

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery today the hon. Prouse Chappel, the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry from Prince Edward Island and the grain co-ordinator with the Agriculture and Forestry Department in Prince Edward Island, Mr. Reid Sangster, who are visiting the Province. We welcome them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon, the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, as, I indicated previously, I now present the 1981 - 82 Municipal Capital Works Programme for water and sewer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: For water and sewer and municipal roads, Mr. Speaker, the total approved funding for this year is \$31,598,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: And, Mr. Speaker, last year the total approved was \$27,291,409 and in that amount was included the Federal Community Services contribution programme of \$6.9 million. And this year the Federal Government has discontinued this funding so actually government has increased its approved funding by \$11,206,591.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: It is a long list of all the projects, Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT: Give us the list.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Alright then.

Mr. Speaker, these are in alphabetical order, Admiral's Beach, Water Supply, \$40,000; Appleton,

MRS. NEWHOOK: Water and Sewer, \$365,000; Badger's Quay, \$110,000; Baie Verte Roads, \$95,000; Baie Verte, Water Supply \$1,400,000 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - Bay de Verde, Water and Sewer, \$675,000; Bay L'Argent, Roads, \$49,000; Bayview, Water and Sewer, \$120,000; Bonavista, Water and Sewer, \$500,000 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - Bonavista roads, \$142,000; Burnt Island, Water and Sewer, \$20,000; Campbellton, Water and Sewer, \$500,000; Cartwright, Water and Sewer, \$850,000; Change Islands, Roads, \$84,000; Conception Bay South, Water and Sewer, \$850,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: Corner Brook, Curling Dam, \$100,000; Corner Brook, Roads, \$1,000,000; Deer Lake, Roads, \$200,000; Dunville, Roads, \$92,000; Durrell, Roads, \$80,000; Elliston, Water and Sewer, \$320,000;

MRS. NEWHOOK: Fleur de Lys, water and sewer, \$200,000; Gambo, water and sewer, \$700,000; Gander, roads, \$644,000; Gillams, sewer, \$25,000; Goulds, roads, \$77,000; Goulds, water and sewer, \$125,000; Goulds, water and sewer, \$275,000; Grand Falls, water and sewer, \$2, 510,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: Grand Falls, roads, \$322,000; Hampden, water and sewer, \$50,000; Hampden, water and sewer, \$290,000; Happy Valley, sewer, \$400,000; Harbour Grace, roads, \$150,000; Harbour Main, \$84,000; Hare Bay, \$320,000; Holyrood, roads, \$83,000; Labrador City, sewer treatment plant, \$2,300,000; Labrador City, roads, \$500,000; Leading Ticks West, water and sewer, \$220,000; Lewisport, roads, \$200,000; Little Catalina, water and sewer, \$330,000; Main Brook, water and sewer, \$110,000; Marytown, roads, \$100,000; Marystown, sewer, \$150,000; Massey Drive, \$275,000; Meadows, water and sewer, \$60,000; Ming's Bight, water and sewer, \$125,000; Mount Pearl, roads, \$700,000; Nippers Harbour, sewer, \$375,000; Northwest River, water and sewer, \$610,000; Northwest River, water and sewer, miscellaneous, \$100,000; Pacquet, water and sewer, \$250,000; Paradise, water and sewer, \$500,000; Parkers Cove, sewer, \$200,000; Pasadena, roads, \$396,000; Petty Harbour-Maddox Cove, water and sewer, \$500,000; Pilley's Island, water and sewer, \$625,000; Placentia, water and sewer, \$300,000; Plate Cove East, water and sewer, \$300,000; Point Leamington, water and sewer, \$600,000; Port Hope Simpson, roads, \$50,000; Portual Cove, water and sewer, \$800,000; Pouch Cove, water and sewer, \$500,000; Ramea, roads, \$550,000; Robert's Arm, roads, \$51,000; St. Bernard's, sewer, \$70,000; St. George's, water and sewer, \$400,000; St. John's, roads, \$1 million; St. Phillips, roads, \$70,000; Sandy Cove, water supply, \$25,000; South Brook - Hare Bay, water and sewer, \$400,000; Spaniard's Bay, sewer, \$50,000; Stephenville, roads, \$500,000; Stephenville Crossing, water and sewer, \$425,000;

June 15, 1981

Tape No. 2454

ah-2

MRS NEWHOOK: Torbay, water and sewer, \$410,000;
Trinity, Bonavista Bay, water and sewer, \$520,000; Triton- Jim's
Cove, water and sewer, \$390,000, Twillingate, roads, \$100,000;
Upper Island Cove, water supply, \$600,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS NEWHOOK: Wabana, sewer, \$250,000; Wabush, roads,
\$211,000; Wesleyville, water, \$25,000; Whitbourne, water and
sewer, \$25,000;

MRS. NEWHOOK: Windsor, roads, \$300,000; Windsor, water and sewer, \$100,000; Windsor, water and sewer, \$27,000; Woodstock, roads, \$76,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has about three minutes.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On this side of the House, we welcome finally the tabling of the figures. I think that every mayor and every council has been advised of this and everybody knows what is in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that was \$31 million worth of grants that was being announced today we could all get up and be very excited and say, 'Thank you very much.' But instead of being so excited we should recognize that the thing that happened, Mr. Speaker, was the government got very excited about the fact that they are announcing \$31 million worth of loans, that the people in all of these areas have now been given the consent to borrow the money and that this is what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, the people who are looking for water and sewer services according to the Five Year Plan are going to have to pay their own way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: This ties in with what has been decided in the Five Year Plan as the imposition of a mandatory property tax on all developed municipalities by 1985.

So, Mr. Speaker, what has really happened today - and the government has got very excited about the fact - is that they have allowed the municipalities throughout Newfoundland and Labrador to get \$31 million worth of loans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: How much of the \$31 million -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there is not \$5 million worth of roads in the \$31 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: So that 60 per cent is \$2,400,000. Something less than 10 per cent is a grant. The rest of it, the people of the municipalities will have to pay it back. And they will have to pay it back in the form of property tax, they will have to pay it back in the form of assessment. So this great, exciting news is that they have given permission to councils in the Province - Mr. Speaker, the real news, just in the same way as most other statements by this government, the real news is the other

MR. L. STIRLING: \$90 million, \$90 million worth of requests from all over this Province from people who want also to put in water and sewer and roads.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement is not as much as for what it says as for what it does not say, that three quarters of the people have not even had the permission to borrow as these people have done. But we welcome the announcement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further statements?

000

DR. P. McNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. P. McNICHOLAS: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon?

DR. P. McNICHOLAS: A point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege, the hon. member for St. John's Centre.

DR. P. McNICHOLAS: On the last sitting day, on Friday a statement was made about me by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) which is not true. He said I was offered a position in the Cabinet and that is not true. I have the greatest regard in the world for the Premier and the Cabinet and everybody on this side of the House, and most of the members on the other side, if not all - and I am not excluding my friend for LaPoile. There was also another implication made that the reason - which, of course, must be untrue when I was not offered a position - that I wanted to stick to my practice and make a million dollars. I think it is well known that I wrote pointing out to individuals that my duty was to carry on my practice because of the shortage of ophthalmologists in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of privilege I would have to rule, of course, that there is no prima facie case. The hon. member has taken the opportunity, I understand, at least, to make some explanatory comments or make some remarks about remarks that were attributed to him.

Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and actually it ties in with the point of privilege raised by the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) who is only carrying on his practice, much as he would like to be serving full time in politics, is only carrying on his practice because of the severe shortage of medical specialists.

Would the Minister of Health now advise the House of Assembly whether or not he has any additional information from any of the hospitals on the closing of beds and the severe shortage of nursing positions throughout the Province?

MR. STIRLING: He has given us the impression that he has a very limited amount of information. Can he now tell us what additional information he has received since we last met?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not see that tying in with the point of privilege raised by my colleague behind me here. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I have been in contact with a fair number of hospitals, I had mentioned that the last day. I have not been in any contact since Friday except with one particular situation and what I said pertained Friday is still the case today. There are some hospitals closing bed because of the shortage of nurses this Summer, there is no question about that. I said this is a normal situation in the Province in the Summer.

MR. HODDER: Not so. Go out to Sir Thomas Roddick Hospital and find out what is going on, boy. Go out and visit a few hospitals.

MR. HOUSE: It is a normal situation this summer and, of course, as we have said -

MR. FLIGHT: Go visit the Central Newfoundland Hospital.

MR. HOUSE: - that we are trying in all ways possible to assist hospitals in finding nurses and recruiting nurses, but I have been advised by all hospitals there is the fact that there is no problem with giving the services and I am advised by them that they can serve the public well at this point in time.

We had one case where one hospital, for instance, Waterford has more vacancies than they had anticipated and they had anticipated about twenty-six to thirty and there are forty. If we had forty people to place in the Waterford at the present time it would give a total service system. Right now I have been advised by that hospital that they can handle the situation and handle it very well.

MR. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Health (Mr. House) stop playing games and have us get this information one bit at a time or from the news media one bit at a time? Will the Minister of Health undertake his responsibilities, namely, contact all of the hospitals that are operating in this Province and table in this House of Assembly a statement of the assessment of the hospitals of their ability to cope with the existing situation and to table in this House the number of shortages of nurses they have at the present time and the amount of cutback that they anticipate that they will have in order to maintain even emergency services throughout the Summer months? Will the minister table this information instead of playing games with us?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have not been playing games. First of all, I advised the House of Assembly last week that I had been in contact, or officials of the department had been in contact with most of the hospitals, I guess all of the hospitals -

MR. STIRLING: Which now? Most you mentioned are.

MR. HOUSE: - most of the hospitals. There are twenty-four hospital boards operating about thirty-odd hospitals and there are twelve cottage hospitals.

MR. HOUSE: we have been in contact and the information I have had -

MR. STIRLING: Contacting? Last time you told us you were not responsible for contacting.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we were in contact.

MR. STIRLING: With all twenty-four?

MR. HOUSE: We were in contact with the hospitals.

MR. STIRLING: All twenty-four?

MR. HOUSE: I cannot say offhand, Mr. Speaker, if it was all twenty-four. Most of the hospitals, I would have to say that now, and the information we have, the information we received from them, is that in some cases the shortage is not as bad as it had been anticipated in two or three cases.

MR. STIRLING: Name them. Name them.

MR. HOUSE: One particularly was at the General Hospital, the Health Sciences. I just mentioned one that has a bigger shortage than was anticipated and there is another one - there are two - I believe it is the Western Memorial has more than was anticipated.

MR. STIRLING: Three. Grand Falls, four.

MR. HOUSE: The rest of them are pretty well on as to what was anticipated.

MR. STIRLING: Will you give us a report by hospital?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I will give reports that I think, and my assessment and in the boards assessments is the best interest of the hospital - the best interest of the public. We are advised that the situation is normal for this time of the year and the public need not be necessarily alarmed because the hospital boards have, right to a board, said that they can handle the situation.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the minister - I do not trust the minister's judgement because he says that the is going to tell us when it is in his judgement. Well, will he now undertake to table a report from each hospital for this House of Assembly so that we can see what the state of the situation is in each hospital. Because based on the government's record, they only deal with crisis - after it has happened, after there is a big problem, after the fishermen walked out, after the nurses are now telling there is a real problem. Will the minister undertake to table in this House of Assembly a report, by hospital, of the situation throughout the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of my situation as Minister of Health. I am on top of it and I will keep the public informed in what I think is the best interest of the public. I am not about to be tabling information, I am not about to get in a bargaining position with the hospitals or anybody else. We will determine what information - I will say I have a responsibility to see to it that the public is well served and I believe that they are being well served and I will get the House the information that I think in my judgement is the best kind of information for them to have.

Right now there is no hospital indicating to me - now I have not visited all the hospitals. I am getting a report from the directors and as far as I can gather from the assessment of what I am getting -

MR. STIRLING: Careful now. Be careful.

MR. HOUSE: - the assessments from -

MR. STIRLING: Be careful.

June 15, 1981

Tape No. 2458

NM - 3

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to listen to the hon. member telling me to be careful. I know whereof I speak. From the information I am getting, and the assessment of that information by people who are capable of assessing it, we are saying that at this point in time

MR. HOUSE: there is no emergency situation. I gave advice about the problem at St. Clare's two or three days ago and all I can do now is rehash what I said then, what I said at the time. "

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question in for the Minister of Development (N. Windsor). It has to do with Newfoundland Hardwoods. I have been hearing some reports lately that Newfoundland Hardwoods is having a difficult time to survive because apparently they were doing a lot of business with the United States and because of the exchange on the American dollar they have been expressing a view that they may have had a difficult year financially. Would the hon. gentleman care to tell us what is happening with regard to Newfoundland Hardwood?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any undue difficulties with Newfoundland Hardwoods. We are reviewing it consistently on a consistent basis. As it relates to the exchange rate, that would only serve to help a company that is exporting; where the Canadian dollars is devaluating in relation to the U.S. dollar, it is in the best interests of a Newfoundland company that is exporting to the United States. If you are talking about what is being imported, yes, then it would have a negative effect.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Obviously the hon. gentleman does not know very much about the operation of Newfoundland Hardwood, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to what they import from the

MR. NEARY: United States and they are concerned about it. But the hon. gentleman mentioned that they are reviewing the situation. Well, why are they reviewing the situation? Is there any problems with Newfoundland Hardwoods?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: No, Mr. Speaker, it is our policy to keep a constant monitoring of all Crown corporations for which the department is responsible.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman saying that the long-range future of Newfoundland Hardwood and the asphalt plant that they operate at Clarendville is guaranteed? Can he reassure this House and the employees of Newfoundland Hardwoods and the asphalt plant down at Clarendville that there will be no lay-offs, that they will be able to continue their operation at least in the foreseeable future?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, the asphalt operation, as I understand it is quite viable. As also stated in the Five Year Plan of the Province, we are looking at divestiture of all such Crown corporations which are not directly related to utilities or whatever, such as Newfoundland Hydro, and we are reviewing Newfoundland Hardwoods in that light as well.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Premier and I would indicate that in June 20, 1980, the hon.

