



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 27

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

6 June 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, one of the major and most encouraging developments to appear on the world fishing scene in recent years has been with respect to aquaculture. A number of fishing nations, particularly the Scandinavian countries, have pursued development initiatives in such areas as salmon and trout farming to provide significant economic contributions to their overall fishing efforts. Here in this Province, we have been pursuing similar initiatives.

Over the past four to five years, my department, in co-operation with other groups, has been actively involved in a number of aquaculture research and development activities. These have included support for the rainbow trout farm at Hopeall, Trinity Bay, support for scallop farming activities in Marystown and on the Port au Port Peninsula, and support for ongoing aquaculture research activities being carried out by Memorial University's Marine Science Research Laboratory.

Up to this point, the pace of this development has, out of necessity, been cautious. Aquaculture is a very precise activity requiring strict attention to appropriate

environmental conditions. There is a significant time lag between the period of initial capital investment and return on this investment. A failure to pay strict attention to the environmental conditions could result in the initial investment being wiped out in this interim period.

I believe this cautious approach has served us well. The research which has been conducted and the experience gained has shown us that we have the potential for aquaculture development in Newfoundland. As well, it has identified where potential for success is the greatest. We are now ready to move forward to develop this potential and, this government believes it has a major role to play in fostering this development. Consistent with this, hon. members will undoubtedly have noted by now that the budget estimates for my department for the new fiscal year, contain a significant increase in support for aquaculture development: \$250,000 as opposed to \$85,400 during the last fiscal year. In addition, my department has recently acquired the services of a full-time aquaculturist.

Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to inform this hon. House that my department has taken a major step forward towards the increased promotion of aquaculture development through the introduction of a new programme: the mussel culture incentive programme.

In recent years, there has been an increasing market demand for mussels and our research has shown that we have the potential to cultivate mussels to supply this

market. However, at the present time, there is only one commercial mussel farm in the Province. We hope that through the incentives provided by this new programme, there will be an increased and widespread testing of potential mussel culture sites and that, in turn, this will lead to the establishment of other commercial farms.

Under the programme, my department will provide qualified prospective mussel growers with sufficient gear to determine the feasibility of potential mussel culture sites. This gear includes everything from floats and anchors to the collectors which are required. In addition, my officials will be providing significant technical advice and follow-up. They will assist with the initial site evaluation, on-site technical instructions, follow-up evaluation of the results, and planning assistance for subsequent commercial development.

Prospective mussel farmers interested in obtaining additional information or, availing of the assistance provided by this new programme, are requested to get in contact with my department.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this represents a significant step forward for the future development of the potential of our fishery resource. Over the course of the next few months, I hope to be able to make public the details of other measures we are intending to implement.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me again thank the minister, as I did yesterday, for passing me his ministerial statement with lots of lead time to go over it.

I want to say to him right off that we welcome any new initiative that the minister and his department will take, in view of the number of people unemployed in this Province we have no other choice. But let me say to him that I believe what he is taking here is a baby step rather than a major step, that it is high time that the department took some of those steps.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:  
There is a bunch of nasties over there in that corner somewhere, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mussels in the corner.

MR. TULK:  
Mussels in the corner and the flying undertaker.

If he looks at his budget estimates he will find that his budget has \$.25 million. I could even put it better for him perhaps and say \$250,000 as compared to \$85,400 last year for aquaculture in the Province. And I say to him that that in itself, compared to what is needed in the fishery, is peanuts.

Let me point out to him that his federal buddies, have recently taken \$50 million out of their fisheries budget, and that certainly is not going to help either aquaculture or any other kind of fishing enterprise in this

Province. And I want to point out to him that this is not new. He talks about the cautious approach so that we can gain valuable experience, that experience has been gained by other countries long before ever the minister got into this whole field. For example, there are thousands and thousands of jobs I understand in places like Norway in aquaculture. And I say to the minister that the number of unemployed in this Province today requires more than the cautious steps that he has taken in the Department of Fisheries. There is not much point in bringing this somewhat minor programme into this Province when he has so many major problems to deal with in taking care of the unemployed and the underpaid fishermen in this Province.

MR. FLIGHT:

Hear, hear! Excellent.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks the Department of Education has received representation from parents concerning the provision of French Immersion classes in the St. John's area.

The St. John's Roman Catholic and Avalon Consolidated School Boards received requests from 218 Kindergarten students for admission to early French immersion classes in September of 1985. The Boards were able to accept 150 students into programmes already established, but did not have the resources to accommodate all of the students.

I met with the parents and listened to their concerns and

also discussed this programme last week with representatives of the Boards. They are prepared to make every effort within means available to them to accommodate the wishes of all parents who want to enrol their children in French immersion classes.

Funding for French immersion programmes is cost-shared with the federal government under the Federal-Provincial Bilingual Agreement. The Province's capacity to provide financial support for new French immersion classes will depend on the level of funding we receive under the agreement for the 1985-86 school year.

The St. John's School Boards have informed me of their willingness to provide additional classes which will facilitate entry to all of those students who have previously been refused admission to French immersion, provided funding is available from the agreement. The Department of Education supports this initiative, and has submitted proposals for funding to the federal Department of The Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education will continue to support this programme, and will make every reasonable effort, within the resources available, to assist school boards in their efforts to meet the expanding demand for French immersion classes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome any initiative taken by this government to demonstrate the fact that we are a bilingual country. Any advancement of our education system in this Province with regard to French, or any other language, should not be political but should be an educational outlet for developing one's intellect.

It is unfortunate that this has had to come about. I am a little bit surprised at the defensive attitude the minister took in the first place. I referred to Justice to see if we have to provide French at all and then countering that we do not have to. Editorials have said French immersion is a violation of the Education Act. If French immersion is a violation of the Education Act, is the Education in violation of the Charter of Rights? We are only providing French immersion for larger urban areas, and we have to be careful we do not become elitest and we should provide it in rural areas also. And it should not be limited to one particular school board so that you have to live in a designated area of the town in order to get your children into it. So there are problems that will come up in the future.

Here we are talking about French immersion, while on the Port au Port Peninsula, where 65 per cent of the population is of French descent and have been trying to get their own French school system from Kindergarten, up. We are not even providing them with the basics of their culture. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) raised yesterday in the Committee the problem with languages in regard to the Inuit

and Innu. I hope that the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) will make sure that Native children in our Province are educated in their own languages as well as English.

So this side welcomes the minister's statement. Again, it resulted through pressure from the parents. I advise all parents in the Province if there is an issue that comes forward with which they do not agree to protest, and not just in the area of education. This again proves that public pressure does work - letters to the editor and open line programmes. If people do not like a programme brought in by this government, Mr. Speaker, then it is up to them to object. So I compliment the minister for doing it and compliment even more so the parents who want their children to have a first-class education. I hope that in future, the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) will ensure that our Native peoples are educated in their own languages, just as the French people of Port au Port have their own French language school. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Before we get into Question Period, I wonder if we could have some comment from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) with respect to the scheduling of Estimates Committees. It has all broken down again, apparently.

The last schedule we had was that the Energy estimates would be

coming up tomorrow evening, and my colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) referred to this. We had a tentative schedule. We realized it was tentative, but still we definitely had the Department of Development to come up after the continuation of Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, we have to make certain plans on our own schedule and we know we want to be subject to the House, but we do not want to be misled, particularly when it involves other Committees of the House, where the member for Windsor - Buchans, who is the energy spokesperson, has been invited to a function concerning the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I myself have been invited to the same function.

Now, it is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to have MHAs do the job if they do not receive proper notification with respect to these Committees. I would refer Your Honour to the editorial in today's Evening Telegram, which gives some explanation of why I have yet to see a reporter from The Evening Telegram in an Estimates Committee that I have been attending. I understand they have been to a couple of the Committees, but by far the majority of the Committees have not seen an Evening Telegram reporter. Well, we have the editors of that paper stating, Mr. Speaker, that it is because they are not receiving sufficient notice with respect to the scheduling of these departments, and they are not receiving enough lead time to arrange for coverage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, frankly I do not see how this can continue in another session of this House, that we have this farce with

respect to dealing with the estimates, where you have members sitting down having a nice, casual chat amongst themselves, with no opportunity to get out to the people of this Province the issues involved in an analysis of the estimates. Now, the whole point is to make it known to the general public how government is spending or is not spending the money which is entrusted to their care. If the public cannot have this information raised with them, we do not have the capabilities of the Premier's Office to churn out these little brochures with barrels of oil on them and so forth. We do not want to have to resort to propaganda, Mr. Speaker, in order to get out the legitimate business of this House which it should be possible to get out by giving the press proper notice of these estimate committee meetings.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am still not clear whether the hon. gentleman got up on a point of privilege, a point of order or just a soliloquy but in any event, Mr. Speaker, I shall take it as a point of order and I will respond with respect to it. First of all with respect to the schedule, the hon. gentleman in this House last week - and we endeavour to cooperate to make these committees function properly - said, 'We are not getting a schedule.' Do you remember that? Hansard will bear that out, 'We do not know what is coming up next.' So, at the end of the day I gave him a schedule, 'In the Resource Committee,' I said, 'on Monday it will be Fisheries, on Wednesday it will be Energy and on Thursday it will be Development.' That is the

May 30 notice, I have a copy of it right here. Then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman went into a state of apoplexy or whatever, I cannot get my tongue around the word, and he started shouting over on the other side, 'But we do not know if Fisheries will be over. You are presuming that it will be over and that it will follow.' And my response was, 'Well, if Fisheries is not over then Fisheries will flow into the next day and things will be postponed.' And that is exactly what happened. On Tuesday, Fisheries met; on Wednesday, Fisheries met; and, tonight, scheduled in logical fashion is Energy. Now the hon. gentleman mentions he has a function. I have the same function as well, Mr. Speaker, but I regard these committees to be sufficiently important that it is the main duty of any member of this House, and certainly the minister, to make himself available. I have two or three functions tonight but the Committee has asked me to appear and I will appear. Now as for the what the hon. gentleman indicates with respect to one of the press indicating they did not have sufficient notice, Mr. Speaker, the notice is there in Standing Order 120. The procedure is that after the budget is over the various departments are referred to the committees and it says in Standing Order 120 that for fifteen days they consider the estimates. So all of the press know that it is a fifteen day period, they know that you meet in the morning and at night, not in the afternoon. So I do not see that it is any real hardship for them to programme themselves. If they do not it has something to do with the internal operations of that particular newspaper or that particular medium. But all we can

do is say the business of the House has to go on and the business is going on. Now as to these committees, this is one of the most forward steps that has ever been taken. It was collaborated in and agreed upon by the most distinguished member from the Liberal side away - I have to differentiate because all members of the Tory Opposition, except one, in history were distinguished - hon. Don Jamieson, who agreed with this. This process is used in every parliamentary jurisdiction under the British parliamentary system. It is used throughout Canada, it is used in Britain, and it is used elsewhere, in the other Commonwealth countries, and the idea of it is you get a committee of five to seven people and it enables a more detailed examination of the estimates.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Not if they stay on the minister's salary for hours.

MR. MARSHALL:

What has happened in this case is the hon. gentlemen there opposite are trying to derogate from the process and all the rest of it. What they are doing in the Committees is staying on the ministers' salaries, they are not asking the questions as to what this expenditure is for and that sort of thing. Mr. Speaker, you can bring horses to the water but you cannot make them drink.

Now, we have set up the process, the process is ongoing, it is the same process that has worked so well in the British parliamentary system, it could work here with good will and co-operation on both sides. We are willing to co-operate. We give notice of which Committees are meeting and

which departments they will be considering, timely notice. There is nothing more we can do except to say that we have the responsibility for the business of this Province, we are putting it through in an orderly fashion, we have set up this procedure, and this is what we will continue to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I do not want to extend this, although it is a very serious matter from our point of view. If I could just mention that the Premier stood up in this House and he gave to this House a good commitment with respect to what was intended. He admitted that there had been some difficulty, and we understand, Mr. Speaker, that at times ministers require consideration. The representatives of this side of the House on the Resource Committee undertook with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) to excuse him from meeting with the Committee this evening so that he could meet with a minister from another country, the minister from Iceland, who is visiting the Province. We felt that that was an important function, that the minister should be excused from the Committee and should go and meet that gentleman.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have a commitment from the Premier that there will be co-operation. Granted the committee system seems

to work in other places, but that co-operation has to be there, and the same day the Premier gave the commitment, they changed the schedule on us. I will just table for Your Honour the schedule that was given us last night -

MR. FLIGHT:

At six o'clock.

