give the Premier credit for having the brass to go down and announce what the policy was, not just for the Government of Newfoundland but, the policy of the Government of Canada.

When the press went, after hearing that statement by the Premier, and asked Mr. Clark and asked Mr. Crosbie, what could they say? They had to say, "yes, we have an agreement." Then it was a matter, Mr. Speaker, of a number of weeks where we had to get provincial officials and federal officials to sit down and draft a letter. But, you know, that letter has not been lived up to, as I have stated earlier today. The principle of Joe Clark's letter was that the resource was to be treated as though it were on land. As I have explained, Mr. Speaker, earlier this morning, the resource is not being treated as though it were on land and that, of course, goes back to the fact that Newfoundland has no right, as does Alberta, to curtail production in the event that the government of Canada decides to set an artificially low price in the future. The Province has no right and because it has no right to curtail production, Mr. Speaker, there is less bargaining power.

Mr. Speaker, that was one little anecdote, a human interest story with respect to the Joe Clark letter that I think it would be an awful shame if we did not have history record because it shows how we got the Joe Clark letter out of Joe Clark and John Crosbie. John Crosbie was not prepared to let us have a letter, Mr. Speaker. We had to go out and announce it.

There are so many things that should be mentioned in terms of the historical development leading up to this Accord, all of which, Mr. Speaker, should be set out for the record. Can you picture the school children in this Province in the future as they go back ten, fifteen, twenty years to check,

Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would assume that I would be afforded the same courtesy as others.

MR. SPEAKER:
Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No! No!

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

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I assumed that I would be afforded the same privilege as we have been affording the members opposite. I need about another ten minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I ruled on that matter yesterday and last Friday. All hon. members have thirty minutes, unless they are extended leave by the House. Leave has not been granted.

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

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think under the Standing Orders the Leader of the Opposition has an hour. Am I not correct?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has had an hour.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will not take an hour to respond to the Leader of the Opposition. It will only take me about six or seven minutes. There are two things I want to say before I ask a number of questions. Number one is I listened with interest to the Leader of the Opposition as he related the Clark experience, which is not completely accurate, for the record. Number two, if the Leader of the Opposition wishes to release negotiations that the government gets involved in with the federal government like he did today, then I can release certain documents from the Leader of the Opposition that he put before me in the dying days before he resigned which will show that he was willing to sell out the offshore a lot more than John Crosbie or anybody else in Newfoundland or Labrador. I just might one day have to release those documents.

If the Leader of the Opposition is going to persist in releasing certain parts of negotiations that went on government to government, then I might then say that I have the license to release certain

documents that the Leader of the Opposition put before me which demonstrated that he was not in favour of the kind of Accord that we now have in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the following questions? Did the Liberal Party support ownership of the offshore?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. PECKFORD:

Answer: No. Number two, Mr. Speaker: Did the Liberal Party support joint management of the offshore?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Answer: No. Number three: Did the Liberal Party support having the Province tax offshore resources as if they were on land?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Answer: No. Number four: Did the Liberal party support having the Province have control over mode of development?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Answer: No. Did the Liberal

party support Newfoundland getting substantial offset payments to compensate for equalization?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. Did the Liberal Party support that the social laws of Newfoundland apply to the offshore?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. Did the Liberal Party support preference of Newfoundland for goods and services and labour content?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. Mr. Speaker, did the Liberal Party support a sellout by supporting the Nova Scotia type agreement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is where we find -

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the questions the Premier asked.

MR. YOUNG:

That is not a point of order.

MR. CALLAN:

I am not standing on a point of order, I am answering the questions the Premier asked.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

I would like to ask the Premier a question. Did he promise to open the refinery in ninety days?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member is out of order. The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

May I ask eight more questions, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Then I will sit down.

MR. CALLAN:

Did he promise to keep the Markland hospital open as long as he was Premier?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Did the P.C. Party support ownership of the offshore?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Did the P.C. Party support joint management of the offshore?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Did the P.C. Party support having the Province tax offshore resources as if they were on land?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Did the P.C. Party support having the Province have control over the of development?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Did the P.C. Party support Newfoundland getting substantial offset payments to compensate for equalization?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Did the P.C. Party support that the social laws of Newfoundland applied to the offshore?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Did the P.C. Party support preference of Newfoundland for goods and services and labour content?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Did the P.C. Party support a sellout by supporting the Nova Scotia type agreements?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. That is where the answer lies, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition can get up and concoct all the kinds of theories he wants to in this House, the long and short of it is that the people of Newfoundland know who supported us getting a fair deal on the offshore and that that fair deal now is encompassed in the Atlantic Accord which is going into the legislation of Canada and the legislation of Newfoundland.

