



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 50

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

Wednesday, 21 November 1984

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I am today tabling a report on the results of the Province's financial operations for the full first half of the present fiscal year. The provincial budget for the year was presented in March past, and hon. members know that I released a public statement of the first quarter results in early September.

Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland economy is only beginning to recover from the worst recession in recent memory, the impact of which on the Province's financial performance is still very evident.

The March budget projected a current account deficit of \$32,300,000, in round figures. Actual experience during the first quarter of the year necessitated a revised projection which showed a new deficit level of \$57,100,000. That change was caused by an upward revision of expenditures of some \$10 million and a \$15 million reduction from the budget projections on revenue sources estimated by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, the results of our review just completed covering the whole first half of the year now indicate a current account deficit by year-end of \$64,100,000.

Let me first deal in some detail

with revenues. In total, these have now been revised downward by \$16,800,000 arising out of a \$7 million reduction in provincial source revenues and a \$9.8 million reduction in federal source revenues.

During the second quarter of the fiscal year, that is July to September inclusive, receipts from two provincial revenue sources, Retail Sales Tax and Mineral Tax and Royalties, actually exceeded March budget projections. Accordingly we have adjusted our annual forecast for these two sources upwards by \$3.8 million and \$3.2 million respectively.

However, offsetting these gains is a decline of \$14.7 million in expected personal income tax receipts, which are provincial source revenues, although estimated and collected by the federal government.

In regard to federal revenue sources, the latest forecast of equalization payments has been revised downwards by \$18.2 million, whilst the established programmes financing forecast has increased by \$8.4 million.

Current account expenditures are now forecast to be about \$15 million greater than at budget time. Major factors contributing to this change are increases in the prime bank rate during the first half of the year and in the United States exchange rate. These factors resulted in an additional cost of about \$8.9 million. An additional \$6 million expenditure will also be incurred in our community development programme.

Now for capital account, latest estimates indicate that net

expenditures will increase by \$7 million, bringing net capital expenditures for the whole year to \$181 million. The main factors causing this upward change relate to highway improvements, airstrip construction and payment of damage claims resulting from last April's sleet storm.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is expected to grow this year by about 2.5 per cent, the first encouraging change we have seen since 1979. Our economy has turned a corner and we are confident that it will continue to grow at a moderate rate. However, the fact remains that the economy has not yet achieved pre-recession levels of output. The contraction which has taken place in some of our resource industries is particularly difficult to reverse. The restructuring that has gone on in such key sectors as mining and pulp and paper will likely maintain new but lower output levels for some time to come.

The recession has also very much affected government's ability to extract revenues from our economic base - revenues used to provide the numerous public services enjoyed by the citizens of this Province.

As all hon. members know, the recession obligated the government to act quickly and responsibly in order to protect our budgetary position. At times, this required us to make unpopular decisions. No one, least of all government, wants to see services reduced or eliminated. However, just as individual citizens must live within their income, everyone recognizes that government must also make adjustments if revenue increases are less than expected.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear from what I have just said that restraint measures are as necessary today as when introduced. While a new period of economic growth seems about to begin, this has not yet reflected itself in an improvement in our budgetary position. Just let me repeat that because it is necessary to understand this fundamental truth, and it is necessary sometimes to din it into the minds of some people: While a new period of economic growth seems about to begin, this has not yet reflected itself in an improvement in our budgetary position. As a result, restraint will continue wherever possible in such areas as health and education, building and highway maintenance and the public service salary bill, which in itself represents about 40 per cent of all expenditures on current account.

Mr. Speaker, we have to maintain an awareness of present deficit levels on current account and do our utmost to achieve improvement. Not to do so would only court long-term financial problems.

In the short run, therefore, we must continue to ask our people to maintain a realistic view of our financial capability and a commitment to its improvement, all in a spirit of co-operation and determination. Having weathered the worst of the storm, we have yet to reach safe harbour. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, this is another in a long series of budgets and

financial statements which the minister has been giving this House in which he has been incorrect on capital account on every occasion. The minister should really resign. I do not know if we should ask the minister to resign, because the minister is only a minister in a government which is run by the Premier. Perhaps the Premier should resign, because the government has been consistently wrong in the last four years as far as their projections have been concerned. The last budget predicted a \$32 million deficit on current account, now in this statement they are predicting a deficit of \$64 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, in every case where we have had a statement from the minister he has been wrong. I predict that when the budget comes down in April, or if there is another quarterly statement, we will find out that he is out again.

Two years ago I asked the minister if the miscalculations in the Department of Finance were being caused because his officials were reading tea leaves. I sometimes wonder now, Mr. Speaker, if there is a Department of Finance, because the minister has issued a different excuse each time as to why his projections are incorrect. He did say the last time and the time before that it was because they were depending on federal government projections, but that his department would be doing their own projections. If they are doing their own projections, then nothing has improved.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that what we are hearing today reflects the fact that there is no development in this Province. We saw yesterday in the report of the

Economic Council of Newfoundland that we can no longer depend on development in this Province, we must have short-term solutions.

There is no development in our fishery, in our mining or forestry, and we have not heard anything about high tech industries in this Province yet, something that is happening in the other Atlantic Provinces of this country. Mr. Speaker, the sales tax was increased some time ago and we find that the money that is coming into the government, even though the minister says that there is an increase in sales tax, I would that to the minister that he getting less money from sales tax than he could have gotten had the government not put the tax so high. I say, Mr. speaker, that we are losing money because of the increased sales tax. The Province is losing money because there is a decrease in consumer spending brought about by the restrictive measures of this government and because of high taxes and fees. I should stress fees as well, Mr. Speaker, because this government has found a way to tax people so that those in the lower income bracket are taxed worse. They have raised fees on every conceivable thing that they can possibly raise fees on.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired, except by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, no leave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
No leave.

MR. HODDER:  
Mr. Speaker, if I could just

conclude my comment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your time has expired.

A Ministerial Statement, the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of the Human Rights Commission with respect to a complaint made by Marie Furlong-Bass against the Deer Lake Integrated School Board.

Miss Furlong-Bass alleged that the school board discriminated against her in its hiring practices contrary to section 9 (1) of the Newfoundland Human Rights Code on the basis of her marital status and because of her sex. The Human Rights Commission found that the particular school, the Elwood Regional High School, had not employed a full-time female staff member at the school since 1972. However, the Commission did find that the Deer Lake Integrated School Board itself did not discriminate against females as over 40 per cent of its teachers were female in 1983/84. In addition, the Commission found that the school board has on numerous occasions hired a husband and wife as teachers within their system.

Based on the evidence presented to it, the Commission held that there was nothing in the evidence to suggest that Miss Furlong-Bass did not get the teaching position for which she applied because she was female or because of her marital status and that the board considered miss Furlong-Bass' application on the same basis as

it considered all other applicants.

In recent years the Commission has held a number of hearings on allegations of discrimination on the basis of sex. In 1982 the Commission held that a complaint alleging discrimination by the Building Committee of Burgoyne's Cove was valid because the complainants had been discriminated against because of their sex and at that time I made an order implementing the recommendations of the Commission.

In 1983 a complaint was received from Miss Sharon Curtis against Coastal Shipping Limited alleging discrimination in employment, also on the basis of sex. The Commission then held that the person in question had been discriminated against because of her sex and an order was made on January 10, 1984, implementing the recommendations of the Commission.

These hearings demonstrate the effectiveness of the Newfoundland Human Rights Commission in addressing allegations of discrimination on the basis of sex and the other areas of discrimination set out in the Code. I am also pleased at the increased educational effort being made by the Newfoundland Human Rights Commission which has clearly had the effect of informing Newfoundlanders of their rights under this important piece of legislation and the recourses that are open to them if they feel that they are the subject of discrimination.

I think this is an important area of interest to all hon. members and for that reason I have had circulated copies of the report of the Human Rights Commission.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister's statement would have more credibility had we not seen in the House two days ago an indication of how government itself is discriminating on the basis of sex, and I would ask that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) pay attention to the matter raised by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) with respect to discrimination in the manner in which the Department of Social Services is hiring people for work which is being done through the department, where the minister is digging himself deeper, and deeper into the hole with this antiquated concept that it is the male that is the breadwinner by some sort of tradition.

Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) would agree, it is because we have had, in many cases, traditions of discrimination that it became necessary to set up a Human Rights Commission in the first place. And I would suggest to the minister that he consider referring to the Human Rights Commission the department run by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and specifically the way in which these programmes are being administered.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Oral Questions.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move under Standing Order 23 that the regular business of the House be adjourned to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely, a \$64 million deficit on current account. Deficits on current account for three years running is something that cannot be tolerated. It is something that is threatening the very foundation of the fiscal integrity of this Province, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the ordinary business of the House, including Question Period, be postponed to permit debate on this item.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I refer the hon. gentleman to the Standing Orders which require that such a motion be made at a time when Orders of the Day are called. Now the normal, ordinary routine of orders have not gone through yet so the hon. gentleman is out of time, out of order in making it. I refer Your Honour to Standing Orders 22 and 23 with respect to it. In any event, I will be prepared to address myself to the nature of the motion in substance, but the hon. gentleman is doing it at the wrong point in time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The point raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is quite correct. Certainly if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wishes to make that motion, the

appropriate time to do it, of course, is upon the calling of Orders of the Day, and the Chair would be willing to take a look at the motion at that time.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Very good. I will make it again. We felt that it was of such urgency, Mr. Speaker, it should be raised at the earliest possible occasion. We are prepared to put aside Question Period, but we will wait then until Orders of the Day and we will make the same motion when Orders of the Day are called.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. BARRY:  
I would like to direct a question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Premier whether he needs any further proof, having listened to this statement, this second quarterly statement, Mid-year Financial Report for this fiscal year by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), whether the Premier needs any further proof that he has an incompetent Minister of Finance who was unable to give a proper forecast of revenue and who has lost control of expenditures of this Province?

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

#### PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think everybody in the Province knows, as we all do across the nation, that almost every jurisdiction coming through the recession that we have just come through, it is an extremely difficult piece of business to predict what your tax revenue is going to be. If you will notice, Mr. Speaker, we have done an excellent job on the expenditure side except for a few very minor altercations; one happens to be on the current account side where we have provided an additional \$6 million take people off the welfare rolls and put them into meaningful jobs. And I think that is a very justifiable additional expenditure as we saw unemployment rise throughout the first half year.

Mr. Speaker, look at what happened to the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) confreres in Ottawa, when only a couple of months ago the former Minister of Finance predicted \$27 billion to \$29 billion deficit only to find that it went to \$35 billion deficit. We have gone now, from one quarter to the other, from \$57 million to \$64 million, \$57 million to \$64 million on a budget of - what? - on a budget of \$2 billion. We have gone up \$7 million in very hard times, \$7 million, only \$7 million in a quarter on a \$2 billion budget. That is pretty good budgeting. And rather than accuse the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) of being incompetent, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as saying that he is a very, very competent Minister of Finance to be only out that much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And on the capital side, Mr. Speaker, where we are out at all, is the sleet storm. We had to wait to see what the funding arrangements between the federal government and the provincial government were going to be, we could not predict those. We did not know exactly how much damage was done, we had to get the receipts in from the broadcasting companies, we had to get the receipts in from the utilities, then we had to sit down and negotiate with the federal government. So that is not an outlandish thing to be out, when you did not have the receipts there before you. Also on capital, there is a provision there as it relates to highway improvement. We spent a bit more on highways to create a few more jobs. The Opposition are always crying out, Spend more money on roads. There is a Private Member's motion on today by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), spend more money on roads, and then they turn around and say, You have too big a deficit. Now, you cannot have it both ways, you are either going to say you have to lower the deficit and therefore take money away from roads, or, otherwise, forget about the deficit and just spend money helter-skelter.

The Opposition always takes the view when we issue a statement like this to the people of Newfoundland through this House, Oh, is this not terrible? But then when petitions come up in the House the Opposition are up, Spend more money for my hospital, spend more money for my road, spend more money for my school. Now they cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House in the last seven or eight days, since this session started, we have let ministers on that side go on and on and really carry on and abuse Question Period. The Leader of the Opposition asked a thirty second question and I think we have gone on for something like six minutes with the Premier just standing in his place and raving on and on and on. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that we on this side do want answers but we want answers to questions, not speeches and not debate. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is time for the government ministers, and in particular the Premier, to be brought back in line and to keep his answers to questions as brief as possible and to refrain from jumping up and down and debating the questions.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to it.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier to that point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The extent of the question, how long it took the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) to ask it is one factor, the other factor is what the substance of the question was. It just dealt with an economic statement, or financial statement for the second quarter of this year and I was trying to explain the variances on current



account and the variances on capital account and I had not finished doing that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that I have been a bit long, I realize it, but the nature of the question not in how long it took to ask the question but in the substance and the pith of the question led me, automatically, to try to respond to the current account deficit and the capital account deficit and to give the various numbers and to justify why there is a variance. And whilst I have been long, Mr. Speaker, it is due to the pith and substance of a short question asked by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please!