MR. BARRY:

- at six o'clock by the minister who just stood on his feet, which set out the continuation of the Fisheries Department for last night, and set out Development for tonight. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the minister to say, Well, all members have to attend and be diligent in their attendance in Estimates Committees, including members on this side, we agree, but it is another thing for members of this House to be misled by information supplied by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and that is what has happened, and that is what is continuously happening with respect to these Committees. We are misled, the press is misled, nobody knows what is going on, and the Committee system is not working as a result.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I can table what was given the House on May 30. The Chairman of the Resource Committee (Mr. Peach) can get up and contradict me if I am not repeating correctly to the House what he said but, first of all, the schedule called for Fisheries, Energy and Development despite



what the hon. gentleman said. Yesterday they agreed to this with the Chairman of the Resource Estimates Committee that we would meet today on Energy. So the members had notice of it. They agreed. They are obviously, Mr. Speaker, playing games with respect to it. We are bending over backwards to co-operate, we will continue to co-operate, but we have to conduct the affairs of the Province properly.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order. I have monitored this since I made the statement in the House the other day. As I understand it, the Fisheries Department now is still on the Minister's Salary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You are still on the Minister's Salary.

MR. BARRY:

That is normal.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

But how many hours have you had? The federal budget of \$90 billion or \$100 billion have been approved in principle after six days. You are not being fair. You should be down through the Minister of Fisheries's estimates.

MR. BARRY:

Hold on now! We will see who is fair.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Minister of Fisheries has been

there now. Besides, the whole report from the Resource Committee comes back here for three more hours debate. There are fifteen days. The federal budget has been approved in principle in six days. Now what I would say is if hon. members opposite want co-operation, we will co-operate. But it seems to us that the members opposite are trying to deliberately delay getting through all of the departments so that at the end of the fifteen days you can make the point then all of the departments were not scrutinized by the Committees.

MR. REID:

Right on. Right on.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Because the Department of the Environment, you know, should be scrutinized. The Department of Public Works, or whatever other departments are ready to come up, should be scrutinized, but not in the same amount of time, perhaps, as Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

But there should be a more reasonable approach. All they have been in Fisheries up to now is making speeches on the Minister's Salary. Now stop making speeches and get down at the subheads and examine each subhead and ask questions of the minister and his officials.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we now see the Premier embarking upon his little game which is to try and modify the way the estimates proceed. Because the Premier knows full well that while we are on the Minister's Salary the Committee is entitled to ask questions about anything under the sun as far as the Minister's Department is concerned. And, believe me, there are a lot of rocks to overturn in that department, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well why do you not (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

And to say that after two meetings of that Committee six hours, that we have exhausted what we can raise on the most important industry in this Province, which is in a total state of disarray is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- false, Mr. Speaker, and misleading.

And the Premier says they are not asking questions, they are giving speeches. The Premier has not been at those Estimates Committee meetings. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the entitlement of members of this House and it is one of their obligations to make a speech if it is not getting through to the ministers what they should be doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, sometimes the Premier's little tricks, his

little diversionary tactics work, Mr. Speaker, but they are not going to work this time, because I will refer the Premier to the schedule of what has taking place in the Resource Committee to date. For the Premier's information, after Fisheries there are only two departments that remain to be completed in that Resource Committee, namely, Development and the Energy aspect of Mines and Energy. And, Mr. Speaker, that Committee is much further ahead because we decided that we would give up time on other departments in order to zero in and concentrate on the Department of Fisheries, as we are entitled to do, and on the Department of Energy and on Development. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to forego the right of the Opposition to decide where the scrutiny should take place, where the examination should take place, and we should not, Mr. Speaker, in order to have that right, in order to have the right to scrutinize the estimates of government, we should not sacrifice the right of knowing when these departments are coming before the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

To all of those grandiose words I can reply that schedules that were given were tentative. I can advise the House that the Resource Committee schedule was changed by agreement. It was a 'tentative' schedule which was supplied to the Opposition in trying to co-operate with them. Anyway, it was changed by agreement last evening by the members at the meeting.

MR. FLIGHT:

I am a member of the Committee, I

was not told.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
You were not there last night.  
How could you agree or disagree?

MR. TOBIN:  
Your House Leader (Mr. Tulk)  
agreed.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Yes, the member for Fogo agreed.

MR. TULK:  
That schedule was not given to me.

MR. TOBIN:  
You agreed to it last night and I  
was there when you agreed to it.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, apart from all that,  
there are referred to each  
Committee, at the start of the  
fifteen days, six or seven  
departments. Now, surely the hon.  
gentleman there opposite are  
conversant enough to have been on  
notice fifteen days ago that these  
can come up. Surely they are  
conversant enough with affairs.  
They were given notice fifteen  
days ago with respect to it. The  
fact of the matter is that  
yesterday the schedule was changed  
by agreement. The other fact of  
the matter is, which I think is  
quite evident, Mr. Speaker, is  
that the hon. gentlemen are trying  
to torpedo this system. They have  
attempted to torpedo it. I would  
say to the Leader of the  
Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the  
members there opposite that the  
process of government would be  
better served if they made an  
honest, sincere effort to make it

work. If it does not work it is  
not the fault of the government,  
Mr. Speaker, it is the fault of  
the hon. members.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
It looks very much now like the  
Opposition are trying to torpedo  
this whole system. They are not  
going to torpedo it, Mr. Speaker.  
It is in the Standing Orders. The  
other thing is they are  
demonstrating every day their  
incompetence. They have had this  
budget now since the Minister of  
Finance (Dr. Collins) introduced  
it, they have shadow ministers  
over there for every department  
who may have to take that one  
department and go through it and  
be the lead opposition member in  
that Committee on that department,  
with the others filling in and  
asking questions along the line.  
There is no excuse for the various  
members over there taking the  
department or two that they shadow  
and going through eight or ten  
pages of subheads and so on,  
getting their research done and  
being ready for those committees.  
That is what we are here for.

Now, other members opposite have  
other functions. I told the  
ministers here, in writing and in  
Cabinet, that the first obligation  
of every minister and member is to  
this Legislature and to its  
committees. Other functions  
notwithstanding, this is too  
important. It is what we have  
been elected to do. The budget is  
there, they have read it. You can  
tell in Question Period, Mr.  
Speaker, how much they know about  
the budget. We have to refer them

to I do not know how many things every day. So the Opposition are not being fair and they are trying to torpedo the whole system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We will co-operate, but we are surely not going to bow down and allow them to torpedo something. They are demonstrating their incompetence and why they deserve to be on that side of the House and not this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To the point of order, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, it is not a case of the Premier bowing down, it is a case of fair play. If the Premier wants to know why I was not at the Resource Policy Committee it was through no choice of my own. Morning, noon and night this past week we have been sitting on committees and on the Privilege and Elections Committee. This morning at 10:00 a.m. we met on the Privilege and Elections Committee and I was there. This afternoon we are in the House of Assembly. Yesterday evening at 6:00 p.m. the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) presented to me and the rest of this Opposition a schedule showing Resources on Thursday night, tonight. Now it has changed and Development is on tonight. Energy

is replaced tonight simply because the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) is hosting a function on behalf of the Newfoundland Government in the Holiday Inn. Now the function that I am attending tonight as a member of that Privileges Committee is just as important to me and to the House as the function the Minister of Development is sponsoring. All we are asking is for the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to look at it and stand by the commitment he made yesterday evening at 6:00 p.m. and let us keep Development on tonight as was scheduled on this schedule. I mean, the House has been misled, Mr. Speaker, because this is the schedule that was delivered at 6:00 p.m. and members of this House leave this building at 6:00 p.m. and they have no way of knowing what the Government House Leader has done since. So, Mr. Speaker, what we are asking is for a little sense of fair play and either put Development back where it was supposed to be tonight or else change the scheduling so that Energy will not take place tonight because there is a possibility, Mr. Speaker - and maybe the Government House Leader would want to live with this - that we can boycott the Committee. What a farce it would be if the minister arrived tonight at a Committee with government members and no Opposition members. Maybe that is what the government wants to happen. Maybe it is not our scuttling the Estimates Committees but rather the government would like to shove those kinds of things through. So, Mr. Speaker, we are asking for a little sense of fair play.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!  
Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the President of the  
Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

May I suggest the point of order has been disposed of, there is no point of order. As to the hon. gentlemen boycotting, it would not make any difference anyway. We have been sitting in this House and the hon. gentlemen there opposite, none of them, except for one morning, I remember, has asked questions on Energy and they retreated in defeat very shortly thereafter. So it does not make any difference. Apparently it does not make any difference when the hon. gentlemen turn up anyway. I wish it did. I wish you would be more conversant with the Energy estimates to be able to ask some incisive questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think I have heard enough. To that point of order, I felt right from the start that there was not a point of order but I felt that there was some misunderstanding about the times of the committee hearings and this is why I let the debate continue. As far as I can see under Standing Order 84 (d), page 28, "The said Standing Committee may sit at all times during the Assembly for which they are appointed, whether or not the House is in Session, adjourned or prorogued." I do not think there is any point of order here. It is a matter of trying to arrange times that are as mutually satisfactory as possible.

Before calling Oral Questions, I have great pleasure in welcoming Senator Joyce Fairburn to the gallery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

I would like to welcome fourteen Grade VI students from Horwood Elementary, with their teacher, Danny Rideout.

Also, I would like to welcome twenty-five students from Holy Cross High School, with their teachers, Kevin Major and Mrs. Linda Pike. It does not say where they are from, presumably St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand two letters, one of which, on Tuesday evening, was tabled in the Resource Estimates Committee by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and clearly pointed out the government's position on the West German overfishing offshore.

I have another which was tabled yesterday afternoon in the House by the Minister of Fisheries. It was in reply to some questions from the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), but he tabled it yesterday afternoon. It was supposed to be the letter sent to the federal Minister of

Fisheries (Mr. Fraser), the Right Hon. Joe Clark, the hon. John C. Crosbie, the hon. Gerald Ottenheimer and the hon. the Premier. It was only upon reading this letter yesterday evening, Mr. Speaker, that I found out the government's position was nothing but pure gibberish and has been changed from the original draft. Consequently, I questioned the minister on it last night in the Estimates Committee, since the Premier wants to know whether we ask questions. I questioned the minister and he said first of all that it did not change the position of the government, that there was no change in the letters, but then he finally admitted that there was. This morning, I received a telephone call from the minister, telling me that this second letter, the one that was tabled in the House yesterday, is not the letter that was sent to the people named in the letter, either copied or original. I think the minister said the original draft was re-typed yesterday, with the pertinent phrases, namely, those about the West German overfishing being regretted as part of the total EEC, being left out.

Now, I want to ask the minister, will he now table the third letter that he is referring to, and will that be the final and authoritative letter that we can expect from the Minister of Fisheries? Also, when did he send that letter? Was it April 30, as was stated on this supposedly re-typed version of the original draft?

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the minister, I would like to welcome to the galleries, Mr. Joseph Maingot, Q.C., who was Law Clerk

and Parliamentary Consul at the House of Commons, Ottawa, and is now a member of the Law Reform Commission of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. TULK:

Apologize now.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to apologize for.

MR. TULK:

You misled the House.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will try to answer the question that the gentleman from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) raised. I explained to him this morning there was nothing underhanded, no misleading of the House, nothing of that nature, Mr. Speaker. He asked me if I could table it, and I will. As hon. gentleman can see, and they can look at it pretty closely once it is tabled and passed around, this is a very, very poor document, very, very poor copy because of the quality of the copying. So yesterday, before I came to the House to table the letter, my good secretary, in her wisdom, decided we would do it over again so that it would be very nice looking.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are a poor copier.

MR. RIDEOUT:

And that is about it, Mr. Speaker, it is laughable. We did it over again so that we would have a very nice, glossy copy for all members, the press, and anybody else who wanted to read it. In doing it over again, four or five words -

the hon. gentleman was right - were left out of this one that were in this one, and this is the one that sent by special courier to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. This is the one that was sent to Ottawa by special courier and has included in it the words that the hon. gentleman was talking about, 'And that the fish taken by the West German fleet will be regarded as the full EEC allocation for the duration of the LTA.' These were in the working document but were left out of this effort to present a nice little copy to the House of Assembly.

So no doubt, Mr. Speaker, when things arrive in ministers' offices, as when they arrive in ministers' offices here, they are stamped, they are logged, and they are recorded. And there will be no doubt, I am sure, that this document, which was sent by special courier from this Province on April 30, is the same document that I have here now, the same one that without any malice or any intention to mislead, we attempted to provide to the House yesterday. It was just that we went overboard - not overboard, perhaps, but we went out of our way to provide a nice copy so that it would be easy to read, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing underhanded, there is no attempt to mislead, it is just an attempt to be accommodating, to be courteous, to provide good, readable information to the House.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, why does the minister not trade in the shredder and get

a good copier? He seems to good shredders but poor copiers. Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether the minister meant to or not, he did mislead this House yesterday. I want to ask him is this copy glossy or if it is an affair that has been glossed over?

