



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 33

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

14 June 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, since there seems to
be a total collapse over there,
maybe I could ask the Leader of
the Opposition one more time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
The Leader of the Opposition?
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Sorry. I meant the Government
House Leader. Which side are we
on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. TULK:
We know which side we should be on.

MR. BARRY:
I ask the Government House Leader
(Mr. Marshall) for leave - Your
Honour has not given a ruling yet
as to whether I can read this
resolution - to read this
resolution once more on senior
citizens' pensions and
de-indexing. Are we going to get
leave?

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether
it is a Freudian slip or not, but
calling me Leader of the
Opposition means the hon.
gentleman, at least in his own
mind, has finally attained the
status of Premier - in his own
mind.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
It might mean that you are going
to cross over.

MR. MARSHALL:
Maybe he is in a delusionary state
or something, in the same
delusionary state and illusory
state that finds him on the other
side of the House. But no, Mr.
Speaker, this House of Assembly is
reserved for serious government
business and not for the playing
of base politics.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Maybe this is the
time, then, that I should make a
comment on the point the Leader of
the Opposition brought up. As I
understood, it was not a matter of
hearing the motion and then
deciding whether it was in order;
it was more a matter of deciding
whether it would be in order to
state the motion at the time and
in my opinion there was no place
there at that particular time to
state it. I would like to refer
the hon. member to Beauchesne,
paragraph 296, and it says here,
"It is a paramount principle that
no Member may speak except when
there is a question before the
House. Among the few exceptions
to this principle are the
following: questions put before
the commencement of public
business to Ministers or other
Members of the House, questions of
privilege, personal explanations
and statements made by the
Ministers of the Crown regarding
public affairs with other Members
commenting on such statements."
So it is not only by leave.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Your Honour's ruling and, of course, it is correct. But what I have been seeking leave for, with the respect to this resolution, is to call upon the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and members opposite to grant leave, which then, of course, supercedes the Standing Orders and, if leave were granted, there would be absolutely nothing wrong with my standing and asking to have the resolution condemning the de-indexing of senior citizens' pensions go before this House for debate immediately. The problem, you see, Your Honour, with tabling it and putting it on by way of a Notice of Motion is that it will not come up for debate, as Your Honour knows, during this session because it will be treated as a private member's resolution and will not come up for debate until next Fall. This will mean that the senior citizens of this Province will not get the protection that they should be getting from members opposite, from the government of this Province, in the interim. I am not trying to abuse the rules of the House, I am not trying to have debate on a matter out of order contrary to the Standing Orders, but what I am asking for is for leave of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to put forth a resolution condemning the budget for de-indexing senior citizens' pensions. Other provinces have already done it and I am wondering if this Province is prepared to do it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, he appreciates your ruling, as we all appreciate your

ruling, but the hon. gentleman just made a political speech. The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) clearly indicated that the Premier is going to be making a statement next week. I mean, if the hon. gentleman wants leave I would like to give him my usual co-operation and my usual answer, and it is no.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I would like to welcome to the visitor's gallery today eight students of the Business Education Stenography class from the CBS District Vocational School with their teacher Pat Brown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. I would like to ask the minister whether he has taken any steps to review the situation regarding the close down of beds for children at the Carbonear hospital. We have not heard anything from the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) on this. I wonder if the minister is going to review that situation with a view to seeing that there are sufficient beds for the treatment of children in that area of the Province where beds are desperately needed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I understand when the board of the Carbonear General Hospital met on June 6 they made a decision they would close the 12-bed pediatric unit, which is a part of the 100-bed general hospital in Carbonear.

I understand that that 12-bed pediatric unit has about a 50 per cent occupancy throughout the year. I also understand that they are providing two beds in the surgical unit.

I should inform this House that I have not been officially informed by the chairman and the board or by the chief executive officer of the Carbonear General Hospital. When we receive these communications in full, a discussion will take place between members of the Department of Health and, hopefully, members of the board of the Carbonear General Hospital.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health, as he is accustomed to doing when he is not entertaining this House with frivolities on PCB use for diet or arthritis treatment, is trying to pass the buck to the hospital board of Carbonear. The reason the board closed down these beds, as the minister well knows, is because the minister and his colleagues did not provide sufficient funds for that hospital.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now, I would like to ask the minister whether he is aware of the comments by concerned citizens and members of the board with respect to their belief that now their children will have to be treated in the Janeway Hospital, and whether the minister would indicate what the situation is with respect to bed closures at the Janeway Children's Hospital in St. John's? Will the beds be there to treat these patients from Carbonear who are now being treated in the Carbonear Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I did hear public comments on the closure of the beds in the pediatric ward in Carbonear General Hospital. They had made arrangements in the surgical units to accommodate two surgical cases. That is my understanding at the moment. I have read, but without official confirmation, that cases will be referred to the Janeway. I am also aware they do not have a pediatrician on the staff and that they refer many of their pediatric problems to the Janeway.

You mentioned about funding. I think it is important that you would know how much funding has been provided to the Carbonear General Hospital. In 1982-1983, \$8,154,000. In 1983-1984, \$8,722,000. In 1984-1985, \$9,157,000. In 1985-1986, \$9,604,000.

MR. BARRY:

Not keeping up with inflation at

all! What about the Janeway beds?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer my second question. I asked the minister is he aware of the situation with respect to the Janeway? Are beds to close at the Janeway also? If children's beds are closing at the Janeway, will there be sufficient beds to deal with the additional patients that they will get from the Carbonear Hospital? If I could go on, talking about making room in the surgical ward, would the minister confirm that there is already a waiting list for surgery at the Carbonear Hospital and will this not have the effect of meaning a longer waiting list now for surgery patients at that hospital? And how many other hospitals around the Province are going to have to close children's beds because of lack of funding from this government?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I am aware that beds are going to be closed in the Janeway Child Center. Beds there have been closed for quite a number of years during the Summer season. Yes, that is happening.

MR. BARRY:

The Janeway is closing beds.

DR. TWOMEY:

Yes, this is quite true. I said I understand, because it has not been officially confirmed, that arrangements have been made

between the board of the Carbonear General Hospital and the Janeway Child Health Center that accommodations will be made for referrals, as they have been in the past, from Carbonear to the Janeway Child Health Center. I understand that some pediatric beds are going to be closed across this Province as happens every year, They have been closed for many, many reasons. As you are aware the occupancy rate in most pediatric wards has decreased.

MR. BARRY:

Are you saying this is a normal, temporary close down?

DR. TWOMEY:

I said yes, there is a closure of beds in most hospitals across this Province every Summer, every single Summer for a number of years. There is a closure of the beds during the Christmas and New Year period every year.

MR. BARRY:

That is not what we are talking about here, and the minister knows it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Listen! Listen!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

These are permanent closures we are talking about now. Permanent closures. You are misleading the House. You are misleading the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Windsor -
Buchans.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! A point of order,
the hon. the President of the
Council.

MR. BAIRD:
Sit down, boy! Sit down!

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman clearly said
the Minister of Health (Dr.
Twomey) is misleading the House
and misleading the Province. I
think that really is out of
order. I mean, the hon. gentleman
should control himself and his
temper. He is an embarrassment to
the members on the other side.
You can see by the look on their
faces when he starts shouting and
screaming, and you can see how
they try to rescue him when he
gets up on a supplementary
question by getting up themselves
and hoping that Your Honour will
recognize the other members and
thus rescue the Opposition from
the embarrassment of the Leader of
the Opposition (Mr. Barry) with
his antics.

MR. TULK:
Silly Willie is at it again.

MR. BAIRD:
Withdraw!

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
To that point of order, the hon.

the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the
Government House Leader (Mr.
Marshall) for providing me this
additional time, so I would like
to speak to that point of order.
I repeat: The Minister of Health
(Dr. Twomey) has misled this House
and has misled the Province by the
comment that he is making to give
the inference that what is
happening is temporary, normal,
Summer or Christmas closures.
What we are talking about here,
what is happening at Carbonear is
a permanent closing of hospital
beds. That is what the question
referred to, not the usual, normal
Summer closures. And what I am
asking the minister is do we not
have the same thing occurring at
the Janeway? Do we not have, in
addition to normal Summer
closures, the close down of
children's beds at the Janeway for
lack of funding, as well as the
closure of pediatric beds in other
hospitals around this Province on
a permanent basis, not just a
temporary Summer close down? The
minister has misled this House.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the President of the
Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Now the hon. gentleman gets on his
feet and he throws histrionics.
Look, on behalf of the House,
including his colleagues in the
Opposition, I ask him to try and
conduct himself in a civil way,
try not to lose his temper, and to
try at least to exhibit some kind
of parliamentary mettle that would

be worthy of a leader in the House of Assembly.

MR. BAIRD:

They should have another leader. They always change them every six months.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) suggested that he misled the House. I think it would be out of order if he had said deliberately, that it was a deliberate thing. That in itself is not out of order.

I will call on the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) in as far as he is responsible for mine inspections, and mine inspectors are attached to his department. The minister is aware that the mine in Buchans has been shutdown and allowed to flood. The operators have commitments to mine-abandonment procedures and some aspects of the mine-abandonment procedure are going to be spread over a period of time. But does the minister have a schedule as to when the mine abandonment at the Buchans workings should be completed?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. There has been an inspection of the mine at

Buchans carried out. There was a meeting and an inspection on May 9, and following that meeting the Deputy Mayor of Buchans wrote to the department and put in writing some concerns with respect to water that had gathered in glory holes and some problems with dust from the tailings there. Another meeting was arranged for June 4. That meeting consisted of representatives from the Department of the Environment, the Department of Mines and Energy, and the Department of Labour. Prior to the meeting an inspection was carried out and it was found that, yes, there may be some problems with accumulation of water in the glory holes, and they thought that the water could sort of seek its own level until such time as some corrective action ought to be taken. The upshot of it was that all the people at the meeting, the union representatives, representatives of the employees there, representatives of the community all were satisfied with the procedures.

The direct question which the hon. member asked, Mr. Speaker, was is there a procedure? The answer to that is yes.

MR. FLIGHT:

I asked for the schedule.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, the schedule is stipulated in the procedure.

MR. FLIGHT:

The procedure is stipulated by the schedule.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. minister has been asked a question and he should be afforded the courtesy of being able to give a response without the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) rudely interrupting him the way he is doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

When a minister is replying to a question he has been asked, he is certainly entitled to have silence.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister alluded to some of my concerns, but my immediate concern is the safety aspect. These are old mine workings, as he says, great holes as a result of surface mining, and these holes are filling with water and posing a serious safety threat to people, particularly children. Now, why has the company not eliminated these hazards under their mine-abandonment programme? The mines has been closed for six months, and there is a very, very dangerous situation existing in that area.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to give the hon. member an answer. I am not sure if he wants an answer to

it. There is an answer and the answer is that inspections have been carried out. The note here about the glory holes is that the three mined-out glory holes were checked during the visit prior to the meeting and the intention is to hold any final decision on the glory holes until - flooding has occurred, as I said to you earlier - the water reaches its own level. They are thinking about sloping them and later, perhaps, fencing them.

But I am told it is no different from a pond by the side of the road. It is a gentle slope, it is not a cliff or anything like that where a vehicle might go in and disappear or something like that. But I am not minimizing the safety hazards that might exist there. There is a procedure for the abandonment of mines and it is done in accordance with the legislation, various sections of the legislation and Regulation of Mines Act. And there are time limits contained in those guidelines for the abandonment of mines. If the hon. member is really interested in the safety aspects of it, we will certainly provide him with a copy of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister explained a situation whereby he is going to allow the risk to get worse. There are vertical sides on those glory holes. You could drop twenty Confederation Buildings down in those holes. And they are filling up with water and the more water

goes in the greater the risk that a vehicle or a child or unsuspecting people could walk in. There is undermining as a result of the water action flushing in and out of the mine. There is undermining erosion taking place. And the very action that he described, that he is sitting back and watching, is allowing the risk to people to become greater. So I am asking the minister when will he order the companies, if they have a commitment to mine abandonment, to eliminate those risks. As he sits there the threat and the danger to people are getting worse, not getting better. We do not need inspections, we need the hazard and the risk to be eliminated. When will the minister have the company responsible eliminate those risks to the safety of the people in that town?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I perceive that the hon. member is setting himself up as some kind of an authority on inspection of mines.