To that point of order, the Chair has ruled many times, or suggested several times that questions and answers should be as short as possible. However, the Premier is quite justified in saying that sometimes a question can be fairly short in the number of words it contains but the answer required could, indeed, go on for some time. However, that is not to take away anything from the Question Period. Indeed, the whole purpose of the Question Period is to provide questions that require short answers. The Premier has a few more minutes to finish up his answer.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I will try to sum up as quickly as I can.

MR. HODDER:  
Stop making speeches, boy. Be a man.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I am trying to give information. So on the current

account side of things, some of the money that we are responsible for - some of it was predicted by the federal government, over which we had no control - what we did have some control over, one very big item was the \$6 million on community development through which the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has provided now something like \$16 million, \$18 million, \$20 million. How many people do we have working? How many jobs?

MR. HICKEY:  
Six thousand now, seven thousand by the end of the year.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Six thousand jobs have been created out of this. This is wonderful stuff, Mr. Speaker. On the capital account side we spent more money on roads, once again as a job creation effort to try to keep the unemployment rate at some kind of an acceptable level even though it is not there yet.

MR. BARRY:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Will the Premier confirm that this \$6 million which is being expended under the community development programme comes about as a direct result of the need to create jobs because of the declining economy, because of the totally unacceptable increase in unemployment, because of a lack of other job creation other than through the Department of Social Services, and would not the Premier agree that this again shows a shameful lack of performance on the part of his

government in jobs creation in other areas apart from the Department of Social Services?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if the implication in the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) question is that governments have to move to being the chief source for creating jobs in Canada, look at what happened with the federal government over the last ten or twelve years. The Leader of the Opposition's party have through job creation projects spent millions and millions and millions of dollars to create employment in Canada, and all the money that they threw at the economy saw the unemployment rate go up because they were only doing short-term things. Now, there is a philosophical question here and the philosophical question is, is it the role of government to create the proper environment for private investment so that the private sector will create most of the jobs, or is it the role of government to step in where angels fear to tread, as we did with the Stephenville linerboard mill and with other industries, and for the government to take over all the industries and create jobs that way? Now, I mean, that is it. Now, we know where the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) stands, he wants the government to take over all the industries in the Province and run them and somehow create jobs. Now, I think, because the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and his party feel that they are in a little bit of trouble now that we have a socialist in the House, they are starting to move in that direction also; they want the

government to go to New York, and London, and Tokyo and all over God's creation, borrow money - talk about deficits - borrow money and throw it at the fishery, borrow money and throw it at the forestry. This government does not believe that that is the way to create long-term, permanent, meaningful jobs in this Province. We think our role is to create the right environment by taking the tax off manufacturing equipment, bring it from 12 per cent to zero. We believe we have to do that kind of thing. We think we have to put some money, for example, into the forestry for reforestation and silviculture. We think we can do certain things in the fishery to assist people, incentives, but allow the individual and allow the company to actually create the jobs. And there is no other way, Mr. Speaker. You can throw as much money as you want at the economy and it will not work. It has been proven over and over again almost everywhere else in the world. I travelled throughout Norway last fall. Looking from a distance at Norway a lot of us think it is the socialist dream. But when you get to Norway and you look at the fishery from the Southern part of Norway to the Northern part of Norway, what do you find? Private sector fish plants, private sector forestry. It is more private sector in many of its components than is Canada. So the question comes down to - and you cannot evade it by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) saying that government is responsible, you have to spend more money on this, you have to spend more money on that - the role of government, as we perceive it to be, is to create the right environment so the private sector can create more jobs. And we think the majority

of people in Newfoundland and Labrador agree with us. You just do not go out and have the government buy up industries to create jobs, Mr. Speaker, you cannot do it that way. And when that has been tried, as it has been tried by the Liberal government of Canada, instead of creating more jobs they created more employment. Short-term, UIC, short-term, UIC, that is what we have had from the Liberal government of Canada, that is what the Leader of the Opposition wants us to do, that is what we are not going to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

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

MR. BARRY:

We have had the Premier for three minutes and thirty seconds, Mr. Speaker. We are just going to keep count and we are going to see whether government is afraid to permit the Opposition to ask questions and keep trying to run out the clock on Question Period so that the Opposition will not have the time. Because that is what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, and we will keep the clock and we hope that the press will keep a clock as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the rules of the game are that we are not permitted to engage in debate and we are not permitted to go on, we have to ask a question and we have to sit down. And members opposite are not able to engage in debate either.

Now I will ask the Premier whether he believes that the deficit increase from \$32,300,000 to

\$64,100,000 in six months is performance, whether that is something for which his government should be commended? The Premier talks about the private sector. If the Premier did something about encouraging the private sector to create business instead of lashing out and attacking the private sector at every opportunity, we might see some job creation and we might see no need for \$6 million going into the Department of Social Services to create jobs. Now, will the Premier confirm that the decline of \$14,700,000 in personal income tax receipts is nothing more than a direct result of the declining economy brought on by the Government of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a crybaby over there. When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) gets up and asks a question and I answer it so he has difficulty then responding, then he is a crybaby. Then he is a crybaby. Get on and ask your questions and I will answer the questions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me correct the Leader of the Opposition, first of all. He said, as I understand it, that this was a six month deficit. This is not a six month deficit, this is a projection for twelve months based upon six months activity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, now. It is a projection for twelve months based upon six months. It is not a six month

deficit. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is wrong, so would he please, Mr. Speaker, consult with his finance critic. He took his finance critic and kicked him out as House Leader, where he did an excellent job, and now we have a crowd over there who do not even know the rules. The Leader of the Opposition did not even know when he could get up and make his motion, he made it in Question Period rather than under Orders of the Day. We want 'Hodder', we want the member for Port au Port to bring some sanity to the Opposition so that they will know when to do these things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
May I finish my answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
So the first part of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's question was an incorrect fact, that was that he said it was a six month deficit and it is a twelve month deficit based upon the performance of six months. That is what we predict that the deficit will be at the end of this year if it continues like is has for the first half of this year. So that is number one.

Number two. What have we done to stimulate the Newfoundland economy? Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked that question. Now, if he wants me to answer it it is going to take me some time.

MR. BARRY:  
Put it up for debate. Put it up for debate.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
The Leader of the Opposition asked me a question and I want to answer it. What have we done for the Newfoundland economy? Number one, we have provided \$29 million in guaranteed loans to small and medium sized fish plants in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, we have attracted an industrial firm from England to reopen the St. Lawrence mine and to build a mill there for the first time in the history of St. Lawrence.

Number three, Mr. Speaker, we expropriated the mining properties at Baie Verte and brought in a new operator and have people working at Baie Verte in the asbestos mines.

Number four, Mr. Speaker, we have negotiated with the federal government a rural development agreement of \$18.5 million for the next four years to assist small and medium sized business in rural Newfoundland.

Number five, Mr. Speaker, we have signed with the federal government an ocean industries agreement to get into the high tech marine area of industry, that was talked about a few minutes ago by the finance critic on the opposite side, to provide loans and grants to manufacturers and industrialists in this Province to create jobs. That is what we have done, Mr. Speaker.

Number six, Mr. Speaker, we have taken the retail sales tax off manufacturing equipment which made Abitibi-Price spend \$33 million on

the modernization of the Grand Falls mill.

Number seven, Mr. Speaker, we have in the last fourteen months negotiated with a new industrialist to bring a modern, up-to-date pulp and paper enterprise to Corner Brook, which was about to die.

Number eight, Mr. Speaker, we have negotiated through the restructuring agreement for a special fund for the Burin Peninsula and now we have the Cow Head facility on the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

I think the joke has been carried far enough now. I believe it is now time to enforce the rules of the House. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier has gone on too long and I believe Your Honour is aware of that. I know Your Honour did not want to intervene, but because of the way the rules are being abused today during the Oral Question Period, I believe now it is time, Mr. Speaker, to get things back on track again.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked a general question as everyone heard, what is the government doing with respect to the economy. And if the hon. gentleman wants to ask general questions he is going to get both general and specific answers. The hon. gentleman who raised the point of order, I could see him in the House here just a moment ago when he was trying to get up and his leader told him that he wanted to ask supplementaries and he still got up. So that is really why he is getting up on the point of order, his leader is embarrassing him and he wants his own leader to sit down so he can get a chance to ask a question. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that if somebody asks a question which is general in nature, such as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has asked, the government is entitled to respond and respond in the fullest detail that is necessary in order to give a full and complete answer, unless the hon. gentleman does not want an answer.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition to that point of order.

MR. BARRY:

If Your Honour wishes to check Hansard for the very first day, the very first Question Period, he will see that the Premier went on for ten to fifteen minutes in answering one of the first questions in this House. Now, members opposite say and the Premier says crybaby! Well, let us see if the Premier has the guts to carry on a debate - I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker - the intestinal

fortitude, the courage to carry on a debate which can be a two-sided debate, Mr. Speaker, and let us see what position the Premier will take. Now you know why I raised my request for a debate on a matter of urgent public importance before Question Period, because I knew we might never get to it. Mr. Speaker, the point is, general questions or not, Question Period is designed to permit the Opposition to question government on matters of the day that require answers and it is government's responsibility to avoid eroding away the time that the Opposition has. Government can, and it has been done in the past, make a farce of Question Period if they wish. But we will keep bringing the attention of Your Honour to the fact that they do not have the courage to have a proper Question Period but that they will try and run out the clock time after time rather than give the answers that are requested.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Just on the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I find it rather passing strange that he gets up with a superfluous request for a debate, then he asks questions and he complains that there is a debate on the very subject he asked the House to debate a moment ago. So the hon. gentleman is not only inconsistent in his politics, but he is inconsistent in his mind as well. I mean, it just defies logic. He wanted a debate a few moments ago and now he is complaining. But this is the Question Period, Mr. Speaker, and I would emphasize again, if the hon. gentlemen there opposite ask questions, the government is going

to respond to them.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please!

The whole matter of the point of order is entering into debate at the present time. Again I must reiterate that the purpose of the Question Period is to ask questions that require very short and very specific answers. Certainly if the questions asked require longer answers, then it is the responsibility of the Chair, I suppose, to intervene at a time when the Chair deems it appropriate to do that. I would again request members on both sides of the House, those asking and those answering questions, to try to keep their questions and answers as short as possible. I invite the Premier to finish off his answer as soon as possible.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will so, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for being so long. Let me just finish. I think I was at number nine. Number ten was Cow Head, which is now underway. Number eleven is a tourism agreement of \$25 million which gives incentives to private business all around the Province. We have a technical assistance programme through the Department of Development, 100 per cent provincial, to help business. We took over the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation when the federal Liberal government got out and did not want to put any more money into business in Newfoundland so we are doing it ourselves, \$2.5 million. There is the industrial park programme which we persuaded the federal government to get involved in that we will have to take over, and we have a venture capital programme. I do not have any more

time, Mr. Speaker, you want me to clue up. But these are a few of the small number of things we are doing. If I had more time I would give you another thirteen or fourteen.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of quotes in the statement read this afternoon by the hon. gentleman that intrigued me. He says, 'At times the government is required to make unpopular decisions.' Now, would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what measures the administration plan on taking to reduce the deficit in current account? What unpopular decisions is the hon. gentleman referring to?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member remembers that we had to bring in a royal commission to look at health costs and that the royal commission made some recommendations which people complained about. Now if people complain about something, I presume they do not complain about something that they think is popular. Now, we did not complain, we thought the royal commission report was a good report. But some people complained about it and I believe some members opposite complained about it, so they considered it unpopular.

We also had to bring in a wage restraint programme which was an absolute necessity. We are not alone in that, most jurisdictions had to bring it in. Some people

complained about it. People do not complain about popular things, so it must have been in some people's minds, misguided in our view, that the restraint programme on wages was considered by them unpopular.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary question, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the matters to which the hon. gentleman referred are down in the next paragraph. The 'unpopular decisions' is in the previous paragraph. gentleman referred. And let me repeat again what I am asking the hon. gentleman: What measures, what extraordinary measures, what measures over and above the ones that are mentioned in the second last paragraph of page three, what other measures does the hon. gentleman anticipate to cure the deficit that we have now had for three years in a row? And could the hon. gentleman while he is on his feet, because there is not much time left in Question Period, tell the House if there has been any communication with the people who set our credit rating to determine whether or not substantial deficits three years in a row on current account will eventually affect our credit rating?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have lost track of how much time is left in Question Period so I do not know how quickly I should speak, because he asked a variety of questions

there. One of the things he asked, What are we going to do about the deficit? Well, that was already answered some time ago.