Let me put the question to him. Is it not fair to conclude, given the confusion that the minister has created with this whole situation - and there is no point in his trying to lay it at the door of his secretary, he is the minister - is it not fair to conclude that the one reason the Newfoundland Government is in such ignorance of its major resource is that the minister has shown us that he simply does not know how to carry on communications either with the federal minister or anyone else? Is that the real problem in the Department of Fisheries?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Of course not, Mr. Speaker. That is not the real problem in the Department of Fisheries. The Department of Fisheries is functioning very, very well. The Department of Fisheries has had excellent leadership since this administration came to office, it has excellent political leadership again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:  
That is your problem.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

This administration is dedicated to the preservation of the fishery; dedicated to the preservation of the fishery in Fogo, along the Northeast Coast, and along the Southeast Coast. This administration, Mr. Speaker, is so dedicated in providing good, readable documents to the House that the only little thing that happened, Mr. Speaker, was that in our overzealousness to do so three of four words were left out. There was the real document, the document that mattered, and the document that the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

- came down to the Committee with last night and he thought he had us committing crimes, he thought he had us committing treason! He came down and he spent twenty-five or thirty minutes ballyragging me, beating me into the floor, beating up on me, Mr. Speaker, little old me compared to him, and he got caught out. That is what happened, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

And then they want more time in the Estimates Committees.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I have to say to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) that yesterday evening in Committee it did seem that I was bullying, and I backed off. When it was

revealed to him, he would not have bled if you had stuck him, not at all. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister if this is the original copy? Is this the final copy that we are going to get or does the hon. gentleman really have something to hide here.?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to hide. We are as honest over here as the day is long, and this minister, I can say to the House without sounding boastful, is as honest as two days are long, if that is possible, without being modest. This is not the original, Mr. Speaker, but this is a copy of the original. The original is in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, with all the words that were in the working document, with all the words that are in this document, pointing out very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that this Province made some very strong, very determined positions, and presented them to the federal government. We have followed up on them verbally, as I told the hon. gentleman, and will be following up on them again in the Atlantic Council of Ministers meeting next week. We are 100 per cent aboveboard and on deck, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary by the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. minister that there will be no more need for the shredder, because you will not be able to read the minister's files from now



on. No documents are going into the files from here on in. Let me let the minister settle down. Let him settle down. There were five people named in the letters that were dated April 30 - I suppose they were dated - and yesterday we have received a second copy. They were the Hon. John Fraser, Joe Clark, John Crosbie, the Hon. Gerry Ottenheimer and the Premier. Those letters were sent by special courier on April 30 and today is June 6. Now if those letters were sent on April 30, the minister, I am sure he will agree, should have received a reply by now. Will he table those replies?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, when I am finished with the reply, or all the replies for that matter - I have had a response from Mr. Fraser, I have had a response from Mr. Crosbie, I have had some correspondence with the Premier - when it is good and ready and we deem it appropriate, we will table whatever correspondence we want to table. But if the hon. gentleman wants to know if this is the document that is in Mr. Fraser's office, or Mr. Clark's office, or Mr. Crosbie's office, then he can go to Ottawa and they can pull out the file and show him that it is there word for word, not one word missing, Mr. Speaker, not one period missing, not one dot over an 'i' missing, not one bar across a 't' missing, just as we said it was there.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the minister can bawl his way through this one, or he can settle down for a minute and realize that what he did yesterday was serious. Now, it might have been inadvertent but no amount of shouting can gloss that over. He gives us his assurance today that there are no 'i's' missing, no crossed 't's' missing, and so on, but I am not sure I am comfortable with that assurance. Because yesterday we have evidence that he signed a letter that he clearly did not read or did not understand, because his signature is on letter number two which indicates to the House that he either did not understand it or the whole substance of the letter was missing from it. He did not understand that or he did not care what he gave to the House. And for either reason, Mr. Speaker, he should just quit the yelling and understand that he owes an apology to the House for coming in here with a document that he purported to be a true copy of a original which we now know was not a true copy of the original. So, first of all, Mr. Speaker, is he now prepared to apologize to the House for that omission? And, also, would he give the House the assurance that the less than competent sequence of events which is revealed here is not typical of the way he runs his office, that this is the exception that proves the rule, that it is possible when he sends a letter to the Minister of Fisheries for Canada (Mr. Fraser) to have a copy on file which is readable, and in the oft-chance that it is sometimes not readable, and they do not have good copiers around because the money is all tied up in shredders and so on, can he give us the assurance that he has a secretary down there who can type word for

word what is placed in front of that secretary? And thirdly, will he give us the assurance that he has the competence to read well before he signs his name in his capacity as minister?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, sometimes the Opposition will say I have a short fuse. But, I mean, you would hardly want to have any fuse at all to reply to that type of question. The hon. gentleman should know how competently I run my office, Mr. Speaker, he has been there.

MR. TULK:

We all do.

MR. RIDEOUT:

He has indicated how secure he feels in the competent way that I am approaching the job as Minister of Fisheries. He has said it to his constituents, Mr. Speaker. So the hon. gentleman has seen me in operation. I signed the letter that was brought to this House yesterday, Mr. Speaker. And, as I told the Committee last night, I do not slough off responsibility on secretaries or officials.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The fact of the matter is, I take responsibility for it as minister. It was brought into me, it said 'This copy is a better copy to go to the House', and I signed it. I did not read it through because in the files of the department, Mr. Speaker, is

the true copy of what went to Ottawa.

Now, if it makes the hon. gentleman's heart beat any faster or makes his mind more at ease or gives him a greater capacity to understand that, if I did not want to be open and honest about this, I need not called the hon. gentleman this morning and said, 'Boy, look, here is really what happened, I need not have called the Chairman of the Committee, as I did this morning, and said, boy, look here is really what happened. If there was any cover-up on the go, Mr. Speaker, I do not think you would do that kind of a thing. But if it makes the hon. gentleman's conscience any easier so he can rest tonight, if he wants an apology for whatever error I may have committed, I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister in the first part of his answer for being so magnanimous as to acknowledge that I am one who does give credit where credit is due. And what I said to him last week, when there was a delegation here, was that I had thought he had done a marvellous job of being open with me and with the constituents. That is not the issue today.

The issue today is whether he can manage his files. That is the

issue, and we have dealt with that issue. So my supplementary, Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with the issue of managing files, and we have demonstrated, he cannot. Now the second issue, Mr. Speaker, which is really the gut of this entire matter is not so much how the letter went or what version went, but what kind of substantive response he has been able to trigger five weeks after the event. He was kept in the dark for two and a half months. The letter went by courier five weeks ago because the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) did not think it was important enough to send via Telex, so they have got it, we have to assume, by now. What substantive response has he triggered in Ottawa to this very serious issue? That is the answer we would really like to know.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You can now see very clearly, Mr. Speaker, where the opposition is coming from. First of all, the great matter of principle here was misleading the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

Which you did.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Secondly, the great matter of principle here was that you cannot read. Thirdly, the great matter of principle here was that you cannot manage your files. Fourthly, the great matter of principle was that you should apologize to the House. Now the substantive question is, if you got this off as you say you did,

what kind of response did you get to it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I answered that question for the gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). We have indeed received a response from the Federal Minister (Mr. Fraser) and Mr. Crosbie and others. We are going to be meeting as a Council of Ministers over the next few days to further expand on our position and the federal position, and when we are ready, Mr. Speaker, when we deem it appropriate, we will table any and or all correspondence that we have relative to this matter. When we deem it appropriate so to do!

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I understood the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) to say yesterday evening in Committee, in answer to a question I put to him, that he had received no formal written reply from the Minister of Fisheries or any of the other people. Is he now saying that he has received a reply?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman should check the transcripts and I do not think he will find that there on this particular score. There were some other items that were mentioned when an answer along those lines were given. But on this, I do not think the hon. gentleman will find those words in the transcript.

MR. TULK:  
We will see.

MR. HISCOCK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. He said that the original copy of the letter is in Ottawa and the reason why the copy was redone was to make sure that he had a nice glossy copy for the House. I would be rather surprised if the copy in the minister's files is the same as the one presented to the House. But if that is a copy of the original, is it not true that the letters that went to Mr. Clark, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Ottenheimer and the Premier would be in the same condition? How could you send a letter to the Minister of External Affairs and the Minister of Justice in such condition?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, the Spanish Inquisition is riding well.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. gentleman may do some copying from time to time. We all have to help ourselves at the copying machine from time to time. I would feel very comfortable in saying -

MR. HISCOCK:  
Then why accept a letter like that for your own files?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, does he want an answer or does he not? I would feel very comfortable in saying that we sent a good quality product off to Ottawa and to the Premier and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and so on. But when it went to be copied again you ended up with this kind of thing. If you copy off a copy it is not very nice, so my secretary, to be honest, a very competent girl, did not think this would be very nice to make seventy-five copies from - fifty-two for the House and so many for the press I think the rule is, and by the time you made seventy-five copies of this you would not be able to read any of it. So we thought we would be really pleasant and courteous and do this, and in doing so we created the little problem that we have today.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Do you have the glossy one in your files?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I would just as soon not have it, but it is just as well to be honest about it.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Now we hear he made too many copies. He wore out the file copy making copies. How ridiculous!

Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with the other issues and they are

issues of principle, that the minister should be misleading the House and should be trying to slough off on us bogus copies and so on. We have gone through all of that. But the other issue, Mr. Speaker, which we should not lose sight of is that in another time, when another regime was in Ottawa, if they whacked off a Telex - it would not have gone by courier, I assure you - and they did not get a response within days, or a telephone call, he would be in here with a resolution getting both sides of the House to get together to get after the federal government to answer their mail. Now it is five weeks, it is a serious matter, and the best the minister can give us is that one of those days he is going to go up to PEI somewhere, wherever it is, and have a cup of tea with John Fraser. Well, that is not good enough. I now ask him what he has done as a follow-up to that letter. Has he been on the phone? Has he sent a further Telex? Has he done something to convey to Ottawa the very serious concern we have with this matter on an urgent basis? What is happening to ensure that the views of the Newfoundland Government and the Newfoundland people are being properly heard insofar as the West German overfishing is concerned.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I answered that question in detail last night when I was asked by the official critic for Fisheries for the Opposition. We have been in touch on a number of occasions, myself personally, with Mr. Fraser. I met him face to face in Montreal as he was enroute to West Germany, and I embarked again on making sure that

he understood our position. The Premier has talked to him, and the Premier has talked to the Prime Minister. Mr. Speaker, we have done everything possible and will continue to do everything possible to make sure that we do to the best of our ability our job to protect the interests of Newfoundlanders.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. In recent days we have heard a number of complaints coming from the various hospitals with respect to the effect budget restraints are having on the quality of health care. The latest, Mr. Speaker, came out yesterday from St. Clare's Hospital to the effect that 'Financial restraints at the hospital are putting too much stress on the nurses and will affect the quality and the quantity' - and I am quoting the Administrator now - 'of health care.' Is the minister now prepared to concede that financial restraints placed on the hospitals will have a very serious and adverse effect on health care? And if that is the case, will he not, then, make sufficient money available to the hospital boards to ensure that does not happen?

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
Yes, we are aware that there will be some restraints in the health care system where our budgets have been tied to the zero. That happens in St. John's only. Yes,

we know there will be cutbacks. Yes, we know that there will be a slowing of admission for elective cases. These will happen. We have not decided at this time that we would add any more money to the budget for these hospitals.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:  
A supplementary to the Minister of Health. This last weekend, I am sure, many of us watched the telethon on CBC television for the Janeway Children's Hospital and it raised something like \$340,000. We also hear now that St. Clare's Hospital is planning to set up a foundation in order to raise money as well. I was curious that at the end of the telethon the Administrator of the Janeway Hospital said that this money was not to be used for helping visitors to the hospital, or for supplementary programmes and so on, but was going to be used to pay for basic equipment, such as x-ray equipment and other essentials.

MR. BAIRD:  
What is your question?

MR. FENWICK:  
I am getting to the question. Now, I am not a medical expert, but it seems to me that x-ray equipment is pretty basic stuff. My question to the Minister of Health is does this mean that the hospitals are now so short of funds they have to go to the public for fund raising in order to get the basic equipment they need?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:  
Mr. Speaker, it is not an unusual procedure for hospitals all over the world to organize a group you can call a foundation to raise funds. I think that you are very well aware that they have one at the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto. It has been there for years and years, and they have an executive staff full-time to raise funds on behalf of sick children in Toronto.