June 15, 1981

Tape No. 2459

EL - 3

MR. FLIGHT: James McGrath, in defending Newfoundland's right to transport power across Quebec, across boundaries, was pressing the Prime Minister with a series

MR. FLIGHT: the Prime Minister with a series of questions trying to establish this Province's right and supporting the Premier. The Prime Minister indicated at one point in the Question Period that he believed that it was already contained in the Constitution, that Newfoundland under the old Constitution, the present Constitution, had the right to transport power. So Mr. McGrath then asked this question having established that. He said, 'In view of the fact that talks have broken off' - that is, talks between Quebec and Newfoundland, April 1980 - 'why has the Prime Minister not acted upon the formal request of the Premier of Newfoundland on April 16th advising him that these talks have broken off to exercise his authority on behalf of the Province of Newfoundland to provide for a corridor through Quebec for the transmission and potential sale of Newfoundland hydro-electric power to customers in New York and Ontario.' And the Prime Minister, 'Mr. Trudeau: Madam Speaker, I would think that such action would only be possible if Newfoundland had the contracts for the sale of power to some other part of the country and if Quebec were imposing unreasonable charges in the transfer of that power in the sense that it would constitute some kind of tariff or barrier which would constitutionally be advisable. I have no evidence as of yet' - April 20th - 'I have no evidence as of yet that either of these conditions have been met.' And I would simply ask the Premier, Does the Prime Minister of Canada in the intervening year, or the Parliament of Canada or the Cabinet have evidence now that if we had the constitutional right to transport our power across Quebec, if the federal government imposed that constitutional right, does he have the evidence that we do indeed have contracts in hand that would enable us to start immediately on the development of the Lower Churchill? No that is a simple question.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member was for the past year when his question was asked. Where was the hon. member when the government released information on a contract in principle that the Government of Newfoundland has with the Power Authority of the State of New York? I do not know where the hon. member has been during the past year that he was not aware that we have made representations to the Prime Minister's Office and to the Minister of Energy (Mr. LaLonde) in Ottawa indicating that sufficient firm intent on behalf of the Power Authority of the State of New York where they say, 'We will buy whatever power you can generate if you can get it to us.' And all that information has been provided to the Energy Minister in Ottawa; it has been provided to the Prime Minister. And we have been through the past number of months continuing our efforts in making representation both to Mr. LaLonde and to the Prime Minister on this very issue. And we solicit the support of the hon. members to see that we are given the same treatment under the Constitution as others should have. And may I say to the hon. member also that the Prime Minister does not have to wait until there is an obstacle before he exercises his constitutional responsibility, the Prime Minister should

PREMIER PECKFORD:

execute his constitutional responsibility regardless. You do not have to wait for an obstacle to suddenly present itself between two provinces before you exercise your obligation; you exercise your obligation in any case.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I just have one question to ask the Premier. Assuming the people of Newfoundland have a right to know what to expect from the Lower Churchill, how soon we are going to get the Lower Churchill power sites under construction and the power available either to the Province or for export, and assuming - and I realize it is a little presumptuous but I have to ask the Premier - assuming that the Prime Minister of Canada is prepared to exercise that responsibility and to give Newfoundland the constitutional right to move its power through a corridor through Quebec, are we now in a position, if that were to happen now - it has not happened this past year according to the Premier - if it were to happen now are we then in a position as a Province to undertake the immediate start up of the Lower Churchill, the Gull Island sites and the Muskrat sites, assuming that the Prime Minister meets what the Premier calls his constitutional responsibility to Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am not going to get into a hypothetical situation here this afternoon with the hon. member. All I can say is that our position, all the information that we have, all the homework that we have done on the Lower Churchill through the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, as a government in trying to get sales West, in trying to attract industry to the Province

PREMIER PECKFORD: to use some of that power, which took myself and the Minister of Development into the United States a few weeks ago to try to accelerate that effort, And as we continue day by day now to try to use that surplus power, that we are trying by every means possible, constitutionally and otherwise, to move a project on the Lower Churchill River whether that is the Gull Island project or the Muskrat Falls project and we will leave no stone unturned to do that! We have been doing everything in our power now, we have identified a number possible industrial incentives or industrial projects that might help that.

But we want, Mr. Speaker, the same rights as all other Canadians have now and exercise now. And we cannot seem to get that. We want to be able to transmit hydro power in the same way as other provinces can transmit oil and gas and that our energy product should be treated no differently. Until such time as that happens there will be some difficulty in transmitting West.

Meanwhile, we have not put all our eggs in the one basket, Mr. Speaker, we are also trying to attract industry to the Island or to Labrador to take some of that surplus power now seeing we cannot use all of it as it relates to Gull Island. Muskrat Falls does not give us any flexibility because you can use all of that within our own grid now. We would much prefer to do Gull Island first because it is cheaper power and the people of Newfoundland need cheaper power. We do not want to give them more expensive power than necessary. It is cheaper than any other form of power that we can generate for the consumer of electricity. So, therefore, that is

PREMIER PECKFORD: the cheapest power that we must get into.

MR. STIRLING: Cheaper than what? Cheaper than what?

PREMIER PECKFORD: And if the Leader of the Opposition will let me finish my answer without interruption as I try to treat him - talk about treatment, Mr. Speaker, one notices that when the Leader of the Opposition or the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) asks questions, I do not interrupt. I would like for them to record to me the same courtesy in return that when I am answering the questions I can also have that kind of courtesy. And if I cannot then, Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the questions.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member yields. A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier just made a statement, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland, he feels that Newfoundland should have the same rights as the Western provinces have for transporting gas and oil and I do not think anybody disagrees with that. But that right that the hon. gentleman just referred to will be guaranteed in the new constitution. Now why is the hon gentleman not behind Mr. Trudeau and the Parliament of Canada in trying to bring home the constitution when that will guarantee Newfoundland the right to move its goods and services across provincial boundaries?

MR. HANCOCK: That is right. A good question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I thought it had been abundantly clear in different brochures and different things that the Government of Newfoundland has put out in the last number of months as it relates to the constitution that under the new constitution proposals Newfoundland will no longer

PREMIER PECKFORD: be equal to the other provinces of Canada. Primarily Ontario and Quebec will have a veto for all time and they can veto any measure that the rest of the provinces can bring forward. Now if the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants to accept that constitutional package, wants to see Newfoundland downgraded within Confederation, if he wants to see some of the other provinces downgraded within Confederation, fine and dandy. If he is willing to trade that off that is fine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am not willing to trade it off, nor am I willing to trade off ownership of the offshore oil and gas resource. Now, if the member for LaPoile and the Liberal Opposition want to be a part of a proposal which sees ten equal provinces being reduced to two provinces who will have a veto over any kind of constitutional provision in the future, with the rest of the provinces grappling for some kind of power, then that is where he can stand. This government, this party is opposed to a constitutional package which sees the downgrading of Newfoundland in the Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member yields again. The hon. member for LaPoile,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not answer the question - and I know I cannot argue about that. I can put it down for the Late Show on Thursday but the question that I put to the hon. gentleman had to do with moving of goods and services across provincial boundaries.

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The new constitution as I understand it will guarantee that every province will be equal as far as the movement of goods and services is concerned. So I cannot debate that, Mr. Speaker, but I will just make that as a preliminary to the next question that I am going to ask the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman says there is an agreement with the New England States, with New York - Pardon?

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible) the Power Authority of the State of New York.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman just said in answer to a question there is a contract. Will the hon. gentleman undertake -

AN HON. MEMBER: He never said a contract.

MR. NEARY: An agreement, a contract, what is the difference?

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible) that is all.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I would ask the hon. member to put his question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier would stop interrupting me I might be able to get my question -

MR. HANCOCK: He does not do that, he is just sitting there.

MR. NEARY: No, he is the one who does not interrupt anybody, we only interrupt him.

Would the hon.

gentleman tell the House whether there is in actual fact and agreement, a contract or merely a letter of intent? And would a letter of intent be sufficient for the Government of Canada to force Quebec to allow the transmission of our hydro power? Merely on a letter of intent from somebody somewhere in North America, is that sufficient? Or is the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada talking about a contract or an agreement with somebody to actually buy the power?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The only reason why I interrupted the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, was because I wanted to get it straight; it was not with New England, it was with the State of New York. And I apologize for interrupting the hon. member in his question but I just wanted to make sure he had it clear.

I do not know where the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has been for the last year, I do not know where the member for Windsor - Buchars

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Mr. Flight) has been for the past year, nor do I know where the members of the Opposition have been. I thought they had been across the floor from me but obviously they have not been paying much attention.

Now, the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order;

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- question itself,

Mr. Speaker, lends itself to the kind of Liberal philosophy that makes us the government and makes them the Opposition - and it fits - that we must kowtow somehow or another and do something unusual before our rights are maintained in this Confederation. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we should have the same rights - whether there is a contract, whether there is an arrangement, whether there is a letter of intent, whether there is a letter at all. It should be common and fair and equal to all Canadians that we can transport our energy products the same as other Canadians -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- whether there is a

contract, whether there is an agreement, whether there is a letter of intent. So let us make that straight first, Mr. Speaker, that there does not have to be a letter of intent, there does not have to be a contract, there does not have to be an agreement for our rights to be honoured in the constitution, they should be honoured automatically. Automatically!

MR. FLIGHT:

But what would you do

with the power -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT:

(inaudible) from the

Island -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order! order!

MR. FLIGHT:

- would you -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- that is the first thing. There does not have to be anything. Quebec does not have to say -

MR. FLIGHT:

Who said you do not -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- no, PASNY does not have to say yes for power, it should be automatic, as it is for all other Canadians. Right now it is not automatic; we have been prevented from developing the Lower Churchill because we are not given the same rights of transmission over our energy products as other Canadians. And when that becomes operative, then we should be able to take that kind of procedure and sell and get a good deal. Now we are asked, Mr. Speaker, to go the other way around. Which comes first, the chicken or the egg? What is supposed to come first is our rights in the constitution and we should be able to go to PASNY or New England, we should be able to go to industrial customers and say to them, 'Gentleman, New York, PASNY, industrial customer, we are able to transmit energy power across Quebec in the same way as Alberta can transmit oil; therefore, can we do a contract? - so that, therefore, we are in the driver's seat. PASNY knows now from the negotiating

PREMIER PECKFORD:

point of view that we have got to go to them first so that therefore they are in a stronger bargaining position to get a better price on our power than we are when we should be able to go to PASNY and say, 'We can go through Quebec', no problem, because oil and gas goes across Canada.' Then we are in a stronger bargaining position to get a better price for power. So, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - in trying to respond to the hon. member's question, let me say to him that whether his questions want to be phrased as cowing down, I for one, as one Canadian, want to be treated equally to others and therefore there should be no question about our transmission rights across Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member yields again, The hon member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping to get a straight answer, not this anti-Canadian attitude, this separatist attitude the hon. gentleman has been displaying. But, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is this that we already have the right, the constitutional authority is there to transport goods and services across provincial boundaries. The new constitution will strengthen that. Now the Prime Minister is saying to the hon. gentleman, 'Bring us your contract and if Quebec is being unreasonable we will deal with the matter'. Now the Lieutenant-Governor, when he read the Throne Speech on February 25th said, "My government has concluded an agreement in principle with New York for the sale of this surplus power." Now would the hon. gentleman care to tell us whether that is an agreement in principle or

MR. NEARY: whether it is a letter of intent? What is it we are talking about? Because the hon. gentleman, I am sure, would not expect, even though he is anti-Canadian and separatist, would not expect the Government of Canada or the Parliament of Canada to deal with the Province of Quebec merely on a letter of intent. Is that what the hon. gentleman is talking about? Will the hon. gentleman undertake to table whatever it is he is talking about, a letter of intent or an agreement in principle, would the hon. gentleman care to table it in this House?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, apparently the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), never got it clear before, it has been tabled long ago. The hon. member is getting tired, he forgets just how many things that have been made public by this government over the last year. There is a voluminous number of them, Mr. Speaker, and he cannot keep track of them. So I am very sorry if this lame duck Opposition still do not understand and read what is being tabled in this hon. House and what has been made public. So I am very, very sorry that the hon. member for LaPoile is so far back in his research that we really should be in last year's estimates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to deal with a number of the other matters -

MR. STIRLING: Separatist.

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'Sticks and stones may break my bones but names will never hurt me', and if the hon. member wants to continue to call me a separatist or so does the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) let them go right ahead, I am a proud Newfoundlander and a proud Canadian and I will tell you right now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - I will tell you this: I am a proud Canadian and I will be a prouder Canadian the days that we are

June 15, 1981

Tape No. 2464

SD - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: treated the same as Alberta is
treated, the day that we are treated the same as Ontario is
treated -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - I will even be a prouder Canadian.
And to come back to it again to show the difference

PREMIER PECKFORD: between both sides, Mr. Speaker, to show the difference between both sides again, once again, the Liberal member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the Opposition want us to cow down, and we must have a contract before our rights can be honoured, when any other Canadian does not have to have a contract before his rights are honoured. I say, treat us fairly without contracts, without certain things that we have to do that no other Canadian has to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Why should we not be treated the same, equal, as other Canadians? We do not have to cow down to anybody else and therefore be less Canadians than other people.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, you know, it seems as though the people on the other side still cannot get used to the fact that they have been in government for ten years. They still cannot quite get used to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order.

MR. STIRLING: That was just a comment, Mr. Speaker. Dealing with the point of order, the Premier said that this Opposition wants them to kowtow or 'cow down' to use his expression. Cow dung might be more appropriate. Well, Mr. Speaker, he cannot use that kind of a comment about this side of the House. We believe that we have the rights under the Constitution. We supported strengthened rights. And there is nobody expecting anybody, except somebody who is paranoid, who got beat up in Toronto one time, who figures he has got to kowtow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, he used the expression that we want him to kowtow. Now, regardless of his interpretation, he has to withdraw that comment. We are not - it is imputing motives and we do not have a motive of suggesting that the Premier should kowtow. He may feel that he is some kind of an inferior being but we do not feel that he is and we do not expect him to kowtow. He is an equal Canadian.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order. This once again contrasts and classically shows the difference between both sides. Now, most points of order that are brought up, the Leader of the Opposition and his friends usually end up not having a point of order. And to be brief and to be short, I am very sorry that the Leader of the Opposition still has not learned the rules of this House. There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I rule there is no point of order, but a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ooo

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, could I get a petition out here that I have? I missed you when it was going by.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that we revert to Petitions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for
Port au Port on a petition.

MR. HODDER: I want to thank the members
opposite, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to
present a petition from 231 residents of the community
of Kippins.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: The petition, Mr. Speaker, asks
that Area 102, which is the area known as the Romaine Block,
not be sprayed. The letter that is included with the
petition, Mr. Speaker, says, "As you are aware -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of
Fisheries could restrain himself, please.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or retain himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
Perhaps everybody could restrain
themselves so we can hear what the hon. member is saying.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the
petition is

MR. HODDER: that the Romaine block not be sprayed. The letter which accompanies the petition I will read it for hon. members, says, "As you are aware area 102 is to be sprayed by the controversial chemical matacil in the very near future. This area is very near a fresh water source, namely Kippins River. This river is frequently used by children for swimming purposes. Some areas bordering the river is privately owned and grazing animals are presently feeding on this property. Also some crops are planted in the area for private use.

