

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

Since this is the first opportunity, I think, on behalf of hon. members I would like at this time to offer congratulations to the hon. Minister of Justice, Mr. Ottenheimer, who has recently been elected as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the entire Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

This of course is an organization which represents the parliaments and legislatures of the forty-five countries of the Commonwealth and indeed is a tremendous honour for our Province. And it is interesting to note as well that Mr. Ottenheimer is the first Newfoundlander to have been elected to the position of Chairman of the Executive Committee, and I believe only the second Canadian ever.

We are all aware of his interest in CPA and we know that he will do his utmost to continue to foster parliamentary institutions throughout the Commonwealth and to continue to work towards the goal of greater understanding amongst parliamentarians from all walks of life and from all over the world. I know hon. members would like to join me in wishing him every success in his term of office.

Secondly, hon. members will hopefully find placed before them a number of thank-you letters received from a number of people who attended the twenty-first regional conference which this Province had the pleasure of hosting back in August, and as it is the Speaker's responsibility to pass along all communications to members I thought the easiest way would be to do it this way rather than to take the time of the House to read them all. But I would ask members to refer to them and read them because there are many complimentary remarks made, especially as it pertains to the

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):                   hospitality of the people of our Province and the members of this Legislature who were the hosts.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER:                           The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:                         Mr. Speaker, I wish, if I may be heard, to make a brief announcement to the House, that the Province has today completed a \$100 million U.S. bond issue. The issue, which has a term of ten years and carries an interest of 15 per cent coupon, has been priced at 99.5 so that there was a yield of 15.10 per cent.

The issue has been well received and represents the near completion of this year's borrowing requirement. The issue is managed by Merrill Lynch, White, Weld Capital Markets Group, Goldman, Sachs & Company, Dominion Securities, and McLeod Young Weir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:                   Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:                         The hon. member for the Straits of Bell Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:                         Mr. Speaker, the minister's announcement obviously requires no comment, because it is hardly contentious. I wonder though if the minister could indicate to us - I believe I am in order in asking a question in response to a ministerial statement - how much of our borrowing authority, how much of the borrowing authority which the government has taken onto itself with

MR. ROBERTS: the consent of the House has now been met on a long-term basis? Or I guess another way to put the question would be how much are we now into the banks for on a short-term basis because, of course, I would assume that almost all of the capital account monies has been spent or committed for work programmes carried on this year. We have borrowed one hundred and some-odd millions -there was at least one earlier. How much is now outstanding? How much is being financed and at what interest rate?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we went very briefly into our bank lines earlier in the year but after we floated an issue in Europe we were out of our bank lines again and we have no short-term debt with the banks except on the sort of usual day-by-day basis.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further statements?

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) arising out of a television programme he did recently in which he estimated that he is somewhere in the hole, \$40 to \$50 million this year caused by an increase in expenditures and a lowering of revenues. Would the minister now confirm to the House that in fact that is the case and what action he has taken to correct this situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Dr. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I might just say at the beginning that I am expecting, possibly next week, to make a statement to the House which will clarify this whole area, so I do not really feel that this is the time to go into things in any great detail. I would say though

DR. COLLINS:                   that I do not believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition is correct if he said that I made a statement we are \$40 or \$50 million in the hole. I think I did state that we had a requirement to review our budgetary position because of what is happening to the national economy and the Newfoundland economy as part of the national economy, but also recognizing that we do have particular circumstances here we have to take cognizance of.       That, plus the fact that there were certain unexpected expenditures that could not be anticipated in the budget. For instance, the level of collective bargaining settlements, those could not be anticipated when the budget was brought down. They were a bit higher than we had anticipated at that time, so there were

DR. COLLINS: certain unexpected expenditures at that time. But I will be making, hopefully next week, a statement when our review is totally completed as it is now nearly completed.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the impression that the minister gives is that he is going to wait until the federal budget comes down so that he can go back to their favourite stance of blaming everything on Ottawa and it is all the federal government and the economy. The Premier recently has said that retail sales tax is down. Is it not true, I ask the minister, is it not true that in fact he has sent a letter, or a letter has been sent to the department heads telling them now specifically how much money they have to cut? Or, in the words used by one deputy minister, what sacrifices they have to make. In fact, is it not true that that has been already forwarded and each deputy minister has received an envelope as to what it is that he has to do to bring his expenditures in line?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate that I will make a statement next week. There is not much point in bringing in dribs and drabs when the whole picture can be presented to the House in a logical fashion, and the total picture will be made available at that time.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: That answer is an insult to this House, Mr. Speaker. It is not uncommon for the Minister of Finance to insult people as he has just insulted the lab and X-ray workers, and we will get used to being insulted but we

MR. STIRLING: will not accept the insult.

Does the fact that the minister has now taken the action and has written each department specifically and told the departments what it is that they have to cut back, does that have anything to do with the fact that welfare offices all over this Province have now taken a sudden stringent crackdown position and that widows and children are being cut back in their requirements?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate almost to say a word. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is so thin-skinned he is insulted by anything anyone says, apparently. His question, I think, should be more properly directed to my colleague, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey).

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think it is shameful that the minister on opening day when the House reconvenes is not in a position to give a statement of the finances of this Province. They have had ample time to do it and instead we are here today with more or less routine legislation. Now, the minister should have come in with a statement, Mr. Speaker, to allay any fears that the public service may have that there is going to be a cutback or layoffs of people in the public service. The minister has hinted at that, the Premier has been hinting at it, and I think, Mr. Speaker, today, this very day, that instead of

MR. NEARY:

waiting for the federal budget to come down so they can blame things on Ottawa -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. member should ask a question now.

MR. NEARY:

- that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should today make a statement to this House whether or not there are going to be any layoffs in the public service? That is the least, Mr. Speaker, we can expect.