We are obviously going to have to borrow a bit more than we anticipated at budget time because of our deficit position. He is also, I think, suggesting that I should lay out what other measures are going to be brought in in that regard. In other words, he is asking me what the next budget is going to be about. I am afraid he will just have to wait until we bring down the next budget. We are getting into the time frame when we will be preparing our next budget and we will do that as quickly as possible and we will bring it into the House as quickly as possible. In regard to the credit rating agencies, we have had an assessment of our credit risk on the financial markets by the two major credit rating agencies in the United States and they came back to us and said, We will not change your credit rating. We do not have a high credit rating, we have always said we do not have a high credit rating. We are a small, narrow economy but we have maintained our credit rating. And despite the most severe recession that the Western World has seen, and the great stresses that have buffeted this small Province, the credit rating agencies in the United States say, You have done a good job, we will not change your credit rating.

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House when the assessment on the Province's credit rating was done? And would the hon. gentleman also indicate what market they intend to go into to borrow this extra amount of money? Will they be going into the Japanese market again for yen, or will they be going into the United States market or into the European market? Could the hon. gentleman give us the answers to these two questions?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, on the first part, the credit rating agencies assessed this Province in conjunction with an assessment of all provinces and, indeed, some very large corporate borrowers over the past year or so. I think hon. members will remember that the Premier and I were in New York in the Summer over this exercise, and it was just recently we got the final answer from one of the credit agencies and that answer, as I repeat, is that they will not change our credit rating.

In terms of where we will borrow, we have, fortunately, many financial markets open to us and we therefore pick at any particular time the financial market which is to the best benefit of the Province in terms of availability of money, in terms of interest rates and that type of thing. So we will pick, when the particular time comes, one of the larger financial markets that are open to us.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:



The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just a very short question. Since the Premier has been promising he is going to change the rules under which elections are contested in the future, and he has been promising it since 1979 and there have been two elections since then, I would like to ask the Premier if, in the interest of disclosing the financial contributions, he would be interested in making the legislation retroactive for the last six years?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, this is the last of fifteen or sixteen commitments I made, and all the rest have been kept. Why this one has taken longer is because we did have a Select Committee of the House, and we have done it democratically and given everybody around the Province an opportunity through public hearings to have an input into it. I do not think that this bill, the election bill, impacts upon the economy of Newfoundland in the way that other bills do which, unfortunately, have had to be made retroactive. As a matter of fact, we know now that the other bill that the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is referring to impacts -

MR. FENWICK

I did not refer to that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Implied. You have talked about retroactivity and, obviously, sarcastically trying to do through the backdoor what the hon. member does not have the nerve to do

through the front door.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Very clever.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, very clever, yes. Yes, extremely so. Too smart by half. It just so happens that the mining industry is in serious trouble in the hon. member's district and that if certain measures are not taken a fair amount of money will be owed by the corporation. This is not true in the Election Act.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

I asked a simple, straight question, whether it will be retroactive for six years or not. That takes a yes or no answer.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I am trying to answer the question to show the difference between why the Election Act should not be retroactive and why another piece of legislation, implied in the question, has to be retroactive even though we do not like it. Therefore, there is no question that implied in the hon. member's question was the implication that in one place we are doing it and in another place we were not doing it and therefore this was inconsistent. I was trying to show the hon. gentleman how it was not inconsistent.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

The hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) certainly did not raise a valid point of order. In

any case, the time for the Question Period has now expired.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that has been received from the residents of Burin - Placentia West and areas covered by the schools operated by the Burin Peninsula Integrated School Board. Now it is my understanding that there has been some attempt to try and have the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) present this. I do not see any sign of the member.

The prayer of the petition is: 'We the undersigned parents of students enrolled in schools operated by the Burin Peninsula School Board fully support the Harfitt Primary and Sheen's Hill Parent Teacher Association in the unbiased pursuit of a settlement in the current dispute that is having such a detrimental affect on the education of our children.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation on the Burin Peninsula where children are out of school now for I think going on four weeks. Mr. Speaker, these are weeks that will never be caught up in the lifetimes of these children. They are losing weeks and weeks of education and we see government standing idly by and doing nothing, at least the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has not seen fit to intervene so

far. Now perhaps the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) would stand up and speak on this petition and indicate whether she is prepared to take a look in seeing what government can do. And we realize that there is a responsible bargaining authority here, but it is time for government to step in and do something to make sure that the children in these areas are not out of school any longer, too much time has already been lost. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for government to do something to look at the fact that these children are going to be behind the children in other parts of the Province, they are going to suffer in their schooling and this strike cannot go on any longer and must be dealt with expeditiously.

MS. VERGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to respond to the prayer of the petition and the comments made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). First of all, I would like to make clear that the member Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) did give me the petition, he has discussed with me at length his concern about the harmful affect to students in his district resulting from the strike of the Burin Integrated Board support workers strike and the consequent closure of schools in that district for the past four weeks. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the good member for Burin - Placentia West arranged for me to speak by telephone with one of the parent leaders who initiated that

petition. Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the MHA and the parent leader, this dispute is between the employer, the Burin Integrated School Board, which is an autonomous employer, and the support workers who are represented by the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, or NAPE. Mr. Speaker, the employer and the employees' union have been conducting talks to attempt to reconcile their differences and, Mr. Speaker, the provincial government has been involved through the Department of Labour and Manpower which has provided one of its experienced officials to assist in the talks and to mediate the dispute. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that while the schools in the Burin Integrated school district have been closed for almost a month now the disruption of the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am having trouble hearing myself talk. I would ask for order to be called.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), as any hon. member, does have the right to be heard in silence and there are members on both sides of this House who are interrupting and I would ask them to please let the hon. the minister be heard in silence.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, any member that stands in this House to speak on a petition is supposed to support the petition. Now we want an answer from the Minister of Education: Does she or does she not support the petition? If she does not, she is out of order in speaking on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The so-called petition, so presented, has been brought to my attention by the people at the Table and it appears as if it is out of order because it is not an original petition, it is a copy of a petition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the Speaker permit discussion on that point, a presentation of that point?

MR. SPEAKER:

No.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) had the original concealed and delivered to the minister and not presented to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

It is certainly a well-known fact that any member in this Legislature is not compelled to present a petition to the House. That is their own decision whether they decide to present it or not.

MR. MARSHALL:

I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has brought before this House a petition which is a copy, which is not a petition. Now I refer Your Honour to Standing Order 91 (a) which says, 'A petition may be either printed or written and if more than three petitioners sign it, at least three signatures must appear on the page containing the prayer of the petition.'

Now the hon. gentleman must know that a photograph of a signature is not a signature. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege because this is a very serious abuse of the rules of this House. If anybody is going to get up in his House and say that he has a petition, he is saying he has in his hands a petition signed by at least three citizens of this Province who have asked him to bring this to the attention of the House. When somebody gets up and makes statements, he or she is responsible for those statements. The hon. gentleman, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, has committed a flagrant violation of the rules of this House. And I think it should be drawn to the attention of the House itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to that point of privilege. I received a telephone call late last night, approximately 11:15 from a concerned parent on the Burin Peninsula who was speaking out not on one side or the other

in that labour dispute, but was speaking out for the children, some of whom were her own, who have been out of school for four weeks. And that lady said to me that she would see that I had a petition delivered to me with hundreds of names, and Your Honour can count them, signed to that petition for tabling in the House of Assembly. I received that petition today, Mr. Speaker, in that envelope, and the lady's name is on the envelope as is there.

Now I have not done any chemical tests. I do not know if the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has done any chemical tests to determine whether or not those signatures are hand written or photographed. Perhaps we should call in some experts and determine that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

But, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the Government House Leader that when I receive a late night call from a concerned parent in this Province, and when I have a petition delivered to me in my office as Leader of the Opposition, it is going to be tabled in this House. Is the Government House Leader standing up and saying that these people have not signed a petition to this House, Mr. Speaker? If the Government House Leader wants to take that approach, when I have a document delivered to me following a telephone call from a concerned parent because her children and hundreds of other children have been out of school, it is going to be tabled in this House, Mr. Speaker. And if I am ruled out of order sobeit. Members opposite do not have the courage to table a petition.

MR. STAGG:

That was not an original document.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and just on that point, before Your Honour makes a final ruling, maybe Your Honour should consider the principle of law which the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) can refer to, which the member for Stephenville just reminded me of, Mr. Speaker, and that has to do with the doctrine of lost grants and lost original documents. We have here, Mr. Speaker, what seems to have been a petition that has either been lost or deliberately misplaced with the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) rather than being tabled in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I stand by what I tabled in this House. It has the names of hundreds of concerned, interested parents who are desperately anxious to get their children back in school and something should be done about it.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. NEARY:

It is four o'clock, Mr. Speaker. What about Private Members' Day?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I will remind the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that a point of privilege has been raised and should be dealt with.

MR. SIMMS:

He does not know the rules either. Give him another twenty-five years and he might learn them.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, all the fits of apoplexy of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) are not going to deter me from this particular point. Nobody detracts from the right to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) or any member of this House to present a petition on behalf of any group of citizens no matter whose district they are in. But it follows, Mr. Speaker, that any member of this House who gets up and says, "I have a petition", knows the rules of this House define a petition. All the histrionics in the world that the hon. gentleman is throwing now about getting a telephone call in the dark of the night last night cannot gainsay he had a copy of a petition, apparently, which is not an original petition. The point of the matter, and well the hon. the Speaker has already ruled on it, is the hon. gentleman got up in this House and made a representation to this House and to Your Honour that he had a petition. I have not seen the petition. Your Honour has and Your Honour could look at it and in a moment say this is a copy of a signature, it is not the signature itself, so really the hon. member must have known that. This leaves the way open, Your Honour, for people to manufacture things. Now I am not saying the hon. gentleman is manufacturing anything. The hon. gentleman has been slapped down so much today I do not want to slap him down any more. But, Mr. Speaker, these are rules of the House that have come down over a period of time and this is a most serious, flagrant breach of the rules of this House as one can imagine. A member has gotten up and suspended the time of this House by saying he had a petition, when in fact he did not have a petition and with all due

respects, Mr. Speaker, I think it must have been quite obvious to him he did not have a petition.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The Chair has heard enough argument on this matter. I shall take it under advisement and then hopefully be in a position to make some kind of a ruling on it tomorrow.

It being Private Members' Day, Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I move that under Standing Order 23 -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I refer Your Honour to Standing Order 23 (f) paragraph (1), subparagraph (1), on page 8, and it says, "The right to move the adjournment of the House," and this Standing Order deals with matters of urgent public importance that the hon. gentleman is rising on, "for the above purposes is subject to the following restrictions: (1) Not more than one such motion can be made at the same sitting". Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a sitting of the House, this day, Wednesday, November 21, is a sitting of the

House. The hon. gentleman got on his feet earlier in this sitting and made a motion and he was ruled out of order. The fact of the matter is he did not make it in the right time and maybe Your Honour wishes to consider that, but I would say he is governed by that particular rule and it is not possible for the House now to consider another adjournment motion at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, if I understood the Speaker correctly -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
- when the motion was attempted to be put the first time, the Speaker himself interrupted the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and pointed out to him that he should introduce it when Orders of the Day were called. The motion itself was never put.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
I would submit to Your Honour, and I believe that has come up before, we are into a matter of some serious precedent being set here. Standing Order 23(f)(1) refers to not more than one validly put motion, one motion that has not been ruled out of order. And it is designed, Mr. Speaker, so that

the time of the House is not taken up by a running series of motions which then have to be either debated or dealt with by Your Honour. But it does not mean that if Your Honour has ruled one motion out of order that that same motion cannot be put at the proper time. To do that would make a mockery of the business of this House, Mr. Speaker. To say that because a motion has been ruled out of order by being raised at an inappropriate time, that a matter of urgent public importance could not be raised at the appropriate time shows how serious members opposite are to debate matters of serious public importance to this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The point of order was originally raised by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) earlier today attempted to make a motion which was out of order because it was raised at the wrong time. The Chair ruled at that time that he would certainly be willing to hear the motion at the appropriate time and is prepared to hear the motion.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I realize the Government House Leader and members opposite are desperately afraid that we might end up debating the statement of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Mr. Speaker, I move that under Standing Order 23 the regular business of the House be adjourned to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely, a \$64 million deficit on current account. Deficits on current account for three years running are devastating to the financial

position of this Province and the well-being of our people and should be dealt with immediately. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader is going to stand up and say the usual, that this is a matter that may be urgent but does not have to be debated urgently. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that we are dealing with an economy that is in shambles, we are dealing with, as shown by the minister himself, declining personal income tax returns, which indicates declining income to our people, we are dealing with desperate attempts to create employment by government, and, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a situation where misery is being suffered by thousands of Newfoundlanders. The last statistics show 44,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed and it is a matter of urgency.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), in the Chair's opinion, if the motion is in order is doing what should be done at that time.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:  
I thank the hon. gentleman for his assistance in referring me and I cite specifically page 92, Section 287 of Beuchesne. When he got up, at least I thought the import of his words were he thought his motion was out of order. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, it reads, "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 to be brought on early enough and public interest demands that the discussion take place immediately."