I think you can move down again into the Maritime Provinces and you will find that the Killam Hospital in Halifax has the very same foundation. For many years, the General Hospital has had a foundation, so has the Janeway, so has the Central Newfoundland Hospital. And you will find, if you go across this Province, that there are various funds available from private donations, from gifts that might come from service clubs and other interested groups. That has been a part, as far as I know, of hospitals' means of raising money, as long as I have been in the practice of medicine.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Right on!

DR. TWOMEY:  
I do not think it is anything unusual, and I think it is a commendable thing, since people want to give gifts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:  
Now, if you go a little further and ask does it serve a purpose? - Yes, it does, because, as you know, you are a remarkable reader and you have read in detail the

things that have happened, especially in the Social Democratic Party back in the Province of Manitoba, you know that Mr. Des Jardins, if you will excuse my French, gave a speech in, I believe November, 1984, to a meeting of the Municipalities in the Province of Manitoba, and he stated most emphatically that the Province of Manitoba and its government, which is the New Democratic government, could, under no circumstances at that time, go beyond 8.8 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product of their province. As far as I know - I am not quite sure at this very moment - a few years ago, ours was 12.7 of our Gross Domestic Product.

Now, you asked me if X-ray equipment is part of that equipment that is going to be purchased?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:  
To the best of my knowledge, the answer is no because, in the last two years, we have doubled the amount of money that we have put into a special fund for technology in all hospitals across this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:  
The present figure is around \$6 million. I understand, hearsay, that, yes, some money is going into this, but, also, the Department of Health would do it. And I think if you look around the world, no matter where you go, even to the richest kingdom in the world, you will find that there is a curtailment of money in all health care services. It started

last year in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and I can go on and on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
Tell us about that one.!

DR. TWOMEY:  
If it is possible it is right to have a group that are civic-minded, they are volunteers, they will be delighted always to help hospitals because it shows the great humanity in our culture.

MR. SIMMS:  
Good short answer!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:  
It is always nice to ask a question of the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) because you get the answer in such volume and you get it in such good humor. However, if I am not mistaken, I did hear, in all that avalanche of information, an admission that the administrator of the hospital has said that he is using the funds for X-ray equipment.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The other day in this House, Mr. Speaker, when you made a ruling at the beginning of the day, you, if I remember correctly, explicitly instructed members of this House that in supplementary questions there was to be no preamble. We are losing a lot of time out of our thirty minutes for valuable questions in this House. The hon. member now is up on a supplementary and, again, members are continuing to make speeches and have preambles. Now, there is a standing rule which says that there is to be no preamble to supplementary questions or there is not. As I understand it there is, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to see it enforced.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

I think if the hon. the Premier were in the House the last half an hour he would have realized that any supplementary that was asked before this had twice as long a preamble as the one that I have had so I do not see that that was necessarily so long.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That point of order is well taken. There should be no necessity for a long preamble. I do think that the hon. member was getting into an excessively long one and I was going to draw his attention to that.

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like to welcome to the

gallery the delegation from the council of Trinity in the district of Bonavista North. The council is represented by the Deputy Mayor, Mr. Earn Rogers, and, councillors, Mr. Daren Brown and Mr. Harold Morris.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Answers to Questions for which  
Notice has been Given

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

I do not think I will read it, Mr. Speaker. I would like to give the answers to questions asked by the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) the Order Paper of May 15. Unfortunately, Sir, this is only some of the answer. It will take about two people on my staff about another month to get it ready, but for the information of the hon. gentleman I will table the Annual Report of the Department of Public Works and Services, which contains information he asked about pertaining to all tenders and public contracts we go into.

Petitions

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.



MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition. As I pointed out yesterday to the House when I tried to present this petition, this is an original petition. It is not a copy of a petition. It is an original petition on behalf of approximately three hundred and some odd people in the community of Marysvale and we have some names from the Georgetown area included as well. As I tried yesterday to present this petition, Mr. Speaker, I tried to bring to the attention of Your Honour something that came to my attention about two days ago and that is that this petition, that I am presenting today, this original petition, a photostat copy of this was presented in the House a couple of days ago. 0

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

Standing Order 92, "Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains." I would suggest to you that the hon. member is getting off on a tirade that he started yesterday and has no bearing to that particular Standing Order.

MR. DOYLE:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

As I go on in presenting this petition I think Your Honour will see that what I am about to say does have some relevance in presenting that petition.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The Standing Order does not refer to the relevance and connection. It is very, very specific as to what the member may speak to.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that he should confine his remarks to the prayer of the petition.

MR. DOYLE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, then maybe I will have to rise on a point of order or a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

The point of privilege that I make is this: The hon. gentleman from Port de Grave (Mr. Effort) presented a photostat copy of this petition to the House a couple of days ago as an original with not one original signature on the petition except his own. Now the people in the Georgetown and Marysvale area have approached me, Mr. Speaker, to present this petition on their behalf, and they also asked me to convey to Your Honour, as well, their very grave concern, their very grave

displeasure, as a matter of fact, in having a copy of their petition presented to the House without their permission to do so.

Mr. Speaker, that is a serious breach of the rules of this House. The fact that the hon. gentleman presented a photostat copy is, in itself, a breach of the rules of the House, so I would bring that to the attention of Your Honour as well.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
To the point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
What a shame!

MR. DAWE:  
There are rules in this House and you should learn operate by them.

MR. TULK:  
Get down basket ball (inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:  
The fact that I as an MHA received a petition -

MR. TULK:  
You were better at basketball than you are at politics.

MR. BARRY:  
You were hit by too many pitch balls.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order please.

MR. DAWE:  
That is why I was in the championship and you were not.

MR. EFFORD:  
You are certainly not in the

championship now.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. DAWE:  
The championship is on tomorrow. Are you ready?

MR. EFFORD:  
Is the hon. member finished?

Mr. Speaker, the fact that I as an MHA received a petition from a group of people in the district of Harbour Main, which the hon. member represents, and I took it upon myself, when they asked me, to present it to the House, I did not think I was committing that much of a crime. The fact that it was a very necessary petition, and the fact that the people of the district, and people of part of my district, in Georgetown, were so concerned about the fact that their students were going to be moved from Marysvalle to Brigus, it is still a mystery to me why the minister had not presented the petition himself. Now, when I got up and presented the petition -

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

I would ask the hon. member to confine himself to the point of order that was raised.

MR. EFFORD:  
I am. Mr. Speaker, in speaking to that point of order I will go about it another way. The hon. member for Harbour Main (Mr. Doyle) has accused me of presenting a petition that was photo copied. Yes, I found that out today. I did not take notice of it in the beginning, but I did present a petition that was photocopied.

MR. BARRY:  
Bring out the whips. Cut off the member's hand. Lash him.

MR. EFFORD:  
Shocking! Shocking!

I guess the hon. member was upset -

MR. BAIRD:  
Surely you should know a photostat from an original.

MR. EFFORD:  
I would not want to seek your advice on that part.

MR. YOUNG:  
Tell us what you did on Saturday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh.

MR. EFFORD:  
The hon. the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) finally said something. What I did on Saturday was for a very good cause. It was for a lot of sick children at the Janeway Hospital, and I would do it again if it will help sick children.

To get back to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, Yes, I unknowingly presented a photocopy of a petition. I do apologize to the House for that, but I did it with the intention of helping the children of Marysvale and Georgetown. And if the hon. the member for Harbour Main thinks it of benefit to discredit me as a member, I will accept that.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

To that point of order, it is a valid point of order. The hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) has pointed out that he was not aware of the fact that an

original copy of the petition was necessary, and the Chair certainly accepts that.

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting this petition I would like, naturally, to speak in support of the petition. I am not quite sure how many people are listed on the petition, but I present it on behalf of approximately 340 people in the area of Georgetown and Marysvale.

Mr. Speaker, in view of what has happened over the last few days in presenting these petitions to the House, because we saw the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) present a petition he was unauthorized to present to the provincial Legislature, because it was clearly addressed to the federal Legislature, probably, Mr. Speaker, we would do well to have Your Honour have a look at those petitions before a member rises in the House to present them.

MR. DAWE:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:  
That might be a method by which we could cut out the business of having petitions presented in the House by people who are not authorized to do so.

MR. BARRY:  
We will have a means test before (inaudible).

MR. DOYLE:

So, Mr. Speaker, anyway I am not going to ask Your Honour to reprimand the hon. gentleman opposite because he is a new member and, obviously, he does not yet know the rules of the House. But, be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I have been approached by a number of people in Marysvale and Georgestown who have asked me to present this original petition on their behalf. And as I said a moment ago, to convey to Your Honour their grave concerns regarding what has gone on in the last few days.

However, I am pleased to support the petition, Your Honour. The petition reads: 'We, the undersigned, demand that the elementary students in Grades IV and V remain at our Lady of Peace School Marysvale. We do not wish to have our children transferred to Brigus.'

Now I think the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) is quite familiar with the petition because, as I said, it was presented last week, a photostat copy. The minister at that time did respond to the petition. But I do wish to support -

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

The hon. minister's time has elapsed.

MR. DOYLE:  
Could I have a minute, by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:  
By leave!

MR. TULK:  
You had leave yesterday. Will you

be nice today?

MR. DOYLE:  
Yes, I will be very nice.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. minister, by leave.

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman opposite for leave.

MR. TULK:  
You are welcome.

MR. DOYLE:  
I do wish to support the efforts of the good people in those two communities who are quite anxious indeed to have these two classes remain at their small school. It is only a five grade school in the community of Marysvale. I have asked my very good friend and colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) to look into the matter on behalf of the people in those two communities. And, of course, he has assured me that he will be doing just that.

I have to assure also the people in those two communities that I have made representation on their behalf, not only to the Minister of Education, but also to the School Board representative in that area. I am presently awaiting a reply from him on that particular matter. But it is a very serious situation, because the people in those two communities feel that they are being swallowed up, I suppose, by a neighbouring municipality, a bigger municipality, in having a couple of classrooms transferred to the Brigus area.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will not abuse the leave that I have been given. I will, however, say once more, in clueing up, this is a serious

matter that the people in those communities have, and they want our support on it, and I have no reservations at all in supporting the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, seeing it is a fact the petition that I presented the other day was a photocopy, for some reason it must take away from the validity that the children from Marysvale have a problem, I will certainly have to rise in support of that petition.

I whole-heartedly agree with the concerns of the people of that district, and the fact that their children may be bussed down to Brigus which is some distance away. Also to the fact that I am quite concerned over any problem that arises in my district or in anybody else's district. I hope in the future that I will, as the hon. gentleman pointed out, be more preceptive in the fact when I present a petition that it is not a photocopy. Believe me I can assure the hon. gentleman one thing, give me as long in the House that they have been in and I will be able to tell those people a few things.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You will not be here that long.

MR. EFFORD:

I will I will guarantee you that.

But I am also very pleased to know

seeing that the hon. gentleman is a member of the Cabinet and also that he presented it to a member of the Cabinet, I feel assured now that he will do everything in his power so those students will not be transferred from their school. So I will be willing to -

MR. TULK:

If he does not do that, he should resign.

MR. EFFORD:

- tell my constituents when I go back that this matter is certainly being looked after and we will have no problems in the near future.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for bringing me the petition, the real petition, even though, I suppose a petition is a petition, it is a concern or a list of concerns of people in a certain area, and certainly in this case the people have a very legitimate concern. I will certainly be looking into it on behalf of both members and, we will make whatever progress we can to alleviate any of the concerns of the people in the area. Certainly the problem concerns the School Board, but we have worked in co-operation with the boards, of course, in the various areas to try to do the best we can for the people that are governed by that board.

MR. HISCOCK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we are now hearing the minister saying it is the responsibility of the school board. The minister knows that if the government gives enough money to the school boards then they will be able to have this school open.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is no point of order.

#### Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Committee of Supply.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

#### Committee of Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, before we begin can we be advised as to how many minutes are left, or how many seconds in Committee of the Whole?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! There are two hours and fourteen minutes.

MR. MARSHALL:

Excellent.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Does 2.1.01 carry?

MR. BARRY:

I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I think now we are seeing an indication of the Premier's attitude towards the estimates. He does not bother showing up to the Estimates Committee. Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, was Wednesday, I believe that was Private Members' Day, was it not? Tuesday I was out making an excellent presentation to the Atlantic Liberal Caucus pointing out how this cozy relationship between the Premier and Mr. Mulroney is not doing very much to help this Province, if we judge by the budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

The Premier has given us his philosophy as to how the Estimate Committees should work. I was half tempted to ask the Premier if maybe he would write out the questions that should be asked for the Committee and if he would schedule which members on this side of the House should ask those questions, Mr. Chairman.