MR. ROBERTS:

What they should do is lay off half the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY:

That is the least we can expect from the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge I have not at any point in time said there would be any layoffs in the public service. I certainly did not hear the Premier say it, but I am sure the Premier is more than able to speak for himself. If anyone has brought up the question there might be layoffs, it is the hon. member opposite. So if he wants to spread rumours, there is nothing I can do about that.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Let me ask the hon. gentleman now a direct question. Will there be any layoffs as a result of this restraint that they are now embarking on, the retrenchment and cutbacks? What services are going to be cut and will there be layoffs in the public service?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I expect the hon. member will be waiting with bated breath for my statement

DR. COLLINS: of next week when I will answer whatever questions need to be answered.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie). Could the minister confirm that his department has been advised by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that his department is requested to charge an extra 5 per cent on all goods that will be sold in the stores operated by his department in Northern Labrador to get money back for the Treasury?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague the Minister of Finance has just pointed out that he will be making a detailed statement next week in relation to the financial position of this Province. As it relates to prices of goods in the five depots operated on the North Coast of Labrador by the Northern Development Division, some prices increase, some prices decrease.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Windsor) - I am having a hard time identifying the Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FLIGHT: I would like to ask the question to the real Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker, looking over everybody's shoulder. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, the question is with regard to the Baie Verte Peninsula situation with the forecasted closing of the Advocate Mines. Now Advocate in the last weeks, as the minister knows, have acted in a way that people would perceive as slowly moving towards bankruptcy,

MR. FLIGHT:           there has been called a meeting of the creditors and what have you. A lot of people who understand the operation are concerned that the present mining operation going on right now in Advocate is not conducive, in the event that the minister or somebody or we can put together a group of people to make that a viable operation

MR. FLIGHT: after, in the event Advocate pulls out. Can the minister confirm to the House that he approves of what is happening in Baie Verte in the mining, the fact that they are high-grading, not taking out any waste? Is that conducive to re-opening that mine in the event that it closes? Does the minister approve of what is happening in Baie Verte with regards to the mining itself?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, first of all I think we should address the question of the definition of the term high-grading in that the hon. gentleman says that the mine at Baie Verte is high-grading. That is not entirely true. What has happened is that a waste removal programme has been terminated or suspended temporarily. We agreed to that, Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that the mine could open, at least for a three month period, to give us the opportunity to pursue all the alternatives that are available to government and to the industry to either keep that mine operating or otherwise to find an operator that was prepared to move in and to operate that mine on a long-term basis.

My engineers in the mines division have assured us that obviously any operating which does not include that waste removal programme has some impact on the mine but that over a three month period it certainly will not have any long-term detrimental effects to the mine.

I might also point out to the hon. member that what that does in effect is provide a better cash flow situation to the mine and that the people who will benefit primarily will be the local creditors, who, obviously, if the mine does close at the end of this year as is scheduled, then the best cash position that the mine can

MR. WINDSOR: be in will be to their advantage. Considering all these facts, yes, we have approved that operating. The hon. gentleman is about to pop on his feet and ask me will we approve it past the end of the year; I honestly do not know but I certainly doubt that.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the next question I want to ask the minister is again in keeping with what is perceived by the general public, that Advocate is slowly but surely moving towards a bankruptcy position based on their own actions. It has been suggested by a lot of knowledgeable people concerned about keeping that mining operation going down the road, that the government should move to freeze the assets of that company, that the company should not be permitted, if they go into receivership, the receivers should not be permitted to sell the plant and the equipment. Now, would the minister give us the government's position on that? Is he prepared to see that the plant and assets of Advocate are not sold but left in place so that it will be more conducive again for identifying new operators. What is the minister's position on the disposal of the plant and assets?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I think I made it quite clear in my press conference last week that government has every intention of pursuing whatever alternatives are available to us to ensure that that mine continues in operation for a number of years. There is still a fairly significant ore body there available that I think, quite personally, can be worked on economical basis and that if Advocate Mines or

MR. WINDSOR: Johns Mandville are not prepared to do that, as I said last week as well, we are pursuing all other alternatives and we have a number of companies that have expressed an interest in that. I have an assurance from the company that the mine closure will be orderly, if indeed it does take place, that it will be an orderly closure and that no equipment will be removed unnecessarily. Now I qualify that by saying that certain equipment is owned or is leased to that company by other companies and that some of that may be removed by the people who actually own the equipment. But other than that, no, certainly nothing will be removed.

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, as it should be, of course, it appears to me in the past month or so the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has been the spokesman representing government in anything that happens in White Bay and there is nothing wrong with that in my opinion.

But one of his statements, Mr. Speaker - and it is on record as a public statement - was that one of the options, in the event that Advocate Mines pulled out and closed, one of the options was for the Government of Newfoundland to continue to operate that mine. Now I want to ask the minister, was that government policy? Is it indeed an option that the Government of Newfoundland would continue to operate the Baie Verte mine in the event that Advocate closes their operation and pulls out of Baie Verte?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay although - and I thank the hon. gentleman opposite for reminding me that the member for Baie Verte has played a very significant role in government's efforts to resolve this problem -  
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N. WINDSOR: -but I do not think, Mr. Speaker, at any time the hon. member said that government will be taking over the mine. We have said that we will consider all possible options. I have said, and I, say it again this afternoon, that we have a number of companies that have expressed an interest. Whether or not we can persuade them to become involved in Baie Verte - I honestly think we can - but that is going to take some time perhaps and it is not an easy

MR. N. WINDSOR: problem that we are facing here. Perhaps Somewhere down the road government may have to consider the possibility of government stepping in. I would personally think that that would be not desirable. If private enterprise cannot operate that mine effectively, I think it would be very difficult for a government to do so. Nevertheless all options will be considered before we allow that mine to close permanently.

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

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Baie Verte operation, we know that there is a lot of committees working diligently to try to find solutions. We are aware that the federal minister, the member for that area, the MP for that area, is working night and day to find a solution. And there are committees, Mr. Speaker, provincial committees, I understand, and federal committees. I would ask the minister this: is there co-operation between the two committees? Are the efforts to find a solution to the Baie Verte problem a joint effort? Are the provincial government of Newfoundland and the federal government at Ottawa co-operating in an effort to find a solution or are the committees working independently of each other? Would the minister tell us what the situation is re: the federal/provincial?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of dialogue back and forth between the province and the federal government on this matter. The federal government, as the hon. gentlemen opposite knows, has a number of programmes which have been utilized in other parts of Canada to bail out, so to speak, if I can use that term-

MR. N. WINDSOR: nology, industries that have had particular problems, particularly when it has the kind of a social impact that a closure of the mines in Baie Verte would have. And so there are programmes that we have asked Mr. Rompkey and other people in the federal government to identify for us and to tell us just what might be available if we needed that kind of financial assistance.