Every Newfoundlander knows that the Liberal Party was true to its history. It sold out Newfoundland and, except for the P.C. Party, it would be sold out again this time, Mr. Speaker. That is the story.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Liberal Party will go down in the history of Newfoundland again, on 700,000 square miles, as the sellout party in Newfoundland and Labrador politics, the Leader of the Opposition notwithstanding. He can get up here in the House and try to pretend that he had something to do with the oil and gas regulations.

When Mr. Crosbie took over from him, and I took over from Mr. Crosbie, there was not one regulation written, Mr. Speaker, yet he tries to pretend - he is trying to have it both ways at the same time - that he had something to do with the regulations. Then he sneaks over there because he

could not get the leadership of the P.C. Party, goes over there and tries to take on the Liberal Party, a party, he now supports and is leader of, which wanted to sell out Newfoundland and wanted us to sign a Nova Scotia type agreement. We will not let the people of Newfoundland forget which party tried to sell out 700,000 square miles of minerals on the Continental Shelf.

The Leader of the Opposition can have his own personal ambition. He can go Leader of the Liberal Party, he can go Leader of the NDP Party, we will not let the Liberal Party forget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, I am not doing this as a whim.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No! no!

MR. MATTHEWS:
You were coached.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, we have before us an extremely important piece of legislation.

The Premier gets up and tries to blame Liberals and praise Tories,

or blame Tories and praise Liberals. That is totally irrelevant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:
What I want to hear, Mr. Speaker, as a Newfoundlander, and what Newfoundlanders want to be assured of is this: Do we have here another Churchill Falls, another sellout? I was not a member of this House of Assembly, the member for Gander was not a member of this House, Mr. Speaker when the Churchill Falls deal was struck. I want to know, do we have before us a good piece of legislation or are we throwing out the baby with the bath water? I do not want to know who to blame or who to praise.

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

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I can tell the hon. the gentleman he knows in his own heart and soul that that piece of legislation is the best piece of legislation ever to come before a Legislature of Newfoundland, which controls resources for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we are here in this House. The body politic of Newfoundland is made up of three parties, the PC Party of Newfoundland, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, and the New Democratic Party of Newfoundland. The Liberal Party of Newfoundland, under its present leader, has gotten up in this House and has tried to criticize the Atlantic Accord when every member on the opposite side of the House knows that the Liberal Party of Canada, in cahoots with the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, tried and tried their darndest and almost succeeded in getting us to sign a deal which would have seen the sellout that the hon. member for the Straits is talking about today. But we persisted, Mr. Speaker, we persisted! Everybody in Newfoundland and Labrador today knows we have the right to tax as if it were on land, we have joint management, we have a stabilization fund.

It is really a funny thing that the hon. member is part of a political party, yet he stands up in his place there and tries to disassociate himself from all political parties; "I am a citizen of Newfoundland" - and here he is sitting in the Liberal Opposition - "let us forget about the past". Let us forget about all of that suddenly, when he is a member of a party that wanted to sell out Newfoundland, 700,000 square miles.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he cannot have it both ways. If he is part of a political party, he either supports their position of a sellout on offshore or he does not. Otherwise, he has to resign.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition knows he is lost. He thought that when he crossed the floor it was going to make the government tumble. It did not. It made it stronger than ever. He did produce a number of documents that one day will be in the Archives and will come out for historians to record, that the Leader of the Opposition wanted the same kind of sellout. He was not willing to take the heat, and he was not willing to be number two, number three, or number four in the Cabinet of this Province. But we persisted, Mr. Speaker, and we prevailed, and the people of Newfoundland will know who stood up for their rights and who wanted to sell them out.

Today it is clear to all that we were the ones who stood up for Newfoundland and the Liberal Party, even though the traditional political Party in Newfoundland, lost its mainstream support because it was willing to sell out again, in the same way as they had on Churchill Falls and with John Doyle and John Shaheen.

That day is over. I know it is hard for these hon. members to accept that day is gone and there is a new day in Newfoundland, which says, 'We will support the party which protects our best interests and has no more sellouts like in the past.' That is why we are on this side of the House and the Liberal Party is on that side and, Mr. Speaker, I predict they are going to be there for a long, long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I believe His Honour is in the precincts of the House.