But since the recent election we have seen a very unhealthy attitude develop within this government. We saw evidence of it before the election but it has broken wide open since the election. And I refer, of course, to the breakdown of the

appointments of individuals to positions in a Province which has been trying to get back to the Public Service Commission, get back to a philosophy of appointments on the basis of confidence, and in recent weeks and months, we have seen patronage rearing its ugly head amongst members opposite. We have seen the Premier of this Province permitting his administration to fall back to patronage. We have had the defeated candidates, which have been mentioned, appointed to government jobs.

MR. TOBIN:

From both parties.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Chairman. Any appointments that are made here are appointments that are set out in the discretion of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), not to go to public tender, Mr. Chairman. Never in the history of this Province has it ever been contemplated that those positions would go to the Public Service Commission. It is done completely at the discretion of the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier has certain positions like that to in his office on the eight floor, he has certain positions that he is entitled to do by discretion.

Unfortunately it seems that the Premier now feels that the entire public service of this Province can be at the whim of the discretion of either himself or ministers. Mr. Chairman, we have seen it with respect to defeated candidates in the election, we saw it with respect to defeated candidates for the nomination for that party, and now it is coming down, and there will be questions over the next few days, where it

seems that it is coming down to campaign workers, campaign workers, Mr. Chairman, being permitted to avoid the Public Service Commission, avoid the interview process, avoid appointments on the basis of competence, and we see the ugly head of patronage rearing over on that side, and appointments being made of individuals because they are or have been campaign workers for the party that is now in power.

MR. TULK:

The disease in Ottawa is catching on down here.

MR. BARRY:

It is a contagion of patronage and the only question is are members opposite catching it from their colleagues in Ottawa or are their colleagues in Ottawa catching it from them? That is the question.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we see again, when we look at members opposite, the sad picture of an administration that comes into power in its first year, it is fresh, it is idealistic, it is going to change the world, Mr. Chairman, it is going to reform the political process, and within a very short period of time we see that administration falling back into those practices which the ordinary person in this Province reject as being improper.

Now, apart from patronage there is another 'p', Mr. Chairman, and that is the 'p' of propaganda.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have seen a steady stream of this flowing out of the Premier's office, out of the executive office, little brochures that are printed with the taxpayer's money. We have nothing against political propaganda in terms of party

messages being sent out but it is the party, Mr. Chairman, that should pay for political propaganda and not the taxpayer, not government.

When we send out a message on behalf of this party, we do not do it with the taxpayers' dollars. Members opposite, the Premier specifically, has been continuously engaged in a process of using the taxpayers dollar of this Province to send out these little brochures. And, Mr. Chairman, in addition we see members opposite, such as the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). I get newspapers in my office from various parts of the Province. A couple of days ago I got the latest edition of The Senior Citizens News and lo and behold what do I see, a full page ad by the Minister of Transportation.

Now the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), has had a few ads here and there, but the Minister of Transportation seems to have gone beyond anything that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, in his wildest dreams, in his utter audacity would ever dare. The Minister of Transportation knows no bounds. It is now full page ads with pictures of the minister spewing out pure propaganda, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the party in power. It has nothing to do, Mr. Chairman, with getting the job done in terms of creating jobs which everybody seems to feel, at least they say, members opposite on the other side say that should be the prime task, job creation. I would like the Minister of Transportation to get up and describe how these full page ads are going to create jobs, other than the job in the printing

service that is putting out the publication.

Mr. Chairman, there is an other "p", we have patronage, we have propaganda, and Mr. Chairman, we also have privilege, privilege in the sense that members of the House of Assembly sitting on the government side of the House are given privileges which members on this side are not given, Mr. Chairman. And I would like the Premier, and I do not want the Minister without Portfolio, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) to get up and give us his other two "p's", namely "pious platitudes." I want the Premier of this Province, whose initials are "PP", to talk about these three other "p's" of patronage, propaganda and privilege.

And Mr. Speaker, the press would do well, and I issue an open invitation to the press, if they are listening somewhere in the bowels of Confederation Building, I would issue an open invitation to the press to come down and examine the offices that are made available to Government MHA's and compare them with the offices made available to Opposition MHA's. We see a deliberate attempt to downgrade the ability of the Opposition to provide the services which the people of this Province wish them to provide, which their constituents need them to provide. We see a deliberate attempt, Mr. Chairman, for the rankest of gross partisan reasons to do everything possible to make it difficult for the Opposition to do its job.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
That is rubbish.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the rubbish that is



over there, sitting in the chair reserved for the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), Mr. Chairman, that is where the rubbish is.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

That is all I see spewing out of that member is rubbish. Now I would like to have the Premier respond to some of these points that concern, directly, the Office of the Premier.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I really do not think there is anything to respond to that has not already been responded to. With respect to the positions that the hon. gentleman is referring to, we have already dealt with those, we have already indicated that the government is quite prepared to give the salaries of the persons involved. The employment of these people has been based on merit. It has not been unknown that this type of thing has occurred in the past. The way the hon. gentleman derogates elected members you would swear a Cabinet Minister who has occupied a position for a number of years, or a member who has worked assiduously on the part of his district in public service is thereby precluded forever and a day from employment in the permanent public service or as a contractual employee. And that is the way in which the system as it is works and I can tell the hon. gentleman that with the individuals who are involved that the government and the people of

the Province are going to - I do not know precisely what their salaries are and they will be given in due course - but the public is well served with respect to these gentlemen.

The hon. gentleman, you know, it is all right for him to get very sanctimonious and all the rest of it. He can be as much as he wants to be, and he talks about piety and platitudes and all the rest of it, I can remember certain hon. gentleman who in 1975 was defeated and I cannot see that hon. gentleman when in 1975 when there were certain engagements given to the hon. gentleman refusing to accept them at that time. I am not talking about the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), I am talking about the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).

As to the matter of propaganda and privilege, I mean that is all the hon. gentleman wants to speak about. The fact of the matter is within the limits of the budget of this Province, and certainly this budget is limited and there is not a single individual in this Province who is not aware of the fact that it is limited and has not been affected by the limitation of it. Everybody pays the high sales tax and everybody is aware of the constraints passed upon us by the large deficit that we have that we are doing the utmost and the Opposition proportionately gets as much if not more of the share of the public purse as anyone else.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear. More.

MR. MARSHALL:

The fact of the matter is that they are given ample money for the

purpose of dealing with their constituents, they are given ample money for research. I do not know how many research assistants they have down there -

MR. SIMMS:  
Too many.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
One.

MR. MARSHALL:  
- but certainly they have the wherewithal to employ more than one. During the last Assembly they had two or three that the hon. gentleman decided he was going to dismiss.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
We had one.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Okay, well he gets the same amount of money and he has decided to use it for other purposes and that is his prerogative. So the fact of the matter is, you know, what he call patronage - God, he must have stayed up all night, did he? - to patronage, propaganda, -

MR. SIMMS:  
He read Steve Neary's old speech.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Yes, he tried to doctor up Steve's old speech but, you know, we have heard it all before. It is deja vu all over again from the lips of the hon. member. You know, we are on Executive Council, we are talking about the office of the Premier and, of course, you can raise any question you want to. I think I have responded to the questions as well as you could possibly respond to them. I wish the hon. gentleman had made a little bit of a different speech because then you could respond to the speech a little bit better

than the hon. gentleman invites you to respond. But as I say, I mean, the points that he raised are points that have been dealt with, have been dealt with amply and fully and sufficiently. I will now sit down, I will not take the full time because it is not necessary to take the full time to respond to the hon. gentleman, he really did not give us anything to respond to. So I will sit down and hope -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:  
I treated it directly and I said that the answers that the hon. gentleman want with respect to salaries would be given; the matter of privilege that he talks about or he tries to allege, I mean, we have given ample money to the Opposition as can be seen in the legislative vote. We have given as much as is available, as much as was given to the Opposition when the hon. gentleman was over here and we did not hear the hon. gentleman screaming at that time that the Opposition should be given more because he knew full well when he supported the estimates the proportion of the estimates that were before the House that the Opposition was given a fair shake and a fair share of the public purse.

As to the office space: I mean, the office space is just not available. There are two members to an office on the government side.

MR. BARRY:  
The offices are four times as big.

MR. MARSHALL:  
And the situation is that we are doing the utmost and as much as we

possibly can under the circumstances. I will sit down and let the hon. gentleman get indignant again but, as far as I am concerned, we have responded as adequately as we can to the hon. gentleman.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Chairman, there are a few items in the estimates that I would like an explanation on. One, for example, is the office of the Premier under Transportation and Communications: \$100,000 - Transportation and Communications; Executive Support - \$50,000 for Transportation and Communication; Administration - \$20,500, again for Transportation and Communications; President of the Executive Council - a \$30,000 vote for Transportation and Communication; the Resource and Social Policy Committees of Cabinet, I do not know why they would need that kind of a vote but there is a \$45,000 Transportation and Communication vote there for that Committee; Executive Support, Transportation and Communication, \$31,000; Administration - \$6,000 for Transportation and Communication; Cabinet Secretariat another \$6,000 for Transportation; Programme Review and Development - \$3,500; Newfoundland Statistic Agency - \$5,000; Cabinet Secretariat, Classification Appeals Board - \$9,000 for Transportation and Communication.

There is one here and for the life of me I cannot understand it unless the new President of

Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) maybe wants to maintain the lifestyle that he had as Minister of Development. I notice in that vote - the Treasury Board Secretariat - there is a vote for Transportation and Communications for \$40,000; Executive Support another \$8,000; Administration - \$3,000.

I have not taken the time, Mr. Chairman to total up all of these but I suspect that the total vote for Transportation and Communications, within that heading, would probably go close to or be in excess of \$500,000.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, would the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Premier explain to the House the reason for these, in most cases, rather substantial votes for travel and communications?

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
As everybody knows the cost of everything has increased. It is obviously necessary for there to be boats for travel and communications. Some of it relates to phone calls, to long distance calls. The Executive Council office, as one might expect, is a very busy office. It is necessary from time to time when one attends meetings on the mainland to take one, two or sometimes even three public servants and, of course, that has to be at public expense. So, you know, that particular vote there, I do not view it as being extremely high.

For instance, Transportation and

Communications in Executive Support for this year is \$50,000 and last year, while it was budgeted at \$54,000, only \$45,000 was spent. So it is only \$5,000 more than was budgeted last year. We think that is reasonable. I mean, the fact of the matter is there is no travelling that is unnecessary. We try to keep travel down as much as it can possibly be but the hon. gentleman must remember we are on the other end of Canada, the Eastern most part of Canada. A lot of the interrelationships of, particularly, the Executive Council office is with the federal government and with other governments in Canada, so we have to be able to respond and it costs money to travel. I think that, you know, we do keep the amount down as we possibly can and I think that is reflected in the amounts there.

Now, the other observations that the hon. gentleman made, I know you can get down and talk about specific items and I will be glad to respond to them, but, you know, quite frankly, the heads he picked on to draw to the attention of the Committee, I do not really think it is warranted to turn and say that it is inordinate or it is high. Resource and Social Policy Committee of Cabinet have to travel. There has to be a certain amount of travelling there and people throughout the whole Office of the Executive Council have to be travelling. I do not really think it is out of line.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I realize there has got to be a certain amount of travel, Mr. Speaker, and I know that travelling today costs money. The cost of travel has increased, I suppose, like everything else in the past few years, but I wonder can the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) explain why it is necessary to vote \$40,000 for the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor)? That is a lot of travel. The Minister does not head up a department as does the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). I, for the life of me, cannot see why it would be necessary for the Treasury Board Chairman to travel to that extent where the House would have to vote \$40,000.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, while I am on my feet, make reference to the comments by our leader having to do with support staff for members. I think, certainly members on this side will all agree, that we are short of secretarial help and research capabilities.

Maybe that is what is making the work of the committees, Mr. Chairman, so disorganized and maybe that is one of the main reasons why the committee system is breaking down because there is not enough research capabilities provided members.

We are sitting in the House; we have our constituency work to attend to; we have House Sessions; we have committee meetings; what time do we have to do any research to take the estimates as the Premier suggested we should and study them item for item and do research? We just do not have that kind of time and maybe that is why there should be more

research capability provided, certainly to the Opposition members, because - I suppose all members have a responsibility to examine the estimates - but I think there is a greater responsibility on Opposition members than what there would be on a government member.

With respect to secretarial help, Mr. Chairman, again, I do not think anybody will argue that we are vastly under staffed. I am not suggesting that we go out and start spending huge sums of money on hiring new girls, new secretaries.