We have committees in place here, provincially, that are looking at the mine operations. A number of provincial officials from the various departments of government, from the Department of Mines, from the Department of Development, from the Department of Finance are looking at the various options available to us.

MR. WINDSOR: As well, we have put in place a task force, I might add, again with the full co-operation, and in fact, spearheaded by my hon colleague from Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout), a task force of local people to identify, if we must have to, if in the case that the mine does close, Mr. Speaker, to identify possible alternative industries to support the economy of the Baie Verte Peninsula. I might add that we are meeting at Baie Verte with them on Monday night next week, to talk to these people and to begin the process of indentifying alternative industries.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further question for the Minister of Mines, if in fact - the hon. gentleman does hold the portfolio, I understand, anyway, the gentleman from Mount Pearl, and it is really a very basic question. But in all the talk there has been about the Advocate Mines threatened close-down, or whatever actual close-down is about to happen, if in fact that is the case, there is one question that has not been addressed; can the minister tell us why Advocate Mines Limited are closing down?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of factors here. I guess the prime factor is one of sheer finances of the company, that they find themselves in a financial difficulty, and it is basically a cash-flow situation. There are a number of reasons for that. Number one, is a severe weakness in the market for asbestos, particularly in Europe, because of decisions and regulations that have been put in place by the German government which has impacted on the whole European asbestos market.

Secondly, of course, as a result of the weak markets, obviously inventories build up,

MR. WINDSOR: and with the high interest rate in Canada today, the cost of that is extremely difficult to bear by any company. It is not only asbestos companies, Mr. Speaker, but a number of - well, every industry, I guess, is being hurt by the high cost of money today in Canada.

MR. POWER:

And Liberal policies.

MR. ROBERTS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the

member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, if

I might. I thank the hon. gentleman. If I hear him correctly it is a matter of cash flow and not one of profitability. Can the minister tell us whether there have been any unusual cash flows out of that company in the last - I was not sure whether there was someone interrupting or not - whether there have been any unusual cash flows out of the company? And perhaps if I might put a second one in at the same time, Mr. Speaker - it is the same question another way around could the minister tell us whether all that is needed to keep the company open is an injection of additional cash, or, if you wish, an additional injection of cash?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is

fair to say any company that is having financial problems, and if somebody were to give them a gift of X number of millions of dollars, obviously that will keep a company going as long as those millions of dollars are available. There is indeed a cash flow problem, but there are other problems. Part of the cash flow problem, and I tried to give the hon. gentleman a very distinct answer to his first question, his original question, there are other problems besides the ones that I spoke about which are the prime problems.

MR. WINDSOR: Obviously the cost of the waste removal programme the hon. gentleman from Buchans (Mr. Flight) referred to earlier is a factor which reflects on the viability of that operation.

MR. WINDSOR: So I suppose the answer to his question is yes, a large infusion of funds would keep the operation going. The question, Mr. Speaker, that any government, whether it is federal or provincial, has to address itself to is, Is that in the best interest of the taxpayers of the country to put that kind of money behind an industry? Is that industry a net contributor to the economy or is it a net drain? I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the operation at Baie Verte can be a viable operation if there is the will on the part of the company to do so and if the funds can be found to put into that operation to make it a viable operation. There needs to be a restructuring of the finance of the company, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have done the minister the compliment of assuming a) he knows what he is talking about and b) that he is prepared to treat the matter seriously, which I think is the least he owes to the people of Baie Verte. Now, if he wants to try smart aleck answers he will get better than he can give, but I would suggest to him that the matter is much too serious and I would suggest to him he approach it in his usual dull, plodding, thorough and sometimes accurate fashion. He has told us now that in his opinion - which I value, unlike that of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) which I do not value - in the opinion of the minister, the operation is economically viable if a large amount of cash is to be injected. I think these were his words; if not his words, I hope they were his thoughts and I hope I reproduce them accurately. Could he tell us, please, what order of cash is needed? Are we talking \$1 million or are we talking \$100 millions, just to take two numbers? What order of cash is needed?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very difficult for me to give a definitive answer primarily because the company has not been definitive in answering my question to them. I have asked them many times for a proposal, a definitive proposal, 'Exactly what do you want? Will you put a proposal to us?' And I admit the federal government has asked the same question. There was a proposal put to them last week which, in my opinion, was not a proposal, it offered really nothing; it was a one page summary of a bunch of figures that really said nothing and really asked for a lot of money, I think, without really explaining why that money was needed and how it would impact on the economy of the mine. I do not know that I can answer the question either way.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I think the minister is now approaching it in the spirit I hoped he would and I appreciate that. Can he tell us really whether the company, Advocate Mines Limited, which I gather is managed by Johns-Mandsville, if I understand it correctly, whether that company really wants to keep going at Baie Verte or not, because is that not the nub of the operation? They have said they are closing down. They have put in a proposal which the minister appeared to indicate, and I believe is to be the case from what I know from the press and generally, you know, had almost to be dragged out of them - they were weeks late getting it in; and the minister indicated the proposal appears to be derisory, that it was not a serious proposal, if I understood him correctly. Could he indicate to us whether that company

MR. ROBERTS:

really wants to keep going or not, because that surely should determine the public policy?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I think I was quite clear in my press conference last week on that particular point, that it is my opinion that Johns-Mandsville does not wish to continue operating a mine at Baie Verte. In fact it would appear to me that just the opposite is true, that they have every intention of closing that operation. And that was why government has taken the position and why I said last week that we are pursuing very actively other companies that might move in there, into Baie Verte. And that I sent a telex to Johns-Mandsville and asked them very distinctly 'under what terms and conditions will you withdraw from the operation on Baie Verte? Under what terms can another company move in and take your place?' And that is the main thrust of government's effort at this point in time.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am really shocked to hear the hon. gentleman say that they sent a telex to Johns-Mandsville to ask them under what terms and conditions they would withdraw in favour of another company. I think this government should take the bull by the horns, and I am asking the minister now, have they taken steps to freeze all the assets of these two mining companies in Baie Verte?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And if they have not taken steps to freeze the assets of these companies, why have they not