MR. FLIGHT:
No, I am just concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:
He is concerned? Well, his concerns are being addressed. The manager of the company was there, two people from the Department of Mines were there, and the mines inspection engineer was there.

MR. FLIGHT:
They have been going there for fifty years.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:
Representatives of the community, the town council were there, the mayor and the deputy mayor were there. They are all satisfied -

MR. FLIGHT:
Eliminate the risks!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:
Do you want an answer or do you not? They are all satisfied that it is done properly.

MR. FLIGHT:
They are not. That is not so. They are not.

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

The hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) brought up a point of order a few moments ago about interrupting an hon. minister when he is answering a question. I would think that it is far more appropriate for an hon. member to ask a supplementary rather than interrupt the answer that is being given.

MR. FLIGHT:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Would the minister tell the House exactly when the mayor and the deputy mayor and all the officials who are concerned, and whose job it is to be concerned, the mayor and deputy mayor indicated to the minister that they were satisfied

with the mine-abandonment procedure and that they were satisfied that the risk to people has been eliminated? Would the minister table any correspondence he has got showing that and indicate to the House when they indicated that to the minister?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, the meeting the hon. member is asking about was held June 4. But I am not saying now, and I did not say at any time that everybody is satisfied that there are no risks. There are risks in mines all the time, risks in every work place, but it is being monitored and a procedure is in place for correction of the problems, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, during the most recent election a Cabinet minister made a commitment to the people of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir concerning a senior citizens' home. I have here a statement that was mailed out to the voters of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and it says, "Incumbent minister Hal Andrews, at a public meeting in Milltown on Friday night, March 22, 1985 committed a senior citizens' complex for the Bay d'Espoir area. This announcement was the result of a need and demand study which was conducted earlier and sponsored by a federal government grant. The project is estimated to cost approximately \$4 million, with a capacity to accommodate 75 senior

citizens. It will be constructed over the next two years with site preparations to commence in 1985. The project will employ approximately 50 to 60 people during construction and will have an estimated permanent staff of 75 with 15 to 20 seasonal workers."

Now earlier this week I asked the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) was he aware of this, and he, in his typical British Colonel Blimp fashion, said, "No, not at all, not at all."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

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

I would ask the hon. member if he would pose his question.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, I will get to the question. Since that time I have found out that there was a committee from Bay d'Espoir which was in here and had a meeting with the Minister of Health, so I feel that the Minister of Health was less than honest in his answer. In view of the fact that the Premier is not here this morning, maybe the House Leader would like to answer this question. Could he advise when the government will honour its commitment and establish a senior citizens' home in the Bay d'Espoir area?

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard sexist questions, today we are hearing allusions to a person's nationality, but I think we are all very proud of the Minister of

Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

The fact that the Minister of Health comes from Britain, or I think he comes from Britain -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, Ireland. Ireland.

MR. MARSHALL:

Ireland. I am sorry. You would never know it he has such a flat Newfoundland accent, but I am glad to know he does come from the British Isles, since so many, Mr. Speaker, of our own forebearers did. And I am quite sure a lot of people in Newfoundland would like to know - and I hope it gets out to them - the type of insult passed across the House by the hon. gentleman. I will tell the hon. gentleman that all of the commitments made legitimately by this government will be carried out and will be executed, and we hope they will be executed sooner than later, because we are in the process now of plans and economic development over a period of time. I want to tell the hon. gentleman as well, since he referred to the previous member, he might be interested to know as well that I was talking with Mr. Andrews last night and he tells me that his own home is inundated not only with calls but with visitors from the district seeking to have him take up matters with respect to their concerns. So he continues to be very much concerned and I have no doubt that that gentleman, if his mind turns to it in the next election, will relieve the hon. gentleman of his responsibilities, which he is obviously not carrying out very well as you can see by the tenor

of his questions.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is nice to have a cheering gallery on the other side.

The question I have is quite a serious one and it is also for the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). Just in the last little while Statistics Canada has released a Canadian Youth:prospectus on their health study and one of the observations it has made in it is that between 1961 and 1981 the suicide rate among young males and young females has increased dramatically. Among young males between the ages of fifteen and nineteen it has quadrupled, among males between the ages of twenty to twenty-four it has tripled, and among females it has also gone up dramatically. My question for the Minister of Health is in light of this growing cause of death among young people what responses have been made by our Department of Health with regard to concerns about the mental health of young people in our population?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We have been made aware of it very recently. That report has been passed on to the Mental Health Division of the Department of Health. I have asked them to

prepare a report and when that report has been prepared I will be prepared to release it to this House and to the public.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

The reason I raised the question is more than general interest. Unfortunately in my district in the last year we have had at least two instances of teen-age suicide and there has been a response from the community itself in that it is very concerned with what is going on. We have asked the Department of Health for the one employee, as I understand it, they have who is concerned with teen-age mental health which is the area we would suggest is working here. And after meeting with that individual we have been told that there is just no resources available within the Department of Health. What I am asking the minister now is in view of the mounting crisis, in view of the immediate need there, what are you planning to do to increase the services available so that there can be a community response developed so that we can hopefully cut down this alarming increase in this particular kind of death?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

After I have reviewed the report from the Division of Mental Health in the Department of Health I will be able to answer that question for you.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate once again that I am a friend of labour, the rank and file labour of this Province, I want to carry on with a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) from where I ended yesterday when the minister was expressing his concern over the brewing industry. Mr. Speaker, my question now to the minister is in view of the concern for the industry that he expressed yesterday, in view of the fact that his considerable persuasive powers have now failed, in view of the fact that he has failed in getting all the people involved back to the bargaining table, I wonder will he now consider using the legislative powers bestowed upon him as a minister, and I refer to a couple of sections of the Labour Relations Act that give the minister power to act in this particular situation, I wonder now when will he consider using the powers given to him by the laws of this Province, and I refer specifically to the one where an industry is in danger?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. gentleman is referring to Section 98 of the Labour Relations Act, where the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may cause a vote to be taken where the economic outlook of an industry or a geographic area of the Province is threatened.

Frankly, as the hon. member knows since he has raised that with me before, while that provision is in

the act, I do not really see the present situation as being one which ought to be governed by that section at the moment. While the strike is a very serious one - it is having an effect on persons other than those directly employed and it is very serious from that vantage point - the answer to the hon. gentleman's question is no. I think if government ordered a vote in the normal legal process that is going on here, I am sure hon. members to a man on the other side would be down on us like a ton of bricks.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to table some documents in the House today. The first one indicates that the level of fenitrothion persists in the environment and increases over a period of years.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, we are now under the procedure of asking oral questions. The hon. gentleman got up and said, 'I wish to proceed to table documents.' When he was recognized by the Chair it was to pose a question, and the hon. gentleman is not at liberty now to table documents.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is out of order.

MR. BAKER:
My question simply is this, then: Does the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) stand by his statements that there is no scientific indication that fenitrothion will kill polinators, birds and fish and that fenitrothion does not persist in the environment?

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, once again, the Minister of the Environment has been misquoted by the hon. gentleman. What the Minister of the Environment said was that there is no scientific evidence that I know about that it kills birds. I said 'birds', not small fish or polinators like bees and wasps and grasshoppers and so on, because indeed, I know that it does.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BUTT:
As a matter of fact, I want to tell the hon. member that that is why we do a polinator test, and we will be doing that testing after the spray programme, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I am very much aware that fenitrothion will have an effect on polinators, and for that reason government is going to spend a substantial amount of money to ensure that these tests are going to be ongoing and monitored by a consulting firm that will be paid by the taxpayers of this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister, in Committee, mentioned the five kilometer buffer zone around water supplies, and streams. In the press yesterday he mentioned a 1.5 kilometer buffer zone. I would like to ask the minister now which, in fact, is the correct buffer zone.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, once again the hon. member is not quite correct in what he is saying. I told the hon. member in the Estimates Committee, and let us be quite fair about it, that I was not quite sure of the distance. I said, 'I think it might be five kilometers.' You know, it is a statistic, right? I told the hon. member after, Mr. Speaker, that I believed that in sensitive areas, around communities and water sheds, the buffer zone was going to be somewhere in the order of 1.5 kilometers. If it is a big thing with the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, to get the exact statistic, I can phone the department immediately after Question Period and get it for the hon. member in inches and feet, if he wishes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will pull a surprise on them now, Mr. Speaker. Motion 5.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law", carried. (Bill No. 30).

On motion, Bill No. 30 read a first time, ordered read a second time tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act, The City Of St. John's Act And The Municipalities Act", carried. (Bill No. 24).

On motion, Bill No. 24 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The St. John's Municipal Elections Act", carried. (Bill No. 31).

On motion, Bill No. 31 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 3, the Concurrence Motion on the Resource Committee.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The Concurrence Motion on the

Resource Committee. The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed yesterday at the utter nonsense that was being produced by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the nonsense that he got on with yesterday concerning the news media and saying that if questions asked by the Opposition were good questions, then the news media might attend our Estimates Committees. Now, how silly, how stupid, Mr. Speaker, could the hon. member be. And he raised some issues that he wanted us to address.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to address some issues this morning to which this government does not give many answers. I am going to talk about unemployment.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now, now! We are on the Resource Committee.

MR. LUSH:

Yes, resource policy. What better place to talk about employment than under resource policy. Mr. Speaker, I am going to raise some questions related to unemployment and employment as should come out of this particular Concurrence Debate that we are talking about this morning, under resource management. If there are any jobs, Mr. Speaker, this is where they should be revealed. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. As we look through Forestry, as we look through Fisheries, as we look through Development, we see that there is no creation of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a

historic document. This is the first time in the history of Newfoundland, and I certainly hope that the press is listening. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, or fortunately for the people of Bonavista North we do not have any floods, we do not have any pestilence, and we do not have any pesticides, but, Mr. Speaker, we are savaged and ravaged with the vicious and cancerous disease of unemployment. That is what we have, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

And people are becoming indifferent about it. We have a tremendous apathy in the land, even in this House, with respect to our number one enemy, unemployment. It is coming about because of the attitude of the government, the people of our Province are almost accepting it as a matter of faith, those high levels of unemployment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what I want to talk about this morning. I want to tell the people of this Province and I want to tell members opposite that the Premier has violated his commitment to create jobs for the people of this Province. He has violated that commitment. Nowhere in these resource departments can we see that the Premier is going to keep his commitment to create jobs. Mr. Speaker, the reason why he is not going to create these jobs I will get to in a moment.

I said this is a very historic document. This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, in our history that the people of Newfoundland have been hit by a double-barrelled Tory philosophy, the first time

that we have been hit from both barrels, federal and provincial. It is the first time in Newfoundland's history.

What does this philosophy contingent upon, Mr. Speaker? What is it predicated upon? Well, this double-barrel philosophy that we are now getting since we have entered the state of Utopia is that the private sector is the engine, is the motor that is going to develop the economy, that the private sector, business is going to be the motor that is going to create jobs in this Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, how can the private sector create jobs in this Province when we do not have a private sector, when we do not have a business sector in rural Newfoundland? How can they create jobs? Now, this is what I want the ministers to address. How can we expect the private sector to create jobs? How can we expect the private sector to develop this Province when we are lacking a private sector?

DR. COLLINS:
That is not true.

MR. LUSH:
That is not true! We will see how true it is. The Tory philosophy cannot work in Newfoundland. It cannot work in Canada and it cannot work in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, a philosophy that is built on the private sector when we have no private sector. And the Premier (Mr. Peckford) has acknowledged that. Now, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will not recognize that. He will not recognize it, but the Premier will recognize it. The Premier will recognize that we cannot depend solely on the private sector.

We cannot depend on this horse and sparrow philosophy that I referred to the other day. The horse and sparrow philosophy, that is what it is. You feed the horse and hope there is enough left over for the sparrow. That is the philosophy, Mr. Speaker, horse and sparrow economics. Feed the horse and hope there is enough left over for the sparrow. That philosophy will not work in this Province.

MR. BARRY:
Is that the same theory as the trickle down theory?

MR. LUSH:
Same theory. Mr. Speaker, we have a very serious problem. Now that I am got my copious notes delivered, Mr. Speaker, we have got a serious problem on our hands. I do not have all of them, though, but I will take a look here.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Are there any missing?