I would strongly suggest to the minister and the Premier to take a look around the building. For example I am told that in the Department of Fisheries right now there are four top notch secretaries, secretaries of former ministers. Of course, we all know that when a minister moves in to a department he is not obligated to carry on with the former minister's secretary. Usually what happens is they bring their own secretary with them, thereby creating a surplus of another secretary in that department. Like I said, I am told that in Fisheries right now there are three or four, I believe it is four, former secretaries of former ministers that are, I suppose, I am not wishing to put them down, certainly they are doing work far less than that to which they are trained and capable of doing. I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that in every other department, I suspect that in the Minister of Health's (Dr. Twomey) department - well maybe that is an exception - but I think in most government departments today you will find secretaries of former ministers who are doing some

menial jobs, certainly far below that for which they are trained and capable of doing. It might very well be that more secretarial help could be provided members if somebody were to look around in the departments and weed out some of the people who are there now that are not doing that which they are capable of doing.

So, Mr. Chairman, these are the only things I have to say. Maybe the minister can, in reply, tell us why the Treasury Board President would, in this current fiscal year, require \$40,000 for Transportation and Communications?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite easy to explain. The fact of the matter is the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) is a senior minister. A \$40,000 allotment is the same, there are certain variances, but within \$5,000, I noticed as the hon. gentleman was speaking the Ministers of Fisheries Transportation is \$45,000 estimated, this is on the basis of last year. Last year, of course, the President of Treasury Board was the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) so his travelling came within the Finance Department so the comparison is not actual.

The President of Treasury Board is a senior Cabinet minister and travel is necessary for him from time to time. You just do not, as a Cabinet minister, undertake - certainly you take specific responsibilities for that which is assigned to you - but you also take, as the hon. gentleman knows, full responsibility for all

matters relating to government coming under the Executive Council and it is going to be necessary for the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) in the course of his duties to make certain visits to Ottawa from time to time with respect to constraints on expenditures and what have you, but in addition to that, the President of Treasury Board, as a minister of the government, will also have to make intergovernmental trips from time to time, so it is an estimate. I can assure you, I can assure the hon. gentlemen that the President of Treasury Board, as well as all the other ministers in this government, only travel where it is necessary and if less than \$40,000 is needed, then only that amount will be expended. But it is just an estimate as the amount that is necessary in order to meet the estimated travelling charges of that minister. As I would point out, they are approximately the same, as reference to the detailed estimates will show, as other ministers themselves.

Now with respect to research capability we realize the fact that every member of this House on either side, private members or Opposition members, require funds in order to be able to operate effectively, and this government, and the predecessor Conservative government, has moved to make it as generous as we possible can within the circumstances.

We would like to be able to provide more funds for all members of the House, including the Opposition. I do not mean salaries, I mean from the point of view of carrying out their duties, but in that area we are constrained, as well as we are constrained in all government

activity and we have to cut the garment to suit the cloth, unfortunately.

That is not to say - and, you know, I would draw issue - that I do not think that the amount of the funds that are given to the Opposition can, in any way, be construed as being unsatisfactory. The hon. gentleman should know that at one period of time, we moved to provide full capability for members to phone to their districts and to make phone calls throughout the Province at the expense of the Province, which is necessary. We have improved the district allowance to the greatest degree that we can to provide for members who live in districts which are further away from St. John's, and to make allowance for the fact that they have to be in their districts to enable them to deal with their districts and to travel to their districts, particularly for the hon. the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), the Labrador members, who would be more affected than certainly, members in St. John's and the environs.

So we have taken the amount of money that is available and have distributed it as fairly and equitably as possible. Obviously, everybody would like more money. We, ourselves, in government, would like to be able to expend more money for research in certain field. But one has to cut the garment to suit the cloth, and I think that this government needs to make no apologies for what it has provided for the Opposition. We have tried to be as generous as we can. We will look at the

situation and we will do the best we can in the future, as our resources dictate.

So I hope I have answered the hon. gentleman's question, particularly on the matter of travel. Because it is so simple to say, 'The President of Treasury Board does not have to travel.' Certainly, he has a certain amount of travelling, particularly back and forth to Ottawa. The President of Treasury Board, as I say, is a very senior minister whose presence will be wanted at intergovernmental meetings as a member of Planning and Priorities Committee and what have you, and the amount that he has been voted is approximately the same as that of other ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:  
I am smiling because I am trying to be pleasant with the Opposition.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
It is interesting to note, by the way, that in the estimates there is a \$30,000 vote for the Minister of Development, which is \$10,000 a year less than provided the President of Treasury Board, and one would think that the person holding that portfolio requires a lot of travel, international travel, travel all over Canada, over this continent and, I suppose, the Province. One would think that the opposite would be true. Maybe more would be required for the Minister of

Development and certainly, in my view, less for the President of Treasury Board, except, as I said a moment ago, maybe that is needed to enable the minister to continue with the kind of lifestyle that he developed when he was Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to benefits to members, I do not think anybody on this side would be asking for more. We can probably use more in higher salaries but we are saying there should be more facilities made available.

Now, if the government and the people of Newfoundland are unable to provide their fifty-two members with adequate research and office and secretarial help, well then, it may well be, Mr. Chairman, that this Province cannot afford to have a House with fifty-two members in it.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
That is right.

MR. W. CARTER:  
If you want to cut the garment according to the cloth, there might very well be a case to be made for reducing the number of members and at least giving those members who are then elected, the necessary facilities to do the jobs for which they are elected.

For example, for a member representing a rural district, I would suggest to the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that there are many cases where it might well be that there are facilities that could be made available to that member, government offices in my own district, for example. I know there is a government building in Twillingate where there are government offices. I am sure, if

an effort were made, you could probably find some little cubbyhole or an office and a telephone that the member for the district could occupy and use while he is there.

You cannot really provide the kind of service that you are expected to provide and, indeed, elected to provide when you have to be operating from a car or from a boarding house or from a motel room. And I would strongly suggest to the minister and to the government that they do a survey.

I recall when I was member for St. Mary's - The Capes, the Department of Public Works then started laying plans for a public building in the town of St. Mary's, and at my request, the then minister provided an office in that building for the MHA. I am not sure if it was ever used for that purpose, but certainly, it was made available to the member.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that if the government and the minister were to take stock of the government's facilities around the Province, I am sure that in every provincial district within the Province there could be office space found. I do not mean elaborate suites. I do not think any member wants that, but a place to go and hang up your hat and sit at a desk and make a telephone call or have people in who want to conduct business with their member. That is all I am asking for and I am sure that if a survey were done, that kind of space could be found.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder would the House Leader pay a little attention to what I am saying because it is very important. If I can get his attention, I wonder,

Mr. Chairman, would the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) give an undertaking now that, in consultation with his colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), that they will do a survey of the public buildings within the Province and see if there is not a way that the member can be accommodated in these buildings with an office. As I said, not a posh, elaborate suite, but a single office, in my case, would be adequate. That is not asking too much. It certainly will not add to the public debt. It is not going to increase the cost of office space anywhere. I am not suggesting that we buy or built or rent additional office space. But I am saying that I am convinced in my mind that there is now sufficient space in the Province that could be made available to the Provincial member.

MR. DAWE:

And where would you put them in your district, for example?

MR. W. CARTER:

There are several offices in my district. Social Services, for example, they have office space and it is rather elaborate and extensive office accommodations down there. The Minister's own Department of Transportation, they have facilities, wherein which there might just be space available. The Department of Health, for example, they have certain space in the district.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is probably not the most important issue facing the Province right now, in fact, we know it is not. Maybe time should be spent debating more important issues, but certainly as a member, and one who is elected to do the best that I can for my constituents, I think



it is necessary for me to have certain facilities. So if the member would give that undertaking, I think, it might well be that space can be found without adding one single dollar to the cost of administering the government over the next few years.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
We will certainly look at all reasonable suggestions. We are always anxious to see what we can do to improve the representation in the House and to make it more reasonable for people in their districts. There are a few caveats that I would put out and I am not rejecting the hon. gentleman's suggestion. Any suggestion that is made like that is something that certainly could look at. But the financial situation of this Province is precarious and we are borrowing right now and this is something that, I think, I have not even heard this in the House, except on-

MR. W. CARTER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:  
No, wait now.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:  
The hon. gentleman I say has made a worthy suggestion. I am just putting a few caveats. Paradoxically, the only time that

I have heard anything said during the Budget debate and in the Committee about the deficit in this Province is from the government side of this House. This member of the government and other members of the government say, it is a matter of great concern that right now what we are doing, in effect, in this Province today is that we are borrowing to pay for our grocery bill. So the money is very, very difficult to obtain. And while we are borrowing to pay our grocery bill, we are obviously not satisfying the needs of everybody as we would like to.

So having said that, if something can be done, which legitimately is not going to cause an increased expenditure, and if there is not some other good reason that is not reasonably apparent to me now, that matter can be looked into.

But is a request for an office going to be coupled with a request for secretaries there? We must have an executive assistant out in the districts as they do, perhaps, in wealthy Alberta or wealthier Ontario. These are things that we have to look at. But this government wishes to provide, insofar as the capacity of the Province permits it, the optimum amount of facilities for all members, including, and probably most especially, the Opposition to be able to operate as effectively as possible. So we certainly are cognizant of all suggestions of that nature. And I say that it is not a suggestion without merit. We will consider it, but I want to put a few caveats on it. It is not something that we would tend to want to adopt and to follow unless we could be absolutely sure that it is not going to cause an appreciable increase in costs at

this particular time when the financial situation of the Province is so precarious.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please.

I would like to inform hon. members that we have two questions for the Late Show this evening, one for the Minister responsible for Energy and one for the Premier.

MR. MARSHALL:  
If I could, Mr. Chairman? Can we not be told what the nature of the questions are? Or is this just that there is general dissatisfaction with the Minister responsible for Energy and the Premier?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:  
Okay, we will leave it at that.

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

MR. BAKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has just made a number of sweeping statements, one of them being, of course, the only words of wisdom he has heard concerning the budget, and the only concern that he has ever heard concerning the deficit and so on has been from that side of the House.

I suppose, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) at times is missing from the House and at times even when he is in the House may be asleep, but in one occasion, in particular, that I just happen to have in front of me right now, on Thursday, 30 May,

the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and myself had quite a considerable discussion on the deficit and the affect that the deficit might have and the affects the deficit might be causing in this Province. The Government House Leader happened to be in the House at that time and, either he has a poor memory or he was asleep or, if not that, then I am deeply wounded and deeply hurt that he did not remember that a member from this side of the House referred to and mentioned the deficit.

I would also like to point out to the Government House Leader that I am one of those individuals that has to suffer through the sad state of accommodations in this particular building. And I always understood that a member would be provided with accommodation that would allow him to service his district. Instead of that, Mr. Chairman, we have small cubbyholes provided by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), who is renowned for his statement that he would rather shove the Opposition all off in a telephone booth. We have these enlarged telephone booths with two desks put in.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Windows.

MR. BAKER:  
Some of them have windows, some of them do not have windows.

MR. HISCOCK:  
The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Greening) does not even have a window.

MR. BAKER:  
Well we will get to that in a moment.

Enlarged telephone booths with two desks in there, and a couple of

chairs. Nothing! Hardly any glass at the window, if there happens to be a window, leaky roofs, and no room to talk to constituents who come in. If you have a couple of constituents come in to talk to you, you have to, first of all, root the other guy out of the room, and you have to sit him down somewhere and you are all hunched over and so on in these little tiny cubbyholes that we are provided with.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had for a while swallowed the balderdash that comes from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). I swallowed that. I said the poor people are hard up for space. They have no space and they have no money. That is exactly what I swallowed for a while.

But, Mr. Chairman, yesterday, strolling along the corridor the door happened to be open to the government members place down the hall there, now I have seen your office, Mr. Chairman, and it is not up to scratch. I happened to look in. And I was amazed, I was shocked, it was palatial in comparison to what I have to put up with huge rooms, beautiful desks, well decorated, it was palatial compared to what I have to put up with. Now I will agree that maybe the government members would like more office space and better office space, but in comparison to what I have to put up let me assure you that you are living in palatial surroundings, rather sumptuous surroundings. This is just in response to the Government House Leader.

The real point, Mr. Chairman, that I rise to make I would prefer to make while the Premier is in the

House. I would prefer in dealing with the Premier's salary and the Premier's Office, which comes under this particular heading, to have the Premier in the House to hear and respond to comments. I think that, as a Committee, and we are a committee of the House, we have the definite right to have ministers responsible and so on in the House to be questioned and get responses from them.

DR. COLLINS:

Are you saying the ministers here are irresponsible?

MR. BAKER:

No, no, I would not dare say that.

MR. HISCOCK:

I would.