"We, the undersigned, request that you intervene on our behalf to have this spraying stopped because of the water, plant and animal life in this area, and also the safety of our children. We, the people, feel that this matter warrants immediate attention and we fully intend to take as much action as necessary.

"We have researched the matacil findings and we find that a pesticide which cannot stand up to reasonable public scrutiny should be refused registration.

"A survey of names will confirm that the people of Kippins, area 102, strongly object to the spraying of matacil in this particular area of Romaines Brook.

"We strongly urge the government once and for all to comply with what the people want, not with what they themselves want.

"Last but not least, matacil is suspected of causing Reye's Syndrome, a disease of children and teenagers which effects the brain and the liver. It usually kills"-

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not true.

MR. HODDER:

These are not my words, Mr. Speaker.

They are the words of the people of Kippins.

MR. HODDER:

"It usually kills except when treated with such severe measures as exchange blood transfusions, kidney machines, and respirators. It appears to result from an interaction between a usually mild virus and a chemical. Now tell us, is that all worth the risk?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, this petition was signed by just about, I would say, perhaps fifty or sixty per cent of the community of Kippins. 231 residents signed this petition and from looking through the petition there is a cross section of all of the people of Kippins. And, Mr. Speaker, what they are trying to tell the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), and what they are trying to tell the Premier, and what they are trying to tell the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews), is that, "We do not want -" they are not talking about the spray in general. They are saying that they do not want an area where the people of Kippins use for recreational purposes, where people from Kippins spend a considerable amount of their time in fishing and hunting, where crops are grown and where livestock roam.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the minister,

MR. HODDER: if he responds to this, that the minister should consider the use of Bt in this particular area because it is an area which is a source of the water supply, or the water supplies, I suppose, of Kippins because as members may be aware, Kippins does not have a municipal water supply, or the majority of Kippins does not have a municipal water supply and people drink from a shallow wells there. The area being sprayed is the runoff, the area for which the water runs into the town of Kippins and the people just do not want a chemical spray in that particular area. So I would suggest to the minister that perhaps he might either consider not spraying this particular area or, as he has done in other areas of the Province which is near water supplies, perhaps he would consider using the chemical Bt rather than -

MR. POWER: Bt is a biological agent.

MR. HODDER: I am sorry, did I say chemical? Well, the biological agent -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - Bt which from my understanding and my readings is less harmful than matacil and less chance of contamination. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the petition I just find it difficult to believe and even to understand that at this stage of the game that members of the Opposition or anyone else in the Province brings in to the House of Assembly a petition asking for a spray programme not to be conducted this year. After what this government has gone through in order to make the knowledge and information that we have to get the feelings and requests of all persons in Newfoundland, to have petitions coming in here

MR. POWER: which have not directly come to the department, which makes one wonder whether it is a political request or whether it is a real request -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Come on!

MR. POWER: I mean if a person - if we are going to spray in any given block in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and the persons who are so concerned and so directly involved cannot even approach the department -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: The minister when he was speaking there made a reference that this petition was a political petition. I might tell the minister that this petition is on its way to him, they asked me to present it because I am their member.

MR. HODDER: I received it one day ago and I resent, Mr. Speaker, that the minister would stand on his feet and tell the people of Kippins that they are being political when all they are trying to do is to protect the area where crops are grown, where cattle graze, and which they traditionally use for fishing and hunting.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please! This is not a point of order obviously. The hon. member is taking an opportunity -

MR. HODDER: And by the way, I will take his comments and send them out to them, every single one of them.

MR. SPEAKER: - to make some comments.
The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I said simply, and obviously the member besides having problems with other parts of his anatomy also has problems hearing, I said that if the thing is as serious as that, then obviously the direction should be made directly to the department, directly to the field staff of the Department of Forest Resources and Lands who are responsible for implementing the spray programme. Now if, Mr. Speaker, if persons are so concerned I just wonder how many persons who signed the petition also went to the public hearings that were held by the Royal Commission into Forest Protection in Newfoundland, how many persons who signed the petition, including some members opposite who in discussions in this House acknowledged the fact that they had not read the Royal Commission Report, had not bothered to take the time to do their homework, had not bothered to find out the fact of why certain spray blocks were being sprayed, had not bothered to find out the economic value of certain given spray blocks, still they do not seem to know the difference between bacteriological agents and chemical agents,

MR. POWER: And Mr. Speaker, it is just another case, as I see it, of the Liberal Opposition on one hand saying they are for a spray programme, for the protection of our forests, for the fact of saving 5,000 or 6,000 permanent jobs -

MR. MORGAN:

No, they are opposed to it.

MR. POWER:

- and on the other hand they are trying to get the political value of persons who oppose the spray programme.

Mr. Speaker, this government has done everything that was humanly possible to inform the people of Newfoundland of the high priority areas for protecting our forests.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. POWER:

We have done everything we possibly can. We have gone to the Newfoundland Medical Association. We have gone to the federal government and got a licenced chemical which they have done testing on, and we are using that chemical in certain parts of Newfoundland, upon the recommendations of an impartial royal commission that went to every part of Newfoundland -

MR. HODDER:

Why the (inaudible) zones?

MR. POWER:

- was willing to speak with anyone, was willing to speak with anyone, was willing to give information to anyone. We have done that. We have gone to the Newfoundland Medical Association, to the best doctors we have in the Province, they have given us advice that if we use chemicals like we say we are going to do then they are perfectly safe. It is simply another case, Mr. Speaker, of the Liberal Opposition sitting on a fence

MR. POWER: and I just hope there are no budworms on the fence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe the arrogance we just heard from this minister. He wants to deny the people of Newfoundland the right - we denied them the right to go to the courts to protect their property. We -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who? Who?

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, we denied the people of Newfoundland the right to go to court to protect their property and their water systems. Now, we are going to deny them the right to petition the minister to consider something they want considered. Mr. Speaker, this minister and this government indicated to the people of Newfoundland -

MR. POWER: Read it, boy, read the Royal Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: I only presented that petition -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. POWER: If you had read the Royal Commission - you would know what Bt is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must ask the hon. member for Port au Port -

MR. HODDER: The petition asked you to use Bt.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Port au Port and the hon. the minister if they wish to have a conversation, perhaps it might be more appropriate outside the House,

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): because we cannot hear what debate is going on in the House because of the shouting.

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in attempting to sell this spray programme to the people of Newfoundland, a spray programme that we apparently needed or the people of Newfoundland was convinced that we needed, and in order for the people to accept it, they also accepted the word of this government that the voices or the concerns the responsible groups around this Province would be listened to; their concerns would be listened to and be taken into account.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the people of Kippins come to the minister with a petition asking not to have their fields, their crops sprayed with matacil, to use Bt. And what does the minister say? The minister says, Mr. Speaker, they are playing politics. Well, let me ask the minister this, and it is in keeping with the petition, Mr. speaker: Did the Exploits Valley regional water supply board, were they playing politics when they wrote the minister two or three weeks ago - got no reply, I might say; got no reply from the minister - when they asked him to reconsider their spraying of their water supply, the water supply of the people of Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls, Windsor -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

First of all, if the Chair may, it may be the same point of order but I want to, first of all, address myself to this. The hon. member is now asking a question, which is entirely out of order. That should be done during Question Period. The discussion underway now is a discussion on a petition that has been presented by the hon. member for Port au Port (J. Hodder). I would hope that members would try to keep their comments more towards the petition rather than enter into Question Period or debate or anything else.

The hon. member has a different point of order?

June 15, 1981

Tape No. 2469

EL - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):
Resources and Lands.

The hon. the Minister of Forest

MR. POWER:

At least four members of this House have seen copies of correspondance that I have had with the Exploits Valley water supply committee. Therefore I have not, as the member

MR. POWER:

just said, refused, or not answered my mail. There are at least four persons in the House who have seen it. If the member was aware of what is happening in that district or that part of Newfoundland, he would know the problem has been rectified.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary.

MR. STIRLING:

A point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

If I may I will deal with this point of order first. I can only deal with one at a time.

MR. STIRLING:

I want to speak to that

point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Oh, I am sorry. The

hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, the reason that my colleague made the comments is that we are getting this kind of frustration from all over the Province. And all they are looking for is reassurance and answers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they are getting so arrogant on the other side that if anybody dares question they get dumped on from the highest order and say how dare they do anything other than through the minister?

Mr. Speaker, that is why - to that point of order - he got involved with other questions. It was a rhetorical question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes. The Chair is

really -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I did not ask for an explanation why. I must say that really there is no point of order. What the hon. minister raised was clearly - I do not know what it is, it is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has about one minute remaining.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I will try to attempt to avoid asking questions, but in supporting the petition, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition in the light that there are concerns in my own district and all over Newfoundland, the same kinds of concerns as expressed by the people of Kippins.

AN HON. MEMBER: And Port Rexton.

MR. FLIGHT: And Port Rexton. And the minister indicates that he does indeed answer his mail. Well, that may well be so, but he certainly did not answer it to the satisfaction of my constituents, of the people who are concerned about the water supply of Windsor, Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls when he sprayed, because they were forced the day before yesterday, Mr. Speaker, to wire the Premier, to wire the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - and point out that they had not received answers to their correspondence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member should keep his comments to the petition -

MR. FLIGHT: That is to the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: - presented by the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, that is in keeping with the petition -

MR. SPEAKER: No, it certainly is not.

MR. FLIGHT: - that the people of Port au Port are opposing a chemical spray programme -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): I trust the hon. member has heard what I just ruled?

MR. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate to Your Honour that constituents of mine have indicated to the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: That is debate.

MR. FLIGHT: - in the same sense as the people of Kippins, that they are concerned about the indiscriminate use of chemicals in their water supplies, in their fields, in their vegetable crops.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the minister should take those concerns seriously. And if he wants the people of Newfoundland to continue to support this spray programme, to have any confidence in what it is going to accomplish, that he will take their concerns into consideration. And there is evidence at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, that he has not taken the concerns of those various responsible groups into consideration and the messages are going to keep coming -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - and the petitions will keep coming.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 4.

On motion, the following bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Freedom Of Information". (Bill No. 3).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Personal Privacy". (Bill No. 2).

A bill, "An Act To Repeal The Canada Bay Lumber Company Limited (Agreement) Act, 1974". (Bill No. 24).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act". (Bill No. 47).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973". (Bill No. 41).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Environment". (Bill No. 4).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act For The Purpose Of Integrating The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation And The St. John's Housing Corporation". (Bill No. 19).

A bill, "An Act To Amend And Consolidate The Law Respecting Boilers, Pressure Vessels And Compressed Gas". (Bill No. 28).

A bill, "An Act Respecting Amusement Rides". (Bill No. 29).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Drilling Of Water Wells And Conservation And Use Of Ground-Water". (Bill No. 6).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Historic Objects, Sites And Records Act, 1973". (Bill No. 18).

A bill, An Act To
Amend The Landlord And Tenant (Residential Tenancies)
Act, 1973 (No. 2)". (Bill No. 88).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 3. Concurrence
debate (Government Services Committee).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Concurrence debates on
the report of the Government Services Estimates Committee.
On the last day debate was adjourned by the hon. the member
for Grand Bank, who has nine minutes remaining.

We have a total,
incidentally, of two hours and forty-nine minutes remaining
in this debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that all?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

The hon. the member for
LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of
all I want to repeat what I said in this House, I believe
it was last Monday, that the government have not only
mismanaged the affairs of this Province, but are now
mismanaging the affairs of the House.

Let the word go out,
Mr. Speaker, to the media in this Province that it is not
the Opposition who call the orders in this House. It is the
government who plan and call the orders in the House. The
Opposition is forced to debate whatever government calls.
Now they have adopted a new policy, Mr. Speaker, a new
philosophy, they are saying that the -

MR. HANCOCK: He got to go. He
cannot listen.

MR. NEARY: They have a pat
answer now for not being able to pay their bills, they are
saying, 'Oh, we do not have the estimates passed. So we are
still operating on interim supply and in various Headings
where the interim supply is used up we cannot pay our bills,

MR. NEARY: and we cannot do this and we cannot do that. We cannot do anything because we do not have the estimates passed through the House.' Well, the reason the estimates are not passed through the House is the fault of the government and not the fault of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, we would want to be a pretty powerful Opposition - there are only eighteen or nineteen of us - to overrule thirty - how many? - thirty-three. The government has the majority and they are supposed to be governing this Province. And since when did a minority overrule a majority?

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear! Never.

MR. NEARY: The government can do what it likes in this House and is doing it. If the government wanted the estimates passed they would have had them passed.

What they are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to get a little political mileage, a little propoganda for themselves. In fact, we heard the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) this morning saying that the Opposition is wasting the time of the House. The Opposition is wasting the time of the House? Well, what about the government? What about the government members, Mr. Speaker? They are not wasting the time of the House at all. It is only the Opposition, who are trying to do their jobs, who are trying to debate legislation, to debate estimates, to ask questions and to get information for the people of this Province; we are wasting the time of House so the hon. President of the Council thinks. And the reason now that nothing is being done in the way of paying bills or carrying out government programmes, is because they do not have the estimates passed.

They could have had the estimates passed two weeks ago in this House. They

MR. NEARY: developed a strategy
in this session of the House that they are going to debate
bills on Thursday and Friday, they are going to have the
Throne Speech and the Budget Speech on Monday and Tuesday
and bills on Thursday and Friday. Now, Mr. Speaker, that
has backfired, it is not working. And as a result of the
government's

MR. NEARY: strategy, of the government's planning we are running well behind in the work of this House and the way we are going now, Mr. Speaker, we will be here till Regetta Day if not Labour Day. And we are not apologizing for that, the Opposition is not making any excuses. We do not want to get out of the House. We are satisfied to stay here if we have to till Christman Eve and we are going to, Mr. Speaker. We are going to do that to make sure, we are going to make sure that the Government House Leader especially is not going to get his own way, that he is not going to bulldoze everything through at the last minute. So hon. members may as well sit back and relax and enjoy themselves because I can see with the number of items on the -

MR. HANCOCK: You might as well get used to it, boy.