MR. NEARY: taken steps to not allow these companies to dismantle any of the equipment, sell any of the equipment, not allow them to take as much as a stick of pencil out of Baie Verte? Because if a new company is going to come in it will be very difficult for them to come in if they have to start from scratch. Why has the hon. member not moved quickly to freeze all the assets of these two mining companies in Baie Verte?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman had read his newspapers, as he intends to indicate that he does, he would know that there is a temporary holding pattern put in place, that there has been a trustee appointed and that all of the assets are effectively controlled by the trustee.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: To the minister again, Mr. Speaker. He indicated a minute ago that he put great store in the advice given him by his engineers with regards to the type of mining that is going on in Baie Verte now. I must ask the minister if it surprised him that his engineers and his high priced advisors in the department did not have twenty-four hours notice as to what was happening in Baie Verte? What are we paying the Department of Mines and Energy mining division for-to monitor the market, to see what is happening in the mine itself? Yet this government and the minister were caught flat-footed with a twenty-four hour notice. Would the minister indicate his feelings on that and why it is that his people, whom he seems now to put great store in, had no idea what was happening in that mining industry?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of confidence in the engineers of the Departments of Mines and Energy and the information that they are making available to us is the information that is available and on a very timely basis. The fact of the matter is that the closure had nothing to do with the mining operation, it was one of financing. The decision was made not in Newfoundland but by the banks and the managers in Toronto.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to come back to my previous question and ask the hon. gentleman what steps the government have taken to see to it that in the event that both of these mines close at the end of November or at the end of the year, whenever they close, what steps the government have taken to see that the equipment down there will not be cannibalized, that the

MR. NEARY: scavengers will not go in and grab the assets of these two companies and sell it off and leave nothing behind except a couple of stockpiles and a few holes in the ground for the people of Baie Verte ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many ways I can tell the hon. gentleman. Let me simply assure him that I have talked to the board of directors of both companies, he referred in this particular question to the Rambler operation as well, I have talked to both boards of directors who have assured me that that is not the case and it is not their intention, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that we will take every step necessary to prohibit that, if indeed it ever did appear to us that that was the case. But there is certainly no indication at this point in time that that is the case. Advocate Mines have indicated that if somebody else was prepared to come in and to operate the mine they would be only too happy to allow them to do that.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, again it does not matter whether it is a supplementary or a new question but it is to the Minister of Mines with reference to Advocate- I am not onto Rambler at this stage. He told us in one hand that the board of directors had assured him they would protect the assets of the company. He told us a moment or two before that that a trustee had been appointed. Now that is a trustee, I would assume, under the Bankruptcy Act. Is the minister aware of the difference between the two and if so could he reconcile the two statements, because they are not reconcilable? If the trustee is appointed the trustee is in control of the assets, not the board of

MR. ROBERTS: directors.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: And does the trustee then - has the minister had any communication with the trustee as to what will happen to those assets? And while he is at it the minister might as well address, does the trustee have a duty to the creditors as opposed to anybody else to satisfy their claims and not the claims of the government, unless the government happens to be a creditor?

MR. NEARY: Right on. Right on.

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, yes, let me answer the last part first. The government is indeed a creditor and a very substantial one and that there are taxes owing to the Province by the company. I did not say that there was a trustee appointed as such. There is a temporary holding pattern - the hon. gentleman may be more familiar with the terminology than I am - there is a temporary holding pattern which is a voluntary move on behalf of the creditors that will allow the company to continue operating. It puts a hold on any liabilities by the company -

MR. ROBERTS: There is a proposal?

MR. WINDSOR: Yes. There is a proposal -

MR. ROBERTS: It is being voted on tomorrow, is it?

MR. WINDSOR: I beg your pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: Is it being voted on tomorrow or today?

MR. WINDSOR: On the 24th. of November the creditors will be meeting to deal with this proposal.

So it is a temporary proposal, a proposal which proposes to put a temporary freeze on the assets to the end of the year so that the company can continue to operate without the threat that a creditor will move in at any point in time and close him down. So it allows a level of security.

MR. WINDSOR: It is in the best interests of the creditors, Mr. Speaker, because at the end of December the company will be in the best cash position to satisfy the amounts owing to the various creditors and I assume the creditors will therefore agree with that.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the minister know what happens if they do not?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): We have time for one final question.

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact that the government said publicly over a month ago that its position in relation to the Lake Group Limited would be made public by the end of October, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), one, how many proposals they have received, from whom they were received, and

MR. HOLLETT: when can the people of the Province expect the Province's position to be made public regarding this very serious matter? Speaking of creditors, there are thousands related to that company and thousands of workers and everything else and I think it is very important.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): We have about thirty seconds to conclude.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, unless I have leave from the House--there is not much point of me starting to answer the question unless I have leave to answer the question in proper form.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I will have to determine that when Question Period has concluded and if there is leave--

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the question is an important question and I would like to answer it in some detail to the hon. gentleman who asked the question.

The Lake Group company did submit to us some months ago a proposal and we discussed that proposal at some great length with the bankers involved with the company, the company officials and the new management people involved, who took over the operations from the Lake family, and a decision was made and passed to the Lake company. Shortly after that, approximately two or three weeks, the company arranged meetings between the senior officials of the Department of Finance, the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Development - Mr. Speaker, I see my time is up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has been granted.

MR. MORGAN: - and Mr. Speaker, these meetings also, again involved the bankers who are the financiers, in this case the Bank of Nova Scotia, of the Lake Group.

MR. MORGAN: The company announced the plan of operation which was their plan, which they arranged in consultation with the bankers, which was, in this case, to close the Grand Bank branch and to merge the operations with the Fortune plant because the Fortune plant was losing substantial amounts of money because of the lack of an adequate supply of fish going to the plant at Fortune. They also indicated that they would be considering what they would do with the Gaultois plant. They have yet to announce their plan on the Gaultois plant. Approximately five weeks ago the Lake Group, Mr. E. Burn and officials of the company, in conjunction with the President and the owners of the Nickerson empire in the fishing industry, and officials of National Sea and senior officials of the Bank of Nova Scotia, asked for a meeting with the Premier, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and myself, and they put forward to us at that time, in a general way, a proposal for a merger whereby the Lakes were to merge with Nickersons and they would use National Sea also, involved in a management capacity. That proposal was in a general way and since that time the Premier has assigned -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious question on the Burin Peninsula, could I answer it without these interruptions?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as a result of that proposal, because it was put forward to