I would remind Your Honour that the matters of deficits and that are concerns, certainly, but it is certainly not a matter of urgency of debate. I would remind Your Honour also that on the Order Paper, and it is a matter for consideration which will be heard presently, as soon as we can get on to the discussion of business of the House, we have supplementary supply which is an ideal opportunity for the hon. gentleman to bring that matter up. I would also refer, Your Honour, to page 91 at Section 285. The new Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) might get his pencil sharpened and take a note or two. Standing Order 26, which is similar to our 23, gives considerable discretion to the Speaker, etc. 'It must deal' - now that is the motion - with a matter within the administrative competence of the government' - that is one thing - 'and there must be no other reasonable opportunity for debate.' So, I think, Mr. Speaker, that answers it freely and completely.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please!

The Chair has heard argument from each side of the House. Normally the Chair does not have an opportunity to know if such a motion is going to be made or not. But the hon. Leader of the Opposition earlier today made an attempt to make that motion and the Chair was aware that perhaps it would be raised at the

appropriate time and has had some time to think about it. The matter, of course, is whether or not the subject at hand should be debated immediately, and the Chair has to rule that it does not have to be debated immediately. There is an opportunity on the Order Paper. The Committee of Supply is still on the Order Paper and Motion No. 3. Supplementary Supply is also on the Order Paper. I rule the motion made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) out of order.

It being Private Members' Day we shall proceed with the motion which was adjourned the last day by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). He has some six minutes left to finish up.

MR. TULK:  
Did you say I had six minutes left, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Six minutes.

MR. TULK:  
I was saying last week in the debate, and I still take that to be the case, that this is an excellent resolution put forward by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). I could not see, if you look at the non-partisan nature of this bill and the urgency that is being experienced in Newfoundland by people who have to travel over our highways and the safety of the Trans-Canada Highway and so on, how the government members on the other side of the House could vote against it. But it is obvious that in their usual manner they are going to vote against anything that is put forward by this side regardless of whether it is good or bad, just going to toe the party line, and because you are Liberal you cannot put something



good forward in this House and have it agreed with by the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come back basically to where I ended off, a commitment that was made this year by the now Federal Minister of Transportation (Don Manzankowski) when he told the people of this Province that indeed the Trans-Canada Highway would be one of the top priorities of the new Mulroney Government. Now I ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), if he has not already spoke in this debate, and I do not believe he has -

MR. MARSHALL:

He spoke last week.

MR. TULK:

Then perhaps some other member on the other side can confer with the Minister of Transportation and can tell this House whether indeed they are going to keep Mr. Manzankowski to his promise, whether they are going to keep pushing him to see that the Trans-Canada Highway is upgraded. I would further advise him that perhaps what they should do is take a policy that the former Leader of the Opposition and myself, along with four Atlantic Liberal leaders in -

MR. DAWE:

Why do you not read Hansard? I said all that last week.

MR. TULK:

Where you up genuflecting to the Minister of Transportation in Ottawa again? Do not be rude.

MR. DAWE:

I was just correcting you. You had not read Hansard.

MR. TULK:

If you want to correct me, why do you not take your seat? Do not go walking all over the House, that is rude, to be walking all over the House shouting. Do not go at that.

MR. CALLAN:

There is no quorum in the House. You can call a quorum if you want.

MR. TULK:

I can call a quorum. I do not want to call a quorum.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) since he is in the House, and perhaps he can tell one of his colleagues to reply to this, if when he was in Ottawa yesterday, I believe it was, when he was up there, if he did the same thing with the transportation agreement for roads that apparently he did with CN, when all he did was just went up and whatever the Federal Minister of Transportation (Mr. Manzankowski) said to him he just said, 'Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir, whatever you want is there. I am glad you told me about it. I am glad you have consulted with me.' In other words, the consultation is just saying here it is, take it, go home and deliver it to the Newfoundland public.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) that perhaps one of the policies - and I was about to get into that before I was so rudely interrupted by the minister - of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador that we developed along with the other four Atlantic Liberal leaders in July or August of this year is that there should be a look at not at increasing the rates on the CN ferry from Port aux Basques to North Sydney by 15

per cent, but perhaps either to make that ferry an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway and make Newfoundlanders equal to the rest of Canada by allowing Newfoundlanders to have free transportation across this country. One of the great principles of Confederation was the move by Sir John A. Macdonald to build a railway across this country - one of the few good Tory prime ministers, he was so good that everybody considers him to be a Liberal - to build a railway across this country to make Canadians equal from coast to coast. It seems to me that if you live in Newfoundland and Labrador - and the Premier is very famous for talking about Newfoundlanders being equal to the rest of Canada - it seems to me that one of the things that the Premier should be pushing the new Tory government - his buddies, the people that he is in love with, whom he is getting along so well with - one of the things that he should be pushing them for is to indeed make the CN Gulf ferry an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway free of cost to most Newfoundlanders. I am told by some business people in Newfoundland that indeed if you made the CN ferry free, not only to Newfoundlanders but at least to a person who wanted to come across the Gulf as a tourist, that our tourist trade would increase tremendously and the revenues that would come from the increase in the tourist trade would indeed go far towards paying - and what is it we subsidize the CN ferries by now, \$70 million? - would go far towards an increase even in revenue to the Province of more than the \$70 million that we are now subsidizing it by. So I would recommend those things to the Premier and ask him in the new-found love that he now got in

Ottawa if the Premier and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) would indeed push - and he can get agreement on it from the rest of Atlantic Canada, by the way; it is possible to get agreement from his Tory premier buddies in Atlantic Canada - if he would push the new federal government to see that the Gulf ferry is made an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway and that indeed it is available, at least for one trip a year, for any person who wants to cross the Gulf as a tourist. It is not so hard to do. We live in the day of the computer, we live in a time when it is very easy to monitor, if you are talking about tourists, if they are crossing more than once a year or whatever. At least you could grant that special privilege. For example, if you are going to take your family across the Gulf with a trailer and an ordinary car, not one of those big things like the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) drives or anything like that -

MR. STAGG:

Well, address yourself to that.

MR. TULK:

I am not going to.

But if you just take an ordinary car - and the hon. the member for Stephenville knows this because I believe he has done it across the Gulf and back with a trailer it will cost you at least, at this point in time, \$270 and now we are going to have a 15 per cent increase on that. For an ordinary family with three or four kids, wife and husband it will cost \$270 and we are now going to have an increase of 15 per cent on that which is going to bring it up to about \$300. Now if you are coming from the other direction, from the

Nova Scotia side -

MR. STAGG:

What about the air ferry?

MR. TULK:

The same thing. It is exorbitant.

I suggest to the member for Stephenville that most tourists who come to this Province drive and that is the reason I am using this example. If you are travelling between Newfoundland and the Mainland of Canada, yes, obviously the air fares are ridiculous. I would suggest to him that they are more ridiculous within Newfoundland.

MR. STAGG:

F-E-R-R-Y, not air fare.

MR. TULK:

Just be quiet. Have you spoken?

MR. STAGG:

Yes.

MR. TULK:

Too bad.

But in any case, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) who is responsible for Tourism, and the Premier that if they were to take that recommendation and were to push for that development in Ottawa the tourist trade in Newfoundland would increase substantially.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have got, I believe, one more minute left.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for Newfoundland that this is the case, but I believe that the Premier and the government have reached the point where they are now taking whatever Ottawa is

giving them and I believe that that is sad. I know that when the Premier went to Ottawa in June of this year to try and get a road agreement for Newfoundland he just carried up \$470 million worth of road work and threw it on the desk with no prioritization at all and said, 'We want this or nothing.' Now he is prepared to take, it seems to me, nothing. The other point is, Mr. Speaker, that it is time in this Province that we prioritize where our road work is done.

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

And I do not believe that that exists within the department or within government. I would rather believe that what happened is that the strongest guys on that side, and they have a real problem over there now since they have forty-four of them to deal with, the strongest guys on that side are getting a bit of road work done. For example, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), and I am sorry he is not in his seat, won a by-election last Fall basically because the people of Terra Nova wanted paved roads. Well, the dreams are not yet realized. The member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn), is not in his seat either,

MR. MORGAN:

They can see progress in Terra Nova after only one year.

MR. TULK:

Oh, yes. Now you do not have to defend your buddy.

The member for St. Mary's-The Capes again probably won his seat on the basis of pavement for St. Mary's-The Capes. And we heard a

former member of this House for St. Mary's-The Capes stand in this House and point out those issues as well.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart)?

MR. TULK:

The member for Fortune-Hermitage? I do not know if he won on roads or his personality. It could have been his charming personality.

MR. STEWART:

Thank you very much.

MR. TULK:

The member for Fortune-Hermitage is a very nice fellow and they may have voted for him because they take pity on him.

MR. STEWART:

I hope they support me next time.

MR. TULK:

I do not think their pity extends that far to vote for the member again.

But the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr.Hearn) has probably one of the worst districts in this Province in regards to the number of miles of highway that is not paved. I think there was something like 105 miles. I believe I heard a former member for St. Mary's-The Capes stand a good many times in this House and make that statement that there were 105 miles of unpaved, gravel roads in his district. I believe at last count there was 103.5 miles, I believe there has been a mile and a half of road paved. I am not even sure of that, whether it has been a mile and a half, but I understand from some people down there that there has been a bit of upgrading, but I am not sure even if there has been any pavement put

down.

MR. MORGAN:

Where is that?

MR. TULK:

St. Mary's - The Capes.

Has there been any paving done down in St. Mary's - The Capes? The former Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) knows all about that.

MR. MORGAN:

Sure there has been some.

MR. TULK:

Where?

MR. MORGAN:

A mile and a half the first year.

MR. TULK:

A mile and a half. It is great to be a government member because instead of having 105 miles, the people of St. Mary's-The Capes now have only 103.5 miles of gravel road.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I will be supporting the motion and would hope that the government members would as well, especially the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments on that resolution, but I probably will not take up the full time. I am interested, however, in what the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) had

just said. I am sure that the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) had all good intentions in that resolution on the Order Paper. As a member for the rural part of the Province, I can surely understand his concerns for roads because they are concerns of all of us in rural Newfoundland.

I can also understand probably his other concern after the September 4 election in which, if I remember correctly, the results showed that the Liberal Party did not do that well in the district of Bellevue. In fact, I think it showed overwhelmingly support for the Federal PC Party and, in fact, the Liberals lost the Bellevue part of the riding of Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, was lost. So there is no doubt that the member for Bellevue is concerned.

The first part of the resolution which says that the Newfoundland portion of the Trans-Canada Highway is in a deplorable condition, of course, is not totally correct. I guess all of us who have travelled to other provinces in Canada realize, particularly in Atlantic Canada, many of their roads need to be upgraded as well and their Trans-Canada Highway for sure is not up to the standard that they have through the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

However, for one to say that our Trans-Canada Highway as it exists at the present time from the St. John's Overpass intersection with a beautiful four-lane highway leading basically to the Foxtrap Access, to say that that particular part is in a deplorable condition is far from correct. And also, of course, there has been a great deal of work done in the area just West of Gander and

that part has been greatly improved. However, I would have to agree that there are many parts of the Trans-Canada across this Province that needs tremendous upgrading.

The second part of the resolution of the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) says that there is a definite need for a four lane highway across the Province. I am sure that all members in this hon. House will agree that we need four lanes in many places, but I somewhat doubt the necessity of four lanes completely across this Province. From just my own particular observation I am sure that in the Port aux Basques area we need a four lane highway; in the Corner Brook/Deer Lake area we need a four lane highway; and I am sure the Minister for Forest Resources and Lands, the MHA for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), will be pushing for a four lane highway in that very congested area.

MR. SIMMS:

I have for years.

MR. PEACH:

In the Gander area, I am sure that that particular part needs to be upgraded and a divided highway would make it much safer.

MR. STAGG:

They are all Tory areas, by the way.

MR. PEACH:

Yes, I might add, those are Tory areas. The stretch of the Trans-Canada Highway from Roaches Line or Whitbourne, whichever, to St. John's, there is no question that that part of the Trans-Canada needs to have a divided four lane highway. I have to add, Mr. Speaker, that anybody who has gone outside the Overpass realizes that

most of that commitment from the St. John's intersection to Roaches Line is in progress, phase one is pretty well completed. I am sure that in the next construction season the next phase will be done.

So the soundness of having a four lane highway stretch right across this Province I somewhat question. I am sure we would have lanes on the highway that would never be used.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the part that the Province has drastically cut its highways budget brings back what the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) just said and I question that particular part. As an MHA out in rural Newfoundland, as the MHA for Carbonear I can proudly say that in no way has the provincial highways budget been cut in my district since I was elected in 1982, and I have to commend the Transportation Department for providing funds. In Carbonear alone, about \$3.5 million has gone into the Carbonear Bypass Road which we hope will be open to vehicles next week

MR. WARREN:

Some federal money.

MR. PEACH:

That is completely provincial money.

MR. STAGG:

Completely provincial! Hon. members do not want to hear about that.

MR. PEACH:

Yes, completely provincial, no federal money whatsoever.