MR. NEARY: - Order Paper we are here at least for another two months.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many are (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: How many are (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: And our caucus, as hon. members can see, is broken up now into two shifts. One shift is out and they will be back next week or the following week, and the other seven or eight will be here during that time, and then anybody who wants to go will leave and take his vacation and come back again. And that is the way it should be, Mr. Speaker. So hon. gentleman better dig in for a long session. And, Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of it is that the Government House Leader, who usually communicates, has dialogue with the House Leader on this side, so far this session has refused to have anything to do with the House Leader on this side. The House Leader is considered as dirt under his feet and so is anybody who does not conform to the hon. gentleman's philosopgy, the Government House Leader. Anybody who does not kowtow to him is just dirt under his feet. Well, we will soon find out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

But let me repeat again that the government could have had their estimates two weeks ago. The Opposition, in case anybody does not understand the procedure of this House, the Opposition are not wasting time, they are not holding up anything. We are here to approve everything that is good for the people and we are quite prepared to do that, but we cannot do it if the government does not call the bills or does not call the estimates and the order of business. There is nothing that we can do about it, Mr. Speaker. Our hands are tied. I would have liked today to have the Budget Speech, tomorrow dispose of the estimates and get on with the business of the Province. There is nothing we can do about it. We are bound by whatever the government House Leader calls. That is what we have to debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we saw again today, another example of anti-Canadianism, we saw another example of separatism in this Province in reply to questions that we put to the hon. the Premier about the development of the Lower Churchill and the recall of power from the Upper Churchill. The hon. gentleman unleashed his usual anti-government, anti-Canadian attack on the Government of Canada. Now we are not surprised at that, Mr. Speaker. We have become accustomed to it and so have the people of this Province in the last couple of years become accustomed to that strategy, to that tactic, and as a result, Mr. Speaker everything in this Province is grinding to a halt,

MR. NEARY: everything is grinding to a halt. We are slipping backwards. We have the worst year in our whole history in the construction industry in this Province, the worst year.

MR. HANCOCK: The second worst. Last year was the worst.

MR. NEARY: No, this is the worst year. Last year was bad, this year is worse. We have chaos in the fishery. As a result of no provincial fishery policy, we have chaos in the fishery. We have the worst year in the construction industry. And, Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, the economy of this Province is grinding to a halt. We are in a recession.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. NEARY: We are in a recession at the moment, a major recession, and hon. gentlemen cannot blame it on anybody else except themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say, we have become accustomed to this anti-Canadian, this separatism that is being developed in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do you not talk sense?

MR. NEARY: I am going to talk sense now and I am going to tell the House how I think this feeling of anti-Canadianism, this anti-confederate feeling, this separatist feeling is creeping into this House. The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain members of this House who have never accepted the fact that Newfoundland voted for Confederation on the second referendum. When the vote was taken in this Province there had to be two referendums, as hon. gentlemen will recall. The first time there was not a majority and the second time, Confederation won, but only by a very small margin.

Now there are members in this House who have never accepted that fact, especially St. John's members, and they have control of the Province

MR. NEARY: at the moment, they have control of the Cabinet. As I have said so often, seven out of eleven St. John's members are in the Cabinet. And this is why, Mr. Speaker, this anti-confederate, this separatist movement, this anti-Canadian movement is permeating this House. Well, I know I really have not hit my stride yet, so I will sit down and let somebody intervene and then I will come back to why I think we have this anti-Canadian policy developed by this government.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long we are going to sit in this House. Certainly, we will be here long enough to get government business through; we will be here long enough to get the budget approved; we will be here long enough to get the important pieces of legislation through. And the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is not going to threaten this House and we are not going to kowtow to him as we are not going to kowtow to anybody else, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman got up in his place in the House,
Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

Mr. Speaker, let us have a quorum call to see if we can get a few people in who might want to listen to him.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): I ask the Clerk to count the members.
We have a quorum.
The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, we talk about
delaying the House. Mr. Speaker, did anybody see any sense
in what the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did that time or
does anybody see any sense -

AN HON. MEMBER: He ran out of the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order raised by the hon.
member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would not want a
statement like that to stand on the public record. The statement
was either made out of ignorance of the rules of the House or
just plain downright ignorance, but the fact of the matter is,
Mr. Speaker, that it is up to the Government House Leader
(Mr. Marshall) or the Government Whip to see that there is a
quorum in this House and not the Opposition. And the hon.
gentleman should withdraw that statement he made because we,
Mr. Speaker, by having quorum calls are merely pointing out
that the government are unable to keep sufficient members in
the House to participate in the people's business, especially
the debates that are going on in this House.

MR. DINN: There is no point of order, Mr.
Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is quite clear in Standing Orders
any member can direct the Speaker's attention that there is
not a quorum in the House.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for
LaPoile is just continuing to waste the time of the House with
points of order and with -

MR. NEARY: A point of order again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

A point of order raised by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is in enough hot water now without getting into hot water with Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just made a statement that is completely untrue. Mr. Speaker, even if I wanted to I could not waste the time of the House. It is up to the government -the government calls the order of business, the government is responsible for keeping a quorum in this House, keeping members in while government business is being transacted-not up to me; it is the hon. gentleman now who is standing to speak who is wasting the time of the House. The hon. gentleman could stay in his seat, say nothing and the business of the House would go ^{on} just the same, because what he is going to say is irrelevant anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, there is really no point of order but merely the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) took an opportunity to make a brief explanation.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower has about six minutes left.

MR. DINN: The hon. member for LaPoile during his few remarks here in the House got up and said that the bottom is out of her, Mr. Speaker, the bottom is out of the Province, we are into a depression, we are into a recession, we are into just about everything, Mr. Speaker. Well the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, is that this Province is moving along fairly well, not as good as it should, not as good as it will, Mr. Speaker, in the future, but it is

MR. DINN: really moving along, Mr. Speaker. Now how can I look at the statistics and figure out how this Province is moving ahead? Well, Mr. Speaker, that is fairly simple. Hon. members who get every month statistics from Statistics Canada should know just by reading those statistics that we are moving ahead. Last year 9,500 jobs, Mr. Speaker, in this Province and the year before well over 9,000 in this Province; the unemployment rate continues to go down and they will be shocked, frightened to death, Mr. Speaker, when it goes below 10 per cent, shocked to death.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do the figures say? Hon. members should know; I keep telling hon. members but it is not getting in, it is not getting across and, Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that hon. members understand what is happening in this Province with respect to employment.

MR. HANCOCK: I know what is happening with unemployment.

MR. DINN: There are still - yes, the unemployment rate is going down. The hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) wants to know, yes, it is going down. The employment rate is going up, Mr. Speaker, and the outward migration, Mr. Speaker, that statistic is down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DINN: In the '60s it was 8,000.

MR. J. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, we are down just a little over 1,000. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) cannot take the facts, he has to leave the House, Mr. Speaker! He just cannot take the truth! And the truth will set us free!

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the record this year? Well, from January until May - that is the latest statistics that came out, they came out last week, January to May, averaged over that period - we have had a total of 9,800 more jobs this year, January to May average, over last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is performance! That is performance, Mr. Speaker! The bottom, contrary to what the hon. member for LaPoile says, is not dropping out of her. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the economy is in good hands. We will have an economic growth rate this year, Mr. Speaker, better than any Province in Canada, Mr. Speaker, of about 3 per cent to 3.5 per cent. The Canadian average, the Canadian Liberal average will be static or go down. Newfoundland, the economic growth rate of Newfoundland will go up 3 per cent to 3.5 per cent, the unemployment rate will go down, the employment rate will go up and we are all with it, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House. The participation rate will go up and has gone up. The employment figures clearly indicate to hon. members, if they care to read, if they care to understand 9,800 jobs more this year, month over month than last year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see how these figures come out. In January of 1980 we had 158,000 people working, in January of 1981, 172,000, Mr. Speaker. That is 14,000 jobs more this year than last year. In February we had 175,000 this year, 163,000 last year. That is 12,000 difference, Mr. Speaker! That is simply mathematics! Up go the jobs! More jobs this year!

MR. J. DINN: Down goes the unemployment rate! Up goes the employment rate! And, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite no matter what they say to the people of this Province cannot deny the figures. Are they my figures? Are they the figures developed by the Newfoundland Government? No, Mr. Speaker, they are figures developed by Statistics Canada. Statistics Canada put them out every month. They may not be accurate, they may not be 100 per cent but they are the figures that we use. The employment rate is gone up to well over now, over 46 per cent, the highest it has ever been. What is the employment rate? The employment rate is the number of people employed in the work force in the age group of fifteen years of age and over. The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) laughs at that. He does not think it is important! Not bread and butter! It is jobs! The hon. member for Bonavista North laughs at that.

MR. L. STIRLING: No, it is you I am laughing at.

MR. J. DINN: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) got up today and laid out the municipal capital works projects for the year and the hon. member got up and made a big laugh out of it. He thought it was a great joke! He thought it was a joke that the people in Trinity and Bonavista Bay were getting an extension to their water and sewer system this year. He thought it was a joke that Badger's Quay was getting money this year. He thought it was a joke, Mr. Speaker, in this House. I did not think it was a joke. I think these people deserve it; these are Newfoundlanders and should be treated fairly in Newfoundland and not because they are Liberal of P.C.

MR. DINN: but because they are
Newfoundlanders and they should get a fair share in this
Province.

Parkers Cove, is that in a
PC district? Another water and sewer system approved by the
Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). And the hon.
member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) got up today,
Mr. Speaker, and what did he say? Well, Mr. Speaker, what did
he say? He said, that the Government of Newfoundland announced
\$31, 500,000 programme and the people in the
municipalities are going to pay for it all. Well these are just
simply not the fact.

The paving programme is a 60/40
programme. That is not paid for 100 per cent by the
municipalities, or 10 per cent. It is a 60/40 programme and
generally there are times when they cannot meet the 40 per cent,
Mr. Speaker. And the water and sewer programmes. If hon. members
would check the figures they would find out that 75 per cent, 75
per cent of what has been approved in the past in water and sewer
is paid for by the provincial government, Mr. Speaker. These are
the facts.

Hon. members opposite cannot get
up and cloud the issues. They cannot get up, Mr. Speaker, and
give inaccurate figures. They have to listen to the facts. The
facts are there for everyone to see, Mr. Speaker, and I am not
going to sit here and listen to hon. members opposite get up and
state these facts incorrectly.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for St. Mary's-
The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I would like to have a few brief
remarks first of all on what the Minister of Labour and
Manpower said. He did not mention anything, I do not know
if he was ashamed to mention their local preference policy, but

MR. HANCOCK: it seems to have died off lately. It is something that I, as a Newfoundlander and as a Canadian, Mr. Speaker, and I can combine the both and be proud of both, have a great deal of difficulty living with, or even supporting, Mr. Speaker. I think when you take away the free movement of Canadians throughout one end of this Country to the other, Mr. Speaker, then we are in danger of doing away with Canada as a nation, Mr. Speaker.

I think if, for argument say that Alberta adopted such a policy tomorrow, I would pity the unemployment rate - what the unemployment rate would be in this Province two weeks from now or two months from now, Mr. Speaker. It would be unbearable. Only if one province in Canada adopted such a policy, Mr. Speaker, it is dangerous. It is very dangerous. I think the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and this entire administration, Mr. Speaker, should sit down and have a long, hard look at exactly what they are doing to this nation. It is a unique way of destroying it, Mr. Speaker. If Ontario, Alberta, the Northwest Territories and British Columbia adopted such a policy or a philosophy that this government is adopting, Mr. Speaker, then I would hate like heck to see what our unemployment rate is going to be like in Newfoundland a year or six months from now.

It is dangerous. It is just as dangerous as the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is himself, Mr. Speaker, when he intervenes in something that is none of his business, Mr. Speaker. It is just as dangerous and it is ridiculous to come up with such a policy, Mr. Speaker. When we, as Canadians, cannot move and seek employment in one part of this Country as compared to another, Mr. Speaker, then I think there is definitely something wrong. Mr. Speaker, I denounced that local preference policy from day one and I will continue to do so as long as I am elected to this House of Assembly and can speak against it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: It is as anti-Canadian as I can think of,
Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, that brings me back to
come of the comments that I have heard in my own district over
the last number of weeks and months where people have said to
me that they are very scared of this separatist attitude that -
they see for themselves exactly what this government is
trying to do and they can analyze and discuss to me, as a person
who represents them, exactly what is happening, Mr. Speaker. And
they are very concerned that the Premier of this Province is
trying to portray to the rest of Canadians that

MR. HANCOCK: Newfoundland is seen as an anti-Canadian province, Mr. Speaker. I think if we were into another election and the Premier had a five year mandate, I would not be a bit surprised if he did not go to the people on a referendum to determine whether or not they wanted to stay as they are now being a part of Canada or would they like to be their own little Canada being created from Newfoundland itself. I think the Premier of the Province is completely out to lunch.

And, Mr. Speaker, that ten page statement that was made on Friday was a prime example of an anti-Canadian attitude, Mr. Speaker. It is very dangerous when you see the Premier of this Province having to bring in a ten page statement defending Newfoundland and I think it is ridiculous.

But I would like to get back to transportation, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what we have now for a Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe). He is never in his seat. He has not been here - well, I know he was off sick for a while but, Mr. Speaker, you know, you get over sickness and we have seen an absent Minister of Transportation. We can say whatever we like about the previous Minister of Transportation, but he did attend the House and he did put up with the flak that he had to put up with from the people on the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. But we now have a minister who is very seldom in his seat. I do not know for what reason he is not there, if he is ashamed of policies that his government have introduced and the money they have spent, Mr. Speaker, or what but he should be here more often and I think the acting Premier- well, he is not acting Premier now because the Premier is here himself - should see to it that the Minister of Transportation is in his seat more often.

MR. HANCOCK:

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again, I do not know if it is any good speaking about the problems that one is faced with in his or her district in this House of Assembly or not because it seems for one to go unnoticed, Mr. Speaker, nobody seems to give a damn what happens in parts of Newfoundland, especially in the district that I represent where we still have 105 miles of dirt road. I have presented petitions in this House, Mr. Speaker, time and time again from different communities and the same communities calling on this administration to do something about the roads, and nothing has been done about it, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know what happens to petitions when you do present them in this House. Are they just thrown in the garbage or are they laid on the Table of the House and left there forever and nobody pays any attention to them or what? Those petitions, Mr. Speaker, mean a lot to people who circulate them. It is a lot of hard work to circulate a petition to come up with a thousand names and so on and it should not be treated lightly.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe) and the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) once again how much fish was landed and hauled over sections of dirt roads in my district last year alone. I have statistics here for two years, Mr. Speaker. First of all, in Trepassey last year in an eight month period, there were 3.6 millions pounds of fish trucked over that section of dirt road and from St. Shotts a total of 2.6 million pounds of fish was trucked over dirt roads, Mr. Speaker, and nobody seems to give a damn what happens to the quality of fish that comes out. It is hard enough to get into the markets as

MR. HANCOCK: they are but I am afraid in years ahead that we are going to have a harder job getting into the European market or the American market with the quality of fish that is being trucked over dirt roads, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: The Minister of Forestry (C.Power) said to me the other day that the road was going to be paved from the Witless Bay Line - that the Witless Bay Line was going to be paved this year. Well, I can assure the minister, Mr. Speaker, that is the day this House is going to come down if that Witless Bay Road is paved before sections of road in my district and I will bring it down one way or another, Mr. Speaker, because it is ridiculous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: You can get from one end of your district to the other through pavement, Mr. Speaker, but you cannot -

AN HON. MEMBER: It will be paved by September.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: You have a good memory, Mr. Speaker. and the day it is announced in this House, and you can mark it down, Mr. Speaker, if that Witless Bay line gets paved before this section of road I am talking about here gets paved, that is the day this House is going to come down, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, Sir. And you are in trouble.