MR. MORGAN:

government in a very general way, there were no details in the proposal that would enable government to be able to make a decision on such a major proposal which could have ramifications in the fishing industry, in the processing sector in particular. So it is important for government to gather all information, all detailed information with regard to this proposal of a merger of these three large companies. So the Premier and the Cabinet appointed a committee or a Task Force of senior government officials involving the Deputy Minister of Development, my own Deputy Minister of Fisheries and senior officials in the Department of Finance. That committee has been meeting on a regular basis, almost every day for the last three weeks, with the three companies concerned in separate meetings, the three companies combined in meetings and also with the bankers concerned for all three companies. As of last week the Task Force had gathered sufficient information, sufficient detailed information, to be able to submit the information to the three ministers responsible and we, in turn, are now submitting the information to the government, to the Cabinet, to enable the Cabinet to make a decision. As I say, it is a very important decision because there are some significant and substantial requests being made in the proposal to government. And because of that significant - or substantial, I would use, request, and because of the possible ramifications in the processing sector of the fishing industry, looking at the fact they are merging to form one Newfoundland fish company, one company, these three large companies, it is important for us to have all the details, have all the information, so that we can carefully analyse and assess to enable us to make a decision. And the situation now is that government is now in the process of analysing that information gathered

MR. MORGAN: by the Task Force of officials and we are hoping to be in a position to make a decision, a final decision on such a major proposal of this nature by next week.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, there is a second proposal come forward from the Lake group, separate altogether from the proposal of merger. So this means that government is now - we have to analyse the two proposals, one that came in in recent days from the Lake group, Mr. E. Burn the new manager, and in conjunction, I understand, with their bankers. So government has to, as I say, make a decision with regard to number one, the proposal of merger which is the first one submitted to us, which is a major decision to make. That decision will be made now because we have gathered all information and all facts and all details. We will also deal with a decision on the proposal from the Lake group. So, Mr. Speaker, to close my answer to the question, thanks for the consideration of giving the time to answer the question. It is a very important question because the Lake group owns a number of plants around the Province. It is of importance to a number of communities, it is of importance to the whole fishing industry in the Province, in fact. So I

MR. MORGAN: thank the House for giving me time to answer the question now and I can assure the House and the hon. member who asked the question that, in my opinion now, as minister, it is a maximum of a week to ten days that a decision will be made on the proposal of a merger of the three companies concerned.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Between The Government And the Government Of Canada Respecting Reciprocal Taxation Of These Governments And Their Agencies." I also give notice I will ask leave on tomorrow to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Government Re-organization General And Miscellaneous Provisions Act." I also give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Finance Act."

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act."

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act." And also a bill, "An Act To Amend The St. John's Assessment Act."

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act."

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce bills entitled, "An -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - Act To Amend The Insurance Company Act." "An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act." "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law." "An Act To Convey Certain Trusts And Properties In The Province To The Montreal Trust Company Of Canada." "An Act To Amend The Summary Proceedings Act". Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Provincial Parks Act".

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Education Teacher Training Act".

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I

MR. HOUSE: will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce bills entitled, "An Act To Amend The Grand Falls Hospital Management Act, 1961", and "An Act To Amend St. Clare's Mercy Hospital Incorporation Act, 1960".

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will no tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An ACT To Establish The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Of Newfoundland And Labrador".

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Further notices? The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce two bills, "An Act To Amend The Status Of Women Advisory Council Act" and "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973".

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any futher notices?

o o o

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member  
for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned  
there were about sixty or seventy questions on the Order  
Paper unanswered. Could the hon. the Premier tell the  
House - or the House Leader - when we will get answers to  
these written questions that appeared on the Order Paper?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

That is more in the form of a question,  
not a point of order, the hon. member well knows, I am sure.  
We have had many precedents in the past that have enabled  
me to be able to make the ruling that that is not a point  
of order.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a  
petition on behalf of sixty parents in the community of  
Cape Charles, Lodge Bay. It is concerning petitions to  
the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) requesting that an  
extra teacher be put back into that school. This is a  
community that had forty-one students last year and under  
a study that was commissioned by this government, Professor  
Riggs recommended that one room schools or smaller schools  
would get extra teachers because they had a large teaching  
load, up to Grade IX and sometimes four and five classrooms  
in one school, one classroom also, and sometimes two teachers  
in the same classroom.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Lodge Bay, this year, only has thirty-eight students. And they have lost a teacher, even though they still have thirty-eight students, and now they have only two teachers compared to last year with forty-one students.

Up to last year the Department of Education would give these teachers to the schools itself. If I am correct, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has now taken away that responsibility from these smaller schools and given the number of teachers to the school boards and allowed the school boards to do whatever they want with them. And in most cases the school boards, because they need new teaching units, have taken these extra teachers and put them in as guidance counselling, put them in as music teachers and put them in as arts specialists which, of course, is also needed in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

But I am a little bit concerned with Cape Charles and with Pinsent's Arm and with Norman Bay and Charlottetown and other areas of our Province in that what is the sense of introducing Grade XII into this Province, Mr. Speaker, when we are not providing our smaller schools with the opportunity to have the right to education? And I ask the Minister of Education to make sure that schools like Cape Charles do get their extra teacher. The Denominational Education Integrated School Committee brought up a report which said that Newfoundland and Labrador had a 30 per cent drop-out rate. I would like to point out that in the community of Cape Charles it is probably as high as a 85 per cent drop-out rate; in Pinsent's Arm it is 100 per cent drop-out rate; in Norman Bay it is 100 per cent drop-out rate. And I can go on all through my district and other rural areas.

Nov. 12, 1981

Tape No. 3374

DW - 3

MR. E. HISCOCK: And one of the reasons why this is so, Mr. Speaker, is because we do not have the teachers in these schools. We expect one teacher to teach up to five or six grades.

MR. HISCOCK: We expect, also, those students to have the same rights by not having any libraries, any science equipment. In actual fact what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, in our Province now, we are bringing Grade XII as a great step forward, and here we are putting our smaller communities, rural communities in Newfoundland and Labrador back into the Dark Ages. We are having two classes of citizens, two classes of students in this Province and that is, basically, the ones who live in the larger urban areas and the ones who live in smaller areas are not getting the same rights. I ask the Premier and the Cabinet, and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), to make sure that they reintroduce that the teachers go to the school not to the school boards. Because the school boards are under pressure of wanting specialists in music.

The Department of Education should also give so many teaching units to the boards for librarians, for counsellors, for music teachers, and for various other specialists. As it is happening now, the school boards are taking these teaching units away and are delegating two classes of citizens, students in this Province.