MR. TOBIN:

When the question was asked if the Liberals supported a sellout by supporting a Nova Scotia type agreement, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) said yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, Oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am advised His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor is on his way and will be here in a matter of seconds.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Because the Government House Leader had indicated His Honour would be coming into the House at twelve-thirty, I wonder if the Government House Leader would indicate whether his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor was inconvenienced and asked to wait in order to permit the Premier to engage in that tirade we just heard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to engage Your Honour like that, Your Honour being Mr. Speaker, it is another quite disgraceful act on the part of the hon. gentleman to say Her Majesty's Representative

would be involved in some kind of circuitous type of arrangements with the government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER:

Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS:

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is the wish of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor that you all be seated. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present Session passed a certain bill, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Tax On Users Of Tobacco". (Bill No. 50).

HON. W.A. PADDON

(Lieutenant Governor):

In Her Majesty's Name, I assent to this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HON. HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

The first session of the 40th General Assembly of this Hon. House of Assembly is about to be

prorogued. Before relieving you of your duties, I wish to convey to you appreciation for the careful and sympathetic attention given to the important matters brought before you by my ministers.

As has become customary during the tenure of this administration, the first Sitting of this Session was concerned primarily with the Address In Reply to my Speech from the Throne at the commencement of this Session and consideration of the granting of Supply to Her Majesty. The Second Sitting during the Fall, as has become customary, concerned itself with legislative measures.

However, this Session was unique in that a Third Sitting was held in the year ensuing from the Speech from the Throne. The purpose of this Sitting was to acquit my Governments's obligation under Clause 57 of the Atlantic Accord, within one year of the signing of that historic document, to introduce to this Hon. House legislation necessary to implement that Agreement which is so vital to the interests of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I am pleased to note that this was accomplished on February 7, 1986. I am equally pleased to observe that on that same day in the House of Commons, the mutual and parallel legislation envisaged by the Atlantic Accord and entitled the Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation Act was introduced into the Parliament of Canada.

The process of enacting legislation mutual and parallel to a corresponding Bill being simultaneously enacted by the Parliament of Canada is unique in the history of this Hon. House.

In order to preserve the essential mutuality of both Bills, it is necessary that they both proceed through their various necessary stages of enactment more or less in concert. Consequently, it would have been inappropriate to have pursued The Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act through all of its stages in this present Session.

The Second Reading of this important measure can conveniently resume in the Second Session of this 40th. General Assembly shortly to be convened. During that Session, Committee Stage on this historic Bill will also take place coincidentally or following Committee Stage of its sister Bill in the House of Commons. Following this, Third Reading and Assent requisite to pass this most historic bill into the Law of this Province will take place.

My Ministers look forward with immense anticipation and satisfaction to the continued debate on this - the most important Bill to be considered by this hon. House since Confederation with Canada - in the forthcoming Session of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HON. HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

Thirty-five pieces of legislation were enacted during this Session of the Hon. House of Assembly. In particular, legislative initiatives were taken in the administration of justice, labour, municipal affairs, consumer affairs, cultural affairs and finance.

In the area of the administration of justice, my Government

recognized that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms imposes new and substantial obligations on it. My Government ordered a comprehensive review of all the laws of the Province with a view to determining whether they complied with the Charter. The purpose in so doing was to acknowledge our constitutional duty to safeguard the entrenched rights of those subject to the laws of the Province, and to fulfill that duty by ensuring that our provincial laws do not violate the Charter. As a result of this review, this Hon. House passed a bill amending over seventy pieces of legislation in order to ensure the standards of the Charter, with which legislation must comply, would be reflected in the Public General Statutes.

My Government, also in the areas of the administration of justice, introduced An Act to Amend the Judicature Act that increased from seven to eight the number of judges in the Trial Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. The Arbitration Act was passed to provide a new piece of legislation dealing exclusively with arbitrations in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HON. HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

As an indication of my government's commitment to the consumers of this Province, The Public Utilities Act was amended to empower my Government to issue directions to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities on any matter pertaining to compensation for the use of utility poles owned by a public utility by a licensed cable television system. As well, my Government appointed another Commissioner to the Board of

Commissioners of Public Utilities to represent the interests of consumers on that Board. The Insurance Companies Act was amended during this Session to provide for the licensing in this Province of extra-provincial insurance companies and also to provide for reciprocal deposits. Another amendment to The Insurance Companies Act also provides that all insurance companies in the Province must be members of a compensation fund. As well, the Newfoundland Automobile Assigned Risk Plan was completely reorganized to provide further protection to the public during this Session.

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HON. HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

In the area of labour, my Government introduced very significant legislation respecting labour relations, workers' compensation and collective bargaining in the public service.