MR. HANCOCK: People have to travel, Mr. Speaker - I am just taking one section of road; on the section of road from Trepassey through to St. Vincent's and St. Shotts, Mr. Speaker, where people have to drive to work. I have

MR. HANCOCK: have to drive to work. I have been talking to people who can only get two years out of a pickup, Mr. Speaker, and then they have to trade it in and lose in the vicinity of \$5,000 or \$6,000 every two years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bad drivers.

MR. HANCOCK: It is not bad driving, it is bad road conditions, Mr. Speaker. But that is the attitude of this administration, Mr. Speaker, it is the bad drivers. Yes, there may be bad drivers, Mr. Speaker, but if they had good roads to drive over you sure as heck would not see \$3,000 a year depreciation on a pickup.

A lot of people have said that the Tory administration is looking after their own districts. I do not agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I think this administration over there now is not concerned about the road conditions around this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there is a basic need that everybody should not have any dirt roads in this day and age, but this administration seems to do nothing or very little about it. I will go on record, Mr. Speaker - and I have said it hundreds and hundreds of times in the past - roads in rural Newfoundland are the responsibility of this provincial government but they do not want to assume responsibility for them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or anything else.

MR. HANCOCK: And I congratulate Mr. Carter, and I have done it in the past. He did a great deal of road work in the district that I now represent, Mr. Speaker, but it was nowhere near enough and that is probably why I got elected in the first place, because they are poisoned at the attitude of this administration. In the past two years we have seen nothing under

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Peckford and his government. We have seen very little road construction work around this Province. It is about time that they started looking after the needs of the people who elected them, Mr. Speaker. They do have a majority. They are abusing their majority. I tried on several occasions to have sections of that dirt road placed on a priority list with Ottawa, a shopping list to go to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, but with no success. The previous minister ignored it and it looks as if the new Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is going to ignore it.

It is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. If they cannot negotiate with Ottawa over there, Mr. Speaker, there may be some people on this side of the House who can negotiate with them if you approach them in a reasonable and sensible manner.

That brings me to another point, Mr. Speaker. It is a wonder that we get anything out of Ottawa with the attitude displayed towards Ottawa by this administration, Mr. Speaker. It is a wonder we get any road programmes signed whatsoever. It is a wonder that we had the Labrador Straits road signed. The Premier went looking for \$100 million and he got \$30-odd million. They are like a bunch of children, they want all or nothing, Mr. Speaker. It is all or nothing with this administration. We saw the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) get up and criticize the federal government for giving them \$38 million, or whatever it was for road work that was the entire responsibility of this provincial government, Mr. Speaker. Ottawa stepped in and helped out. They did not have to, because this provincial government was responsible for that section of road. I do not know why they did it, Mr. Speaker. It was not their responsibility, it was the responsibility of this local government, the

MR. HANCOCK: Tory Government which we now have, in fact, and Ottawa gave them \$38 million, and what did they get? A kick in the teeth for it, Mr. Speaker. They got a kick in the teeth for giving \$38 million to a Tory responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am finished, but I will be back later on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will give my hon. colleague another opportunity to have a go, but I just want to follow up on something he said a few minutes ago about the list that was tabled in the House today of municipal water and sewer projects.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are we doing Municipal Affairs?

MR. NEARY: Yes, we are doing Municipal Affairs,

that is one of the items.

The list tabled the other day, Mr. Speaker - I remember in this House when the Tories were in Opposition in this Province. One of the great criticisms they had of Mr. Smallwood was that he selected the projects - so they said - along partisan political lines and not in order of priority. Well, Mr. Speaker, how much have things changed? How much have things changed in this Province?

MR. NEARY: Nothing has changed! The projects are still - and more so today - selected blatantly along partisan political lines. And some of the projects mentioned today I might -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is perfectly logical.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? What is that?

MR. BARRETT: That is perfectly logical.

MR. NEARY: That is perfectly logical. Well, hon. gentlemen may think it is logical but I have news for the hon. gentlemen, that the people of Newfoundland are fed up with that kind of policy. They are fed up with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The people of this Province, when the time comes in the next election, will turf the hon. gentleman out whether or not they were fed information under the table by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) or by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). Mr. Speaker, eaten bread is soon forgotten and as soon as - the chickens will come home to roost - as soon as the property tax is imposed on these people to make them pay for these announcements that ministers made today - and I might say this, Mr. Speaker, that when there is good news to be announced in this Province the government feeds the information out to their ministers and backbenchers instead of allowing the mayors and the municipalities, who have elections coming up in November of this year - they upstage the mayors and the councillors, they upstage them and in a shameful fashion they try to get a little political mileage for themselves. They do not realize, Mr. Speaker, the damage that they are doing. Because first of all, it turns off the mayors and councillors, because if there is any good news they are the ones who should be announcing it. But then when it comes to bad news, like implementing the property tax, they leave that up to the mayors and councillors, let them bear the brunt of it. And so, Mr. Speaker, let nobody be under any illusions -

MR. NEARY: - my hon. friend alluded to it that this is just a political game the government is playing and that political game will catch up with them. Because there is nothing in either one of these lists that were announced that will save one member's hide on that side of the House or save the government. Not one item that was announced will save a member or save the government. So they may as well, Mr. Speaker, they may as well face up to it.

Now, a few moments ago I started to deal with the anti-confederate, the anti-Canadian, the separatist movement in this Province. I talked about two referendums and it took a second referendum for Confederation to win. Now, Mr. Speaker, where was the anti-Canadian, where were the anti-confederates? They were concentrated mainly in the St. John's business establishments. That is where the anti-Canadians were. And where are the anti-Canadians today in this Province? Still on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker. When the day of Confederation came in this Province, Mr. Speaker, you looked around in the areas that were predominantly anti-confederate, you looked around and what did you find in Newfoundland? You found flags flying at half-mast.

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The order called was Concurrence Motions, Government Services Committee, the deliberations of the Government Services Committee, I do not see what possible relevance there can be to the Confederation battle in 1949. As the hon. gentleman might know, we are talking

MR. MARSHALL:

about the estimates for 1981/82.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

To the point of order, the hon.

member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about development in this Province - Municipal Affairs, Public Works and Services, Labour and Manpower, Finance, Mr. Speaker, which, in itself, just that item alone, would give you a wide scope, finance.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order let me say that during the Concurrence debates the debate is somewhat wide-ranging but I believe the hon. member was perhaps getting into too big a broader area in the Concurrence debates. So, indeed, I think there was a legitimate point of order.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the reason - I am giving the reasons why we have this anti-confederate, this separatist feeling that is stymieing, that is hindering development in this Province, the anti-confederate feeling that has put Newfoundland into a major recession. And the Minister of labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) who got up a few minutes ago liping off about all the jobs that have been created in this Province in the last couple of years, should go out and tell the people who are unemployed. It is a pity, Mr. Speaker, we do not have television in this House so that the unemployed, the people who are forced on Social Assistance and the people who are forced on unemployment insurance could not see the non-existent Minister of Labour, the one gentleman in this Province who is anti-union, stand in this House and tell us about all the good times we have in Newfoundland. The reason we have poor times is because, Mr. Speaker, this government, this crowd, have not accepted the fact that Newfoundland has become a Province of Canada, they

MR. NEARY: are still fighting the Confederation issue. And, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen will recall in that great battle, the greatest battle in Newfoundland's history that they are still fighting in this House, that the black flags did not only fly in this Province, but they flew at half-mast on the doorknobs, Mr. Speaker, of so many anti-confederates. The Tory doorknobs were draped in black crepe paper and black crepe was hung on the gateposts as well. Black crepe paper and black linen hung in the windows. For the Tories of this Province who were so angry about it and so mad and so spiteful about Confederation, that they cried in the streets. The thought of Confederation, Mr. Speaker, came as a calamity to the hon. House Leader and to members sitting on that side of the House. It was a calamity. Well, why was it a calamity, Mr. Speaker? It was a calamity because for the first time in Newfoundland's history, all over the Northeast coast, the West coast, the North coast, the South coast, the whole territory of Labrador, the whole Province, for the first time in its long history, was going to come into its own.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we seem to be back again to the old Tory times where we have a government that is dominated and controlled by the business establishment in St. John's, the Tory establishment.

MR. YOUNG: Do you know who is anti-Confederate?

(Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Listen to the hon. gentleman who came over to Bell Island with the seat out of his pants sucking around, trying to scrounge off us over on Bell Island who were keeping Newfoundland afloat - with the seat out of his pants -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - trying to get everything free, a freeloader.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the member for Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG: I would like to ask the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to withdraw those remarks.

MR. NEARY: What remarks?

MR. YOUNG: That I went to Bell Island with the seat out of my pants.

MR. NEARY: Yes, so you did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. YOUNG: I have never had the seat out of my pants in my life, Mr. Speaker. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I never sucked around for a job like he did on Bell Island.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not raise the matter, the hon. gentleman raised it during his interruptions and if the hon. gentleman cannot take it he should not be interrupting. The hon. gentleman was typical of -

MR. HANCOCK: That was one of his rare speeches.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is one of the rare times that he has spoken in the House this session. But he was like a St. John's man -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is on a point of order?

MR. NEARY: - he would come over to Bell Island and try to freeload off us on Bell Island.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: Cocktail Willy is getting upset now.

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

I would have to rule there is no point of order but a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

I have to inform the hon. the member for LaPoile that his time is now expired.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I will yield to the hon. Minister of Fisheries if he -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council yields to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Do not be wasting the time of the House boy. Sit down!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, there we go, "Do not be wasting the time of the House". We have a long Summer ahead of us, there is no hurry to get out of the House of Assembly, we have a long Summer!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: As long as we are going to be debating the issues -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, at the same time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, at the same time if they can applaud so - what? - adamantly and stay in the House. Every single day I walk over the steps of Confederation Building and bump into members of the Opposition, 'Jim, when is it going to close, Jim, when is it going to close, when is it going to close? Hey, Jim, get it closed, get it closed, see the Premier, get it closed. The weather is getting so nice we want to get out of here, I want to get home.' Every single day a member of the Opposition comes along and does that, and then he is standing in the House and says, 'Oh, we will stay all Summer, we will stay all Summer'. Hello stay all Summer, hello stay all Summer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if you can stop this clapping - Mr. Speaker, can you stop this clapping?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if you will stop this clapping, it is wasting time of the House, we are trying to do our work here.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who apparently -

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

MR. MORGAN: - the unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, is that -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Order, please! A point of order raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MORGAN: Another spurious point of order.
A waste-of-time point of order.

MR. NEARY: Sit down, do not be wasting the time of the House, sit down. You are only wasting time.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) does not understand -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - the Minister of Fisheries does not understand our motive over here. We are applauding him every time he makes a good point, and the chances are very few that we get to applaud him and we were really applauding him. And that is why, you know, we will

MR. STIRLING:

sit again and applaud and I presume he will say another great thing that we will applaud again, and again.

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

That is not a point of order.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon.

member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the non-existent Minister of Fisheries (Morgan) made a statement there a few minutes ago that some member coming up over the steps of Confederation every day asked the hon. gentleman -

MR. MORGAN:

A different member every day.

MR. NEARY:

- and the hon. gentleman says it was a member who stood in his place here today to take part in this debate. Well, I am the only one so far, I believe, apart from my hon. friend today -

MR. HANCOCK:

No I never asked him.

MR. NEARY:

And I want to say now, Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of setting the record straight -

MR. MORGAN:

This is no point of order, state your point of order.

MR. NEARY:

No. Hold on now. You cannot make accusations against the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, unless you are prepared to name the members.

MR. HANCOCK:

Name him! Name him!

MR. NEARY:

Now the hon. gentleman should either name the members that he is talking about or -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

- refrain from that trend of thought, -

MR. STIRLING:

And withdraw it.

MR. NEARY: - withdraw it and apologize to the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

Once again there is no

point of order.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If the tactics are that the

Opposition are going to allow one member to stand on his feet and speak when he wants to, speak endlessly and say nothing, and then not listen to members of this side of the House speak, that is not going to get anywhere. The fact is that one gentleman in the House stands and speaks on everything that comes up, everything, whether it be squids, or whether it be development of the Province, the constitution, Confederation, all matters regarding the Country and the world sometimes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - a knowledgeable gentleman on all things. Nobody else over there knows anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Another one - call order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. POWER: I think it is time to bring in the T.V. cameras.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, with these kinds of childless tactics in the House that are going on right now, the Leader of the Opposition should be ashamed -

MR. POWER: Yes, boy.

MR. MORGAN: - should be ashamed

MR. POWER: Control your caucus.

MR. MORGAN: This is the people's House here. Let us have some decency here. Come on! Have some decency here.

MR. POWER: There is no respect.

MR. MORGAN: Playing these childish games.

MR. NEARY: Go sit down, boy!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the minister has mentioned one word except to criticize the Opposition -

MR. MORGAN: How can I?

MR. STIRLING: - about things that have nothing to do with the bill. Now the minister -

MR. MORGAN: How can I?

MR. STIRLING: - has already indicated that the other side brought up a point of order dealing with relevance. Now, Mr. Speaker, it should deal with the relevance of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is a good point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Once again there is no point of order.

I will ask the hon. minister to continue. He has about five minutes left.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Opposition members are afraid when I get up to speak, of what I am going to say. Because here is an example of four points of order raised, plus annoyance of the House, disruption of the House, to prevent me from saying anything in debate.