And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, this House and this Province, what is going to happen to these thirty-eight students? What is their opportunity for coming into university, trade schools or Fisheries College? I would say, Mr. Speaker, there is no opportunity. I would also say, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this government, as far as I am concerned, and the people on the Labrador coast, the government do not care about the rights of education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh. oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: They are concerned about Grade XII, but they are not concerned about the content and the foundation of establishment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the petition. As I understand it, the prayer of the petition calls for an extra teacher for the school at Cape Charles. My understanding, from visiting the area of Cape Charles and Lodge Bay, as well as other communities in the member for Eagle River's (Mr. Hiscock) district last Fall, is that the school at Cape Charles is operated only for a small part of the school year, namely, September -

MR. HISCOCK:

(Inaudible) Lodge Bay, you do not know what you are talking about.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MS. VERGE:

- and then the families and students return to the main community of Lodge Bay for the duration of the school year. I will look into that particular situation, but I have to comment on the general statements of the member in calling for some change in the method of allocating teachers to schools.

The present allocation arrangement, which I should point out, Mr. Speaker, is much more generous now than it ever has been in the past, and provides for the lowest actual pupil/teacher ratio ever in our history, with the promise of further significant improvements over the next two years, does allocate a block number of salary units for teaching positions to each of the thirty-five school districts in the Province, in this particular case to the Vinland Integrated School Board based in St. Anthony, and serving the communities of Cape Charles and Lodge Bay. The allocation formula does give each school district extra teaching units in respect of small schools such as the one at Lodge Bay/Cape Charles.



MS. VERGE:

authority and comprising members who are elected as well as being appointed by the churches under the present arrangement, have the discretion of deploying teachers throughout its district. And, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this is a sound system, the local school board being a better judge of the needs of its students and families than a central authority at Confederation Building.

MR. GOUDIE: Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition. And it is a cry from people all over rural Newfoundland, a cry from people in small areas like the area of Cape Charles/Lodge Bay, people who are doing, in their area, what it is that they feel they should be doing for them and their children and their future. And we talk about equality: We have heard a great deal from the other side about being equal Canadians. Well, how about being equal Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: How about equal Newfoundlanders and Labradorians ?

MR. ROBERTS: New schools for all.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, these people expect this House of Assembly to be concerned about a child in Cape Charles/Lodge Bay, just as concerned as about a child in St. John's East. Well, Mr. Speaker, they are not paying any attention. What people are finding all over this Province is that a formula comes up and whether it applies to moose licences or Crown Land, or in this case the number of teachers in a school, it is some formula. The regulation is killing the system. And there is no heart, Mr. Speaker, no heart left in the system,

MR. STIRLING:                                nowhere to make special exceptions, nowhere to be careful about what is happening to children in remote areas. And this is what my colleague is bringing up, a plea, Mr. Speaker, that we get away from just a pure statistical computer print-out that says, 'Now you have dropped from forty-one students down to thirty-eight students and, therefore, the school board is forced to have to take that teacher away.' That is the kind of attitude this government seems to have, Mr. Speaker, that they put in organizations like school boards or municipal councils and then they stand away and say, Well, it is not our fault, we have no responsibility. But I think what my colleague is saying is that you have to look beyond the regulations to the children, the children who we are supposed to be looking after in this Province, the children who we are going to give a great opportunity to. And they do not have an opportunity when they do not have adequate teaching staff. And that is the plea of the petition, Mr. Speaker, that this government have some heart and look beyond the regulations and give people an opportunity to make a living in the part of this Province that they want to live in and give their children the same opportunities that they have in urban Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS:                                Well said.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):                        Any further petitions?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Orders of the day. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Yes I have an Order 23, Mr. Speaker, and it is based on the Standing Order 23. Mr. Speaker, I move an adjournment of this House for the purpose of discussing the current state of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy including the fishery, the mining industry, the construction industry, labour and management relations and other related economic issues which are matters of urgent public importance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: I have to include as documentation of the urgency, and it can only be dealt with in this manner, Mr. Speaker, a letter which I have received from the Premier of the Province which indicates that he intends only to deal with legislation in this sitting of the House and does not wish to deal with matters pertaining to the economy.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: Therefore, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: He is not going to call the Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - we have asked as an alternative that the Throne Speech be brought forward and we were told that he does not intend to and therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is the only manner in which this urgent matter can be dealt with. On this side of the House we are concerned about the real issues and we believe that this is an urgent enough matter for the adjournment of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

I would like to speak to the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, a motion of this nature must come within the framework of the rules and I think that this matter is dealt with quite adequately in Beauchesne, where it talks about motions of this nature in the House of Commons order and the corresponding order, Standing Order No. 26, and there are other kindred orders in all Houses, of course. On page 92 of Beauchesne, paragraph 286, it says, "The 'specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration', for the discussion of which the adjournment of the House may be moved must be so pressing that public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that it says it has to be a specific matter, and I would submit, first of all, that the motion by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was one to discuss a matter that is general and broad sweeping and not specific in nature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

The next, Mr. Speaker, paragraph 287, "'Urgency' within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but means 'urgency of debate', when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject

MR. MARSHALL: to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately."

MR. STIRLING: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone in this government or anybody in Newfoundland would disagree that the matter of the economy of this Province is a matter of great concern. As a matter of fact, this government waits with bated breath to see how the federal government today is going to take care of the place tonight in the budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MARSHALL: But, Mr. Speaker, I do not -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) do not really need help from Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to hear the speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: So that there be no misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, we are not saying that matters pertaining to the economy are not important, but they are not matters of the urgency of debate that warrant the postponement of the business of the House. As far as the economic matters of the Province are concerned, they are a continual daily concern to this government but they do not lend themselves, under the framework of this motion, to debate at this time or warrant the postponement of the House for that purpose.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: If I might to the - well, I understand it is a point of order, Mr. Speaker, but if I might, in any event be allowed, as I know Your Honour will, the same opportunity as my learned friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), he really, of course, has made the

MR. ROBERTS: point in favour of the urgency of the debate. And the issue before us, as Your Honour has pointed out many times, is the urgency of debate. It is pettifoggery of my hon. friend to pretend that this request by my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, is not specific. It could not be more specific, Sir, than the words in which the motion is embodied, and which I assume Your Honour has now before you. That is specific, so it is piddling, petty pettifoggery, piddling and not even worthy of the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) to raise that point. The issue is one of urgency of debate, and what we say, Sir, is that this matter is urgent and that it is urgent that it be debated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: It is urgent that it be debated this day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The point which I submit to Your Honour is this, Sir. The House has before it now no business. The government has written to the Leader of the Opposition to say that the government do not propose to call any of the legislation now on the Order Paper. The point is, Sir, unless Your Honour feels that this is urgent, this House will adjourn very shortly because there is no business before it. The government have told us they do not intend to call the bills. If they will call the Throne Speech we will withdraw the motion, no question at all, withdraw the request for leave. But if they do not call the Throne Speech Debate they have no business before this House and this House will have to adjourn in two or three or five minutes when Your Honour disposes of this matter and then wait until tomorrow.