With respect to labour relations, my Government introduced amendments to The Labour Relations Act, 1977 to clarify the authority of the Labour Relations Board to hold hearings, to permit the Board to settle the terms of a first collective agreement and to provide for the collection by an employer of union dues from unionized and non-unionized employees.

My Government also introduced amendments to The Public Service (Collective Bargaining) Act, 1973 to limit the number of employees in the public service who may be considered essential by the employer and to limit to employees in health care institutions certain provisions requiring a waiting period of thirty days

before calling a strike.

Furthermore, my Government introduced amendments to The Workers' Compensation Act, 1983 to clarify the meaning of "injury" for the purposes of that Act and to provide for the integration of Canada Pension plan disability benefits with workers' compensation benefits.

In the area of health care, my Government introduced legislation respecting the registration of psychologists qualified to practice in the Province.

In the area of the fishery, my Government introduced amendments to The Fisheries Loan Act to afford protection to fishermen respecting amounts deducted by fish processors for remittance to the Fisheries Loan Board on their behalf. An amendment was also introduced to provide that interest owing by a fisherman on a loan that is in arrears through no fault of the fisherman may be forgiven.

In the area of cultural affairs, my Government introduced legislation to revise existing legislation respecting the preservation of the Province's historic resources. My Government has also introduced legislation to provide for the creation of the Heritage Foundation to aid in the preservation of buildings and other structures that are of architectural or historical significance.

The Local School Tax Act was amended to exempt from taxation buildings on productive farmland and woodland and to exempt from the real property tax certain buildings used for residential

purposes.

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HON. HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

During this session, my Government introduced a number of amendments to certain financial measures. A new Tobacco Tax Act was passed to revise the law, particularly as it relates to enforcement.

The Financial Corporations Capital Tax Act and The Department of Finance Act were also amended to clarify administrative procedures. As well, the Liquor Corporation Act, 1973 was amended to enable my Government to prescribe the proportion of alcohol in various classes of beer. That act was further amended to empower the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation to manufacture, blend, package, mix and prepare for sale alcoholic liquor.

In the area of municipal affairs, my Government introduced new legislation respecting the City of Corner Brook. The new act reflects the larger and more developed aspects of municipal government in our West Coast city. My government also introduced several legislative changes to enhance the smooth running of municipal elections in the city of St. John's.

In recognition of the responsibility and representative position of municipalities in this Province, my Government introduced amendments permitting municipalities to make regulations respecting the method of display of pornographic materials in shops and the access by minors to those materials.

Among other legislative measures

enacted during this Session were An Act To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957, An Act To Amend The Youth Advisory Council Act, An Act To Amend the Management Accountants Act, An Act To Amend The Day Care And Homemaker Services Act, 1975, An Act To Amend The Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act, 1975, An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act and An Act To Amend The Memorial University (Pensions) Act.

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HON. HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

I thank you for the large measure of supply you have granted. I assure you that the appropriations that you have granted will be expended by my ministers with care and efficiency.

It is my pleasure that the First Session of this 40th. General Assembly now be prorogued and it is prorogued accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Pursuant to the speech of His Honour, the House is prorogued.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

First Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. P.J. McNicholas, Speaker

Leo Barry, Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (Lib)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Flight, Graham (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hickey, Thomas V. (PC)	St. John's East Extern
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

First Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2...

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Marshall, Hon. William (PC)	St. John's East
Matthews, Hon. William (PC)	Grand Bank
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)	St. John's Centre
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)	LaPoile
Morgan, James (PC)	Bonavista South
Ottenheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)	Waterford - Kenmount
Patterson, William G. (PC)	Placentia
Peach, Milton (PC)	Carbonear
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)	Green Bay
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Ferryland
Reid, James G. (PC)	Trinity - Bay de Verde
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC)	Baie Verte - White Bay
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)	Lewisporte
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)	Grand Falls
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)	Fortune-Hermitage
Tobin, Glenn (PC)	Burin - Placentia West
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)	Fogo
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)	Exploits
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)	Humber East
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)	Torngat Mountains
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)	Mount Pearl
Woodford, Rick (PC)	Humber Valley
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)	Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

First Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Social Services
Hon. John Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Finance
Hon. Ron Dawe	Transportation
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines and Energy
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
Hon. William Marshall	President of the Council/ Government House Leader/ Minister responsible for Energy, Petroleum Directorate/Nfld. and Labrador Hydro

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

First Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. William Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Charlie Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
Hon. Len Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Health
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	President of Treasury Board
Hon. Haig Young	Public Works and Services