MR. NEARY: A point of order! A point of order!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a prime example of trying to keep one minister of this government quiet.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Well, they may keep me quiet in the House but I shall not be quiet outside of the House about the kind of childish tactics displayed by the Opposition members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order raised by

the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. MORGAN:

Here we go again.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon.

gentleman indirectly is questioning Your Honour, questioning the Chair. Because the statement made by the minister that somebody on this side is disrupting the House is not only untrue and false, but it is a reflection on the Chair. I do not think that this House is being disrupted in any way, shape, or form. If the minister wants to carry on with his speech, Mr. Speaker, he can do so, but he cannot question the Chair in the process of doing that. I believe Your Honour has the House completely under control and I congratulate Your Honour for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Once again -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. But I want to point out that it is certainly unparliamentary for any hon. members to get up continuously on spurious points of order merely to interrupt -

MR. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

-another member when he is speaking. Whether it is hon. members on my right or on my left, it is certainly not right and would ask hon. members to restrain themselves. Now, the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has about three minutes left.

MR. J. MORGAN: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, since the time has gone now, I will not launch off in my few words of ten minutes, I will wait until the next ten minutes of my time. But to stand there and see them in this hon. House of Assembly wasting the time as it is being wasted by - controlled by the member for LaPoile. There is no guidance over there from the Leader, The Leader himself is not in control of his own party, he is not in control of his own caucus

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: We have members over there going off in different directions and causing disruption in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have lots to say about the tactics of the Opposition trying to label our present Premier as a separatist and going out making these irresponsible statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: But I will have my say in this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER: Bring in the T.V. cameras and the Liberal Party will be wiped out.

MR. J. MORGAN: The children games are played. These members of the House should be in nursery school, they should be in nursery school with this kind of tactic and kind of attitude and kind of respect for the House.

MR. C. POWER: Boys, you are really frustrated today! You are really frustrated today!

MR. J. MORGAN: Frustration! Oh, are they ever frustrated! You cannot stop a member of the House from speaking when he wants to speak. You can try it now - I have tried to speak ten minutes. We are here with lots of time. I will get my chance to speak. Why stop me from speaking now?

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that because of the disruption they are trying to prevent the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in the provincial Cabinet from speaking in debate in the House. They are trying to prevent me from speaking. Now, it only gives me encouragement to speak lots more in the House. Now, I will wait my turn in the next ten minutes or so.

MR. C. POWER: He cannot get keep you from getting re-elected so he has to get in your way some how.

MR. J. MORGAN: How ridiculous! How ridiculous and crazy!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. CALLAN: 'Jim', you are going to be a short lived Minister of Fisheries, my boy!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member for Torngat Mountains has been recognized by the Chair.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments in the concurrence debates in particular concerning the Municipal Affairs Department and probably in the time get at the list of the capital works.

MR. G. WARREN: programmes that the minister announced today.

Last year, Mr. Speaker- the Cabinet gave approval last year not this year, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was a member of that Cabinet, to the town council of Nain for a guaranteed bank loan of \$1 million. That was last year, Mr. Speaker, Not this year, last year! And as of today, Mr. Speaker, this Cabinet after getting the loan- giving the town council a guaranteed bank loan - as of today they are still saying to the town council 'No'. They already made a big announcement about it over a year ago and now, at the present time, they have their hands tied, the town council in Nain, because they will not give them approval to borrow this \$1 million after giving them approval in the first place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on February 5th. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell the whole story.

MR. WARREN: Yes, I will tell you the whole story and I will lay it on the Table, and I will lay it on the Table, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on October the 3rd., 1980, the Nain Town Council wrote to the hon. minister and, Mr. Speaker, in this letter it says there, "Cabinet approved a proposal early this year" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! Order, please! Order! The hon. member.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I should have the protection of the Chair because I want to make a few comments, and I would appreciate the Minister of Fisheries closing his yap.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on February the 5th. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) asked the Nain Town Council would they give them a confirmation that they would repay back \$170,000 a year. I will read you a letter, Mr. Speaker, that went to the minister on February the 5th, "This will confirm our intention to apply for the amount of \$170,000 from the program of native people for the proposal of water and sewerage at Nain". Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what they asked for. So the minister went back to the Cabinet and still that is somewhere between the minister's desk and in Cabinet and still and all the people in Nain are still waiting for this approval. Now, Mr. Speaker, on June the 3rd. the Nain Town Council became so frustrated with this government they sent a telegram to the Premier, not getting any response from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and here is what the telegram said that they sent to the Premier, "An immediate response is requested from your government in relation to the present status of the

MR. WARREN: proposed water and sewer system for Nain for which a government guaranteed loan was approved of approximately one year ago. Earlier this year the Nain Town Council met with the hon. Hazel Newhook, Minister of Municipal Affairs, at which time an agreement was reached in relation to the debt retirement of \$170,000 per annum on the guaranteed loan. Five months later this Council still awaits official word whether or not the project will go ahead this Summer. The Council was under the impression" - listen to these very invaluable words, very valuable words - "the Council was under the impression that your government was more responsive and responsible than it actually has been and we look forward to a more satisfactory and speedier response than we have received in the recent past." And that is signed by the Chairman of the Community Council in Nain. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: That was on June the 3rd., Mr. Speaker. I spoke to the Nain Council again this morning and the only thing they got back, Mr. Speaker, was from some Special Assistant in the Premier's Office saying, "I will bring the matter to the Premier". Now, Mr. Speaker, Friday they sent another telegram back to the Premier and said, "Sir, we would like to hear from you instead of from your Special Assistant. What are you going to do about it?" And Mr. Speaker, they have also said in their telegram, "Do you want us to continue to throw our slops and our garbage out the back door as we are compelled to do because of the lack of responsibility of this government?" Now, Mr. Speaker, is this not a little bit ridiculous when you can see all those Municipal Capital Works programs guaranteed today and this one on the books over a year ago and this government does not even respond? The Premier for fourteen days -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shocking, shocking.

June 15, 1981

Tape No. 2485

GS - 3

MR. WARREN: - for fourteen days-and he is the man who is supposed to be concerned about the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker. He is more concerned about going across Canada and talking about the constitution and talking about separating Newfoundland from Canada. That is what he is concerned about, Mr. Speaker, that is what he is concerned about. He is not worried about

MR. WARREN: Newfoundlanders, all he is worrying about is making sure, I will get all I can get and get away from Canada, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I am a bit disgusted -

MR. HANCOCK: What an attitude the rest of the Canadians have, they do not call it Newfoundland anymore they call it down East now.

MR. WARREN: But when somebody, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HANCOCK: Ashamed to call it Newfoundland. Newfoundlanders from home are ashamed to call it Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: Newfoundlanders say they are from down East now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I ask the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes to restrain himself.

MR. HANCOCK: Newfoundlanders on the Mainland now call themselves from down East, they do not call themselves Newfoundlanders anymore. They are ashamed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: It is disgusting, Mr. Speaker, when you can get a call from Newfoundlanders who are working up in Alberta, up around Alberta and they call back -

MR. HANCOCK: Ashamed to say he is from Newfoundland now.

MR. WARREN: - and they say, 'Listen I would like to come back to Newfoundland and see can I get a job'. 'But, they say, what is this, that if I come back I cannot get a job in Newfoundland?'. Mr. Speaker, this is what is going right across Canada by the attitude of the Premier of this Province of saying, 'Newfoundlanders first', Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bit disgusting when the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) can call the people in Northern Labrador stark raving

MR. WARREN: mad people. That is the kind of a minister we have, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Minister of Social Services should pay more attention to the people in the North.

MR. HICKEY: The gentleman who said that is a Liberal.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who said that is a Liberal. Come on over.

MR. HANCOCK: What are you doing over there?

MR. WARREN: Come on over. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Minister of Social Services that he should try to do more for the people in the North -

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear! The whole darn government should.

MR. WARREN: -instead of doing that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: My hon. friend is going to be embarrassed when he hears the announcement I will have in a couple (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree with more jobs first for Newfoundlanders. I am the first to agree, Mr. Speaker, that if there are jobs available today that a guy from Newfoundland should be given the first opportunity. But if he does not qualify, Mr. Speaker, then there should be somebody else because we have not got a system in place that can give that Newfoundlander the opportunity of qualifying for the job. Then our problem, Mr. Speaker, is our educational system. There are not enough programmes in the vocational schools to accommodate Newfoundlanders to get properly trained.

MR. NEARY: Carry on, boy. Carry on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. WARREN: In Davis Inlet, Mr. Speaker, where the people are, 85 per cent, on social assistance, all the Minister of Social Services is concerned about is making sure that his welfare workers can give out the money, not

MR. WARREN: to do the rehabilitation programme but just give the money to them, Mr. Speaker. And that is all he is concerned about, Mr. Speaker.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in the town of Hopedale - let us talk about Hopedale. Let me table this, Mr. Speaker, and let the minister know that there is much more the minister can do -

MR. HICKEY: I have managed to tolerate the hon. gentleman but you are going to get me mad.

MR. HANCOCK: I would like to know what he is doing.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, when we get up here and touch one of those thorny thorns in the minister's side he really gets upset, Mr. Speaker, because he has one of the most important

MR. G. WARREN: portfolios in that Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, and he does not know how to administer his programmes. That is all that is wrong, Mr. Speaker! That is all that is wrong!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this government should be more concerned about the people in this Province who are waiting for their water and sewerage, who are waiting for their roads to be paved and not only to be paved but to be cleaned, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this government get on with their daily operation and forget about the offshore oil and do what is best for Newfoundland, and that has to do with community involvement work, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this debate, of course, involves the report of the Social Services Committee -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Government Services.

MR. J. MORGAN: - The Government Services, supply of services to the people of Newfoundland. And this afternoon during Question Period it was obvious that - and it clearly portrayed the irresponsibility of a party that fortunately will never become the government of the Province for many years to come - however, it is aspiring to become the government! It is aspiring! - an irresponsibility this afternoon in Question Period about the health services around the Province. And I would say that the health services we have in this Province today are equal to, bar none, anywhere else in Eastern Canada, our health services we have, especially

MR. J. MORGAN: in the rural areas of the Province. We spent millions of dollars in health services over the last number of years and we will, in the future, do the same. But then to question about the funds allocated to the hospital boards, the funds for the health services needs around the Province left the clear impression that there is no limitation to where or to what the sources of funds are. To top things off when the minister, my colleague, the minister responsible for Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) announces \$31 million worth of projects around the Province which is going to be a boost to the construction industry, obviously, and it is going to supply the services to these communities that so rightly need them and deserve them in many areas throughout Newfoundland, he stands in the House and says, 'Well, that should not be loans. Unfortunately, it is loans. It should be grants. We should make grants available to these communities, \$31 million worth of grants.' At the same time, when we talked about the budget, as I mentioned when I spoke last week, they are opposed to any increase in taxation. They are opposed to taxation to raise the necessary funds and now they are opposed to supplying services unless it is by grant. Do not have an effort to help pay for the local services, do not have any means of taxation to pay for local services, make the grants available. Make the subsidies available for operation. Keep things going all by operation of the Newfoundland government, all by grants! We are spending \$20 million this year for roads, \$21 million I think it is to be exact, for transportation facilities around the Province. And dare this government stand up and portray any kind of fight for Newfoundlanders, because if we do we are going to be labeled as anti-confederates, separatists.

MR. J. MORGAN: We are not standing up and fighting. If we are doing that, 'Oh, there is something wrong, you would not dare, you cannot dare attack or say anything wrong about the fact that the Argentinia ferry service will be gone in a few weeks time.

MR. S. NEARY: A quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. MORGAN: We have a quorum, we have a quorum. There are enough members in the House.

MR. G. FLIGHT: There are twelve members in the House.

MR. J. MORGAN: One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve. We have twelve in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FLIGHT: You have to have fourteen, boy!

MR. J. MORGAN: Yes, we have fourteen.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): We have fourteen members in the House.

MR. J. MORGAN: We do. There is no need for a quorum call. We have a quorum, Mr. Speaker, Stop playing his childish games in the Opposition. We have a quorum in the House.

Mr. Speaker, they will play any tactic they want when people on this side try to score points. But the fact is how dare we stand up in Ottawa and say, 'Look, Mr. Ottawa why are you taking off that ferry service to Argentinia, that important link with the mainland portion of Canada?

MR. MORGAN:

Why are you doing that, Mr. Ottawa? Why are you taking out that important ferry service?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Oh, no, do not dare question Mr. Pepin and his policies and his advisors, do not do that my colleague, who is the Transportation Minister and Mr. Crosbie the MP up in Ottawa, because look if you do that you will be labelled as a Separatist, you will be labelled as an anti-Confederate, you are against Ottawa, against Confederation. The fact is that eight provinces across Canada right now, eight provinces, recognize what we do here in this Province, that nobody among the provinces in Canada are out to destroy Confederation. I would venture to say right now that even Mr. Levesque, the Premier of Quebec, is no longer out to destroy Confederation. I have listened to some of his speeches and he has agreed there will be no more vote along that line in the Province of Quebec. He is giving good government to the Province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, that means there is nobody among the provinces of Canada today, amongst our family of Confederation, there is not one member of the family of Confederation who is out to destroy Confederation.

However, the present practices and the present procedures carried out by the federal national government representing all Canadians, leaves many questions to be answers as to what their means is and what the end result is going to be. Because it is clear the the present policy being practiced is hurting provinces. Their present method of operations is hurting Confederation. Premier Peckford is not against Confederation. There is not one member in his caucus against Confederation. All he is trying to do, Mr.

MR. MORGAN: Speaker, is to protect Canada. He is trying to stop one man in Ottawa from destroying Confederation. That is what he is doing.

MR. NEARY: Him and how many more?

MR. MORGAN: Him and how many more? Him and seven other premiers. Is the Premier of British Columbia wrong? Is the Premier of Alberta wrong? Is the Premier of Manitoba wrong? Is the Premier of Nova Scotia wrong? Is the Premier of Prince Edward Island wrong? Maybe they are all wrong. There are only two premiers right. The question is, are there only two members of the family of Confederation, are there are only two who are right and the rest are wrong?

AN HON. MEMBER: I would agree too if we had a sane one.

MR. MORGAN: I do not care, I honestly, personally do not care - I am speaking as an individual member of this House - it does not really matter what the court procedure is going to be, Mr. Speaker, on the constitutional matter.

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to have some direction on this particular matter, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if Your Honour can give the House direction on it or not. But the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) just made a statement that he is not speaking as a government minister he is speaking as a private member, he is expressing a personal view. Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, for a Minister of the Crown to be able to wear one hat one minute and then take off that hat and say, 'I am speaking now personally', and speak as a private member? Is he not still a minister, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, hold on now. This is very important. Is he not still a minister? And if so, if he is a minister, is he not speaking for the government, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): To that point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order, that is not a point of order. I do not need to explain why. You cannot ask questions of this Chair in this House of Assembly. Now, Mr. Speaker, throughout the afternoon we have been met with points of order by members of the Opposition that have interfered with the previous speech made by the Minister of Fisheries. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this

MR. MARSHALL:

has occurred from time to time with increasing repetition, frequency over the past little while.