We say, Sir, it is urgent that this House debate this matter. We think the economy is urgent, we think the state of the economy is urgent, we think it ought

MR. ROBERTS: to be debated urgently this day.  
That is why my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has made the request for leave. We submit, Sir, it is clearly within the rules and it ought to be granted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention the authority read by my colleague, the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), and the phraseology there of a specific matter. I would suggest that the matter as submitted by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) refers to a series of matters and a continuing condition, a continuing situation rather than a specific matter. I would also draw Your Honour's attention to our Standing Orders, Standing Order 23 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - on page 8 of our Standing Orders under (f), "The right to move the adjournment of the House for the above purposes is subject to the following restrictions:" and under (f) (2) Your Honour will notice it says, "Not more than one matter -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - "can be discussed on the same motion." I would suggest that the motion submitted by the hon. gentleman opposite indicates a whole number of matters and also that it is not a specific, as Beauchesne defines it is, it is not a specific matter but a general condition which has not arisen yesterday or the day before or today, but a general condition which has permeated the Newfoundland economy and the Canadian economy for the past number of months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And I think Your Honour will see that there are rulings to the effect that it must be a specific matter which has come into existence either now or very, very recently, but not a continuing condition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) -

MR. ROBERTS: He ought to have known better.

MR. HANCOCK: A former speaker. A former speaker.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, who -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - made a very, very weak case in support of his colleague, the President of the Council, who says there should not be not be an emergency debate. What was the case that the hon. gentleman put forward? What he said was that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) in his motion did not mention a specific item. Now, Mr. Speaker, how could you be more specific than to ask the House to suspend the regular order of business to discuss the state, the chaotic state of the Newfoundland economy?

MR. ROBERTS: What more specific than that?

MR. NEARY: Now, how can you be more specific than that, Mr. Speaker? Now, if that is all they have to hang their hat on, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the House adjourns without a debate, then people will be very, very upset with the government.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) piddle.

MR. NEARY: As my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has indicated, the government has told the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) - the Premier has told the Leader of the Opposition, in a letter delivered by hand today, that they have nothing to discuss this very day.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not new, that has been true for years.

MR. NEARY: They have given first reading on legislation, and unless the House by leave agrees to allow second reading today, they have no business on the Order Paper except, Mr. Speaker, they have the Throne Speech, and they have the Loan and Guarantee bill whereby the government gave \$5 million to the Lake group, which they did not want to discuss in the last session of the House.

So we have nothing before us. I realize Your Honour that in itself is irrelevant. The fact of this matter is, is this urgent? That is the question. Well, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that every member of this House will agree that the people on welfare, the people who are unemployed, the people who cannot cope with the high cost of living, the people who cannot find jobs -

MR. HISCOCK: They do not know when their town is going to collapse.

MR. NEARY: - that all the people of this Province will agree that we are in a major depression in this Province.

MR. HISCOCK: Major.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member could perhaps be more helpful if he could give me some authorities or some argument towards the point of order rather than -

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: No. I think the hon. member is entering more into debate on the motion itself, if it is allowed.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the authority has already been quoted to Your Honour. I am just reinforcing the arguments that have been put forward by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) when he spoke in support of the emergency debate.

MR. NEARY: I do not think we have ever had a situation in our whole history, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, when an emergency debate should be held on the economy as we have it at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I hope that Your Honour will allow the debate to go on this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I will hear a final submission from the members to my right on the point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, I think I would like to accept your invitation to my colleague to provide some documentation. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the letter of the Premier, of which I have supplied you with a copy, which indicates that specifically he said, On Thursday there will be only two bills on the Order Paper which were left over from the Spring session. Government does not intend to discuss those on Thursday, that would leave no bills ready for discussion but only ministers giving notice of bills under the rules which would have

MR. STIRLING: to wait for another day and hence the House would close before six o'clock. We then wrote him back, Mr. Speaker, saying that we would agree to waive the normal rules if he would debate these very serious issues. Now as to getting the specific wording, Mr. Speaker, although this is not binding on the Speaker, I have had the wording checked by the Law Clerks, who are here to advise both sides of the House, and I have been assured by the Law Clerks that although it is not binding on Your Honour, that the wording is as specific as is required under section 23.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): A final submission on the point of order by the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) unfortunately, and to his detriment, was not prepared, in reading some of the correspondence that I sent to the Leader of the Opposition the other day, to read it all and that is unfortunate.

I wrote the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. STIRLING: A point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, obviously now he will have to, because now I am taking him up on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I already have a point of order.

MR. STIRLING: A point of privilege. A point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
A point of privilege has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have tabled

MR. STIRLING: with the Speaker an entire and full copy of the letter from the Premier and a full copy of the reply. And it was in the interest of allowing the Speaker to move to making a decision that I did not read the entire copies of it, and I would now be happy to proceed with reading into the record the entire letter since the Premier objected on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I think I have heard enough to determine whether or not there is a prima facie case, which is what the Speaker would have to determine when a point of privilege has been raised. I think I can say without hesitation that the matter that the hon. member is now about to get into and refer to is certainly not one which would create a prima facie case. The letter has already been tabled as well.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the Leader of the Opposition has not taken the opportunity of the Summer to appraise himself of the rules any better than he did last Spring.