In the Lower Island Cove/Western Bay part of my district we paved two school bus routes at a total

cost of \$500,000. We had, Mr. Speaker, bridge reconstruction in my district last year totalling nearly \$250,000. I have already been in contact with the minister and the department and I am very confident that next year money will be provided to continue on with this road maintenance programme to pave and finish off the Carbonear Bypass Road and to upgrade some other roads in my district. As well I might say that a number of thousands of dollars was allocated this year for roads in unincorporated areas and four roads in my district were upgraded.

So for the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), who said that our budget has been drastically cut, they are not even close to being correct.

Mr. Speaker, the 'Be it resolved' part of the member's resolution I would tend to agree with, but I think the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) addressed one particular part of it last week when he indicated that the engineering study has already been done on that. His department is very much aware of the needs and concerns about the Trans-Canada Highway and other roads.

I notice the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) holding up a pamphlet there or a brochure put out recently by our newly elected federal MP for Bonavista-Trinity-Conception (Mr. Morrissey Johnson). I might say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the concerns of the people in Conception Bay North, and I suppose in all of Trinity and Conception Bays is better access to the area. I am sure that the

hon. members for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), and Port de Grave (Mr. Collins), and myself, have been pressing over the last numbers of years for an improved access rather than the Roaches Line into the Conception Bay/Trinity Bay area.

I was very pleased to read a couple of days ago that our newly elected federal MP, just one month after being elected to our federal government, wrote the new Transport Minister, Mr. Mazankowski, and expressed great interest in the transportation system in the Province. His letter was dated October 16, just a little over a month after he was elected. And he indicated in his letter to Mr. Mazankowski that an efficient transportation system is necessary for the development of this Province. And I am sure that members on both sides of this House would have to agree that that is completely correct.

He touched on the topic of the marine transportation system needing to be reviewed. He said he felt that the railway transportation in this whole Province has probably been talked about long enough and now we need a task force to give us the direction in which we should go. That is a good representation on behalf of not only the people on this side of the House from Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, but I am sure the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is very much appreciative of the concerns expressed now by our new federal member since we did not have very much contact with our last MP in Ottawa. I did not, and I am sure when the member for Bellevue smiles he concurs with that, that most of his correspondence with

him was through the local newspaper, *The Compass*, I guess.

The Trans-Canada Highway, he indicated, was completed in 1966 and because of that many parts of it has great limitations on it and I am sure nobody in this House would disagree with that. One of the things of great importance with regard to the part of the resolution dealing with connecting roads that the federal MP has addressed in the Conception Bay North area, is the part I referred to a few minutes ago concerning a new by-pass to take the place of, I should say, the Roaches Line. And in his letter to the new federal minister he indicated that the Conception Bay North area is the second largest catchment area in the Province and we have communities there like Bay Roberts, Harbour Grace and Carbonear. This area has a very natural port and very substantial existing infrastructure for being in close proximity and development of our Hibernia oil fields. And the access roads that now exist, of course, are far from adequate and need upgrading.

So to quote our federal MP, he who said, "Assistance in this regard is a necessity whether under a special development fund or with regular transportation agreements." I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that none of us here in this House on either side, from the Trinity-Conception area would disagree with that and I look forward in hope that the funding can become available in the next year or so ahead so that an improved highway system not only across our Province but into the Conception Bay North area can be achieved.

So, Mr. Speaker, dealing briefly

with the motion and the resolution of the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), I say again that I am sure his intent at the beginning was good in that we all hope that our road systems in the Province will and can be improved, but the wording of his motion, in my opinion, needs some more meat in it if we are to ask for something that is dear to all of us in the rural part of our Province. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the resolution as it appears on the Order Paper although I realize it was put on several months ago. But I can assure the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) that I will continue to work closely with the federal government through our federal MP in Ottawa and with our provincial government to see that our roads in rural Newfoundland are improved, and are the roads in our Province, namely the Trans-Canada Highway and our other secondary roads. And, of course, my own concern would be the roads in Conception Bay North and in particular the roads in the Carbonear district. So, Mr. Speaker, having said that I will take my seat and let some other member make some comments.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas):

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief because I have another appointment very shortly. However, Mr. Speaker, my support of the resolution put forward by the member for Bellevue might cause members to ask why would a member who does not get any money whatsoever for road construction in his particular district speak on a resolution such as this one on the Trans-Canada Highway. So,

Mr. Speaker, I believe that while the TCH may not be of all that significance to the people of Torngat Mountains who very seldom have the opportunity of travelling the TCH however it is of vital importance to a lot of people, a lot of people from St. John's to Port aux Basques. Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. member for Bellevue, in presenting his resolution, brought forward a very serious problem on the Trans-Canada Highway and that is associated with tractor-trailers. I could not help observing, I think last Thursday or last Friday morning, just after the hon. member brought in this resolution, that there was a tragic accident on the Trans-Canada Highway near Square Pond involving three people from Labrador and a tractor-trailer. Now, Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe that our government, federally more particularly, has turned a blind eye towards our railway system and subsequently tractor-trailers are on the Trans-Canada in larger numbers. These tractor-trailers are involved in many accidents with ordinary passenger vehicles. I believe, Mr. Speaker, there should be a regulation brought into this House of Assembly -

MR. ANDREWS:

Right on. And if you cannot take the high road, take the lower road.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), I do not worry about the high road or the low road, I worry that roads be made safe for human beings. That is what I worry about, the road that is safe for human beings. And whether it is a high road or whether it is a low road, Mr. Speaker, there should be



regulations brought into this House of Assembly by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), and I say this in the strongest terms possible, making the operators of trailer drivers, the operators of tractor trailer reduce their speed, especially going down grades. Mr. Speaker, this is where most of the accidents are happening with the tractor-trailers, when they gather up so much speed, in excess of 100 kilometers an hour, to make a run up the hill. This is what is happening in many of our serious accidents on the TCH. In fact, I believe there was verification of this last week near Square Pond. If the driver of an ordinary passenger car has to keep within the speed limit whether they are going up grade or down grade, surely goodness it should also be a requirement for drivers of tractor-trailer. It may take them longer to go up the grade but in doing so people's lives can be saved. The Trans-Canada Highway is not ready for tractor-trailers.

MR. WOODROW:

And they should not be on the TCH on Sundays.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, in fact the hon. member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), my good friend, has a good point there, maybe they should be eliminated from driving on Sundays. But then again, we have to be very careful because the next thing they will be saying they cannot drive between five o'clock and six o'clock on working days because everybody else is getting off work.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what you are saying.

MR. WARREN:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that.

MR. SIMMS:

You just said they should not be on the highway at all.

MR. WARREN:

No, I never said any such thing, Mr. Speaker. I never said any such thing. What I said, Mr. Speaker, was that their speed should be reduced in going downgrade but it increases at the present time. Each individual tractor-trailer driver purposely does this, and that is what happened at Square Pond last week.

MR. ANDREWS:

Are you saying that caused the accident?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked me about that accident. No, I am not the investigator on that particular accident. However, Mr. Speaker, if at the end of a grade a tractor trailer runs upon another car, I would say there is a lot of evidence there saying the tractor-trailer was not slowing down going downgrade.

MR. TULK:

The member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) should be in the Cabinet for a suggestion like that.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to support my hon. colleague for bringing in this resolution. In fact, I am looking forward to a couple of weeks down the road when the hon. for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) brings in his resolution because actually he is condemning the federal government. Looking at Mr. Wilson's statement last week, the hon. member should realize that whether they are Tory blue or

Liberal red up in Ottawa, they are all tarred with the same brush, and they will cut as much out of Newfoundland as they can get. The Liberal Party has done it, now we can see the Conservative Party in Ottawa doing the same thing. They will cut out of Newfoundland whatever they can. So I hope the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) when he brings in his resolution will be just as adamant condemning Michael Wilson and the financial statement he brought down last week as he was with the former Liberal government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my closing remarks, are not going to take too long, but I believe that this government should direct the administration immediately to commission an engineering study. And one of the main reasons for an engineering study is that the Trans-Canada Highway - we all know it; let us get the engineering study to prove it - is unsafe for large, heavy tractor-trailers. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are all kinds of members over on that side who wish to say a few words.

MR. ANDREWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to speak to this motion but I cannot let the moment pass without making a comment about the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) in his concern about the CN situation. If you and your colleagues were so concerned, I notice that you did not ask any questions in Question Period, which was a great opportunity.

MR. TULK:

My son, we asked those questions five days ago. Where were you? The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked those questions five days ago.

MR. ANDREWS:

You also know that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) just returned today from Ottawa where he met the federal Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) about these matters.

Regarding CN matters, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned naturally about the CN because my district is a coastal district and very dependent to large part on the CN coastal boat service. I would like to have it noted that I strongly object to those people, particularly on the Mainland of Canada, and the news media within the Province who refer to the CN coastal boat service as a CN ferry service. There is a distinct difference between the vessels that run across the Gulf between North Sydney and Port aux Basques and those that run to Prince Edward Island, which serve different purposes although the basic purpose is the same, but the coastal boat service is a much different service indeed. It is a much more flexible service, it has to be because of the nature of the coast and the nature of the service that it has to provide.

MR. HISCOCK:

It is the nature of the beast.

MR. ANDREWS:

Yes, the nature of the beast.

The men and women who operate the coastal boats along the South Coast, and I am sure the hon. the member from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) will agree, that they do

do their best with the equipment that they have to operate. Unfortunately over the past ten years or so the equipment has been downgraded tremendously and on the South Coast right now in the Wintertime there is only one passenger vessel available.

MR. NEARY:

You have finally cottoned on to what I have been saying.

MR. TULK:

He said you did not worry about asking questions about CN and the coastal boats.

MR. ANDREWS:

You did not ask any questions today knowing full well that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) had just returned from Ottawa with all the fine information he could give you.

The CN coastal boat service has been downgraded for the past ten years and, as the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) knows, of course, there is only one vessel working to the East from Port aux Basques now and to the West from Terrenceville. I think that the move to create a new CN marine corporation is a good one and I would encourage the Minister of Transportation to investigate what has been happening to CN Marine in Newfoundland as well as the passenger service across the Gulf and the coastal boat service all around the South Coast of the Island and indeed Labrador. What has happened with the downgrading of the CN coastal boat service is that the Province has been forced in many cases, in most cases, particularly on the Island - I think it is only on the Island, really - to take up the slack. We have approximately a dozen or so ferry services now. As an

indication of the good service that the Province is giving in this regard, to transport an automobile from Ramea to Burgeo by CN coastal boat costs approximately \$98 - that was a year and a half ago so it is probably a little more now, so let us say \$100 - but to put it aboard the provincial ferry that runs from Burgeo to Ramea to Grey River, the fee is \$10, a significant difference in the cost. This was one and half years ago before we had a car ferry running to Ramea but we have one now thanks to this provincial government. So our rates are considerably lower. Now I just have one more thing to say about the ferry service before I get into roads and I have to turn around to look behind me at the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) who does not seem to be getting too much enthusiastic support when he mentions air ferries. He said it is a futuristic concept but then we are all going to live in the future, certainly not in the past like you gentlemen do, we are going to live in the future. He talked about such huge, monstrous air crafts as the 747 and the C5A, which we all know.

MR. HODDER:

Where will the money come from?

MR. STAGG:

Note that the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) is scoffing at it.

MR. ANDREWS:

Hansard will note that the member for Port au Port is scoffing at this futuristic concept. It is indeed nice to live in the past as he is living in the past.

Now I understand that such a

service could carry approximately sixty European size vehicles and probably forty-odd of our larger cars.

MR. STAGG:

And their passengers.

MR. ANDREWS:

Do they have to stay in the cars?

MR. STAGG:

Yes.

MR. ANDREWS:

So I would certainly like to see what the cost factor is on those type of planes leaving Nova Scotia and flying into the new airport that is going to be built in Bay d'Espoir. But it is certainly something we should look into, Mr. Speaker, because we are sending men to the moon and now we have equipment that we can send out into outer space to make repairs and retrieve satellites and all that, and who would ever have believed it fifteen or twenty years ago?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be on notice and to say that I am not going to support the motion because there is nothing here to support whatsoever. The motion is redundant.

There are some truisms in the motion that the Trans-Canada Highway is not up to standard. There is no doubt about that. It is not up to Canadian standards although it does surpass some of the standards of Trans-Canada Highway construction in parts of Canada and I refer particularly to some areas that I know, sections in the Province of New Brunswick.

But why is not our Trans-Canada Highway up to standard? Because it was never built to standard.

It was rushed through, 'Finish The Drive In '65'. The road bed is insufficient, it is not wide enough, the curves are bad in this road.

MR. SIMMS:

The only decent part of the highway is Pearson's Peak.

MR. ANDREWS:

Pearson's Peak, that is the highest point there. We have been spending a considerable amount of money on the road, and unfortunately a large part of this has been provincial government money since the past administrations in Ottawa was reluctant to sign a roads agreement which would have given us the funds to finish the job. Now this is the main problem. I look forward to a better understanding from Ottawa in this regard so that we can get these road systems improved.