I want to draw Your Honour's attention to Erskine May Parliamentary Practice 19th. Edition , page 441, which says,

MR. STIRLING: Repeat that again, that reference you give.

MR. MARSHALL: Page 441 which says that "When the attention of the Speaker is called to a supposed breach of order -

MR. HANCOCK: He is consuming your time 'Jim'. He does not even want to listen to you.

MR. MARSHALL: - he at once gives a decision on it and if in his opinion this member whose words or conduct is complained of is disorderly, he calls upon him to conform to the rules of the House."

But the next quotation, Mr. Speaker, I think is quite relevant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh , oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: The next quotation, "On 1 July, 1952 the Deputy Speaker deprecated a growing practice of interruptions of debate by members who "When the hon. member who is speaking refuses to give way , think that the only way that they can get their word in is by raising a point of order". He stated that in his opinion such interruptions constitute fraudulent points of order and should be stopped".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen this afternoon, what we have seen by the point of order raised by the hon. member, is what is described in that text as a fraudulent point of order and, Mr. Speaker, it can only lead

MR. MARSHALL: to disruption and disorder in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that these types of points of order stop and cease or else they irreparably infringe upon the rights of a member to speak. Points of orders are all right, Mr. Speaker, when they are raised legitimately, but they are being raised, I suggest, with increasing frequency for the purpose of interrupting a member in debate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and injecting a contrary comment to one that has been made by the member in debate itself, which observation should be left to debate and not to the matter of a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, we saw in this House the Government House Leader use on two occasions last week, and a minister of the Crown use, points of privilege to which that reference would have been a very excellent reference. And he has made some very good points, Mr. Speaker, but it has nothing to do with the legitimate point of order raised by my colleague about a minister who is speaking one minute on behalf of the government as a minister, then started to say something that he thought was against the government -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: - thought was against the government - and we get this kind of interjection - and then changed, it said no, that is not government policy, I am speaking as a private member. And, Mr. Speaker, the point of order had nothing to do with that reference, although it is a legitimate reference by the way the

MR. STIRLING: President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has been acting.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: What he was bringing up was a legitimate point of order about whether or not, a simple question, a minister can speak as a minister and also as a private member?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I will hear one more submission, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: - has given a very pointed and relevant reason to why this point of order was raised because the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been using this from time to time, as Your Honour will recall. The last few days on six occasions he rose when the Premier was making a Ministerial Statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And all I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is what occurs and what happens as a result of this is that you get chaos in the debate and the debate cannot take on in an orderly manner.

If hon. gentlemen wish to get up and make a point of order they should ground them, Mr. Speaker, within the established precedents that have been set down either in Beauchensne or May or from, of course, first of all, the Standing Orders of the House. But the way it is going now, Mr. Speaker, all you are doing is just having a disruption, continuous disruption of debate in the House and it cannot take place effectively.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): I believe I have heard enough debate on the point of order to rule on the original point of order presented by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). There is nothing that I am aware of in the Standing Orders or anywhere else that can preclude a member of this House speaking in any debate as a member of the House. And I presume that is what the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was doing.

I do want to make an additional comment though, if I might, and draw to the attention of hon. members the fact that the points that have been made with respect to spurious points of order, I think, are quite accurate. And hon. members are well aware that every member of this House has the right to present a point of order if they feel there is a breach of order. And if that point is presented, it should be presented clearly and precisely but certainly that right should not be abused. And I bring that to the attention of the hon. members in the hope that everybody will consider it and when points of order are raised, they should be what they consider to be legitimate breaches of the practices and procedures in the House.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries has about one minute remaining.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, again, I guess, I will be coming back at the next chance to speak on this debate. Again time wasted because of the fact the Opposition do not like the things I am saying. That is a very obvious reason why these spurious points of order are brought forward. They do not like the things I am saying. And the fact is that the truth is there, that there are eight provinces, eight parts of Canada today, eight important parts of Canada, just as important as Ontario and New Brunswick. And the questions are, of course, who are right in this case. For example, the members who are

MR. MORGAN: opposed to the action taken by the federal government, are these people right? Are they? Or are they wrong? And the fact is irrespective of the decision to be made in the courts when it is made, irrespective of that decision, I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that irrespective of what that decision will be from the courts, that damage to our country has been done and is being done now, not by the Premier from this Province, not by the Premier from Alberta, not by the Premier from British Columbia but by the federal government in its method in dealing with the regions of our country. And I will come back to point out the way in which they are dealing with the regions of our country the next time I get a chance to.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Now we are going to hear some sense.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, they say that if

you give enough man a rope he will hang himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence. I would like to be heard in silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Maybe I should stand and ask the two hon. members to carry on their conversation outside the House. It is very disruptive.

MR. WARREN: It is the minister of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I think it is on both sides, back and forth. The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. W. CALLAN: There is an old that if you give a man enough rope he will hang himself. And there is another old saying that a man alone is in bad company. And the hon. gentleman who leads this government, I think these two old sayings are very applicable to that hon. gentleman, the Premier of our Province. I think he is a man alone and I think he is on an ego trip and the other reference, of course, is that he is being given enough rope and I believe he has taken that rope with which he will hang himself in due course. Now, the Premier in the short order may want to shuffle his Cabinet and make his government look a little bit better than it is now, it is in a shambles.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. W. CALLAN: I talked with a number of school teachers over the weekend and they will never forget the treatment that they received at the hands of -

MR. MORGAN: They still talk to you.

MR. TULK: Better than ever.

MR. W. CALLAN: - this government over the past -

MR. MORGAN: In the election act there they all voted against him.

MR. TULK: That was the last election boy.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, as usual, does not know what he is talking about.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) out there last week, a standing ovation.

MR. W. CALLAN: The hon. Minister of Fisheries went out during the Bellevue by-election and tried to confuse the people in North Harbour and Dildo and Norman's Cove and Chance Cove. He pulled the lowest kind of tricks but none of it worked. Mr. Speaker, last week we had the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) table in this House a list, the roads programme for this year. Today we had the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mrs. Newhook) Table the list of water and sewer and roads programmes for municipalities. I wonder when the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, is going

June 15, 1981

Tape No. 2491

RA - 2

MR. W. CALLAN: to Table his list of approvals for
community stages, for community stages this year, Mr. Speaker.
Or is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. CALLAN:

or is the Minister of Fisheries going to do it the way he did it last year? Mr. Speaker, I was shocked, I was shocked as I sat down on the fifth floor last Summer and picked up the newspaper and saw four tender calls for community stages, four tender calls for community stages, Mr. Speaker. And as I looked through the list and the names I knew that Duntara was in Bonavista South and of one or two others I knew but I had to check all four. They were all contained within the same newspaper, the same weekend edition, and they were all, Mr. Speaker, every one of them, all four were in the hon. Minister of Fisheries' own district. And these, Mr. Speaker, were the only four, were the only new community stages erected last year, and they were all erection in the Minister of Fisheries' own riding.

MR. MORGAN: Nonsense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Pork-barrelling. Pork-barrelling.

MR. CALLAN: Well, if the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird) Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: - if the Minister of Fisheries says 'nonsense', then he is calling the people who work in his department liars because I have it from his own workers in his own department who tell me that there were a lot of community stages repaired and so on last year, but there were only four new ones and all four, Mr. Speaker, were in the minister's own riding. He pulled the same trick, Mr. Speaker, when he was Minister of Transportation and Communications, he pulled the same trick. He pork-barrelled his own district.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. Minister of Fisheries has on this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: I wonder what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has on this government. He was kept in the Cabinet of the former administration and he is kept in the Cabinet of this administration by a weak-kneed Premier, by a weak-kneed Premier who has not got the nerve to ask for his resignation even though four colleagues on his own side of the House on a Public Accounts Committee asked for it, or thought that it should be asked for it. I wonder what the Minister of Fisheries, what he has on this government or the members who formed the former administration and the present administration. Mr. Speaker, about four years ago in this House I stood and I questioned the Minister of Fisheries, who was then the Minister of Transportation, about a trip that he made out to Brownsdale on a Sunday afternoon in a government helicopter -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) in the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: - and, Mr. Speaker, the minister got so upset because he knew that he was in the wrong obviously -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think right now we are discussing items under the Heading of Government Services. Fisheries is not written down in this listing.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about transportation now. I am talking about how government spends the taxpayer's money in pork-barrelling PC districts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. CALLAN: P.C. districts and flying around in the government helicopter at public expense. And, Mr. Speaker, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) got all upset at that time.

MR. D. HANCOCK: He is upset again now.

MR. W. CALLAN: He is upset again now. I wonder what he has on the Premier. I wonder why the Premier is afraid to ask for his resignation or to bounce him out of the Cabinet, which is where he should be.

Mr. Speaker, the man who is taking enough rope to hang himself, the Premier of this Province, continually insults the intelligence of the people of this Province by making foolish statements, foolish statements like the one that he made last week when he said that it was the Opposition who was preventing legislation from going through the House. Mr. Speaker, we only have two hours a day as it is. When you take Question Period and Ministerial Statements out of it, we have about two hours left for debate. If the Premier was serious about getting this House of Assembly closed down, getting legislation through and the budget debate and so on clued up, he would have us back here at night so that we could get the legislation cleared off and get out and enjoy -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CALLAN: - then, Mr. Speaker, that would free us up so that we could get out and enjoy visiting our districts, talking with the people, the fishermen, find out about their problems and so on and so on. Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. W. CALLAN: - I wonder how many communities in the district of Bellevue will receive a community stage this year? Last year when I picked up that advertisement -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible) get one.

MR. W. CALLAN: Hodges Cove, I hope. Hodges Cove, I hope. It was applied for last year. When I picked up that advertisement last year, Mr. Speaker - calling tenders for four community stages in the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) own riding, I got on the phone and I phoned a half a dozen towns.

MR. J. MORGAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): A point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, you have already made a ruling and you asked that this debate continued to involve -

MR. D. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) fisheries.

MR. W. CALLAN: Hodges Cove, I hope.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: - that the debate be relevant to the Government Services Estimates. And you have already pointed out that Fisheries is not in the Government Services Estimates, it is in the Resource sector of the government's estimates. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: He is talking about Finance, boy.

MR. W. CALLAN: Then what is the minister talking about?

MR. J. MORGAN: The hon. gentlemen continues to talk about fisheries matters. Now, I begged, begged, begged two weeks ago to have some discussion, debate on fisheries. Nobody took me up!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is out of order to debate fisheries.

MR. STIRLING: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): To the point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, when Your Honour was not in the Chair, a minute ago, that Minister of Fisheries took his full ten minutes to defend his Premier and his anti-confederate and his separatist actions, spent the whole time debating the federal issues of separatism. And there has been a wide-ranging debate. And what my colleague was doing, he was dealing with two subjects involving Transportation and Finance, Mr. Speaker, and it was quite relevant to the general discussion, certainly the rules that have been set for this afternoon.

MR. MORGAN: He is going to be so embarrassed.

MR. HANCOCK: Who is going to pay for it?

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen. I wish to remind the hon. member for Bellevue that his time is up.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I will follow the example of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) be on my feet every time I can get up on my feet to be recognized by the Chair and carry on speaking, speaking speaking. We have a long Summer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are spending, government is, as I mentioned earlier, \$20 million for transportation, \$31 million for water and sewer under this estimate now, the Government Services. And the Opposition keeps on bringing up the point that we should never stand up - for example, the Opposition leader (Mr. Stirling) a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, damaged this Province

MR. MORGAN: So much it was disgusting, by standing and trying to score to points, that the funds that Ottawa was spending in Newfoundland were provincial responsibility and the Newfoundland Government should carry out the spending on these projects, like roads for example. Roads were a big issue, transportation. I could not believe it when I turned the radio on and I heard a comment, voice tape, saying that the Newfoundland Government should be happy and pleased and be thankful for - that was the word - be thankful for the few dollars we got for Labrador just recently.

MR. STIRLING: Right, you should get down on your knees and be thankful.

MR. MORGAN: Sure get down on our knees, be thankful. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously does not travel much about Canada these days. He is not travelling much across our great country of Canada.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) the people of Labrador.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, please!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to restrain himself.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious he has not travelled much across Canada. He has not

MR. MORGAN:

travelled the Northern part of Manitoba. He has not travelled the Northern part of Quebec. He has not travelled the Northern boundaries of our country of Canada which, by the way, Labrador happened to be on the Northern boundary of Newfoundland, the Northern boundary of Canada. But suddenly, Mr. Speaker, suddenly - you know, it was embarrassing. I am sure it was embarrassing to the members from Labrador who seem to be doing a reasonable job of making representation for the Labrador constituents. But thank God we have the guidance of a Cabinet minister who is genuinely concerned for Labrador, thank God for that. If it was not for him they would be lost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

So, Mr. Speaker, it had to be embarrassing to them because they know, as I do and all ministers on this side know, that Labrador has not been given a fair shake out of the federal funding. They have not been given a fair shake and suddenly it is wrong for the Newfoundland government to stand up and say, "Ottawa, look, Minister of" - what? - "External, Minister of Northern Affairs, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Fisheries, minister responsible for DREE look, it is wrong for us to go and ask for any help for Labrador because we are asking for funding to be spent on projects and on sectors which are provincial responsibilities". The Opposition Leader did unknown damage to our case, unknown, it is unlimited the damage that was done by statements made by the man aspiring to become Premier of the Province, by pointing out and saying, "But Ottawa is only doing it out of the goodness of their hearts, they are only doing it because -

MR. STIRLING:

That is right.

MR. MORGAN:

- look, because they do not have to do it, they do not have to spend their money in Newfoundland because the Newfoundland Government should do all the spending in Labrador, for example."

MR. HOUSE: You did not see that article that was around the other day about (inaudible)?