MR. LUSH:
Not really. There is one missing. But anyway, we have a serious problem. We have the Premier believing more or less in the Liberal philosophy that we should have a bit of a mixed philosophy, a mixed economy. The Premier is believing that we have got to have some government stimulation, but the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) believes only in the Tory philosophy, the horse and sparrow philosophy. He believes in feeding the private sector and hopes that there will be enough left over for the sparrows. That is the Minister of Finance. But the Premier is on record saying that there has got to be government stimulation. He said it at a Premier's conference not too long ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, how are we going to bring together the philosophy? Which way is it going to be? Are we going to go the way that the Premier seems to think we should go, or are we going to go the way that the Minister of Finance wants us to go? Now, which way is it going to be, Mr. Speaker? Well, Mr. Speaker, this is it. It is the first time that we have been bombarded with this Tory philosophy and it is why, Mr. Speaker, the government will not answer any questions with respect to unemployment. It is because they cannot, because they do not know what is going to happen. It is like playing a card game. They have no confidence in the system. They are just going to feed the horse and, as I have said, hope there is enough left over. But it is a sort of a hazy thing. They cannot tell you. They have no objectives established.

They do not know what the rate of unemployment is going to be for Newfoundland next year. They have no goals as to what the tolerable rate of unemployment should be. If they have one let them tell us this morning. What is the tolerable? What is the acceptable rate of unemployment of this Province? Is it 10 per cent? Is it 15 per cent? I mean, what a sickening statement here. I read by the minister somewhere in his budget, he made the reference - oh, this is it, Mr. Speaker. Talking about the difficult times and he has the audacity, he has the affrontery to include this sentence in his budget. "Having successfully met the challenges of the past several years, the Peckford government looks forward with enthusiasm to the opportunities presented by our emerging economic prospects". Mr. Speaker, met the challenges? Does

the minister believe that an unemployment rate of 26 per cent is meeting the challenges? How the minister can sit there and laugh when this Province has an unemployment rate of 26 per cent, 60,000 people unemployed! Mr. Speaker, how could any sincere person include that statement in the budget? No, Mr. Speaker, they cannot tell, they do not know what is going to happen. They are just drifting along. They cannot tell us by what percentage points they intend to reduce unemployment to this year. Imagine a government that has been in power for so long not having established any objectives with respect to job creation in this Province? They cannot tell us by what percentage points they intend to reduce the level of unemployment this year, next year, thirty-six months from now, they cannot tell us that.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Why can they not tell us? Why can they not give the answer to that simple question? Why can the Minister of Finance not rise in his place this morning and help allay the fears of the people of the Province and tell them that in this year his government intends to reduce the level of unemployment by 5 percentage points, by 6 percentage points, by whatever? But, Mr. Speaker, let the people of this Province know they are in control of the economy, let the people know that they have plans? No, Mr. Speaker. , I am afraid that there is no where in this document to indicate that the Premier intends to keep his promise of creating jobs. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, wherever we look we can see that the Premier has violated his commitment, has violated the mandate that the people of this Province gave him, the mandate to create jobs. Mr. Speaker, it is

unfortunate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the reason why, of course, we are not going to get any jobs is because, as I have said, we have the wrong prescription, Mr. Speaker, of depending on the private sector in this Province, when we have no private sector. When rural Newfoundland has no private sector, how can we expect the private sector to create jobs, Mr. Speaker?

Now, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), when he rises in his place, as he should, to answer some of these questions, tell the people of this Province, tell this House by what percentage points he and his government intend to reduce unemployment this year or next year? What he believes to be the acceptable level of unemployment in this Province? What is the tolerable rate of unemployment for people in this Province? When he speaks to that, I also want the minister to tell this House how it is that he believes that the private sector is going to create jobs in rural Newfoundland when we have no private sector there, Mr. Speaker. It is a matter of logic that rural Newfoundland has no private sector, so how is this philosophy going to work?

Well, Mr. Speaker, how has it worked, this philosophy, over the past couple of years? As I have said before, we have been very fortunate, we have not had this philosophy shot at us from two barrels until this year, we have had it just from the one barrel. Fortunately, we have had the federal government in Ottawa going along with a mixed economy, with a philosophy that did not believe in the horse and sparrow economics.

But now, Mr. Speaker, we got it from both barrels. Will the minister when he gets up, will he tell us what his specific goals are with respect to unemployment in this Province? And I am not asking the minister to get up and talk about the Atlantic Accord and the jobs that are going to be in the future. I want him to say what are the specific goals with respect to an employment strategy, by what percentage points is this government going to reduce unemployment in this year, next year and the third year? That is what we want to know, Mr. Speaker. And secondly, what is the specific goal of this government with respect to the acceptable rate of unemployment, what is it going to be? Does the minister believe in full employment? If he believes in full employment then the minister should never have the face again, ever, to make a statement that he has met the challenges of the past, if he believes in full employment. He should never do it, Mr. Speaker. He should never do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the resource section in this Province, the ones that we are now discussing, Fisheries, Forestry, if I can find them in my book here. I want to talk about a couple of things that the minister has mentioned, just a temporary break, Mr. Speaker, while I am finding my copious notes.

MR. FENWICK:

Tell us about the horse and the sparrow.

MR. LUSH:

The horse and the sparrow, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the member of Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), the friend of labour in this

House, the horse and the sparrow philosophy is the one where you pour money into big business, into the private sector, the horse.

MR. FENWICK:

I know what it means. Tell us the joke about the horse and the sparrows.

MR. LUSH:

No, I do not have time to get into that one right now because I want to get to this resource that the minister is talking about.

In talking about the potential of the resources of this Province, forestry, fisheries, in telling us what the prospects were for this coming year, and this is the year that we are going to see this double-barrelled philosophy, what is the forecast? What does it look like? The minister says, 'The fishery is expected to contribute positively to economic growth in 1985.' It is 'expected', Mr. Speaker. Well, we hope that it does contribute positively. We thought that it would last year, but what happened last year? Last year, Mr. Speaker, the total landed value for the fishery declined by 14.5 per cent. That is what happened in the fishery. Now, we hope that does not happen this year. This looks like the best prospect that we have, and even that we do not know because of all the problems we have in the fishery, the problems with processing and marketing. We are not even sure that it is going to be as bright as the minister suggests.

Now, he says, 'A further increase in mining industry output is forecast for the year.' Now, Mr. Speaker, we hope that is accurate because it is in direct contrast to what is happening all across

Canada. This year mining does not look like it is going to increase all across Canada. There is still not a big demand for minerals, Mr. Speaker, and there could be a decline.

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member intentionally, but I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) will be interested in this point of order as well, because during the debates on the estimates for the various departments, and we are now dealing with a Concurrence Debate, the report on all resource departments, the media could not find time to attend, to listen to what was being said in questions and answers and debate during these discussions.

I think the gentleman for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is making a good speech this morning, I am sitting here listening to him, but unfortunately the media have all left the gallery. They seem to think this House of Assembly closes down after Question Period. I would like this House to eventually, some day, make a point of making our views known the media, to the Press Gallery that when debates are ongoing in the House, and here we are -

MR. BARRY:

We should lock them in. We should not let them out.

MR. MORGAN:

- discussing in a Concurrence

Debate on all resource departments and there is nobody from the media interested enough to sit and listen to what is being said from either side of the House. I think it is very inappropriate, Mr. Speaker, and I am hoping that we could somehow get a message to the media, to the Press Gallery that there are some important debates taking place here other than in Question Period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I agree with what the member just said, Mr. Speaker. We get in Question Period, and it seems that the only thing the media is reporting in this Province today are things related to floods, and pestilence, and pesticides, and, as I said at the start of my speech, those are not the only things going on in this Province, as important as they are.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look at what the minister was talking about, what his forecast was. Now, I have said about the fishery we hope it is going to be good. The minister has it cloaked in very optimistic language and we certainly hope that he is right. He talks about mining, that it looks like there is going to be an increase in mining activity. But I was saying, Mr. Speaker, if we have an increase in mining activity that is a bit different from what is happening across Canada. Because there is not much hope across Canada that there is

going to be much of an increase in the mining activity in Canada as a whole. I certainly hope the minister is right with respect to Newfoundland, but it does not fit in with the Canadian pattern, or the North American pattern, where there is a decline in mining.

MR. DAWE:

The biggest single exploration projects in North America, or at least in Canada is taking place here.

MR. LUSH:

Well, I certainly hope so, because I wanted to make that point. I know that there is a decline in mining activity and if we have an increase, that is fine, Mr. Speaker, and that certainly augurs well for Newfoundland, and all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will be proud of that particular development.

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to speak about newsprint production, and he says, 'Newsprint production will fall slightly in 1985.' So the newsprint will fall. That is not good news. What does he say about forestry in general? He says, 'The Province's forestry sector experienced strong recovery in 1984,' but what we are expecting over 1985 is just the status quo.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have talked about the fisheries, where the minister is just giving guarded encouragement, he is hoping that it is going to be prosperous this year, certainly hoping that it is better than last year where it was a terrible failure. Mining is going to improve, but do not know whether it is going to be marginal. It is not going to be big when the mining activity is down throughout North America, but he suggests there is going to be

an increase. What is it going to mean in terms of jobs? Newsprint production is going to fall. So, Mr. Speaker, these are the resource areas. Now, how about the Atlantic Accord, Mr. Speaker? What is that going to offer us, the Atlantic Accord? That is the big one. That is where we are going to get all of our jobs. That is where the Premier has hung the people of Newfoundland out to dry, on the Atlantic Accord. This is where he is going to create the jobs. Well, Mr. Speaker, what jobs?

MR. BAIRD:

You are a good one to talk! You would give it away.

MR. TULK:

Never mind giving it away, Mr. Speaker. That is what the Premier is saying is going to give us all the jobs. Well, let me read to hon. members what the Premier said about Hibernia a couple of years ago, back when we were not in the state of Utopia, back when we had two different governments and the Premier was fighting for our offshore rights. Let hon. members listen to what the Premier said about Hibernia. "My government has published studies which demonstrate that even with this Province's ownership rights being confirmed, and then only if oil prices in Canada are at world levels, the revenues from the Hibernia field would meet or exceed equalization payments for only three years of its estimated twenty-year life span." Now what the Premier said there, Mr. Speaker, was that if we were given ownership of Hibernia, just the same as Alberta, that we would be receiving equalization payments for seventeen years of the twenty-year life span of Hibernia. Only for three years

out of the twenty would this Province not receive equalization payments.

MR. FLIGHT:

How many?

MR. LUSH:

Just for three years. The life span of Hibernia or any sizeable find of an oil well is twenty years. So out of the twenty years, for seventeen years we would still be receiving equalization payments. For only three years out of the total development of Hibernia would we not be receiving equalization payments.

MR. BAIRD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

If the Opposition had their way we would be receiving equalization payments for twenty years because we would have had nothing.

MR. DECKER:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

I am a new member in this House but since I have been here I have seen the rules of this House abused so many times that I am wondering what I am doing here. I did not come here to see a farce made of this hon. House. My colleague is putting forward an admirable speech is to the point of the committees which we have been forced into attending over the past few weeks, an exercise in nonsense we have gone through, and

now this House is going to be held up as a farce before the people of Newfoundland. I resent it, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that this be ruled out of order, this silly point of order, that this man is bringing into this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, this is what the Premier said about that statistic, that we would be receiving equalization for seventeen years. He said, "This startling revelation has remained unchallenged by those inside and outside the Province who oppose my government's policy. It is fair to say therefore," and this is the revealing point, Mr. Speaker, the Premier was making in 1981 - "that oil and gas developments will not provide any relief for our pressing financial situation in this decade." That is what the Premier said.

AN DAWE:

That is your hope.

MR. LUSH:

It is not what I hope. Can we believe the Premier? He said, "It is fair to say therefore that oil and gas developments will not provide any relief for our pressing financial situation in this decade." That is what the Premier said.

MR. DAWE:

Read it all. That is without the first part. That is not it all.

MR. LUSH:

That was with the first part, that was if we got full ownership. Mr. Speaker, that I do not have a problem with reading but I am not sure that the hon. member has. So that, Mr. Speaker, is what the Premier has said and that I say is the truth. That is where we stand with the Atlantic Accord, no monies, no substantial monies in this decade. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has violated his promise to the people of this Province that he would create jobs. I demonstrated it clearly, Mr. Speaker. When I looked through the potential in the resource departments that we are now dealing with, the Premier has violated his commitment to the people of this Province to create jobs. We have 26 per cent unemployment. And, Mr. Speaker, instead of being in a Utopian state I suggest that this Province is coming closer to being a Ethiopian state. We are coming closer, Mr. Speaker, to an Ethiopian state rather than an Utopian state by the policies of this government. No, Mr. Speaker, there is no provision for jobs in this most important area, the resource sector, in forestry, fisheries, and development.