MR. BAKER:

However, the issue that I wish to get on with I find that I now cannot simply because the Premier is not around. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would move that we stop the clock until somebody can find the Premier somewhere in the depths of the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is silly. I mean that is really silly. I mean the hon. gentleman now is a mature gentleman, I mean he has moved from I understand one party to the far left, to the other party to the far left. A moment ago when he got up on his feet he gave a hint that he was thinking of coming over because he said he liked us fellows or he started to like, so it goes to show another change in mind. And then he got into the office space.

We are talking about the Executive Council vote, there are three ministers, including the Premier, listed under Executive Council and we were able to respond to the questions that have been asked. There has not been a single question that has been asked this afternoon that has not been disposed of. Now as far as the Premier not being here, the Premier is usually here, he was here all day yesterday, or the day before yesterday when Executive Council was considered. He is presently about public business downstairs. We are dealing with the estimates and I really do not see the point that the hon. gentleman is making.

Now you know here again we have exhausted I think the topic of facilities and that. The Minister of Public Works tells me for instance that - the hon. gentleman talks about our palatial offices -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Sumptuous.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Yes sumptuous he says. Now when the government changed, or after the election and the members of the Opposition changed and the private members changed, I understand that the Opposition was offered the offices that had previously been occupied by government private members. But they did not want them because they were not adequate for them they said. They were not up to scratch, and now these same offices that were not up to scratch and they refused to have, they are saying they are sumptuous. So that is really an inanity for the hon. gentleman to get on.

Now look, I have responded I hope

responsibility to the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) and told him that the government would consider the proposal he made. I have explained to the Committee the situation with respect to the funding of the Opposition as well as the funding of all members and how we would like, if we had more money, to provide more, and there is not much more I can say. If he had the Premier here he would say the same thing or any other minister. Now what I suggest, Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many hours we spent on the budget speech or in Committee or what have you but I suggest we get down to the meat of the issue before us, and the meat of the issue is this: this whole process of examining the accounts of the Province. There has not really been anything constructive done with respect to the examination and in order to make it constructive it depends on the Opposition asking questions. And here we have an example of what has occurred in the Executive Council vote as well as the other votes in committees, they just get on the minister's salary, they talk about generalities, they do not ask specific questions such as you -

MR. W. CARTER:  
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
On a point of order, the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
I do not really believe that the hon. House Leader is serious in what he is saying. For example what can be more important than discussing for example the cost of ministers' travel and we have gone into that at length and I have pointed out to the House, to the

Committee for example, one case where the Treasury Board President this year will be voted \$40,000.

We are made look like a bunch of irresponsible idiots by simply suggesting that we be given better facilities from which to operate. And then of course we are lectured by the House Leader on the need to be thrifty. Mr. Chairman, surely a government that decides to build an extension on this building that is being built, a government for example that takes Mount Scio House and spends, I do not how much but certainly that figure should be made available, to accommodate half a dozen lawyers. Let us take a tour around the city, Mr. Chairman, and visit the palatial offices of the heads of the various Crown corporations. Let us go in and look at the layout, the spread, for example -

MR. MARSHALL:  
Is that a correct point of order?

MR. W. CARTER:  
- that is made available to the Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. Let us look at the palatial offices of the Chairman of Newfoundland Hydro. Let us look at the offices, for example, of the Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission and all of the other Crown corporations that are around the city.

Surely, you cannot make chaulk of one and cheese of the other. If the minister is going to be preaching to the members and telling us we cannot have this and that by virtue of budget restraint, well then, surely he should practice what he preaches and maybe have a look around.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is not a point of order.

MR. W. CARTER:  
The office building next door to this building, surely the last thing this Province can afford is another big ivory tower, and I suggest to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that -

MR. MARSHALL:  
That is not a point of order.

MR. W. CARTER:  
- it is a point of order. I suggest to the minister that if he were to look around the city, he could find many places where there is a lot of waste. But certainly, he will not find it in the offices occupied by the members.

MR. MARSHALL:  
That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Is Your Honour going to rule on the point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Are you speaking to the point of order?

MR. MARSHALL:  
I am not bothering, Your Honour. I am quite sure that is not a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:  
Okay, then, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will just say it is a point of debate. I am going to answer that question, as well. The fact of the matter is, before we entered into the contract for the construction of the extension to Confederation Building, a very careful survey was done with respect to the economics of it and it was found that over a very short period of time and almost immediately, with the rents that are being paid by government to house various other departments out around the city -

MR. YOUNG:

Ten years.

MR. MARSHALL:

- as the Minister of Public Works says, within ten years it will more than pay for itself, because these facilities have to be housed, to which you have the added economies provided as a result of both units being close together to avoid messenger services from one end of the city to the other.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

I am not derogating, as I said. I want to make it quite plain, I thought the hon. gentleman made a good point and I said we would look at it. But, you know, having said we would look at it, why belabour it?

MR. BAKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BAKER:

I do not mind listening to the

hon. gentleman opposite although he has gotten off the track. I just wonder what happened. I moved that the clock stop until we found the Premier. Now, has there been anything done with that? What happens to that now? Has the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) just continued on with the debate and ignored that, or what? I would like some indication of what happens to that.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

There are accepted ways to move motions and then the motion is put to a vote. In Committee, the Committee is delegated by the House to sit as a Committee and it sits as a Committee, and the appropriate motion, if anyone wants to make it, would be to make a motion that the Committee rise, then Your Honour would put the question, after which it would be put to a vote, and then, before the Chair, that type of motion may be made. But, you know, there are proceedings for making that type of motion, and a motion like that is not in order, because the hon. gentleman or this House cannot make an order that the government business would be conducted on the basis of the presence of certain people in the House; otherwise, the hon. gentleman could make a motion, for instance, that I move that no consideration of any business of the House be given until the full compliment of the House were sitting. So the hon. gentleman is really out of order.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

As far as I am concerned, and I am sure the hon. the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) would agree, there was an attitude at one time in this Province of keeping the Opposition in the dark, giving them as little information as possible, to reduce their chances of getting elected.

Unfortunately, with respect to the member for Placentia and the member for St. John's Center, this attitude is carried over from those days, back thirteen years ago. We now have - and the Minister of Transportation and the former Minister of Fisheries will agree - a new era, an era of democracy brought in by former Premier Moores. We have seen in the past thirteen years, the rise and increase of pressure groups, more town councils, more rural development associations, and more unions in the Province, and a lot more lobby groups bringing their concerns to the House of Assembly.

With regard to the question of office space for House of Assembly members, particularly the Opposition, I believe the Premier answered that.

When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked about space, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) suggested we take over the Government Members' Office. On going in, we found leaks galore, but half of the space was liveable, so we moved into half of the space while the other half was being repaired.

The Minister of Public Works suggested that a partition be put up to ensure that while work was going on on the other half, and the leaks repaired, that work could go on in the other half and once the work was completed, then the partition would come down. I believed that once this was done that this vacant space that is there, and still is there under repair, that once the partition comes down, the majority of the members on the Opposition side will have adequate office space, unless the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and the government is going back on their words.

Since I was elected in 1979, I have to be honest, in most cases, I say the majority of the cases, the Premier has never gone back on his word. If the Premier says something, in most cases, he carries it out. I do not think the Premier is a vindictive man. The Minister of Public Works would like to see the Opposition in a phone booth. In most cases, as I have said, the Premier is not. And if the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) would listen for a second, I am sure once he checks what the Premier said, then we will get that additional office space.

But let us look at the Province itself. Each minister, who does not have a department here in the Confederation Building either has it in Atlantic Place, or in other places throughout the city, and they have a full suite of offices in those buildings. Then, when they come into Confederation Building they also have a full suite of offices.

MR. RUSSELL :

It is not true.

MR. HISCOCK:

It is not true. Well I suggest the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and you check the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and you check some of the other departments.

MR. RUSSELL :

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications, on a point of order.

MR. RUSSELL :

I would like to advise the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) that my office is in Elizabeth Towers and I do not have a office or an office here in Confederation Building whatsoever.

MR. BARRY:

You are an exception. But you have a nice office in Elizabeth Towers though.

MR. HISCOCK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

With regards to that, Mr. Chairman, I never said that. Maybe I will correct it. I am not saying all the offices, but I do know that a fair number of ministers did maintain two.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

No minister with an office outside has an office on the sixth floor in this building.

MR. HISCOCK:

I did not say the sixth floor.

MR. TULK:

What about the parliamentary secretaries?

MR. HISCOCK:

They come under the ministers, so I presume they have offices on the outside. There is no minister with his department outside with offices in this building not to my knowledge.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

What about the Premier? The Premier was suppose to have an office over in Corner Brook and over in Grand Falls and also in Goose Bay, the former Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development, and the former Minister of Fisheries.

But the point is as I have said, and I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) will agree with this, when we asked about office space, that the office space that was formerly occupied by the government members a partition was put down in between so that repairs could go on. Once the repairs are completed, the partition comes down and the Opposition ends up taking the remainder of the space.

I hope when the Premier said this to the Leader of the Opposition that his word is his bond, and that problem is basically straightened out. I say it is not all straightened out because we



still have a lot of excess members, and the former Minister of Fisheries had a very, very small office that was shared with his secretary. The former Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) was put in an office that was condemned by us and delegated to the former Minister of Social Services by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), rain, plaster and other things falling down, men working, the smell of paint etc. I suppose that is one of the things that happens when you fall out of favor with the government.

As I said I believe the Premier is true to his word, and that the office space itself will be solved in most cases when the partition comes down.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to say a few words on this matter regarding the accommodation for individual private members of the House, because after I guess, living in the land of luxury for about nine and a half years as a minister and finding the very nice and comfortable offices with air conditioning etc. in a minister's office over these years and they now have to work in a confined space which I am now working in, so confined I am unable to put my desk in the office. My desk is now on the sixth floor, I cannot put my desk in my office on the fifth floor it is not large enough to get my own desk in there, a desk I have used over the years.

It is a very confined space. The last desk I had as a minister over the years, for example, that desk was moved with me, I could not even move my desk that I have used over the years -

MR. BARRY:  
They did not shred the desk?

MR. MORGAN:  
So, Mr. Chairman, the confine quarters on the fifth floor that I am using, and I think I can speak for practically all of the members on the fifth floor, the government side and the Opposition, they are very uncomfortable, especially from here on in with warm weather conditions. There is not even a fan in the office I am using. I just cannot even work in the office because it so confined it is almost to the point of suffocating.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Is it big enough (inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:  
I have written to the Speaker -

MR. HISCOCK:  
Is it big enough for a delegation from the town council of Bonavista?

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Chairman, I think I am trying to make is the fact that it is on behalf of all private members really, because I just cannot see how private members can function adequately and properly with the kind of accommodations we now have.

Now I realize there is a problem with space and the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) is doing the best he can to find space to accommodate but when you have two members, for example, working in one office and

delegations come in, they do not want to be sitting with two members. They want to talk to their own member and they want to talk in private. It is not a very good system to have a delegation come in and to have to say to your colleague and buddy, 'Well, you got to leave the office now and go down for a coffee somewhere while I am meeting with a delegation from my district.' It is not the way to work as a member. I think the Minister of Public Works and Services is making an effort to try and accommodate the individual members, but it is of the utmost importance that it be done as quickly as possible.

Also I want to mention one thing which I find interfering with my work as a member, and that is the phone system.

MR. BAIRD:

You did not worry about yours when it was down there for six years.

MR. MORGAN:

Now the hon. member for Corner Brook can have his own comments in the debate and I will speak my views without interruption, hopefully.

Mr. Chairman, when I find anything interfering with my work as a member I am going to speak up on that issue and I find the telephone system right now interfering with my work. The phones I use to get calls from my constituents are presently the same phones in the Common Room and every day the House opens at 3:00 p.m. nobody can get through to me in my office on the Fifth Floor, the reason being because the phones in here in the Common Room are all busy. Now I am getting complaints every day from my constituents saying, 'I cannot get

a hold of you, Mr. Morgan. I cannot get a hold of you any more' Why? 'Because the phones are always busy in the afternoon, I cannot get through to you.'

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize this is not just me, it is all the members on the government side. I am saying it is not a good working system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. BAIRD:

He is not a spokesman for the members on the government side.

MR. MORGAN:

Well the hon. gentlemen can speak for yourselves, I am speaking for myself. Goodness gracious, what is wrong with some of the members of the House of Assembly these days? I speak for my constituents at any time I want to speak in this House and I will do so, hopefully, Mr. Chairman, uninterrupted by my colleagues up in the corner.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I am going to be effectively carrying out my duties as an MHA I want to ensure that every effort is being taken by government to accommodate me in trying to do my job as an MHA and all I am asking is a mere little request. I have written to the Speaker over a week ago, a copy to the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), I have not got a reply on the issue. All I am asking for is whenever it is possible to have adequate accommodations. 'Adequate' means a reasonable size office with at least a bit of ventilation in it and the most important thing is a phone system where my constituents can know where to call me and get a hold of me when they want to.