What I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, since the Leader of the Opposition brought it up, was that on Tuesday I did two things, number one - and I do not think it has been done very often in the history of this Province or any other Province - I provided to the Opposition a list of the bills, the names of the bills that would be covered on Thursday, today. Number two, I went on to indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that because these bills would be given notice of today, and because we are masters of this House, and masters of the rules of this House, I asked the Leader of the Opposition would he consider that after the first four or five bills were given notice of and were distributed, some of the non-controversial bills,

PREMIER PECKFORD: the ones that were easy to read and to understand, so that we could get on with the business of legislation, that after the Question Period was over and the notices had been given, seeing we are masters of our own rules, we could, if unanimity was given, agree to begin first reading, and second reading, and Committee of the Whole on those bills so that, therefore, we could use the time of the House up to six o'clock. So let us make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we have, on this side of the House, requested of the Opposition unanimity so that we can get on to discuss these bills that have been distributed. If the members of this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and the Opposition want to use the time of this House wisely, they can so do by considering these bills that have been proposed to them. That is the reason why the House was opened, we want to get on, to pass the bills that are ready to be done. It is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) saw fit to only quote certain parts of the letter and not the proposal that I put before them.

On the whole question of an emergency debate, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the whole question of an emergency debate, the whole Province knows, and everybody in this House knows, that the state of the Canadian economy, yea the North American economy, is what is at stake here and not just the Newfoundland economy. Everybody is quite -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: - familiar with that and we rest our case.

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! Order, please!

I thank hon. members for their submissions to the matter before the Chair at the present time. I think I have heard enough submissions to be able to make a decision on this particular matter. I refer hon. members, first of all, in addition to those citations that have been quoted, to page 92, Beauchesne's latest edition, paragraph 292 (1), which says, "The Speaker's duty with regard to a motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 26", which is the same as Standing Order 23 here, "is confined to determining as to whether, in the first instance, a motion so proposed is in order. There his responsibility ends. There is a further question as to the propriety, or desirability of discussing a matter of such grave importance. That is for the House to decide".

Paragraph 287: "'Urgency'" within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): means 'urgency of debate', when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately".

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The other pertinent quotation, and as I refer to the motion which was offered for leave by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), is our own Standing Orders, Standing Order 23(f)(2) which says: "Not more than one matter can be discussed on the same motion". Clearly there are a number of other matters outlined in the motion itself so that particular section there is relevant.

In addition to that, of course, we have had similar precedents in the past where motions have been made under this particular point in the daily routine. Clearly it is the responsibility of the Speaker or the Chair to determine whether or not other opportunities exist to discuss the matters that might be outlined in the motion presented, not whether or not the matters are important. Obviously everybody agrees the matters are important, but in looking at the Order Paper, and that is all the Chair can be guided by at this particular time, the Chair has no idea what orders may be called, there is provision there under the first order, Address in Reply, which is clearly wide-ranging and has been used in the past many times to debate matters of importance by whatever member wishes to speak in the Address in Reply. Therefore, I cannot rule at this particular time that that particular motion is in order.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to call first readings of the bills, the Notices

MR. MARSHALL: of Motion were given earlier today.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Such leave would require -

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I would now like to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. FLIGHT: 'Charlie', write another letter to Joe Clark.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader on the government side has asked for leave. As I understand the Speaker's ruling, the Speaker's ruling on our emergency debate, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
We have a point of order raised by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSALL: Mr. Speaker, I requested leave of the House for, really, first reading. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is now getting up and making a speech. They have their option of either giving leave or not giving leave but not of making a speech at this time. He can make a speech on the bills as they come up, Mr. Speaker. I will be interested in hearing what he has to say then.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: To the point of order. That is below even the usual standard of my friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: That is no point of order.  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is giving leave, or not giving leave, as the case may be, and he is simply stating it, that is all, and he ought to be able to get on without this harassment from the other side.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order.  
Normally the procedure is that such a request by the government House Leader would require unanimous consent. The Chair normally would ask if there was unanimous consent. I was presuming the Leader of the Opposition was about to give the position of the members to my right. Following his position, and I might ask him to keep it as brief as possible, we will determine where we will go next.

The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I agree in the context in which the House Leader has brought it up, the urgent business of this Province. Last week, for example, we had no hesitation in giving leave, that was an urgent matter. As I understand the ruling on the urgent matter we brought up earlier, the Speaker has said it should be brought up in the Address in Reply, which is the Throne Speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do give leave now to have either the emergency resolution that we introduced, as I set out in the letter and the Premier wanted to have the letter read -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - or we will give leave to have the Throne Speech brought up. So, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - we are looking for some clarification as to what leave he is looking for.

MR. STIRLING: as to what leave he is looking for.

If he is looking for leave to bring up the Address in Reply, we will give it.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: If he is looking for leave to bring out the resolution we had we will give it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I believe I understand clearly what has been put before the House. First of all no leave is required for the Address in Reply. It is up to the government to determine whether they wish to call that piece of business. The other motion has already been dealt with.

The request is that leave be granted to proceed with first readings of certain bills that were introduced today under Notices of Motion. Such a request would require the unanimous consent of the members of the House. I now ask if there is unanimous consent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand unanimous consent has not been given.

MR. HISCOCK: We want to debate the economy.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House rise and adjourn until tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. and that this House to now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour 'Aye', contrary 'Nay'.

MR. ROBERTS: Call a division.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. STIRLING: Division.

MR. SPEAKER: Division? I need members to rise to call a division.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is easy enough.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Call in the members.

DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I understand agreement has been reached to waive the ten minute waiting limit and to put the motion.

I would ask those in favour of the motion now to adjourn to please stand:

The hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford),  
the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I wonder if we could ask for a bit of restraint, because there is some difficulty with the microphone and the Clerk cannot be heard.

The hon. the Minister of Forests,  
Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries  
(Mr. Morgan), the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing  
(Mrs. Newhook), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services  
(Mr. Young), Mr. Butt, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and  
Culture and Environment (Mr. Andrews), the hon. the Minister of Labour  
and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins),  
the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the President  
of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr.  
Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development  
(Mr. Goudie), the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the hon. the  
Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Brett, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Baird, Mr. Stagg,  
Mr. Carter, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Patterson, Dr. McNicholas, Mr. Barrett.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Those against the motion please rise.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

Those against the motion please rise.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Stirling), Mr. Moores, Mr. Flight, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Warren, Mr.

Neary, Mr. Hancock, Mr. Callan.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Results of the voting, twenty-five

in favour, eight against. I declare the motion carried.

This House now stands adjourned until

tomorrow, Friday at 10:00 a.m.