Development, Mr. Speaker, is the one that is going to follow this philosophy of the horse and sparrow.

MR. SIMMS:

Intimidation.

MR. LUSH:

Intimidation, Mr. Speaker. I will not be intimidated. I do not know if Mr. Speaker noticed the way that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) looked at me when he passed by.

MR. FLIGHT:
Intimidation.

MR. LUSH:
Intimidation. I think, the Speaker should have noticed that.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LUSH:
I have clearly demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, that there are no jobs, that the Premier has violated his commitment to the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, they certainly do not have my concurrence I can tell hon. members that.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
I would like to welcome to the galleries the Town Council of Hare Bay; Mayor Robert White, Councillors Terry Collins and Yvonne Collins, and the Town Manager, George Collins from Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:
They must be ashamed of their member.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I thought that there might be somebody up on our side but although unprepared, I want do wish to say a few things.

MR. BARRY:
Nobody over there is ready to

Speak anyway.

MR. MARSHALL:
As I say, I do wish to save the House from the pain of having to listen to two Opposition members in a row in debate.

Now we are talking about the Concurrence Debates. Now I want to answer, first of all, a few questions.

MR. BARRY:
You have nothing to say.

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman looks like - honest to heavens! - he is about to jump out of his skin everytime I stand up. You know, he does not make me nervous. I wish he would smile. I will not look at him, Mr. Speaker, I will look at the Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with a few matters that were brought up and a few matters that were not brought up with reference to the Estimate Committees, and the speeches in the Concurrence Debate. I will just deal very quickly with the remarks that have been made by Opposition people as to the way in which the Estimates Committees have been conducted this year. I want to say that, first of all, and repeat once again that fifteen days following the referral under the Standing Orders, fifteen days following the referral of Items of Expenditure to the various committees, it is provided in the Standing Orders that the report must come back. So there is a fifteen day period and we know it is a matter of policy that the meetings will occur in the morning and in the evening in that particular time span.

Now I would suggest even if there was no notice given in the House as to which estimates were going to come up the next day that that in itself constitutes sufficient notice. But in addition to that, each day we give notice to the effect of what departments were going to be considered. Now much has been made by the Opposition to the effect that the press has not covered it. What the press does and what the press does not do is the concern of press. Now, you know, the fact of the matter is I think there were only two committees meeting at a time, so there was quite adequate time, if the press wished to cover it, to do so. But I suspect, really, that the major reason why the press has not covered it at this time is because they have found nothing really newsworthy. And nothing newsworthy has come out, Mr. Speaker, because of the way that the Opposition has conducted itself in these particular Committee meetings. I mean, there is very little to report to the House let alone in the Committees themselves.

But the point of the matter is that the Committee system, I repeat again, is a good system. It is one that is used in other jurisdictions. When we changed the rules of the House we conducted a fairly exhausted examination of other jurisdictions, other provinces, and, indeed, other jurisdictions that use this particular system of parliamentary government. We picked out what we thought, and we being at the time, as well the Opposition as it was then constituted, were the best rules and they find themselves in the Rule Book in 115.

So the government has no intention

of changing the proceeding. The proceeding is a good one and it will continue in the future. The government has responded. The ministers have all been there on time to give their estimates and all been prepared to answer questions. And the fact that the Opposition cannot accommodate itself to it, that is its concern. The fact that the press does not cover it is probably the Opposition itself. So that is the first thing that I wanted to say.

Now I want to talk about various matters that relate to the overall consideration of the budget and the concurrence debates and what have you in the House this year. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that there has ever been a time when an Opposition has treated so ineffectively and abysmally the matters that they are under a duty to consider and to bring before the House and to bring before the committees. All one has to do is to refer to the Hansards, the record of the debates, to see just how ineffectual the Opposition has been. There has hardly been a single question, certainly in the Committee of the Whole on the main estimates, when they consider the Premier's office, the Executive Council, Legislative and the Consolidated Fund Services, where there is plenty of scope to answer questions. There were very, very few if any real incisive questions. And certainly there was not an addressing of the problems that we meet and we have met with, our large deficit and the fact that we are borrowing on current account and the effect of that. And, as I said before in one other debate, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has not been effective on that at all, has not even asked a question and it has been up to the government to suggest to the

Opposition, as I do now, the appropriate way to carry on the Opposition. But they just have not done it. They cannot do it, they are incapable of it.

Now, the thing is we all know the problems that we are in financially in this Province, and we all know what the solutions are and we all know - I think the Opposition do not acknowledge it, but I think most people in the Province do - that the only real long term cure is to be able to get some half decent revenues, some reasonable returns in our revenue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

You notice, Mr. Speaker, it took him thirty seconds to count to thirteen.

MR. SPEAKER:

I move that the estimates of the Resource Committee carry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Carried! Carried!

MR. MARSHALL:

Your Honour did not have a chance to put the motion.

MR. TULK:

There was a quorum call? I understand that we have to have three minutes.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, you do not, no. On that point of order -

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

There was not a quorum call, there were fourteen in the House.

MR. TULK:

There were thirteen when I called

the quorum.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, there were fourteen. The hon. gentleman cannot count to thirteen or fourteen. Make no wonder they could not deal with a budget involving billions of dollars. They cannot count to thirteen or fourteen. God Almighty!

But anyway now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about a few matters. I will talk to my colleagues, you know. One of the items considered by the Resource Committee or one of the departments is the Department of Fisheries. The estimates of the Department of Fisheries brings to mind, what and we have done. I am not going to go into, because the hon. gentleman will get up again and walk out of the House as I have driven him out of the House because he just cannot stand the heat of the debate, what we have done with the fisheries in this Province, with restructuring the inshore fishery, the loans to the independent plants and what have you. But one of the biggest problems I think we have with the fishery, obviously, is the supply of fish that is available. I think I would like to draw to the attention of the House in the few minutes I have the seriousness of the judicial decision that was recently decided in the Supreme Court or the Queen's Bench of New Brunswick under the Charter of Rights which decided - and it is presently under appeal - that in the estimation of that one single judge, Mr. Speaker, that fishermen, as I understand it, from New Brunswick can go into waters that had been reserved for the fishermen of Prince Edward Island and vice versa. And the implications of that decision could have horrendous consequences

for the people of this Province. I think we are going to have to watch that with a great deal of apprehension and concern as it proceeds along the judicial process to the Supreme Court of Canada. I feel the decision that was taken by the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) was an absolute correct one. His immediate response was very timely and appropriate when he said he would shut down all the fishery if this was the way in which it was going to be done because it is extremely serious and can have extremely grave consequences for the people of this Province.

I would like to point out as well at the time when you are considering that the reason why this decision was able to be made, and one of the real problems that is going to be confronting us in the future, is that particular Charter of Rights. Now it has become customary in Canada, and throughout this Province, to embrace the Charter of Rights as if it were a matter of motherhood. You would swear to God, Mr. Speaker, that we enjoyed no rights before the Charter of Rights was brought in and enacted into legislation and incorporated into the Constitution. Nobody is against rights, obviously, but it is ridiculous to treat the Charter of Rights as being the vehicle which brought rights to Canada, rights to Newfoundland, or rights to British Columbia or what have you. Because those rights existed before, and they existed for many years. Really what the Charter of Rights has done is transfer from the Legislative body to the courts the rights to make decisions of this nature. And I think the seriousness of the step that is being taken is no more vividly demonstrated than in the decision

that was made by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. Because, Mr. Speaker, I do not care how qualified a judge may be, judges are human beings as well as anyone else, and I do not believe that rights of that nature are really appropriate to be vested in the decision of one single judge or, for that matter, two single judges, or a panel of five or six or seven judges, or the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada on a panel on appeal. I believe that rights of that nature are rights that should be decided through the democratic process, by the legislative bodies in a province, or by the House of Parliament, as they had been in the past. No matter how we get on, be it the House of Parliament, be it the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, or the House of Assembly in Newfoundland, the people who are here making decisions are people who have been duly elected by constituents, and they are supposed to be, as a result of that, more responsive to social and cultural concerns. And many of the issues that will come before the courts are not really appropriate for courts to consider, because what you are doing is placing in the hands of judges, of single individuals, the right to decide policy.

Now, I would differentiate between certain rights and the rights that were decided by the court in New Brunswick. For instance, the right to life of an individual is an inviolable right and obviously that is something that, whether you put it in the Charter of Rights or you do not it does not matter, if it is in the Charter of Rights it means that it is appropriate for a judge to decide on that. But on issues such as were decided because of the

mobility sections in the Charter of Rights by the judge in New Brunswick, what you are getting is a judge deciding from a policy point of view that there cannot be discrimination. But there has to be, Mr. Speaker, in all inter-relationships between people.

MR. TULK:

There has to be discrimination?

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, there has to be discrimination. And I will tell you why the discrimination has to be. The hon. gentleman represents the district of Fogo (Mr. Tulk), on the Northeast Coast, if you are part of Canada and if a firm in Ontario wishes to send a trawler into the Northeast Coast, a judge makes the decision that they may do it, and I do not think that that is appropriate. The way we have society ordered in Canada today as a result of the Charter of Rights, is we have it locked into a decision of a single judge, or a panel of judges, as we saw in New Brunswick.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

As to what the hon. gentleman had to say with regard to fish, I certainly do agree with him. But would he also agree that the same principle of setting up zones has to apply to different regions of the Province? Would he address himself to that? I agree with him on the New Brunswick case.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the potential critical situation we find ourselves in today as a result of that decision made by the New Brunswick Court, and the reason why it was competent for that judge to make that decision was by the Charter of Rights. Quite frankly I think that the First Ministers of Canada, in the near future and in the far future, are going to have to look at the effect of the Charter of Rights and how the enactment and the adoption of the Charter of Rights has changed the method of making policy decisions in Canada as it affects individuals.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. BARRY:

It is a basic and very important rule of parliamentary procedure that Her Majesty's judges are not to be criticized in this House of Assembly. Now, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) should be aware of this. I realize he does not get all that much time to practice law these days, but he should realize -

MR. BAIRD:

You do.

MR. BARRY:

No. As a matter of fact, I am full time, Mr. Speaker, and enjoying it, I must say. I am engaged in a full-time conspiracy to see that the blight which has been infecting this Province since 1972 is removed once and for all in the next election. Full-time, Mr. Speaker. Full time!

The member for St. John's East knows that you are not permitted to criticize Her Majesty's judges. Now, the Constitution does not come from the eleven First Ministers of this nation, the Constitution comes from the people of this country, Mr. Speaker. And I would say thank God that the ordinary individual in this country has more respect for the rule of law and for protecting the rights of individuals and for the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms than does the arch conservative, small 'c', and big 'C' member for St. John's East. But I will refer the minister to a little article which I had the opportunity of writing.

MR. MARSHALL:

He should not be allowed to take the time of the debate.

MR. BARRY:

I am just finishing up quickly.

To save the minister time, before he continues on in this ridiculous vein, I would like the minister to read my little article. It is called Statutory Interpretation after the Charter. It is in The Canadian Bar Review. Even The Canadian Bar Review published it, Mr. Speaker. It is contained now in textbooks, Mr. Speaker, that are going out across Canada. And in that Charter, I point out, there is absolutely no difference between what a judge does now under the Charter and what he did before, except now he cannot substitute his own values, his own reasons, he has to be bound by the values of the Canadian nation as a whole, contained in the Charter. So the member is totally off-base, totally out to lunch, completely illogical, not only that, he is criticizing Her Majesty's judges and that is not allowed.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman thinks himself a great legal scholar, and if there were ever an argument for precluding judges from making decisions affecting the lives of the people, it is the prospect of one of these days a Liberal government getting in and appointing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) to the bench.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. BARRY:

Does Your Honour realize what the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has just said? He has just said that judges are appointed on a partisan political basis, that judges who are now being appointed in this country are being appointed because they are Tories.