MR. MORGAN: I happened to see a project about three weeks ago. I saw a project being carried out, a major road project, not really Northern but semi-Northern Quebec. The project cost in the vicinity of - I think the figure was - one project, it was four-laning a highway going to the Northern part of Quebec, four-laning a highway, and it cost \$33 million, one highway, \$33 million cost-shared 90/10 by Ottawa. And that was not Northern Quebec, that was not Northern -

MR. STIRLING: That was negotiated by a separatist

MR. MORGAN: That was done by Ottawa. But, surely, of course, Quebec had to come again and get on its knees and say, 'Thanks Mr. Ottawa, thanks'. The fact is that all we are doing is asking for the kind of a just society that the present Prime Minister of our country was talking about ten years ago. I happened to be here ten years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Ten years ago I recall this House talking about Mr. Trudeau and his just society. And he had one more key phrase, Mr. Speaker,

MR. J. MORGAN:

one more very key phrase, and that was regional disparity! Regional disparity! He was going to take action to overcome regional disparity. Well, regional disparity did not get any further than, I would say, the Eastern boundary of the Province of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: Because Atlantic Canada today, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, could I have some quiet please. The gentleman from Labrador there, the hon. member for Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the fact is Atlantic Canada today, not just Newfoundland, is suffering the consequences of ill-conceived, ill-conceived policies and programmes, lack of any planning to develop the region and a general lack of concern. But this is from the same Prime Minister of our country, the same Prime Minister who said a few years ago, no longer than the early part of the seventies he was saying 'We want a just society in our country of Canada. We intend to overcome the regional disparities in our country of Canada. We intend to help those have-not regions from funds from the have regions, to help out these have-not regions, help them develop'. 'And we', I can recall him here in St. John's - the Prime Minister as saying - 'and we will develop the policies to make sure that the investment will come in from the private sector, into places like Newfoundland, to help you develop your resources'.

And now what is happening, Mr.

Speaker, now what is happening? If it was not for the resource of the oil and gas and the potential of the fisheries - there

MR. J. MORGAN: are policies in place, there are no incentives in place, there is no encouragement there from the federal government to bring in industry into the Atlantic region, to have them come in to invest.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I said it earlier and I will say it now, anybody today who is anti-Confederate, it is not from the Province's position because Confederation is being destroyed as surely as the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: - articles that come forward from different - article after article, the papers across - I have a habit of reading most all of the prominent newspapers across Canada - article after article -

MR. STIRLING: Do you read the (inaudible)?

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman now would give me the same courtesy I gave him a few minutes ago.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: Article after article from the most prominent writers for the papers are saying that if Mr. Trudeau, the present Prime Minister, continues on his present trend of ignoring the wishes of the Provinces, of

MR. MORGAN: ignoring the kind of incentive that should be in place by the federal government to help the poorer regions of the country, if he continues in that kind of a trend, that he and his government, the present federal-national government, is the biggest threat to Confederation, not our premiers in any of the provinces in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, just to remind the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), if he is quoting from a paper, in today's paper it says in here, "Unfortunate Term. In his speech in Alberta, Premier Peckford referred to Alberta and Newfoundland as the axis. I think this is an unfortunate use of terms. During the Second World War the Axis was comprised of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Japan into the Axis power."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, that could be tabled. Mr. Speaker, I think this is what you would call a rip-off government. I think it would be a good name and a good short term for this government. Instead of being called the P.C. Government it should be called the rip-off government. Because, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the financial part of it, let us look at the taxes. Let us look at the taxes, Mr. Speaker. This government was not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with getting twenty-seven cents per gallon tax on gasoline so what they did, they came in with 22 per cent, Mr. Speaker, in refunds from gasoline taxes. Now, Mr. Speaker, that will work out— I would venture to say by the end of this year, Mr. Speaker, that will work out to roughly about forty-seven to fifty

MR. WARREN: cents on a gallon of gasoline, that this government will be collecting from the taxpayers of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what you call a government that is concerned about this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am not only talking of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) concern. In the Estimates Committee the minister said there will be - fishermen in Labrador will be able to get outboard motors through the loan board. The minister has not announced that yet and the fishing season is ready to start. If you think about Labrador as much as you gab about Labrador why do you not do something about Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I will make one, two, three, four, announcements about Labrador next week.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, he could make the announcements tomorrow if he is concerned. And, Mr. Speaker, when he is talking about the federal government putting any money into Labrador, only two or three weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, a \$47 million DREE agreement, ninety/ten cost shared, ninety/ten by the federal government, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there is another agreement, an agreement for native funding, another ninety/ten by the federal government.

AN HON. MEMBER: All provincial responsibilities I might add.

MR. WARREN: Exactly, Mr. Speaker. And we heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) saying that we are doing marvelous things for Labrador. Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Fisheries is taking Labrador down the drain with this government.

AN HON. MEMBFR: That is right 'boy' you tell them.

MR. WARREN: This Minister of Fisheries is trying to take the people from Labrador down the drain, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, look at the money they are collecting from the taxpayers of this Province through the sale of liquor.

MR. HANCOCK: Joe (inaudible) is right.

MR. WARREN: Over \$3 million from the pockets of the taxpayers. I believe, if they are going to take this money from the taxpayers, at least they can do is put the money back into an alcoholic rehabilitation programme, Mr. Speaker, and probably the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would be the first one to qualify for that special programme.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) as you are.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, let us look at the cost of birth certificates, let us look at the cost of car licences, let us look at the cost of marriage certificates, all those licences, Mr. Speaker, The ordinary people of this Province are suffering because of this government's attitude towards, 'How are we going to get the most money out of the people?'

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)
power.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this government should come up with other means of

MR. WARREN: putting money back into the Treasury such as all those surveyors who are going around for the sake of fifty cents to put a stake anywhere, fifty cents. I think it is ridiculous, where they could be getting more money from those surveyors who are going around laying claim to parts of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else I heard during the past week, that no less than eleven companies - this is very important, Mr. Speaker, I will have to repeat this, I suppose because this is very important.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, boy, go on.

MR. WARREN: I heard in the last few days -

MR. HANCOCK: Take you time! Take your time.

MR. WARREN: - that no less than eleven companies came in in the past three weeks from the Mainland and do you know what they are doing in the Province?

MR. HANCOCK: I do not know.

MR. WARREN: Because of the Federal government's announcement of the home insulation programme, we have eleven companies coming down from up across the Strait and coming into Newfoundland and making a big pile of money and going around knocking on doors,

MR. WARREN:

Companies from the Mainland are down here knocking on doors, and saying, "Listen, do you want your house insulated? Here is the price because you are going to get it back from the Federal Government." Now, Mr. Speaker, if this government is concerned about companies in Newfoundland getting work first, is concerned about companies in Newfoundland getting work first, Mr. Speaker, this is where they should pick up, Mr. Speaker, this is where they should pick up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Thank God, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK:

He left.

MR. WARREN:

- he has gone because, Mr. Speaker, he just comes up once in a while, just like a whale, and blows and down he goes again.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend would allow me for a moment.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I move that the House adjourn, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been moved that the House adjourn. All those in favour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. NEARY:

The 'Ayes' have it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I did not -

MR. MARSHALL:

Call in the members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: You do not call in any members, Mr. Speaker, the majority voted 'aye'. That is a non-debatable motion. The motion has been carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: The motion has been carried, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The House is finished for the day.

MR. MARSHALL: It is not finished for the day.

MR. NEARY: It is finished for the day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what are we doing now?

MR. MARSHALL: We are calling in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Three members stood there so we are calling in now for a count.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the proper procedure. Once a motion to adjourn is made the motion has to be put immediately. The motion was put, the majority on this side voted in favour of the motion and the House is finished for today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: No, it was not.

MR. TULK: Oh, it was voted on.

MR. NEARY: It was voted on. Does Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - understand the rules of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Yes, order.

MR. MARSHALL: The Standing Orders are there for everybody -

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

June 15, 1981

Tape No. 2499

GS - 3

MR. MARSHALL: The gentleman is standing on a point of order. All he has to do is read Standing Order 82, Mr. Speaker. It is there clearly for him to see.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you do not ring the bells and call the members in when a motion to adjourn is in. A motion to adjourn is always in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Our standing rules, Mr. Speaker, "A motion to adjourn"

MR. NEARY:

MR. MARSHALL:

A motion (inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

Hold on just a minute now.

"A motion to adjourn is always in order." The Speaker put the motion, the majority voted in favour of the motion and the House should be finished for the day."

MR. MARSHALL:

That is nonsense.

MR. NEARY:

That is not nonsense, that is

true. That is the rule.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

Sir, while I check it out.

We will recess for one minute,

MR. NEARY:

All right, Sir.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

With respect to the motion to adjourn I would like to make it clear that I did not declare the motion. Three members on my left stood, I assumed they were calling Division as has happened many times in this House. I called Division and rang the bell and now we will have the Division count, please.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, could Your

Honour give us the authority for that please?

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, you cannot question

the Chair.

MR. NEARY:

No, no, no. I am not questioning

the Chair, I am merely asking - this is unprecedented, this is not the procedure -

MR. MORGAN:

You are questioning the Chair.

MR. NEARY:

Hold on now. Just take it

easy now. This is not in accordance with the Standing Rules of our House or Beauchesne, so would Your Honour give us the

MR. NEARY: authority so we can check it in Beauchesne or in our Standing Orders.

MR. MORGAN: You do not have to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: He does have to.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To that point of order, the hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: has given a ruling. The hon. gentleman will find in Standing Order 82 and in Beauchesne the authorities that he requires. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has given the authority. The hon. gentleman has already suspended twenty or thirty minutes of the valuable time of this House. And Your Honour has given a ruling, he either complies with it or he knows what else he can do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To that point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile

MR. NEARY: I intend to comply with Your Honour's ruling but I want to know what the authority is so that we can check it. Because if we are going to set a precedent in this House, Your Honour, which has never happened before -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Under that Standing Order - it is Standing Order 82.

MR. NEARY: Standing Order 82. Well, we will take a look at it and see what it says.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask the Clerk to now count the Division, please.

MR. STIRLING: To that point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of order, the hon.
Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, we accept the ruling of the Chair. What we are looking for is some direction for the future, because when my colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) brought it up, and I would like to make reference - and you do not have to refer to it now, I hope you would give us some indication later on. Page 74 -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
On a point of privilege, the hon.

House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: And it very much involves the privilege of the House, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour has given a ruling in this House, Your Honour has called for the Division of the House in accordance with the ruling. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to Beauchesne, page 39, which says, "Speaker's rulings, once given, belong to the House which, under Standing Order 12, must accept them without appeal or debate."

PREMIER PECKFORD: Exactly, and they are debating.

MR. MARSHALL: "They become precedents and form part of the rules of procedure."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: What the hon. gentlemen are doing,

MR. MARSHALL: What they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is contravening the privileges of this House by debating the ruling of Your Honour. Now, if they want clarification or anything, all they have to do - they get up from time to time with points of order without referring to the book. It is there for them to see. Your Honour has given his ruling and it is a matter of the privilege of this House, Mr. Speaker, that Your Honour's ruling be executed and carried out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): To that point of order, the hon. House Leader for the Opposition.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege -

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege.

MR. HODDER: - I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a privilege of this House when we consider that a motion was put to adjourn and it was voted on, Mr. Speaker. And all the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was doing, with Your Honour's concurrence, he had risen in his place and asked Your Honour what the precedent was for this because, Mr. Speaker, any time that a motion of this sort is put in the future, then we would like to know just exactly what Your Honour or the House is basing its decision on.

MR. MORGAN: The rules, the rules (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I looked at section 82. Section 82 has nothing to cover the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To the point of privilege there is no point of privilege. I have already asked the Clerk if she would count the numbers in the House on division.

Is it agreed to call it six o'clock so we can get the division count.

MR. NEARY: No, no counting because I move that Your Honour's ruling be appealed.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): The ruling of the Chair has been appealed.

MR. NEARY: And besides we have to adjourn now anyway, automatically, Mr. Speaker, because it is six o'clock and Your Honour has to leave the Chair at six o'clock.

AN HON. MEMBER: Stop the clock.

MR. NEARY: Now, we are not going to make another new rule.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Stop the clock.

MR. NEARY: We are not stopping the clock, no. No, we are not stopping the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not agreed to stop the clock?

MR. NEARY: No, no way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. FLIGHT: It has to be unanimous.

MR. NEARY: It has to be unanimous and Your Honour has no choice but to leave the Chair. We are not making new rules in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, this Chair stands recessed for another minute.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, you have to leave the Chair at six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands recessed for about two minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down and let the Speaker operate the House.

MR. NEARY: The Speaker has no choice, the rules operate the House not an individual.

RECESS:

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The situation,

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): as I understand it, is that the ruling of the Chair has been appealed. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? Those in favour 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling has been sustained.

There was a Division vote?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: There was a Division vote called?

MR. NEARY: It is six o'clock, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: There was the Division vote called?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: When a Division is in progress

the House does not carry on as the hon. member suggested.

Those members -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Well, just a second, there is a Division vote now and I am about to call a Division vote. We will do that first.

MR. NEARY: A point of privilege supersedes anything else, Mr. Speaker. That is my understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not believe a Division can be superseded by a point of privilege. If the hon. member wishes to -

MR. NEARY: It supersedes everything in the House, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: No, it does not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member is asked to take his seat. We will now have a Division vote.

Those in favour of the motion

please stand.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to take his seat for the last time.

MR. NEARY: What are we doing, making new rules in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion please rise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The motion was to adjourn.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) that the Speaker's ruling has been upheld?

MR. SPEAKER: No, no, that is carried. This is the motion to adjourn, right?

MR. NEARY: No, no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a Division vote on the motion to adjourn. Those in favour of the motion please rise, that we adjourn.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not hearing a point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: We are having a standing vote.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a standing vote on the motion to adjourn, your motion to adjourn.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the member made a mockery of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: What are we voting on now?

MR. SPEAKER: I am telling the members of the House that we are having a standing vote on the motion by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) which was to adjourn at twenty minutes to six or quarter to six.

MR. NEARY: Well, what about this -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms): Well, your motion now to adjourn is now before the House. I am asking for a standing vote.

DIVISION

Those in favour of the motion to adjourn please rise. I ask the Clerk to count the House.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
- Mr. G. Flight; Mr. J. Hodder;

Mr. D. Hollett; Mr. B. Tulk; Mr. S. Neary -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! We are on Division.

- Mr. D. Hancock; Mr. E. Hiscock;

Mr. W. Callan -

MR. NEARY: They are supporting my motion.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, that shows you how confused they are. The hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford);

the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
- the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall); the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) -

MR. NEARY: If this is allowed to continue, there will be no order in this House.

- the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge); the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House) -

MR. STIRLING: Completely disregarded.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: - Mr. C. Brett; Mr. J. Butt -
The President of the Council -
MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Would the hon.
member for LaPoile please be quiet -

MR. SPEAKER: - Mr. C. Brett; Mr. J. Butt -
- so we can hear the Chair. We
cannot hear the lady call the names.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. J. Carter -
It is after six anyway so it is
a new House in session.

MR. SPEAKER: - Dr. H. Twomey -
It will be when we adjourn, too.

MR. NEARY: A new house in session.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. N. Doyle; Mr. R. Aylward -
-(Inaudible) to meet at eight o'clock tonight.
- Dr. P. McNicholas.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk please give me
the count, please.

The results are twenty-five in
favour of the motion to adjourn, none against.

This House stands adjourned until
tomorrow at three of the clock.