As regards for the twinning of the Trans-Canada Highway, I think at this point in time it is ludicrous to twin from St. John's to Port aux Basques. There is no doubt there are sections where it needs to be doubled and twinned, sections going from St. John's West, eventually, as far at this point in time at any rate, to Whitbourne, in the Bishop Falls, Grand Falls area and Deer Lake to Corner Brook for sure. But this has to be done soon and we are making some progress in this regard. And in effect I think you can almost say that from Bishop Falls to Grand Falls, if my memory serves me right, is pretty well a four-lane highway in most places.

The upgrading on the road is certainly needed and we see by the modern standards of Trans-Canada Highway building, the new

standards of highway construction from Port aux Basques to the Bay St. George area, that new road along there is a much better standard than the section of the road that had been built some ten or fifteen years ago. So that is part of the answer to that. Number one, the road was never built in the first place to Trans-Canada standards, the standards that were being used at the time, indeed, in other parts of Canada.

That was the quick fix. I will refer also to a quick fix that has given me some difficulties as the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, and that is the Burgeo Highway which was opened in 1979. That road was built too quickly because it was built largely with federal government money and the name of the game was to make the connection as quickly as possible. The first half of the road, from the Trans-Canada Highway near Bay St. George, running Southeast, approximately half that highway is of fine standard but a large amount of that highway was built by the paper companies in Corner Brook and indeed the new mill in Stephenville. That was largely built by private money and indeed it was very easy to pave the first 30 kilometers of that road with very little difficulty, just to put down the top layer of fill that was needed and grade it out.

But the lower end of the road, the Southern end of the road is no more than a cowpath in many places and a lot of money is going to be needed to upgrade that road before it can be paved.

It was just rushed. This is very poor planning. I realize that the people of Burgeo and the people of

Ramea and Grey River wanted the connection, but I think now if they look in hindsight, if they had waited even another season that they would have been a lot better off. Because the time and the money it is going to take now to fix that road is something else.

We have some pavement done on that road, in total about fifty kilometers at the end of this Summer, and next Summer there will be some more paving on that road and hopefully in the very near future we will have another federal/provincial agreement. And I would like to say that the only reason why there is any pavement on that road at this point in time -

MR. HODDER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

On a point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, we do not have a quorum while the minister is speaking. Shameful!

MR. CARTER:

We have a quorum.

MR. HODDER:

No, we do not have a quorum, I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member calls for a quorum.

Call in the members.

ooo

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

Is it agreed to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is not agreed.

We will wait two more minutes.

ooo

Is it agreed to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. ANDREWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was making such great points I guess the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) was afraid that the citizens of Burgeo and Ramea were going to be impressed with what I am going to say. But it was indeed this government that insisted that some of the money in the last federal/provincial secondary roads agreement be spent in parts of the Province of Newfoundland other than Mr. Rompkey's district, who wanted to spend almost the whole package in his riding. And we insisted no, there were other priorities for this government and one of those priorities was the Burgeo Highway, the longest unpaved, gravel highway in Newfoundland, a major secondary road. So that is what happened there. We wanted an equal distribution of the public funds in this Province and not centralized because of one federal politician.

Another great example, of course, of Liberal planning took the form of almost outright deceit during the last federal election by the now defeated member for Burin - St. George's, who, on the last day that a candidate or an agent of a candidate was permitted to do any radio advertising announced that \$7.8 million were going to be available this Fall for more paving on the Burgeo road, knowing well in effect that there was no agreement and that there was a letter on the desk of the Premier's office right here in this building from the federal government saying that there would not be a new secondary roads agreement this year or anywhere in the near future. And, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Simmons well knew that. Fortunately for the people of Burin - St. George's and the people of Burgeo and Ramea, the new member, Mr. Price, and I caught that and got back on the radio and the station in Marystown used it four times that day to neutralize those lies and attempts at deceit by the former MP.

MR. TULK:

Lies?

MR. ANDREWS:

It was a lie.

Mr. Simmons knew the difference, knew that there was no agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS:

There was no agreement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the decorum of the House, whether a person be in the House or not in the House, I do not think it is proper to use the word 'liar' particularly coming from the minister and slander somebody who is not here to defend himself.

MR. TULK:

That is right. Withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

To that point of order, it certainly would be beneficial to the decorum of the House if the word was not used, but it has been used in this House, by at least on one occasion that I remember, and it was not ruled unparliamentary at the time because it was not referring to a member of this hon. House.

MR. HISCOCK:

In that case the minister is a liar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There was a remark made by the hon. member for Eagle River which has been on many occasions ruled unparliamentary. He referred to an hon. member of this House as a liar, and I ask him to withdraw it.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the minister is not a liar, he just clouds the truth at times. I withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has withdrawn.

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS:

Mr. Speaker, I was obviously carried away with my enthusiasm. The hard work I did for Mr. Price and all that was very, very beneficial. And for the benefit of the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), if he was so highly insulted, I certainly withdraw those remarks and would like to have them stricken from Hansard.

MR. STAGG:

No, do not withdraw the remarks.:

MR. ANDREWS

Yes, it is for the benefit of the House. But I will say that it was an attempt to fool the people because he knew darn well that there was no federal/provincial agreement for \$7.8 million in place whatsoever. He had it in his pocket, yes, had it in his pocket like he had the water supply for Port aux Basques in his pocket. And the new MP gets to Ottawa and cannot find any money anywhere. These things were an attempt to buy the people and it did not work. They do not work anymore. Now, getting back to this motion, Mr. Speaker, 'Be it resolved that the House direct the administration to immediately commission an engineering study of the Trans-Canada Highway,' and so on and so on. Now, number one, as we were told last week by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) this engineering work has already been done. The needs to upgrade the Trans-Canada Highway have been identified, to twin it where it needs to be twinned. The work is ongoing constantly. The

work is being upgraded all the time. There is no need for such a study to be done so that in itself makes the motion redundant. And, Mr. Speaker, the point on which I agree to some extent is that there is indeed a need for upgrading of the road. We know how much it is going to cost, we know where the work has to be done.

MR. HISCOCK

How much where?

MR. ANDREWS

I do not have the figures, the Minister of Transportation will have all that technical information, but this information is being constantly being updated. Mr. Speaker, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), in his motion, says that the government has drastically cut maintenance and construction money in the past number of years. Now the figures were given out by the Minister of Transportation but I think they bear need to be repeated. In 1981 \$52 million was spent on maintenance; 1983 \$62 million was spent on maintenance; 1984-85 \$63 million. Now that is not a cut, that is an increase. In construction in the fiscal year 1980-81 \$51 million; 1981-82 there was a slight decrease to \$39 million; 82-82 \$59 million was spent on construction, 1983-84 \$73 million, Mr. Speaker, was spent in new highway construction. And this year, 1984-85, \$79 million will have been spent on highway construction. Mr. Speaker, that is not a reduction in maintenance and construction monies on our roads. Mr. Speaker, indeed a lot of this money will be spent this year. And I understand most of it is done now. Where there was some flood damage in my own area of Bay d'Espoir, in that bad flood we had a couple of years ago, I would

expect approximately \$1 million was spent in Bay d'Espoir. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned the fact that money was spent in Bay d'Espoir, but that was as a result of the bad flood a couple of Winters ago, and that is federal/provincial money, cost-shared under the insurance scheme that is in place. So that was work that had to be done, that was not new pavement per se.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find the motion is redundant. I feel for the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) because of the fact that the motion is so old. However, even six months ago the motion would have been redundant. I do not think it would gain any support from this side other than the fact that it leads off by saying, "The Trans-Canada Highway is in a deplorable condition," which we agree with. But the rest goes on and on from there which is redundancy and there is no need for this motion whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take up where the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) left off, and I tell you I find it amazing, and I guess that this is the official message of government, that they are now satisfied that they have brought the TCH and inter-connecting roads up to the standard enjoyed by our fellow Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.



MR. BARRY:

You are satisfied?

MR. TOBIN:

Are you going to support the motion?

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I had great difficulty in understanding, if they are not up to standard, how it is the member can stand up and say that the motion is redundant.

MR. ANDREWS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. DINN:

He was not even here.

MR. ANDREWS:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was not here. I agreed with the premise of the motion that sections of the Trans-Canada Highway, which I think were referred to initially, are in bad shape. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I said, I agree with that. But following from that everything else is redundant. We know that the road is in poor shape but we also have the engineering work done on it. The part which refers to a reduction in the amount of spending for maintenance and construction is wrong. The amount of spending has increased year by year over the past four or five years, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I thought that that was an excellent point of order because it just entrenched and reconfirmed the arrogance and the contempt which members opposite have for the people in this Province who have to daily travel back and forth from work over some of the worst roads in North America. We had the petition from the residents of Hillview in the district of Bellevue a few days ago, and we have government saying that that petition is redundant, that their requests should be ignored.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not why members opposite were elected, nor, Mr. Speaker, were they elected to go cap in hand to Ottawa.

MR. TULK:

A prime example right there.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) was the first, but he was only the first to show the new position of subserviance.

MR. TULK:

He said, 'I am not going to ask embarrassing questions.'

MR. BARRY:

"No, I do not want to put the federal minister on the spot," Mr. Speaker, is what the Newfoundland Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) said.

MR. TULK:

He is my buddy.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what The Evening Telegram said I said.

MR. BARRY:

And he, as one of the leadership candidates on the other side, was used, I am not sure if it was a manoeuver by the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) to have him as the scapegoat, but he was the test and he was the one who was to set the example of that new aggressive posture that was going to be taken by members opposite in their dealings with members of the Federal Cabinet. And he showed his leadership qualities, Mr. Speaker, when he came back and said -

MR. TULK:

Your humble servant is here.

MR. BARRY:

Uriah Heep, is not here?

MR. TULK:

Uriah Heep, yes.

MR. BARRY:

Your obsequious and loving servant. Uriah is not dead, they call the wind Uriah.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately and regrettably it was not enough. The Premier and his Cabinet felt that the message had not gotten across, that this position of subserviance taken by the Minister of Forest Resource sand Lands might not have gotten across so they sent up a second minister, the Minister of Transportation, and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) again came out -

MR. TULK:

He was up too, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. BARRY:

But we have not had the Minister of Fisheries statement yet, we have not had his declaration. But I am sure it will go somewhat along the following lines, oh,

joy, oh, joy, all you good voters of Newfoundland and Labrador, come rejoice with me in this new era of co-operation and consultation where federal ministers will meet with us for three hours at a time! Oyez! Oyez! Oyez! Rejoice with me. Not only will they meet with me but they will even give me their home phone number, Mr. Speaker. No, no, they will not change their decision, Mr. Speaker. No, they will not listen to what we have to say in terms of moving the Forestry Centre, Mr. Speaker. No, they will not listen to what we have to say in terms of no ferry increases on the Gulf ferry. But, oyez, oyez, oyez! Come rejoice with me, Mr. Speaker, because, lo and behold, there is a new era of consultation and co-operation which has arrived. Rejoice, rejoice, let the bells ring out, Mr. Speaker, we have this new era.

MR. TULK:

We have their phone numbers.

MR. BARRY:

We have their phone numbers, all is well. The land is strong and we are good and everything is as it should be, Mr. Speaker. Oh, no, no, do not worry about the Forestry Centre, that is on the long finger, that is only deferred for ten or fifteen years or decades or centuries.

MR. TULK:

Oh, no, we will be back before that.

MR. BARRY:

That is true.

Mr. Speaker, it was almost sad. This morning I was just up having a shave and I turned the radio on and I almost cut my throat when I heard the answers.

MR. WINDSOR:

You did! Oh, too bad.

MR. BARRY:

I know the members opposite would like that, and maybe that is why, Mr. Speaker, members opposite are giving the interviews that they are giving so early in the morning. But when the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) came on this morning and informed us that he had had a lengthy interview with the federal minister but he could not give us anything very much in terms of what was going to happen to that 15 per cent fare increase with the Gulf ferry. That increase is going to mean increased costs for food, for other goods, clothing, everything that is shipped into Newfoundland by water through the CN ferry is going to have to bear that increased cost and, of course, that cost is going to be passed on to the consumer. Now members opposite are not concerned about this because government will set up another committee on food prices or a committee on clothing prices or a committee on prices generally, but they will not do anything to deal with the root cause, Mr. Speaker, the root cause being policies which are being brought in by the Government of Canada which are insensitive to the needs of the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has decided to go over and do a little lobbying directly where the lobbying needs to be done and I am sure when the member comes across there will be many of them brought over with them.

MR. SIMMS:

He is just like the Pied Piper.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has come back from Ottawa and did he come back carrying the bacon? Mr. Speaker, regrettably he is back very much looking as though he had been the one that was put on the table and eaten by the federal minister. The federal minister, I would say, showered him with good will, maybe even broke open those little cabinets that they have in the federal ministers offices, served refreshments, maybe took him into the parliamentary restaurant and dined him.

The hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is gnashing his teeth at the thought of all of that hospitality and bonhomie that is lavished obviously upon Newfoundland ministers now when they go to Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where obviously the entertainment bill of the federal Cabinet is going to escalate dramatically. The amount that they have been spending on government jets is nothing compared to the escalation in the federal Cabinet ministers, entertainment bill as they have these Cabinet ministers from the various Tory governments around the country coming in to be consulted and to be cooperated. Mr. Speaker, there is a great era of cooperation and as far as I can see -

MR. TULK:

They have got two words mixed up.

MR. BARRY:

What?

MR. TULK:

Cooperation and being co-opted.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has a point here now. He is saying that maybe we have not been hearing it right. Maybe it is not the great era of cooperation, it is the era of co-option. Maybe there was a misprint in The Evening Telegram, the media got it wrong and instead of members opposite rejoicing about a new era of cooperation, they were rejoicing about a new era of co-option. But are they complaining?

MR. TULK:

No.

MR. BARRY:

The ministers, we have had two go up there, and you tell me the Minister of Fisheries has gone as well.

MR. TULK:

I think he was up there. I believe he was.

MR. BARRY:

So we have had three ministers go up there now and they have come back with smiles on their faces, not, Mr. Speaker, just to be relevant, not because the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has come back with great news for those being transported around this Province, and not because the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) came back with a decision on the Forestry Center, and not because, I am sure, the Minister of Fisheries came back to say that the slashes to the Fisheries budget would not go through, but they were all smiling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ANDREWS:

What does this have to do with the Trans-Canada Highway or with transportation?

MR. TULK:

Everything. The attitude of the government.

MR. BARRY:

The member opposite asks what does this have to do with the Trans-Canada Highway or with transportation? Well, I think we should let the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) in on a little secret, and that is that I would say 90 per cent of the cost of building and improving roads in the Province, the dollars, the moola came from where?

MR. DINN:

It is a 50/50 deal.

MR. BARRY:

But over the years, if you average it out, we are still talking in excess of 90 per cent of the dollars coming from Ottawa.

MR. TULK:

Oh, absolutely.

MR. BARRY:

Now I would like to point out to the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), that is the relevance of the Ottawa connection.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

MR. BARRY:

If we see members and ministers of the government going up to Ottawa and coming back with smiles on their faces and saying, all is well, and not having the -

MR. TULK:

The bacon.

MR. BARRY:

- the bacon, not having the coins to jingle -

MR. SIMMS:

Where is the beef?

MR. BARRY:

A good question. Where is the beef? Where was the beef when the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) came back? Where was the fish when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Goudie) came back? Where was the beef when the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) came back?

MR. TULK:

Do you realize something? The allocations this year of the Northern cod to foreign vessels is still the same. Now just imagine.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has indicated to me that his most recent research indicates that the allocations of Northern cod to foreigners this year, right now today, right this moment -

MR. TULK:

For 1985.

MR. BARRY:

- for 1985 is -

MR. TULK:

As 1984.

MR. BARRY:

- the same as it was before the minister went to Ottawa. There has not been a change, not a jot or a tittle changed in those allocations.

Mr. Speaker, we have a serious problem here. We have ministers opposite believing that they are fulfilling their responsibility to the people of this Province if they come back with a smile on their face and are able to say that they have received a telephone number, the home

telephone number of a federal minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, the voters of this Province want to have more in the way of performance from our ministers than that. They do not want to have these empty statements from the ministers after they had met and had consultation with their federal counterparts.

MR. TULK:

They have gone from one extreme to the other. All confrontations to all consultations. Lapdogging now. No negotiations. From one extreme to the other.

MR. BARRY:

It seems that members opposite now have decided to put away forever the boxing gloves, put away forever their aggressive posture.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what you ask us to do some six months ago.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, but it seems that there is no happy balance.

MR. TULK:

You have to have a happy balance.

MR. BARRY:

It seems there is no happy balance with the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) and members opposite. It seems that if they are not fighting then they are rolling over playing dead. If they are not fighting they are giving away the shop. If they are not fighting they are praising members in the federal Cabinet who are lashing into the people of this Province with fare increases, with UI cutbacks.

MR. TULK:

And while he is sitting down talking to the Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), there are two research centres being approved for New Brunswick while he chops one out from underneath our minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

The recent research of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has discovered at the same moment that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands was consulting with his federal counterpart, at the same moment that the word was go for two forestry centres in Mr. Merithew's own district, one forestry centre and another big office building, a massive complex, all kinds of money and that is going ahead, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands for Newfoundland was content to come back and say, Oh, I would not put the federal minister on the spot by telling whether or not the forestry centre was going to move.

Mr. Speaker, I think that that is something that is going to live on in the memories of the people of this Province. It is going to be a long time before the voters of this Province will ever forget that the Newfoundland Minister of Forest Resources and Lands did not want to put his federal counterparts on the spot. I think that his leadership ambitions may have suffered an irreversible set back in that one little statement.

MR. TULK:

Gone down. Peckford set you up, boy.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) had a part to play? Where there any suggestions made by the Minister of Development that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) be the first to go?

MR. TULK:

Yes.

MR. SIMMS:

The other minister was there the day before.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, we have another minister who was there. The Minister of Development was there the day before.

MR. TULK:

He set him up.

MR. BARRY:

Well, let us see now. Maybe we are going to learn something from the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. The Minister of Development was there the day before. Now what did we see coming back in the way of jobs? Has the economy overheated since the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) was there?

MR. TULK:

The only thing that was overheated was the minister.

MR. BARRY:

You cannot get a taxi in from the airport, you cannot get a hotel room, because the developers have swarmed in!

Mr. Speaker, if we could be serious for a moment here, we have a problem that is being addressed by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) in this resolution. It is a problem that will be brought to the attention of most members of

this House over the next few weeks. It is a problem that the constituents of this Province, I guess, can experience first hand perhaps more than any other. It is one that sees the ordinary man and woman having to go out and expend additional dollars to repair the suspension, the shocks, the pipes, the undercarriage, the tires, the wheels of their cars, Mr. Speaker. There are places in this Province where people have come up to me and pointed out that they have to take into consideration as a very large part of their budget their monthly expenditure on car repairs and maintenance because of the condition of the roads. And, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough at a time when we have a government opposite that is taking the position that prosperity is at hand. We had a Prosperity Crusade and surely, Mr. Speaker, we now have that offshore agreement, that great offshore agreement has been delivered and prosperity is near at hand.

Now the people of this Province will want to know, Mr. Speaker, what this government is going to do to improve roads in this Province. They will not be content with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) coming back and saying he is happy because he has received the phone number of the federal minister. They will want to see him bring home the bacon, they will want to see federal dollars, and they will want to see more attention paid to transportation than we have seen in the past few weeks.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. STEWART:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do hope in my few brief remarks I can be more relevant to the resolution than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) who seemed to stray quite a bit.

"WHEREAS the Newfoundland portion of the Trans-Canada Highway is in a very deplorable condition; and

"WHEREAS to ensure safe and rapid transportation across the Island there is a dire necessity for a four lane highway." I do not think anyone on this side, Mr. Speaker, would have any problems agreeing with that part of the resolution. However, I would say that from a personal point of view I really do not think that the Province needs a four-lane highway right across the Province. Maybe we can look at areas from St. John's to Whitbourne, maybe fifty or sixty miles; Gander to Grand Falls, another forty-five to sixty miles.

MR. SIMMS:

And Grand Falls back to Gander again.

MR. STEWART:

And Grand Falls back to Gander again, no problem. And around the Corner Brook area, maybe thirty miles, Port aux Basques area, maybe twenty for a total of 140 miles to 160 miles maximum as far as I am concerned that is needed across the Province at this particular time. I am saying that because if we look at the other areas of this Province -

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, could we have a

quorum call?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) has called a quorum.

MR. SIMMS:

Bring in your members, boy. There is only one of you over there.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Order, please!

There is a quorum present. Is it agreed to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. STEWART:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is not dying to hear what I have to say. Maybe some of the things I might say might be embarrassing to him and therefore he wants to cut in on the few minutes I have left.

Mr. Speaker, the Trans-Canada Highway was not properly built in the beginning, back in the early 1960s to around 1965. I think we would all agree that the Trans-Canada was not built to an acceptable standard. The slogan back then was 'We'll finish the drive in '65.' The government of the day had one objective at that time and that was to finish it.

MR. SIMMS:

There was an election in '66.

MR. STEWART:

There was an election in '66 which, again, was probably part of the reason why they wanted to finish it in '65. At that particular time, travelling around the Province myself a bit, I noticed like many others that much of the pavement was laid right on top of bog or even snow. Anyway, most of the job, I guess, was done on the the cost plus system.

MR. SIMMS:

You were not very old then.

MR. STEWART:

No, not very old but a young boy travelling around the Province. I think back in those days the Liberal government of the day totally neglected the people of the Province and its main objective was the upcoming election and to get the TCH done prior to that election in '66.

Part three of the resolution states: 'AND WHEREAS the Province has drastically cut the maintenance and construction budget for roads under its jurisdiction.' Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that is where I would have to differ with the member from Bellevue (Mr. Callan), up to that point I could probably support him.

MR. CALLAN:

Why do you not take this opportunity to talk about your own district?

MR. STEWART:

I will get to my district, no problem. The Department of Transportation has spent more money on maintenance in the past few years. I think the problem lies with the federal government of the day that kept cutting back on the portion they were allotting



to the provinces.

MR. SIMMS:

Who was that government made up of?

MR. STEWART:

Seventy-four point five million dollars was a prime example.

The motion referred to a study.

MR. CALLAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman cannot have it both ways. You know, the government we have in Ottawa now is talking about the terrible mess the country is left in, the deficit. You cannot have it both ways, you cannot expect this government to go to Ottawa looking for barrels and barrels of money and the deficit be cut at the same time. If the deficit left by the Liberal party is there in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, it was there because of handouts that had to be given to provinces like Newfoundland. You cannot have it both ways.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

To that point of order, I do not need any argument on that, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. STEWART:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, referring again to the resolution, the hon. member said that we should direct this

administration to immediately commission an engineering study of the TCH. That has already been done, it has already been carried out within the Province. I think we are all aware that it will cost the two governments something like \$1 billion to upgrade the total roads within the Province when we look at the Trans-Canada Highway, the secondary roads and the trunk roads.

Mr. Speaker, just to speak about my own district of Fortune - Hermitage for a while, I correct the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who stated earlier that the district of St. Mary's - The Capes has the most gravel roads. My district of Fortune - Hermitage has more dirt roads than any other district in the Province, some 160 to 168 miles. The member for Bellevue, who presented a petition a couple of days ago in this House, made it his business to remark that he only has forty-three miles of dirt road in his district. He pointed that out while presenting the petition. He also stated that the government - and he referred to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) at the time - only takes care of PC members and their districts. Well, I would like to inform the member for Bellevue and all members opposite, including the new member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) - I do not know where he is to at this particular time; he does not like to sit in his seat, he prefers to stand above us and look down upon us - that the district of Fortune - Hermitage has 160 to 168 miles of dirt road. One of the members said earlier today that the district of St. Mary's - The Capes has 104 miles of dirt road. To be exact there are 142.6 miles of dirt road in the district of St. Mary's -

The Capes followed very closely by the district of Baie Verte - White Bay which has around 130 to 140 miles. So based on that I would have to say that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not treating the government members right because I think it is grossly unfair that three government members would have more dirt roads in their districts than members opposite. I do hope that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) will lean more towards his colleagues in the future so that we can an equal share. Mr. Speaker, again getting back to my district I have four pockets of people, I guess, in my district. I have an area from St. Bernard's to Harbour Mille and in that particular area I have something like fourteen to seventeen miles of dirt road.

Moving down to the Terrenceville - English Harbour East area and I have another large block of dirt road in that area from Terrenceville down to English Harbour East. Then I cross the bottom of Fortune Bay and I go into Belleoram - Pool's Cove area and that section of my district has the largest amount of dirt road. In fact that road was built some forty-five years ago with pickaxes, shovels and wheelbarrows, and to this day that has not been reconstructed. But, anyway, the Minister of Transportation is definitely working very hard in correcting the wrongs that went on in the past, and hopefully over the next number of years we will see a tremendous improvement in that particular area.

MR. SIMMS:

As long as you are the member there will be improvements.