Mr. Speaker, I insist that the member for St. John's East be demanded to remove that slur on the judiciary of this nation. It affects the privileges of this House, Mr. Speaker, which is the highest court in the land.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, instead of having seats and chairs, we can have sofas, so we can all go to sleep when the hon. gentleman is up. I mean, how silly, how arcane, how stupid is the hon. member!

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about and criticizing judges as people, but I do not happen to think that judges are so sacrosanct that the decisions they make from time to time cannot be intelligently addressed and challenged. As a matter of fact, they are, as the hon. gentleman knows, in the judicial system, that is why they have courts of appeal, so that decisions can be ruled upon and reviewed. How absolutely silly is the hon. gentleman! And, you know, he loves his little articles. The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) will remember this: He was in his little office downstairs, probably reading the rexographs that are written from time to time and contemplating nature, or whatever the heck he does down there, and he must have had on the intercom for the Estimates Committee, so he came up here in a fit of passion, flashing around publications that he had done when he was minister. Because, you know, he is the most published minister as he is the most published lawyer. And he waved this little White Paper that he put out, because when he was minister, every other day there would be things coming out and down at the bottom would be Hon. Leo D. Barry, and, oh, yes, do not forget the Q.C. And he was going on about why he did it and, 'Why did you not do it?' And I said to him, 'Boy, look, if I did what you did we would not have the Atlantic Accord, we would have the Nova

Scotia Agreement.' And it went on and on. And he gets up and talks about another publication that he has made, you know, as if that is the Holy Writ.

MR. DECKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. DECKER:

Will someone please enlighten me and tell me what this is all about? I am so ignorant, I am new. Is this what I am here to listen to, to go back and tell my people? Explain to me what is going on, please, Mr. Speaker. This is an appeal.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to set the hon. gentleman's people free. That is what I am trying to do, trying to set them free. But the hon. gentleman gets up and talks about his publication, and out of his own mouth he gave the very reason why we have to be concerned about the judges' decisions.

MR. DECKER:

Oh, dear!

MR. MARSHALL:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) stated that his publication says, with respect to judges, under the Charter of Rights, that they are the ones - and I quote him: 'to determine the values of the Canadian nation as a whole.'

And that is precisely the point. I do not think that is the function of a judge. I think it is a judge's function to interpret law. It is not the function of a judge to interpret the values of the Canadian nation as a whole, or the values of the Province of Newfoundland or British Columbia or Ontario as a whole. That is precisely the point I am making. It is the purpose of a responsible elected assembly or parliament to interpret the values of the Canadian nation or a province as a whole, and on the basis of their interpretation and the correctness of their interpretation, determines how they fare at the polls the next time. It is not for an individual judge to do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we see the danger that is presented, as I said, by the Charter of Rights. As a result of that decision, the hon. gentleman can yawn all he likes, but I can tell you, the Northeast Coast, and Fogo in particular, the fishery up around there could well be in jeopardy as a result of that decision. And he can yawn all he likes and say what he likes, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, he should really hope that that particular decision should not carry when it goes on to appeal, and he should really intelligently address the consequences of that decision, in that it transfers to judges the right to make those decisions, and I say that that is of real concern to this Province. It is of real concern in our efforts to get control and return from the fishery, and the Charter of Rights that has been embraced as the greatest thing since sliced bread - you would swear we and our forefathers enjoyed no freedoms ever before - is a Charter that should be looked at and, I say,

will have to be looked at by the First Ministers of this nation in the not-too-distant future. That is one point that I want to make. How much time do I have left?

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, could we have a quorum call, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I only have a few moments left, unfortunately, very, very unfortunately. I was going to get into a few areas just to show how clueless the Liberals are and how they have been. But I do want to refer to my own estimates in the Energy area, Mr. Speaker, and note -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Would you ask my own colleagues to be quiet?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. MARSHALL:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I have never in my life really seen such a disgraceful way in which the estimates presented

by the government have been dealt with, either in Committee of the Whole or when they were out in the Committees themselves. The hon. gentlemen do not know how to ask questions; they stay on the minister's salary the whole time; they get up with little elements of gossip; they have no understanding of the operation of government at all, and they have made a complete and absolute farce of the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I also noticed during the debate on the estimates on Energy, and in the House, how they avoided, insofar as they possibly could, any reference to the Atlantic Accord.

MR. FLIGHT:

Two full hours on Energy.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, the type of thing he said was, 'Do not be nasty. If I ask you a question, do not be nasty.' So I said, 'All right, member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), I will not.' So then he would ask me some little question because he was afraid I would get nasty with him. He would not lock issue at all. He got on the thing and he was driven off, his leader came to his assistance, and they ended up with the leader going under. And that was funny. He was downstairs reading his rexographs or whatever he does in his spare time, and he came up here, to the assistance of the member for Windsor - Buchans, and he got up and, as I say, he waved around the little publications he issued in 1979 or whenever it was, and he said, 'Do you not know?', and I said, 'Yes, I know. Your publications were coming out every day, you were a complete and abject embarrassment to the government, you were souping people up all the time and

giving them the impression that it was going to be Klondike through the offshore.' I mean, if there was any dirty water sweat on a pipe or something out on the offshore, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), then Minister of Energy, would get up and announce a find. He had everybody in a state of foment, and we were roundly embarrassed by his tenure.

Anyway, that same hon. gentleman came up here, tried to come to the rescue of the member for Windsor - Buchans, he asked two questions, one on the Atlantic Accord and got in a fit of pique because he realizes his real problem and the reason why he avoids it and all the rest of it, is because he did not have the courage or the gumption to stand in the heat.

MR. TOBIN:

Or the ability.

MR. MARSHALL:

Or the ability. I did not want to say that, because modesty prevented me from saying it, but he did not have the ability to bring about that. So he came up and he asked a few questions on that, and he was put down. Then he got into some foolish esoteric thing about oil pricing, and he got up and asked, What is the lowest price that is necessary? Obviously, as everybody knows, it is not the actual price that is of concern, it is the net profit to the company, because the company is concerned about profits. So I told him I would not do that, and what he did, Mr. Speaker - I wish you had been here in the Chair, because you would have called in the Sergeant-at-Arms. If the Sergeant-at-Arms had been here it would have been the Leader of the Opposition who would have been in

jail, would have been incarcerated, because he walked out in a fit of pique and he ended up down by the elevator screaming like Lord Such about various things.

MR. TOBIN:
Right out there.

MR. TOBIN:
Yes, right out there, says the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin. And then he got in the elevator and he disappeared from sight. He went down to consult Rex again, I suppose, I do not know. But he only lasted for a very short period of time.

The Liberal Opposition is very sensitive about the Atlantic Accord, very, very sensitive, because they realize that throughout the period of - Oh, here comes the judge!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
They realize that throughout the period of time, Mr. Speaker, that what the Liberal Opposition was doing continually was trying to push us to take the Nova Scotian Agreement. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, while they were pushing us to take the Nova Scotian agreement, do you know what they were doing? They were pushing us to take one clause which is pretty well word for word exactly the same as Clause 54.

MR. FLIGHT:
No, it is not.

MR. MARSHALL:
All you have to do is examine it. Mr. Speaker, if I ever have nightmares again, and I do not have nightmares now, I will have

forever and a day Mr. LaLonde in his very austere way saying, when I would say to him, 'But we cannot agree to that, we cannot agree to total federal control', 'But Mr. Barry agrees with it.' I will really have nightmares -

MR. BARRY:
Lies! Lies!

MR. MARSHALL:
I will really have nightmares for the rest of my life, if every time I look at the hon. gentleman I will hear my good friend, Mr. Chretien, saying, 'But, Mr. Barry, he says this, and Mr. Barry he says that, and Mr. Barry says something else.'

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

MR. SPEAKER(Greening):
Order, please!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) - I am sure it is inadvertent - but he is straying far from the truth, Mr. Speaker. But the point of order I rise on is, I am wondering if the minister - I am enjoying his remarks - but I wonder if he could elaborate a little bit at what point in time in his negotiations with Mr. Chretien when, after we had the announcement that he and Mr. Chretien had an agreement, at what point in time did the Premier from the across street in the other hotel room call him up and tell him, to get over there right away, and get out of that room with Mr. Chretien? When was it? Where were they in the negotiations at that point in time? And what is this hold, Mr.

Speaker, that the Premier had over the minister that he managed to put him through this shameful experience, a degrading experience, I know, embarrassing. It is insulting. It is abusing.

What is it that permits the member for St. John's East to subject himself to this type of abuse on a continuous basis? To grovel, Mr. Speaker? I mean, I do not suppose it would be breaking Cabinet secrets if I mentioned, that there were times that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) could not walk after a Cabinet meeting from genuflecting as he came into the Cabinet Room. Mr. Speaker, he could not walk after a Cabinet meeting. Now, I wonder is that the reason why he is on his bicycle so much, and we do not see him doing that much walking?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council, to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows me. Sure, I mean, that is what you do to Premiers, is it not? I mean I did it with Mr. Smallwood, and I did it with Mr. Moores. So why should I not do it with Mr. Peckford the same way? It is exactly the same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, Mr. Speaker, everytime I get up, it is easy to drag the hon. gentleman to his feet if you really have to drag him to his feet. But that is a fact. He was the friend of Mr. Chretien and the

people of Newfoundland -

MR. BARRY:

Could we have a ruling on that point of order, by the way, Your Honour?

MR. MARSHALL:

- and a good friend of Mr. Chretien.

Now do I have time to ask the hon. gentleman a question? Because if I have I would like to ask him, in return, a question. Now I would like the press - the press is gone now I am sure, because they would have to be gone having - you would not expect them to subject themselves to the quality of the debate that has gone on for the past half hour. But I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, is it or is it not true that after - now get this - the Atlantic Accord came out, and that the hon. gentleman read it through, that the hon. gentleman went to his caucus, and I want to tell the hon. gentleman I got this on very good authority, and he said, 'Boys, I have gone through this, I cannot find anything wrong with it. It is infinitely superior to what Chretien has offered, and there is nothing that I can say bad about it.' And do you know what happened? The members of his own caucus got after him, so then you had him tripping back and forth. What was he saying, 'What about the \$500 million? But that was from Mr. Rompkey'. Then I heard him on the air saying, 'Oh, yes, but they have not got in the development fund, but the thing is it can interfere with other programmes.' So I was able to point to him now there is a section there that says, it will not interfere.

Then he got on T.V. with me

onetime trying to say, 'We do not have the rights to turn off the tap.' So as good Canadians that we all are, we would not want, so he pressed down on that. Then the boys got him on Section 54. Now that Section 54 and what they abject to is word for word what was in the Nova Scotian agreement, Mr. Speaker. Exactly word for word. And the hon. gentleman there opposite in his own caucus said this, and his own caucus, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, his own caucus -

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very serious for this Province, Mr. Speaker, to have a minister embarking upon a series of negotiations and presumably there will be future negotiations to clean up Clause 54, as obviously there will have to be, but we will point out to the minister that in Nova Scotia, Mr. Speaker, there is a refinery at Port Hawkesbury which, I think, is closed now, but it is still there, mothballed. There are operating refineries, I think, there are two of them in Halifax, if not, three. Mr. Speaker, the Province of Nova Scotia has, five operating refineries, I forget the count now.

As far as Clause 54 is concerned for Nova Scotia, Mr. Speaker, they love it. They love it. It gives them first preference with respect

to Hibernia oil. Well, Mr. Speaker, can the minister get it through his head that it makes a difference whether there is a refinery operating in the Province or not? And if there is not an operating refinery in Newfoundland, Clause 54 is a complete disaster.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, it is not.

MR. BARRY:

If there is an operating refinery, Mr. Speaker, then it is a different situation altogether.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, you know, who is suppose to know the subject, I say 'suppose to' know the subject, and know it very well. You can see the way he is protesting now. Now I say again and let us not skirt it away, that the hon. gentleman went to his caucus and he said there is nothing - all 68 Clauses - nothing he could find incorrect with it, nothing he could find to criticize with it, yet he got up to criticize it. And I would like, Mr. Speaker, to see the press of this Province ask him the question, did he do that? Or did he not? So much for the sincerity of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), the sincerity of the hon. gentleman opposite. I would also like the press to look at the last section. Look at the last clause, for the love of you know what, of Clause 54 and compare it in the Nova Scotian agreement and say to Mr. Barry, "Mr. Barry, was

that not the one that you and Mr. Chretien were pressing the people of this Province to get. So how come you can criticize it now?" Because the fact of the matter is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) went to his caucus, Mr. Speaker, on this agreement. He said there was absolutely nothing he could criticize in it.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

Oh, look. Look at it.