That is all I am asking for and surely if we cannot get that as private members of the House, either Opposition or on government side, we are being prevented from performing adequately as MEAs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

Debate on the Adjournment

[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:

It now being Thursday, 5:30 p.m., there are two questions to be brought up. One is by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who was not satisfied yesterday with

the answer received from the Premier in response to a question he put.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

That is alright, get up.

MR. BARRY:

He cannot get up until the Premier is here.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a second question here for the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). 'Although this may be a bit premature, I wish to bring up my question to the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) on Hydro's plans to increase their electrical production in the future. I am not satisfied with the answer received.'

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That was handed in yesterday or the day before. That was the reference there.

Mr. Speaker, the question I raised was given the annual report of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro that we received several days ago and given that the corporate report does not indicate any available new sources of electricity for the future, except for the possibility of the interconnect with Labrador, and given the projections that they have included in their report in terms of what electrical consumption is going to be over

the next number of years, it is quite obvious that we have major short falls coming.

I thought that I was the only person who could see it in the report but I went back and had a look at the Speech from the Throne of Thursday, February 28, 1980 and I quote from one paragraph in which it talks about the possibility of hydro production and it ends by saying; 'If we do not obtain additional generating capability our Province will face an electrical generating short fall after 1984' - and I believe 1985 comes after 1984 - 'and thus will be dependent upon oil-fired thermal generating facilities for more than 40 per cent of our electrical capability.'

It continues to go on with the usual harangue against Quebec for the power contract.

MR. BARRY:

They wiped out the economy so the demand did not grow.

MR. FENWICK:

The point here is that the projection is not a huge amount off, it may be this next year, when Cat Arm comes on stream, but as we look into the future, year after year, we will see more and more electricity needing to be generated at the Holyrood generating plant. The question that I had asked the minister, which he did not answer because he goes into his usual, 'Let us blame the Liberals for the fact that electricity is scarce right now routine,' and that is his only standard routine that he ever uses, but the question I ask the minister is, what are the immediate plans for next year, the year after, and the year after that?

We have already gone through a Winter in which electricity rates skyrocketed and, judging by the report of hydro, judging by this Speech from the Throne of four years ago, judging by these projections, we are now looking forward to even worse situations. The only answer we got besides that was that the minister was trying to make like he was an Indian and say that he may be a rainmaker and that he could find some way in order to make things rain. And that was the only other argument that he gave, the fact that the resevoirs were low.

The question and really the argument that I have for him is that that there is no policy at all in place other than the idea of interconnecting with Labrador, which may be the long-term solution. But unfortunately as John Maynard Keene says, in the long term I am going to be dead, I want to know what is going to happen to my electricity rates this year coming up, the next year and the year after.

If these projections are accurate what we are looking at is rapidly escalating prices as we burn more and more oil in order to produce the electricity. And, quite frankly, I think that the government has been terribly negligent in not having an alternative plan for these interval years coming up. And my question, although this is not a question at this point is, where are we going? What is the minister planning for us to do? Are there any particular plans he has in place? Because he has never yet given us any answers to that.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I can tell the hon. gentleman that while I was in the Cabinet in 1980 I was not directly responsible for the electrical policy. At that particular time there was another gentleman who is not too far away. But even that gentleman, Mr. Speaker, as well as this gentleman, as omnipotent as the hon. gentleman is, is not capable of making rain.

What the hon. gentleman for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is really dissatisfied with is the fact that we have not got any water. You know, it is useless to get up and say that we have not supplied the water.

And he asks then, what is our policy? Our policy is quite clear. We have exhausted, as the report shows, as the hon. gentleman has shown, all available sites for the generation of electricity through hydro. And we have to rely, and this is the tragedy that we are now realizing and now experiencing, and we experienced it last Winter, and the intensity of the experience will depend upon the amount of rain that falls this year, the amount of water that is there. But we will experience it next year because we will have to rely, yes certainly we will have to rely, and in the future, unless we can get that interconnect. Unless we can effectively get the interconnect from Labrador we are more, and more, going to have to rely on oil. And consequently the rates of electricity will go up and they will go up further and further in direct proportion to the amount of oil that is there.

So I do not know what other answer I can give the hon. gentleman, you know you are not omnipotent. If

we could we would say, presto, and there would be other water supplies we would be able to develop to get the cheapest kind of electricity. But the fact of the matter is with Cat Arm we have substantially exhausted all of the available sources. Any of the other sources that are there that are physically able to be developed they would so affect the environment that the government would just not entertain those particular developments. So until we get the interconnect, that is right, we live in the practical world, as the hon. gentleman should know.

Now, the decision as to the next source of electricity in this Province will have to be made in late 1986 or early 1987, that is the way it looks at the present time, in accordance with the forecast that we have available to us.

Now within that period of time it is going to be a very important period. We are going to move to see what we can do to negotiate our way into a means whereby we can utilize the untapped resources in Labrador as well as get access to the Upper Churchill. But let there be no mistake about it it should be no news to anyone, I mean it has been said over the years by this administration, and by the administration before it, that we are going to have to rely on oil for electrical rates and there is nothing we can do about it. If we could manufacture more rain we would, if we could manufacture more economic hydro sites we would, but we are not responsible for the forces of nature, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The next question is from the hon.

member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) whose question is for the hon. the Premier.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the question that I raised the other day to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) was that the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) called the teachers hooligans on public TV, but before he did that, in response to questions we raised in the Education estimates, he not only called them hooligans but he also ended up saying that they were acting as if they were trained as trained terrorists in Morocco or Iran.

When I asked the Premier if he was disassociating himself with these statements, is the government endorsing them, is the government allowing the olive branch that the Minister of Education, offered an olive branch to the teachers, and said, okay, the election was one thing now we will start all over again. The Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) offered an olive branch, but as soon as it was offered, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was up making accusations. But he never did table that complaint. He never received the complaint in writing, or by phone call, it was only rumour. He got up and acted on rumours. The Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) is still waiting for that complaint to be made in writing. The Minister of Education is quite correct in saying that he is not going to act until it is in writing. We have maintained on this side that the government is fishing for complaints, and now, because the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr.

Warren) made an accusation and none are coming in, the Minister of Education gets on TV and basically solicits complaints. The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) called the teachers hooligans and terrorists, as if they were trained in Morocco or Iran, and now the Premier is offering an olive branch to the NTA, but the Minister of Education is not doing nothing. In our parliamentary system government backbenchers always toe the government line. They may ask questions now and again if they want to make their ministers look good, or compliment the government on its policy, but in most cases, unless you are kicked out of the Cabinet and you want to be vocal and stand up for your rights - we saw an example today when the member for Bonavista (Mr. Morgan) got up and talked about office space and private members' rights, and then you had the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), saying, "Look, you might be the member for Bonavista South but you are not speaking for us." So, Mr. Speaker, you may have members disagreeing with each other, but, for the most part, that does not happen too often. I think what we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, is a split in government ranks. Mr. Speaker, although the Premier and the Minister of Education offered an olive branch to the teachers, they want to have their cake and eat it too. Because the government is saying, 'Okay, here is the olive branch,' but the stormtroopers are wreaking vengeance on the teachers for exercising their rights during the election.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education stated that he will send the complaints to the NTA, and he

will give them written complaints. Not phone calls, like the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) said, not rumours, but written complaints. And I feel, and this House feels, and I believe the public feels that the Minister of Education should not table the letters or the complaints, but he should at least give this House the number of complaints received so that the general public will know that aspersions are not being cast on the full NTA, the 8,000 teachers. Then, if there are two complaints, or five complaints, or ten complaints, Mr. Speaker, at least the people of the Province will know that there are only two complaints or ten complaints out of 8,000 teachers.

In elections, Mr. Speaker, we often get rather zealous, like the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde is getting now.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, from time to time I leave the House after Question Period to see delegations down in my office, as I have in the last week or so - every fifteen minutes or so I see another delegation - but I always have the speaker on downstairs so I can hear what is going on up here. And every time the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) gets up and speaks it reminds me of when I was in Grade X and Grade XI, and through university, when now and then I

would get an assignment back from an instructor or a teacher or a professor and all would be on it was "clarity and coherence". When I listen to the hon. member for Eagle River I sometimes wonder what it is he is trying to say. I will tell you it is really, really difficult. I tried to explain to the hon. member the other day that-

MR. HISCOCK:  
Do be patronizing.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Well, I am telling you the truth. I mean, I cannot follow the hon. member sometimes in what he is saying, it is convoluted, you know.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I assume that the Premier did not quite describe the full comment on the paper. I assume that on his papers at university was "clarity and coherence, question mark!".

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order, the hon. the Premier.

MR. BARRETT:  
Go back to your law practice.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Yes, go back to your law school.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
The Leader of the Opposition (Mr.

Barry), the great theoretician who has a job living in the real world. But that is another matter.

MR. BARRY:

We are learning. We are getting there.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, you are learning.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the first thing that comes to mind, and that is the truth of the matter.

I explained to the hon. member the other day that there have been times in that party and all parties where members who are private members of the party sit in the backbench and want to make statements about this, that, and something else. It might be directly consistent with what the leader said or what the party said in the last convention, or there might be little diversions from it or whatever. I am sure that the people of Williams Harbour, and George's Cove, and Paradise River, and Mary's Harbour, and St. Lewis, and L'Anse-au-Loop, and L'Anse-au-Clair and all the rest of the places in his district, and Cartwright and Smokey - is Smokey in your district now?

MR. HISCOCK:

Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. - are far more interested - I mean, if there is a question that the hon. member for Eagle River has to ask not only as a representative of his district but on behalf of the people of Newfoundland, they are far interested in a lot more things than what the hon. member is trying to bring up in this convoluted way.

Tomorrow, I suppose, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) may make a comment out in Corner Brook about something and then, of course, I have to say whether I disassociate or associate myself. Do not be so silly. Raise questions and let us have a good debate during the Late Show on things which really matter to the Province. That is only a frivolous kind of point.

MR. BARRY:

Education is irrelevant then?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. Education is not irrelevant, no, but the hon. member is irrelevant. What the hon. member is talking about is irrelevant. Teachers, that is not irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are not going to get up every day and I am not going to start questioning the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) on whether he said exactly what the Leader of the Opposition said, or whether the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) did. I mean, this is just too foolish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is irrelevant, frivolous, petty, small, and I would request that the hon. member - I would love to have a debate on some issue of public importance to the Province, either dealing with his district or the Province in general, but this foolishness of trying to say now the Premier today has to



disassociate one day from remarks of somebody in caucus, and the next day associate. I mean, what a lot of foolishness. There are more important things going on in the Province that the hon. member should be concerned about, on which he should ask questions, and then have an opportunity to debate it on the Late Show. I am not going to get into any kind of argument and foolishness with the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) on these frivolous points that he brings up, they are only wasting the time of the House, and the people of Newfoundland deserve better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, before you adjourn the House I would like to get up in the spirit of co-operation and goodwill and contrition and all the rest of it with respect to the matters brought up when the House originally started today. I can advise the House, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Opposition, particularly the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), who is the very learned and very highly respected energy critic on the other side -

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
He is very knowledgeable

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
When he came over today and

indicated he had made a prior commitment, a prior personal commitment, and the Opposition requested then -

MR. FLIGHT:  
A House commitment.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Well, okay, House commitment, or whatever.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Do not forget the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans is a very, very honourable and knowledgeable man.

MR. MARSHALL:  
- that we postpone the energy estimates tonight, I said, 'Sure. Yes, we will. And so I just wanted to point this out that as a result of consultation with the Opposition, the Energy estimates will not be considered tonight. I do not want to give advance notice too much further, because I am afraid to step in on the Committees. But I understand there will be a meeting next Wednesday morning. So if that is agreeable with the Opposition?

Agreeable?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Agreeable.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I also give notice that tomorrow at 1:30 in the House - now this is notice, it is almost twenty-four hours notice - the Education estimates will be considered from 1:30 to 3:00 P.M. under the Social Services Committee.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
They have not gotten off the Minister's Salary in the Education estimates yet.

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

adjourned until tomorrow, Friday,  
June 7, 1985 at 10:00 A. M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
On a point of order, the hon.  
member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker, we would have been  
finished the estimates on  
Education, but the Minister of  
Education (Mr. Hearn) had to go to  
a function so we postponed it.  
Normally we do not meet on Friday  
afternoons, but because we wanted  
to make sure things were done  
according to the House, we agreed  
to meet Friday afternoon. We  
could have had an extra day, Mr.  
Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
What a big concession, you are  
going to work Friday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order, it is  
a difference of opinion about  
timing between two hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:  
There is already a motion to  
adjourn.

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

On motion, the House at its rising