MR. STEWART:

The minister, I think, has been very considerate in the past number of years. In fact, I guess, somewhere between \$800,000 to \$1 million a year has been spent in my district since 1979 for road reconstruction. But, again, due to the fact that I have more dirt roads than anyone else, the minister has been very considerate. I congratulate the minister and his department for the tremendous work they are going in keeping the dirt roads graded. I think there is an old saying that there is no such thing as a good dirt road and I would have to agree with that. You can put the graders on the road today but if you have rain or something tonight they are back to what they were the day before. Mr. Speaker, I would also at this particular time like to refer to the Resource Policy Committee of government, chaired by Mr. Windsor, that travelled to my district a few weeks ago. And down with Mr. Windsor came Mr. Dawe, the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Goudie, Mr. Simms, the great member for Grand Falls, and Mr. Andrews. During the visit to Harbour Breton there were approximately seven briefs submitted to them and I have to say this really only took care of the people from Seal Cove to Pool's Cove, which constitutes ten communities of the twenty-three within my district. And I must say out of the seven submissions that were made to the resource policy committee at least five partly dealt with transportation needs in the area. Basically, I must say, the ministers were very co-operative and I am sure over the next number of weeks and months and years most of the things put forward to the ministers at that time will be dealt with. But I would just like

to briefly make a comment on some of the things that were said by some of the associations down there. For instance, a brief from the Fortune Bay North Shore Development Association was submitted by Mr. Frank Drake and one of his comments was that the lack of development is a problem of road conditions. He noted that consumer goods were on an average 40 per cent more expensive than in some areas and noted that one of the main reasons for this was damage to trucks travelling over the roads in the area. The town council of Gaultois also presented a brief. Mayor Wayne Baggs presented a brief on behalf of the council of Gaultois requesting a feasibility study on the construction of a road from Pool's Cove across to the Harbour Breton highway and the town of Gaultois on Long Island, Hermitage Bay. And, I must say, if the minister gives us some pavement over the next number of years and we are fortunate enough to have a road into Gaultois, we will still remain at the top of the list of dirt roads because there are approximately forty-eight kilometers of road between Gaultois and Harbour Breton.

Mr. Baggs highlighted the need, I think, for the road and the causeway by referencing the high cost of transporting fish by boat as opposed to transportation by road. He also pointed out that the road and the causeway would reduce the cost of providing other services to the community.

MR. SIMMS:

If the Trudeau government had had any foresight, you would not be facing the problem you are facing today.

MR. STEWART:

I would have to agree with the minister that if the previous Liberal government had had any foresight, we would not be in that situation today.

MR. SIMMS:

For twenty-three years they had a Liberal member.

MR. STEWART:

I would like to speak briefly on the Gulf ferry service. Personally, I think the Gulf ferry service should be an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway with charges, I guess, based on what it would cost someone to drive the distance between Sydney and Port aux Basques, whatever that would be in miles.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. STEWART:

In closing, I would just like to say that I can not support the motion as put forward by the hon. the member for Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when I opened the debate last Wednesday with my twenty minute speech, I indicated at that time that in my twenty minutes today to conclude the debate, I would be talking about my district moreso than about the Trans-Canada Highway. I think I made the points about that last week.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I read and I listened with interest to what the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) had to say last Wednesday. I also listened with interest to what other members on the government side had to say, members like the gentleman from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) who just took his seat. He reminded us that there are 168 miles of dirt road remaining in his district and, of course, in St. Mary's - The Capes, 142.8 miles of dirt road remaining in that district. The member who just took his seat and the minister were saying last week that Opposition members complain because they do not get enough money for their districts for road work and so on. Mr. Speaker, that is not true. Obviously, every member, myself in the district of Bellevue, the member for Fortune - Hermitage, 168 miles and the member in St. Mary's - the Capes, 143 miles, all members would like to get more money for their districts. What I was talking about last week was what the Minister of Transportation said on Province-wide television, in the media, on June 12 of this year, when he said that he was favouring Tory districts.

MR. DAWE:

I did not say that. That is not true.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, he said that it is easier to deal with your friends than it is with your enemies, and that sort of thing. It was on television twice, Mr. Speaker, I saw it twice. It was on television during July, as well, when a bunch of concerned citizens came in from Hodge's Cove in my district and protested down in front of the Confederation

Building, and myself and some of the delegation from the town of Hodge's Cove met with the acting Minister of Transportation, Jerry Dinn, because the minister was out of the Province. The point was made there that if there was money left over in the Fall, perhaps the Minister of Transportation can make some of that left-over highways money available to the people down in South West Arm, in the Long Beach - Hodge's Cove area. But, Mr. Speaker, I have said in this House on several occasions that I do not think this government has been neglecting Liberal districts. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, going back to 1975 when I was first elected, after the district of Bellevue had been created the year before under redistribution, even that year alone there were five miles of roads paved through the town of Come By Chance from the Trans-Canada and also five miles down through Old Shop in the district of Bellevue that year. Mr. Speaker, since then there have been five miles - I am using round figures - five miles of roads paved out through Garden Cove, out through North Harbour and it goes on and on, Mr. Speaker. Let me refer to the amount of money that has been spent in the district of Bellevue this year. The amount of money spent in the district of Bellevue this year, Mr. Speaker, is almost \$1,250,000 out of the capital works fund of the Department of Transportation this year. Mr. Speaker, where did it go? How was it spent? I can itemize each area: A new bridge in Sunnyside, Mr. Speaker, \$153,000; chip seal on the Burin Peninsula in the Swift Current area, which is in the district of Bellevue, \$478,000; the road resurfaced through Arnold's Cove with a price tag of \$227,600. The

Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) said last week and some of his colleagues have said today that all of the engineering studies have been done for the Trans-Canada. That was not true. It may be true now, but it was not true when I put the resolution on the Order Paper back in the Spring, six months ago. This year alone pre-engineering studies done on the Trans-Canada in the Whitbourne - Chance Cove area cost \$16,500. Mr. Speaker, that section of road leading from the Trans-Canada to the railway track at Long Harbour Crossing - the road that leads to Long Harbour then dead ends at Mount Arlington Heights and dead ends at Erco Industries - that road was resurfaced with four inches of brand new pavement from the Trans-Canada right into the railway track at Long Harbour crossing which, Mr. Speaker, is in the district of Bellevue. The railway track from there leading down through Fair Haven, Little Harbour and so on, the railway track is the boundary between the district of Placentia and the district of Bellevue and Mr. Speaker, it cost \$343,200 to resurface with four inches of brand new pavement and the shoulders of the road and so on on that particular stretch of road in the district of Bellevue which totals, Mr. Speaker, \$1,218,200. So it is the minister who is saying that he does not spend money in Liberal districts, not me. Here it is. Here is the living proof, but let us look at where the money was spent, Mr. Speaker. You see, the minister and the Premier and his colleagues are trying to get a message across out there that it is bad to vote Liberal because you do not get anything for your district if you vote Liberal. Mr. Speaker, that

is what they are trying to convey across the Province, but it is not true. Actually what is happening, Mr. Speaker, in the district of Bellevue, and it is happening in Fortune-Hermitage, and it is happening in St. Mary's-the Capes, they talked about the numbers of miles of dirt road that they had in their district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at these places where this money was spent. I am sure that once the people in Long Beach and Hodge's Cove and that area, once they find out that \$1.25 million was spent in Bellevue they are going to be wondering, "Why did we not get some?" The people in Hillview, on whose behalf I presented a petition last week, and the people in Markland are asking, "Why did we not get some of this money? Why was this money spent in these areas?" Mr. Speaker, I will tell these people the answer. Now in Chapel Arm a new bridge is needed, Mr. Speaker, the people who live on the other side of that bridge, who use that bridge on a daily basis in that section of Chapel Arm called Western Cove, because it is in the Western area and there is a cove over there, the people who live in Western Cove, who vote PC by a large majority, they did not get a new bridge. But the people in Sunnyside, who vote Liberal with a large majority, they got their bridge. What message is there in that, Mr. Speaker? The message is that once this government convinces people to vote PC they take the attitude, "Well, you are PC now, we have got you switched over to PC so we will not bother to spend any money on giving you a new bridge in Chapel Arm. We will spend our money in Sunnyside, give these people a new bridge because we want to convince them to vote PC." So it is the

Liberals, Mr. Speaker, who are getting the Tory money in the district of Bellevue. It was the Liberals in Garden Cove and North Harbour and Come By Chance and Old Shop, it was the Liberals who got the money over the years.

Mr. Speaker, in Arnold's Cove, \$227,600 was spent on new pavement. Why was that not done down in Hillview or Hodge's Cove?

MR. SIMMS:

What are you complaining about?

MR. CALLAN:

Because again the attitude is, "Well, you people are Tories in Southwest Arm, so we do not need to spend any money down there to win your vote the next time. You are Tory already, the majority of you, so what we will do is spend our money in Arnold's Cove where the vast majority of people vote Liberal." And on this particular stretch of road from the Trans-Canada to Long Harbour Crossing, what people use that road, Mr. Speaker? What people use that stretch of road which cost \$343,200 to resurface? People who travel to work at ERCO industries. What is ERCO industries? ERCO industries is a plant that was put there by J.R. Smallwood, the former administration, and of course a new contract renegotiated by the present Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Barry), saving taxpayers \$146 million over the life of that ERCO contract.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of people who travel to work at ERCO Industries and travel over this stretch of highway that I am referring to are obviously Liberals. They would not have jobs if it was not for the Liberal Government. They may have jobs

down in Chile or over in Europe or Asia or somewhere else, but they would not have them with ERCO Industries. Because, Mr. Speaker, John Crosbie, the member who represents that particular section in the House of Commons in Ottawa because ERCO and Long Harbour are in St. John's West, John Crosbie is on record as saying that the plant should be closed down and all of the people working with ERCO Industries should be put on welfare and the Province would be better off. I have heard the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) say the same thing, not publicly, but privately he said it. So, Mr. Speaker, the district of Bellevue is getting lots of money but it is not being spent where the people would like to have it spent. That is the problem. And I am sure the people in Hodges Cove and the people in Hillview and Markland realize that all they did the last time was throw their vote away when they voted for the empty promise that they were going to get some pavement. When they realize what government is doing, this dirty trick that they are playing, winning your vote and saying then, 'Well, we got your vote so we do not have to give you anything, we will spend the money now in Liberal sections, where we know there are some Liberals,' once they get that message, of course, Mr. Speaker, then obviously they will change their vote in the next election. There is nothing that makes any more sense than that.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the debate I showed the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) the brochure from the new member of Parliament in Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, Captain Morrissey Johnson which came to the householders in Bonavista-Trinity-Conception last

week. Mr. Speaker, myself and the member for Carbonear are travelling to Ottawa during the first couple of days in December and we plan to meet with our new federal member, because I live in his district, as does the member for Carbonear. The member for Carbonear has only one federal member in his district but in Bellevue there are three, so I also hope to meet with the new member for Burin-St. George's, Mr. Joe Price, and perhaps with Mr. Crosbie if he is not too busy, since he represents Arnold's Cove and Come By Chance in the district of Bellevue, I may get a chance to see him as well.

Mr. Speaker, Captain Morrissey Johnson has a brilliant brochure here. It is a nice brochure. However, he has made a couple of mistakes which I will be bringing to his attention. On the second last page of his brochure he talks about helpful hints in applying for unemployment insurance. Now I get most of the calls, of course, about unemployment insurance from all sections of my district, even though it is federal and not provincial. But anyway he says, 'Your Canada Employment Centres in the riding of Bonavista - Trinity - Conception is Clarendville and Harbour Grace.' That, of course, is inaccurate. I do not think it was prepared by Captain Morrissey Johnson because he should know that a lot of people who live in the district of Bonavista - Trinity - Conception, especially around my area, Whitbourne, Chapel Arm, Norman's Cove, and so on, their office is in Mount Pearl, not in either one of these.

Another thing that the new member for Bonavista-Trinity-Conception made a mistake about was taking credit for federal projects that

were approved before voting day. Let alone approved after he became the member, they were approved before voting day.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we do meet and when I do meet with the new member for Bonavista - Trinity - Conception I will be bringing that to his attention. And I will also be reminding him, Mr. Speaker, of the Tory pledge to revamp the TCH, which is dated August 17, and I am prepared to table it.

And here it is, Mr. Speaker, made by Don Mazankowski, who is now the Minister of Transport but then was the Opposition critic on that department.

Back in August 17, during the heat of the federal election, what did the gentleman say, in an interview at the Lester Hotel in St. John's? He said, 'The least the federal government can do is ensure that we have an adequate Trans-Canada Highway network,' which is what I said in my resolution. And he said, 'We are committed to improving the infrastructure and we are committed to ensuring that the system we have in place is properly utilized and utilized to its maximum. That includes all transportation. But in the Atlantic region the road transportation is very important and it is a top priority if we form the next government.' He is now the minister, and I hope that Captain Morrissey Johnson, our federal member, will convince the new federal minister, as I assume our Provincial Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) was doing in Ottawa in the last couple of days, that we need a lot more money. And last week, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the offshore agreement and how we

should get \$2 billion or \$3 billion up front as part of the offshore agreement to bring up to standard the Trans-Canada and the numerous local roads that we have in our Province, Mr. Speaker, up to par. Mr. Speaker, I did not work for Morrissey but that does not mean that we cannot work together now. I rather doubt that he will work for me when my next election comes either, but that does not mean anything. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Tories in Ottawa now will fulfil their commitment to the people of this Province and the Tory government in this province will make sure that the pledge to revamp the Trans-Canada and the billions of dollars that we need in this Province for roads will be delivered.

Mr. Speaker, it is 6:00 p.m.. I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the resolution 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The resolution is defeated.

MR. NEARY:

Divide.

MR. SIMMS:

You have to have three members to call for a division.

MR. SPEAKER:

It being Private Members' Day I do now leave the Chair until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday, November 22, 1984.