MR. FLIGHT:

The hon. member's time is up, Mr. Speaker. We gave him leave to go three minutes over, Mr. Speaker, so the hon. member's time is up.

MR. MARSHALL:

I think Mr. Neary and a few of them are still operating the Opposition. Oh, for God's sake, you cannot agree with what the Conservatives have done. Never mind what is good for Newfoundland, let us look what is good for the Liberal Party.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. TULK:

This is a point of order.

MR. FLIGHT:

Time is up.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, there is no point of order, just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman did not want to hear it anyway.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with my colleague from the Straits (Mr. Decker), what a waste of time in this House to hear that kind of garbage when there are so many other problems.

Today we have a fishing industry that is in very serious trouble. We have young people today who cannot get a house to live in, who are paying twice what they should be paying for land and then we have to sit here for a half hour and listen to that kind of rubbish. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that that is not going to do much. It is not going to make the people in Twillingate district sleep very much easier tonight, some of the comments from the hon. minister.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the committee system in the House is not working. The minister a moment ago talked about this system working well in other jurisdictions. Maybe it does, but what he failed to say was that in other jurisdictions - and I think he was probably referring to the federal House - up there you have 284 members, you have a much larger press core who are in the House or in Committees all the time. I attended most of the committees that we have had in the past few weeks, and I think I saw the press covering one meeting and I think to a lesser extent a second meeting, but certainly I believe the fisheries committee meeting was covered by, I believe, CBC. That was the only one. I

believe The Evening Telegram made a brief appearance at the Committee dealing with energy and housing.

AN HON. MEMBER:
And forestry.

MR. W. CARTER:

I was not to the forest one. But, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious. I can understand the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) defending the present system. It is a beautiful system for the government. It is tailor made for them. It is a tailor made system, Mr. Speaker, for the government, but I tell you now that it is not serving the Province well. In fact, it is a disastrous problem as far as the rest of the Province is concerned. We are voting billions of dollars, over \$2 billion and I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there being very little coverage on the part of the printed and the electronic news media.

Mr. Speaker, not only that, the hon. House Leader mentioned the poor quality of the questioning on the part of the Opposition which, of course, is totally false. I would also, Mr. Speaker, want to focus some attention on the quality of the answers that we have gotten back from some of the ministers and the minister who is standing outside of the House there responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn) is a typical example. Let me talk about that for a minute, Mr. Speaker. At the Committee meeting I had the privilege of, even though I was not on that Committee, but I did attend and I asked some questions of the minister concerning land costs, because that is a big issue and a very serious issue as far as Newfoundlanders are concerned,

especially young people. Most young people today are trying to or at least aspiring to home ownership. Very few will probably ever achieve it but at least they are aspiring to it. Mr. Speaker, today I think it has become obvious that the biggest single contributor to the high cost of housing today is the bureaucracy at all levels. And I will lump with that the city councils, the provincial government and, of course, the federal government.

During the Committee debate we, I do not believe, got reported. I do not think the press was there then but it should have been because it was an important issue, the housing Committee. We talked about the effect of inflation on housing. In fact, going back to a certain point in time inflation has had the effect of increasing housing by about 400 per cent. A house today that sells for \$80,000 in the city of St. John's, going back to the time when that house cost \$20,000, which is in the memory of most people in this House today, when that house sold for \$20,000, land on which that house would have been built cost the buyer about \$3,000.

Today, a person building an identical house, the same number of square feet in the same area will pay \$80,000 for the house, which is about a 400 per cent increase, but he is going to be paying \$30,000 for his building lot. Going back in time to when that same house cost \$20,000, the land cost \$3,000, today he is paying \$80,000 for the house, he is paying \$30,000, which is about 38 per cent, I suppose. In fact, there was a time when land was about 15 per cent of the cost of a house. Today it is 38 per cent, 30,000 of 80,000, about thirty-odd

per cent, almost 40 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the main culprit - and, the minister, of course, could not answer the question, he begged off, he could not answer it - but the main culprit today in the high cost of housing, all over Newfoundland I suspect, where they are involved, is the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, a corporation for which the Minister of Energy (Mr. Dinn) is responsible and is supposed to answer in this house.

I put the question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, as to why in all other areas, all other components that go into a house - building materials, labour, electrical, plumbing, cement that goes in the foundation, the carpet that goes on the floor - all other components that go into a house have pretty well increased on a par with inflation, it has been pretty well consistent, yet the cost of land, where inflation has increased the cost of housing by 400 per cent in a certain period, in the same period the price of land has increased by 1000 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It must be government-supported land.

MR. W. CARTER:

But I mean in all cases. This is what I am talking about Mr. Speaker. This is land that is bought in the first instance, raw land - and I am told, by the way, at bargain prices in most cases. Certainly this land that I am talking about was bought it was bought at bargain prices, developed, sold to prospective home builders, young people, old people, middle-aged people, at an increase of 1000 per cent over and

above what it would have cost at a point in time, when that same house would have cost \$20,000.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the cost of land which is being developed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, an arm of the government, an agency of the government, and which is a pace setter in terms of land costs.

MR. DECKER:

How do their prices compare to other private sector?

MR. W. CARTER:

That is the point I am coming to. My hon. colleague asks me how does the price of land developed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation compare with that developed by the private sector?

Well, there is a relationship only in that the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is the pace setter, they set the trends when it comes to land costs. If the Housing Corporation is charging \$30,000 a lot for their land, what developer in his right mind and who is profit conscious would go out, develop land, and sell it for \$20,000 or \$25,000?

AN HON. MEMBER:

They cannot.

MR. W. CARTER:

The fact of the matter is they can. I know something about the subject. I know that the Housing Corporation, while its mandate initially was a good one, now I contend they have strayed from that mandate. They have lost sight of their original mandate and now they have become a top-heavy bureaucracy. By the minister's own admission they

employ, on a permanent basis, 375 people. I do not know what the figure was, but it was in the hundreds, of others that are employed on a part-time basis. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not against people being employed, of course, you cannot knock employment, but not when it is costing the average young couple who is trying to buy a house, and that is what it is doing. The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has become a top-heavy bureaucracy. Their costs have escalated, have gone out of reach, and the minister, in his reply to my question in the Committee stage of these estimates, could not answer that question. But I contend, Mr. Speaker, that that is not good enough.

MR. DINN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I know now that the member for Twillingate does not what to mislead, but he did ask that question in Committee and the question was answered.

The fact of the matter is the development of land assemblies today is done by public tender. The lowest price comes in and that lowest price construction firm gets the job in all cases. And, Mr. Speaker, for example, with six phases of the Mount Pearl land assembly, there was no profit made by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation nor CMHC on residential land assemblies. And the fact of the matter is the hon. member on a foot per foot basis cannot point out anywhere in the St. John's region that you can get

a lot cheaper, for the same size lot, in the St. John's region. There is no developer in St. John's producing the lots, for the same size, cheaper than Newfoundland and Labrador Housing and that is why they still are the trend setter in Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order there was no point of order. The hon. minister took the opportunity of explaining to us his position.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order and the hon. member is obviously trying to defend himself, but he can not do it.

Eventually, I suppose, we will get a transcript of what transpired at these meetings and that is another matter that should be discussed sometime. How can you really make the committee system work when you have to wait probably six or eight months to get a transcript of what transpires?

In reply to my question, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister attempted to justify the cost, as he did just now, but ended up by saying that we cannot really explain it. We cannot really explain why land is costing so much in this city, land developed by the corporation for which he is responsible.

Mr. Speaker, you do not need to be an economist or to follow the market too closely to understand. Why would everything else, why would the cost of building materials, why would the cost of labour, why would the cost of cement, why would the cost of shingles or brick or anything else

that goes into a house, why would that be consistent in terms of inflation, and it is? If one were to check, you will find that almost every single component that goes into a house today has consistently increased with inflation. Yet, in terms of land development, terms of land, it has increased two and a half times as fast, and two and a half times greater than other components that go into the construction industry.

So the hon. minister can talk all he likes about public tender calls or about this or about that, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that land costs have increased exorbitantly over the past two years and it cannot be explained by the minister, and I suspect that it cannot be explained by the people who heads up the corporation for which he is responsible.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that they have become too big, maybe too bureaucratic. They have an ivory tower syndrome now developing in that corporation, as in the case of most Crown corporations, and the people of this Province, especially the young people, especially those looking for new houses, are paying the piper.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to spend all my time talking about housing but I think it is a matter that needs to be debated and discussed because a lot of people are affected by it, young and old. I have a family who are now starting to leave the nest, as it were, and to get their own homes, buying them or building them, so I have some first hand knowledge, Mr. Speaker, of what it costs today for a young person to get a house.

Let us take a person today buying an \$80,000 - well let us say a person building an \$80,000, say 1100-square-foot bungalow, which is a pretty average house. I know going back twenty-five years if you talked about \$80,000 for a house it was unheard of. Only the very wealthy could afford that kind of a house, but today I think most members will agree, that it an average 1100 square foot house today, three bedrooms, one bathroom, regular carpeting, and so on. That person more than likely will be applying for a mortgage under the National Housing Act. He will more than likely, he or she, in most cases both of them, jointly will be applying for a mortgage that will probably amount to around \$70,000. Their equity will probably be \$10,000 in that price range house.

First of all, they have to go to City Council, which is a creature of this government. You know we cannot ignore some responsibility because the council is a creature of this Legislature, this government, they will then charge them \$450 for a permit to build, that is the first start.

Then that person will be going to one of the lending institutions and making application for an NHA-guaranteed loan with which to build a house. There will be an application fee first of all that will be collected right at the source of about \$500. So so far we are talking about just about \$1,000 before there is a shovel full of soil turned over.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when a person qualifies for that mortgage there is a mortgage insurance fee that must be paid, and that is a 3 per cent. And, by the way, I should

point out that that has now doubled since the present government in Ottawa took office, without an outcry or without even a mention, without even reference made to it by the Minister of Housing. The mortgage insurance fee, prior to the present administration assuming office, was 1.5 per cent. Now it is 3 per cent, so 3 per cent of \$70,000 is \$2,100. Another \$2,100 plus the \$1,000 for permits, so so far we have spent \$3,100 and there has not been a nail driven, there has not been a shovel full of clay removed from the site.

He will go into the Housing Corporation more than likely and buy a building lot. The cheapest lot you can get today in the Housing Corporation, certainly in St. John's, would be around \$30,000, he is required to pay down 6 per cent of that as a down payment, and then he is given a two week reprieve, he is given a two week period in which he must indicate that he is not going to take the land, in which case he will get his full deposit back, or after the two week period, then there is a 2 per cent per month interest slapped on that buyer.

Therefore, in the period it takes to build that house, say a three month period, then the young couple are saddled with an additional around \$10 a day I think, that is another \$1,000 roughly in interest that he has paid out to the Crown corporation. So now we are talking about \$4,000 and not a nail driven.

Then, Mr. Speaker, if that young couple wishes to build a house in which, at some point in time, they can put a basement apartment in to help pay for it, the city council

will tell them, you cannot use plastic pipes anymore. Plastic pipe is fine if you are only going to build a one-family house, but if you are going to build a house and plan for a basement apartment - as sometimes is necessary, with today's high costs and low wages and unemployment - then the council will tell them, the creature of this House, will tell that young couple, 'Look, I am sorry but plastic pipe will not do. It is okay if you are building a one-family house.' In any other city in Canada - I had a house in Ottawa back in 1968 and then they would not even allow it here in the main house, up there it was used throughout the house, plastic pipe, plastic sewer pipes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is the difference?

MR. W. CARTER:

I have no idea quite frankly. It is a much cheaper way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to what I was saying, if that young couple entertain any thought of putting in a basement apartment to help pay for the house, now or in the future, they have to pay a plumber an extra \$1,000 or in some cases as high as \$1,500 extra on their plumbing bill in order for them to use copper pipe. Now, what nonsense! What utter, absolute nonsense! To expect a young couple to go through the extra expense of putting in copper piping, for example, in a basement just because maybe at some time in the future they are going to put a basement apartment in that house.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious I believe that, first of all, there should be a thorough investigation into the operations of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing

Corporation. I am not suggesting wrongdoing. I do not think there is any wrongdoing. I think the people who run that corporation are decent, honourable people. I have no reason whatever to suspect that there is any wrongdoing at all, certainly on the part of the officers and the directors of that corporation. I have no reason whatever, Mr. Speaker, to believe that.

But I do believe that there are a number of aspects of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation that should be investigated. Certainly the high cost of land is one of them. Are they maybe, Mr. Speaker, imposing champagne regulations on a Province that can only afford beer?

AN HON. MEMBER:

They cannot even get that now.

MR. W. CARTER:

And they cannot even buy that now, my friend reminds me.

Are the standards that are being followed by the corporation, are we making the streets maybe a bit too wide? Is it necessary, for example, to put in two sidewalks one on each side of the street? In other cities it is not done. You know, what kind of luxuries are built into these lots that are not necessary, but yet are pretty costly and making it that much more difficult for young people today to acquire a house?

I believe that this government, we as legislators, Mr. Speaker, owe it to the young people of our Province to make sure that land is being developed by our agency. It is our agency, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. This year I think we are budgeting something like \$12 million, almost

\$13 million for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. I think we owe it to the young people of our Province to make sure that the land is being developed as cheaply as possible and that if there are luxuries built in that are not necessary, well then, let us admit it and let us do something about it.

Housing is no longer a luxury, Mr. Speaker. It is being looked upon by most countries today as being a right, a basic right of people to have decent accommodations and a tight roof over their heads. That is no longer a luxury. We are not living in the eighteenth century. It is an accepted fact now that young people today are entitled to that kind of accommodation.

So, Mr. Speaker, the point that I was making, I suppose, is that there are so many built in costs today that before a young person gets started, before there is a nail driven, he or she will be paying out roughly \$10,000. And then I forgot to mention the most important one of all, I suppose, the 8 per cent sales tax on building materials. In the average house of that size, there are probably \$25,000 worth of taxable - no I would say close to \$30,000 - material of one type or another. Well 8 per cent of \$30,000 we know what that is, \$2400 more in direct taxes that this Province, this government is collecting from people today building houses.

My friend across reminded me there are other fees too and they have not been backward in escalating as well. Survey fees for example. You get a CMHC mortgage, you are required to provide proof that your house is built on the lot. Imagine, you are required to

provide evidence of your lot on public land. Mr. Speaker, it is another cost that, to some extent, I believe is unnecessary in certain cases. Maybe if there is some question as to the boundaries, if the boundaries were not properly established in the beginning, then maybe a second survey.

Then we have, of course, the other learned profession, the legal profession right there to get their pound of flesh. And again the government is not shy. Let us look at it.

AN HON. MEMBER:
And the contractor.

MR. W. CARTER:
Yes, the contractor gets his pound of flesh, but I suspect he probably gets less than anybody.

Mr. Speaker, then we have a situation where years back you could register a mortgage probably for \$15 or \$20. Today to register that \$70,000 mortgage, the new buyer, the young couple will have to pay over a \$300, I think it is, registration fee.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
The hon. member, I know, is about to get into a great long discussion on whatever the topic is, but I would like to ask Your Honour for some direction. I was watching the clock and it seems to me that the hon. member's time has elapsed. Perhaps, Your Honour was not aware of it yet. I am just

questioning whether or not his time is elapsed, because I am sure there are people on this side who wish to get involved in this debate as well.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, I was watching the clock also. The hon. member's time has actually just about elapsed, and the time for the Concurrence Debate has elapsed. So I am now going to put the question. Is it the pleasure of the House that the report of the Resource Committee be concurred in?

On motion, the report of the Resource Committee was adopted..

MR. W. CARTER:
Is my time expired, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I had the impression from here, I could not hear it too well, that you said, His time is almost expired, is about to expire, which would indicate there is time left. Am I correct, Mr. Speaker, in saying that?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
To that point of order, I was just going to interrupt the hon. member to say his time was elapsed when the hon. minister rose. The time for the Concurrence Debate had elapsed at that time and it was then necessary for me to put the question, and it has been carried.

The next Concurrence Debate, Government Services.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, the Government Services Committee met for twenty-three and a half hours in total. We spent six hours on Transportation, six hours on the Department of Municipal Affairs, three hours on the Department of Consumer Affairs, three hours on the Department of Public Works, on the Department of Labour approximately two and a half hours, and three hours on the Department of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the Committee. I think the Committee worked well. It behaved itself, it acted in a responsible and orderly manner. At this time, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the Vice-Chairman, in particular, who took over one of the meetings and chaired it in an orderly and responsible fashion.

MR. LUSH:

He did a good job.

MR. HODDER:

He did a good job, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee were, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), who was Vice-Chairman, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening).

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of comments about the Committee system. I feel that it is a good forum. It gave members, as I said, twenty-three and a half hours to deliberate. The Committee was run in a fashion in which we did not go with ten minutes for each speaker. It seemed to be the consensus of the Committee, without being said, and members on both sides had a chance to question the minister as to whatever points they wanted to bring up, with short questions if they preferred, or for an extended period of time.

So I felt that members got a lot of information from ministers. At the same time, I think the ministers also found out what was on the minds of a lot of members from both sides of the House. I might say, from my experience with other committees, that in this particular Committee members from both sides of the House questioned ministers extensively. The questions did not come from the Opposition alone.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that it was somewhat disconcerting that the press did not attend any of the meetings. I have noticed since the Committee have finished their deliberations that many of the members of the Opposition have been raising matters in the House to which answers were given in Committee. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is because that they wanted to air them publicly.

Mr. Speaker, I sat on the first Committees, somewhere around 1978 or 1979. At that time, they were very, very well covered by all media, and in succeeding years the Committees were always well covered. This year, however, the media did not attend. At one

point, Mr. Speaker, the members wanted to adjourn the Committee. As I stated to Your Honour when I reported to the House, I voted, I broke the tie and I felt that I did so correctly because, Mr. Speaker, since Committee's work is the same as the House of Assembly, if that precedent were allowed to carry, then every time the press left the House of Assembly, we would have to close down. So they really would be running the House of Assembly. But, Mr. Speaker, that does not in any way, in my estimation, excuse the press because there were many interesting questions before the Committee and, I think, many, many newsworthy stories.

Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Finance - to report on what happened in order to start the debate - discussions were held on the Retail Sales Tax Act. Apparently, members opposite informed the Committee that there was some \$14 million outstanding and that about half of that has been written off since some of this goes back to the early sixties, but that arrangements are in place with people owing retail sales tax, arrangements are made so that companies can pay back without going bankrupt.

Discussions came up on the credit rating of the Province and the minister informed the Committee as to what the rating was and where we stood with the various investment houses. The Opposition spent some time and government members talking about the unemployment situation and what could be done. I thought the discussion was very good in that particular committee on finance on ways in which this Province could overcome the terrible unemployment problem which we have, and ways in

which we could get investment. I thought the deliberations in this particular area were very interesting. I thought that both members and the minister benefitted from that particular discussion.

On the Department of Consumer Affairs and Communications, there were a number of complaints. The number of complaints received by the Department of Consumer Affairs last year were 9,000, there were 9,000 enquiries. There were 800 information packages sent out to concerned people in the Province and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there was an 8 per cent increase in the number of complaints over the previous period. I believe 1984 over 1983, the increase was 8 per cent.

We also talked about the staffing of Departments of Consumer Affairs across the Province. I understand that we now have a branch of the Consumer Affairs Department in Grand Falls, Gander and Corner Brook and that a new one will be put in place in Happy Valley. As well, the Department of Consumer Affairs will be spending \$5,000 this year for workshops for cablevision companies who will be working in conjunction with community affairs programming. There were also a great deal of discussion concerning the Landlord and Tenancies Board, their role in mediating disputes between landlords and tenants, the makeup of the board, their role throughout the Province and how they operate.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Municipal Affairs, which took two sittings before we finished the estimates, was also dealt with. Many of the members on both sides asked questions pertaining to

their districts, so much of the discussion was specific as to water systems in particular towns across the Province. There will be \$17 million spent on water and sewer systems this year, but the discussion was mostly specific in nature, rather than of a general nature.

As well we were informed in that Committee that \$6 million will be spent for roads, that is cost-shared roads through Municipal Affairs, \$500,000 for firefighting equipment, and \$500,000 for water services. These will be community water services. There was a great deal of discussion about community water services and the need for water services in unincorporated communities.

Also in that particular Committee, there was a great deal of discussion concerning firefighting equipment and the needs in some of the smaller communities across the Province.

As well, one of the hotter items was development control regulations which are in place on roads which lead into the Trans-Canada Highway which caused a lot of people a great deal of hardship because, once those regulations go in place, building cannot take place on those roads. I think members on both sides of the House have had a great number of complaints from residents who live in those areas who own land, perhaps land that traditionally belonged to their family, yet people cannot build on those particular roads. So that was basically what happened in Municipal Affairs.

The beer strike took up a great deal of the time of the labour

discussions. The minister did inform the Committee that on June 6 he had invited all members to sit down with the Deputy Minister as a mediator. Normally, when an invitation such as that goes out, the unions -

MR. GILBERT:

Did he know at that time that the Province was making more money off the imported beer?

MR. HODDER:

I believe that question came up in committee as well.

MR. GILBERT:

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) knew that when he invited them.

MR. HODDER:

That would not be a question for me, that would be a question for the minister. As the hon member knows, I am reporting what happened in the committee. Now, the member, when I finish, can certainly get up and tell the minister exactly what he has to say. But, Mr. Speaker, they were invited to sit down on June 6, and we were informed that two of the unions refused to sit down but that efforts are ongoing. I believe this matter has been brought up in the House since. As well, a great deal of discussion took place as far as the Workers' Compensation Board was concerned. One of the most frequent problems that a member has to deal with, even new members, outside of looking for jobs for constituents, is people who have problems with the Workers' Compensation Board. There was a great deal of discussion about the right of employees to sue their employer, the problem being that with the Workers' Compensation Act in place, the employee does not have

he right to sue the employer.

MR. POWER:

I would like a tape of your speech for my car stereo.

MR. HODDER:

I will provide an autographed copy of Hansard. Also, time was taken up with strikes in Newfoundland in comparison to other provinces. Members talked at some length about inspections, when the Department of Labour inspects, and notice time. I think the minister gave the Committee a great deal of information about inspections. Depending on the type of inspection sometimes a warning given when a plant has to close down, and at other times inspections are of a surprise nature.

As well, Mr. Speaker, just to revert back, on Workers' Compensation there was a great deal of discussion concerning the people who have been on compensation and who go to retraining. In some cases, they are retrained, but members from both sides thought that the retraining was inadequate. As a matter of fact, the minister told the Committee that one of his prime objectives was to alleviate that particular situation, where people are forced into training for which they are not prepared, or forced into a school situation when it is not suitable for them.

Mr. Speaker, we spent three hours on the Department of Public Works, and one of the interesting things we found out is that the Confederation Building is paid off. The last payment was made on this building this year. Some \$103 million will be spent by the Department of Public Works and Services this year - \$11 million

was voted for capital works in other departments, principally the Department of Health. As well, some of the capital works which will be carried out this year will be the extension to the Confederation Building Complex. Funds will be spent on the new Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, the new hospital at Clarenville, the new hospital at Burin, and the Arts and Culture Center for Labrador City. Some of the new projects which will be started in this current fiscal year will be a new school for the deaf in St. John's, a new highways depot in Deer Lake, redevelopment of the Central Newfoundland hospital in Grand Falls, and the new constabulary building in Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, most of the questions and most of the discussion in the Department of Public Works and Services was of an informational nature. Enquiries were made as to the acquisition of properties on the Ring Road, and things of that nature.

Mr. Speaker, as an overview, I think that pretty well covers the discussions. I would like to emphasize again that I do believe the Committee system does work. I do know that members received a lot of valuable information from ministers, particularly the new members. I noticed that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) did not attend any of our Committee hearings, but I am sure that he would have received a lot of useful information, being a new member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee system does work. I have sat on committees as an Opposition member and I now sit on a committee as a government member. The committee

system does work. The form of the House is a partisan one and members usually asking questions do so to embarrass ministers, to make their own point, or to do their own thing. But, Mr. Speaker, the committee system allows time for members to sit and acquire information. I think it is a very useful and essential part of this House of Assembly. I think it is the most effective way to examine the estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I sat in the House of Assembly when there was no committee system and members of the Opposition and members on the government side got up and debated in a partisan way each particular point but very little information came out as to spending and that sort of thing. I think that this particular form is the best way to be able to examine the estimates of the money spent in this Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Before recognizing the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), I would like to welcome seventeen Grade V students from Immaculate Conception, Bell Island with their teachers, Mary Kelsey and Donna Murphy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact that politicians require two sets of skills. One set of skills are the skills to get elected and the other set of skills are the

skills to govern. The skills that a politician requires to get him elected are the ones which give politicians a bad name. It is those skills which make politicians be referred to as being sleazy, as being shifty, as being deceitful, as being full of empty promises, of being a group that you cannot trust, as being two-faced, as being wielders of long knives, as being a group of nasty, undesirable people.

Now there is no doubt as there can be no doubt in anybody's mind that the people on the other side of this House have the skills to get elected.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A point of order, the hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:
The hon. member (Inaudible) become a politician. In his case I shall remember both of them.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
If the hat fits, Mr. Speaker, let them wear it. The skills to get elected are the skills which give politicians a bad name. And there is no doubt in my mind that the members on the other side of this hon. House have the skills to get elected. It is self-evident. It is prima facie.

But it is evidenced in the Committees that the members on the

other side of this House do not have the skills to govern. This is blatantly obvious in the Committees. But one thing that is also blatantly obvious, Mr. Speaker, is that patronage is alive and well in this Province. Patronage, Mr. Speaker, is raging. It is like an odious cancer which has gone to the very bones, the very marrow of the government of this Province.

The Department of Public Works, Mr. Speaker, one of the departments that the Committee has examined, employs over 600 people. Over 100 of those 600, Mr. Speaker, are part-time, temporary and contractual. Now I will define what part-time, temporary and contractual is, Mr. Speaker. Part-time, temporary and contractual is a mode invented by politicians to get around the Public Service Commission. Like the Sadducee in the bible, they have come up with a devious, scheming way to get around their own system. This is what they have done, Mr. Speaker. Part-time means patronage. Temporary means patronage. Contractual means patronage.

MR. YOUNG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. Minister for Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

I think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not understand what was said in the committee or he does not understand the system.

But I got a feeling he said it is 100. I am sure that out of that 100 who are temporary, some of these people have been temporary for twenty years. Some of those

100 people, who are temporarily employed, were appointed by the former Liberal Party and I would say - I could go further than that - appointed by the former member for LaPoile, by Steve Neary. So it is no blatant scheme to get around things. These people come on with the agreement of the labour force and they come back by seniority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. But I would remind the hon. member that this is a Concurrence Debate on Government Services.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course there is no point of order but simply another attempt to interrupt a speech which is hitting to the bone.

The very department, Mr. Speaker, which encompasses the Public Service Commission has stifled the commission, has smothered the commission, has destroyed it. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is relevant. That is what the committee found out about the department which is in charge of the Public Service Commission. This is not a reflection on the members on that Public Service Commission. The members on that Committee, Mr. Speaker, are honourable civil servants, they are good men. The chairman of the civil service is a man in whom I have the utmost trust and I have trust in his commissioners, and if he were allowed to carry on his job without political intervention, without political interference, he could do an excellent job in the public service of this Province.

But he is not allowed to do his job, Mr. Speaker, he is muzzled, just as the members on the other side would have us muzzled. But we will not be muzzled, we will not lie down, we will not give in! We are going to stand up for the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

Albeit that we have honourable people in this Public Service Commission, albeit we have men of good will, men of good faith, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that because the aims of the Commission are not being carried out, it should be abolished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

This is not a reflection on the members on that Commission, but because of political intervention, political interference, they are unable to carry out the mandate that they are chosen to carry out, so we have no other choice but to abolish it. Because they are being circumvented, patronage is coming into play. Patronage, Mr. Speaker, brings forth corruption, and corruption brings forth more corruption.

Never before in the history of this Province has the old adage been more true, that it is not what you know, Mr. Speaker, but who you know. That is the way you get a job in this Province today. And what do we see? We see electricians being hired as agricultural experts. That is

what we see in our Province today. We see electricians being hired as agricultural experts for a part of this Province in which there is no agriculture, the Northern Peninsula. Of course, we have the Gros Morne National Park, which takes up a considerable portion of that peninsula. And then we have North of Daniel's Harbour. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Aylward) knows, Mr. Speaker, that North of Daniel's Harbour there are no incentives for farming. There are no incentives for anyone who wants to clear land for a farm, because the whole area North of Daniel's Harbour is wiped off, as far as agriculture is concerned. So what are we doing?

The government has chosen an electrician to be an agricultural expert for a region in which there is no agriculture, save for a few potato gardens along the highway, which the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) would like to have taken away, but, because of the spirit of freedom that still exists in outport Newfoundland, he is not allowed to get away with it. This is what is happening, patronage. We have arrived at a stage in this Province where qualifications are not a factor in getting a job. Where is the encouragement in this Province today for young men and women to go to college or to go to trade schools, Mr. Speaker? The message is obvious to the young man who wants a job today. Do not go to college, do not go to trade school, do not get your education, rather, go out and join the Tory Party. If you want a job, join the Tory Party and you will get your job. That is the message that is coming through loud and clear!

MR. BAIRD:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

I realize the hon. member may be an unwanted child, however, I do not want anybody barking and bawling today. If he would like to speak, I would ask him to have a civil tongue and then he can carry on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

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

MR. DECKER:

I will not be civil, Mr. Speaker, I will not be bound, I will not be quiet! It is too serious to be quiet! It is too serious, it is too important - 26 per cent of our people unemployed, and only Tories can get jobs. If I were to be quiet, Mr. Speaker, you would have to tie me hand and foot and you would have to kill me, because I will not be bound.

I asked the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), did it bother him in the least that they have devised a way to circumvent the Public Service Commission, and he said no, it did not really bother him. He shrugged it off as not being important. He was a little bit surprised that a young upstart would even ask such a question as to how he was spending our money. But let me tell the

Minister of Public Works that the people of Newfoundland are very concerned about the political patronage in this Province today. It is no laughing matter, it is no shrugging matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Oh, I know the argument they are going to give, Mr. Speaker. One of the arguments is that if we were to do away with political patronage, we would have to do away with government as we know it today.

To that, Mr. Speaker, I say, well, we might do away with the system as we know it today, and good riddance! Good riddance! Because it does not belong to our democratic system. If we have to maintain political patronage in order to shore up this government, let it go. Good riddance! I know the old argument, I have heard them all. But, Mr. Speaker, the people who supported me to come into this hon. House, the workers on my campaign are not looking around for political handouts, they saw some value in putting me in this hon. House, and that is the kind of members that we would have here, not people who got to go around handing out tidbits after the election and paying off their bills. We want people who are able to govern, Mr. Speaker. If we did away with this silly political patronage, that is the kind of members that we would see, not members who solely have the skills which get them elected, but members who have the skills to govern, and believe you me, Mr. Speaker, that is what Newfoundland

is calling out for today, people who can govern, people who are statesman, people who can rise above this petty nonsense of giving out political patronage. We want men who can govern. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) is not the least bit concerned that there is a way to get around the Public Service Commission. Surprised that anyone would even suggest that there was something wrong with such a system. It is appalling, Mr. Speaker.

Then, Mr. Speaker, from the Department of Public Works and the Public Service Commission, we went to that first cousin of patronage, the Department of Transportation with all its handouts.

The minister came before the Committee, Mr. Speaker, he brought in a blank cheque asking for millions of dollars and he refused to tell the Committee where the money was going to be spent. On several occasions he was asked, where will this money be spent, Mr. Minister? And he would not, he refused to tell the Committee where the money was going to be spent.

MR. DAWE:

You will find out by reading the newspapers.

MR. DECKER:

That is the answer he gave to this hon. House, to members of this hon. House, read the newspaper.

MR. DAWE:

The tenders are always in the newspaper.

MR. DECKER:

I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Newfoundland could hear what is being said, how ministers

of the Crown are behaving. If you want to know where we intend to spend this money, read the newspaper. Utterly disgusting. It is a reflection on anyone who would ever look to becoming a minister of the Crown in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

The minister came in, Mr. Speaker, before that Committee and he brought with him a blank cheque asking for millions of dollars and he refused to tell the members of the Committee where he was going to spend that money. Mr. Speaker, the amazing thing is that the Committee gave him a blank cheque. The Committee signed a blank cheque because the Committee was playing with a loaded dice.

The majority of the Committee members, Mr. Speaker, just as the majority of this hon. House, belongs to the Tory Party. The Tory members on the Committee came to those Committee meetings, Mr. Speaker, like zombies. Do not go away the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I will come to you later. The Tory members on this Committee came in like zombies, obviously told not to rock the boat now, boys, do not rock the boat. Do not ask any embarrassing questions now, boys. Do not give the minister any embarrassment now, boys. Do what you are told. Be good. Be nice. Do not rock the boat. And those majority of government members, like zombies, kept coming in, told what to do, told what not to do, they gave the minister a blank cheque. We do not know, Mr. Speaker, to this day where the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is going to spend that money. We do not

know. We have to watch the newspapers to tell us that, Mr. Speaker. But one thing that we do know, we do know where the minister will not spend that money, Mr. Speaker. It will not be spent in Liberal districts, it will not be spent outside of any Tory district in this Province. We know that, Mr. Speaker. We do not have to wait for the newspaper to find that out. A bunch of zombies coming into Committee meetings told what to do and told not what to do. Told how to act and told how not to act. They gave the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) a blank cheque to go out and pave and upgrade roads in Tory districts.

I agree with the Chairman of this Committee (Mr. Hodder) who said that the Committee system works, because it does. It does work. It works for what it was intended to do, it was intended to stifle Opposition, it was intended to put a blindfold on the eyes of the public of Newfoundland. That is what it was meant for and it is working perfectly. It is government behind closed doors, it is government out of the sight of the public, and this is what the Committee system was meant to do, Mr. Speaker, and it is working perfectly.

But, Mr. Speaker, its very success is a disaster on democracy in this Province because it goes against everything that we believe in. It goes against what we have fought for down through the years. So what you see is a few zombies parading into a Committee meeting, giving a minister a blank cheque to go out and spend in Tory districts. It is working, Mr. Speaker. It is working for a government who wants to govern behind closed doors.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the Department of Finance. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) came into the meetings. One thing I noticed on those Committee meetings, if you saw a minister coming by himself, which we did not see, if ever we saw that we knew we had a good strong minister. But some of the ministers, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) came in with one person. First we thought that we had a top Minister of Municipal Affairs but we discovered that he has an outstanding deputy. He did not need, Mr. Speaker, to bring in other officials from his department.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) came in with a full load of back up support. So we can only assume that the poor hon. gentleman must have needed a lot. But we were surprised when we asked about his qualifications.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What are yours?

MR. DECKER:
What are your qualifications, he was asked, to be Finance Minister of this province? And do you know the answer he gave as to why he is Minister of Finance, the Premier chose him. The answer was synonymous to someone asking a clergyman, "Why are you chosen?" "Because God chose me." And do you know, Mr. Speaker, the same tone of voice, the same reverence, the same crawling and pawing on his hands and knees. "God chose me."

That was bad enough, Mr. Speaker, but what was even worse, in keeping with the spirit of the choice of the Minister of Finance, when we asked the minister about

June 17, 1985 at 3:00 P.M.

the future of this Province, we also asked the minister, did he really believe that the budget was gone out of control. Did he believe that this Province could survive as a Province without going bankrupt and what would happen if this Province did find itself in a place where liabilities exceeded assets? The minister, in keeping with the way in which he was chosen, chosen by a supreme being, Mr. Speaker, his answer was based on faith. This was reflected by the Premier a few days after when he referred to Newfoundlanders as being old people of little faith. When he was asked about the dismal economic conditions of this Province and what our chances were of getting this Province back on an even keel, he said, "Something always happens -

MR. MARSHALL:

Adjourn the debate will you?

MR. DECKER:

I will adjourn the debate because I want to have leave the next time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

It will not be out of leave, Mr. Speaker, it will be out of a sense of wonderment and stupefaction. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn. On Monday we will be continuing the concurrence debate.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday,