



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 20

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

UNEDITED

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

28 May 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. BARRY:
The Estimates Committee met, the first meeting this morning here in the Legislative Chambers, and there was no press present. We checked with the President of the Press Gallery and the indication is as far as they are concerned they are not aware of receiving any notification that the Estimates Committee was meeting at that time and at that place. Now it is useless to have meetings of the Estimates Committee unless the press is going to be present. It is a waste of everybody's time and it does not fulfill the purpose of the Estimates Committee. We wonder if the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) would give some indication or assurances that the press is going to be notified and given an opportunity to attend these Estimates Committees.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I had not risen but I will. I feel much more comfortable complying with your summons, Mr. Speaker, than the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's. But I will say this, being an open government, completely, absolutely open with nothing to hide, completely nothing to hide at all. We have these Estimate Committee and the

Chairman of the Estimate Committees or the Clerk of the House, gives an indication, and this was the practice, I understood, to the Press Gallery as to when meetings were held. This was the practice in the past and we will see that this is complied with in the future.

Now if notification was not given to the press this morning - and I do not know whether it was or it was not - it was certainly inadvertent and we shall certainly see that the normal process of open government that has been practiced by the Peckford Administration for so many years, the Moores' Administration before it, in contrast to the Smallwood Administration, will reign forever and a day, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I rise I believe on behalf of all members on both sides of the House. Some many months ago a young man by the name of Steve Fonyo dipped his leg in the Atlantic Ocean here in St. John's and tomorrow, God willing, he will be doing the same thing in the Pacific Ocean in Victoria. So I would like to make a motion, Sir, that you as Speaker send a congratulatory letter or telegram to the young gentleman who had the spirit and determination to prove to all Canadians that we can fight cancer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to respond to that and say that we fully support that motion. The original idea of Terry Fox that has been carried forth by Steve Fonyo, and he has done an unreal feat, and unbelievable feat that has really helped the cause of the Cancer Society, which is probably one of the most worthwhile causes that we have. I would just like to say that I think every member of this House would like to support that motion. We give full credit to Mr. Fonyo and wish him well on the success which he has had in the last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the motion "aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against "nay", carried.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the workers at Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation have been involved in collective bargaining negotiations with their employer over the past month. We have received information that the union representatives had recommended a settlement to the employees, but

the day on which the vote was to be held, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) spoke with a member of the bargaining unit and indicated that the union representatives, the negotiating committee had left money on the table, because government would be prepared to exempt CFLCo from the wage freeze in the same way that it intended to exempt the Marystown Shipyard. I wonder if the Minister of Fisheries would indicate whether or not there was any such conversation held with a member of the unit at Churchill Falls Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to answer the question. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that at the time that the alleged conversation took place I was Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth and I met a friend of mine, whom I played hockey with and know quite well when the gentleman lived in Baie Verte, at the Airport in Deer Lake, he was enroute back from the minor hockey tournament to Churchill Falls, and I was enroute back to St. John's, I guess just shortly following the election.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Well, what does that have to do with Fisheries?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, I do not know what it has to do with Fisheries either, but I will recount the alleged happenings since the question was asked.

We had a discussion, Mr. Speaker, in the airport about Crown corporations that make money and

Crown corporation that do not make money, and the fairness of the government's wage freeze programme and the unfairness of it and so on. Because I have been aware of this now for several weeks, I called that gentleman when I heard that he allegedly went back to the union meeting that night when the vote was being taken and advised his colleagues in the union that he had been told by a minister that they were stupid and crazy to accept whatever settlement they were voting on, or whatever package they were voting on because Tom Rideout had told him that government was looking at changing its policy or not implementing the policy on the wage freeze as it related to Crown corporations that made money.

The gentleman whom I had talked to in Deer Lake flatly denied that he had ever mentioned that to his union colleagues. Over the telephone to me anyway, he flatly denied that his name or my name was mentioned in the union meeting, and that he did not know where it came from or what they were talking about.

I can go on to say, Mr. Speaker, that at no time during the conversation that I had with my friend in Deer Lake did I ever indicate to him that government was considering changing its policy as it related to Crown corporations that were profitable or Crown corporations that were not profitable, or as it related to the government's wage restraint programme.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to direct a question, in light of the minister's response, to the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall), electrical energy, whom I assume is the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). It is hard to keep track of them, Mr. Speaker, because it is a shell game that they play over there.

But I would like to ask the minister whether it is not a fact that on the evening of the same day that the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) spoke with a member of the bargaining unit, that the employees of CFLCo in the bargaining unit rejected the offer which had been recommended for acceptance by the negotiating committee, by the executive of the union, and whether or not the minister was informed that this was because of information supplied by the Minister of Fisheries to a member of the bargaining unit?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman really sounds today like he is the process of conducting a court case, and conducting a cross-examination.

MR. BARRY:

One step at a time.

MR. MARSHALL:

Very effective.

But, Mr. Speaker, with respect to that particular matter, CFLCo went into negotiations with the union. The union rejected the offer made by CFLCo. The matter is now in the process of conciliation. As

to the alleged statement made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), I think the Minister of Fisheries has dealt quite adequately with that in his answer to the hon. gentleman. I think that is as much of the information, really, that is necessary at this time.

MR. BARRY:
Oh, no!

MR. MARSHALL:
Not to the hon. gentleman, but in the interest, perhaps, of the whole issue and a resolution of the issue, as Minister responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and, indirectly then, CFLCo, by no means, Mr. Speaker, in a public forum am I going to get up and make comments about matters that are now in the process of conciliation. I think it is sufficient to say, and sufficient for the hon. gentleman to know and to understand, that an offer was made, the offer was rejected, and it is in the process of conciliation. The hon. gentleman asked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) a question with respect to certain statements that he allegedly made. He has responded to him, so I think that there has been a full and sufficient and complete response to the extent that is presently necessary to the hon. gentleman.

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

MR. BARRY:
It is not as easy as that. What evidence there is, Mr. Speaker, would indicate that the employees of CFLCo rejected an offer on the basis of information obtained in a conversation with the Minister of Fisheries. Now regardless of what

it was the Minister of Fisheries intended to convey, there was information conveyed. And I would ask the minister whether he would undertake to investigate whether there was a breach of Cabinet secrecy in the course of this conversation that was held by the Minister of Fisheries with this member of the bargaining unit. In the course of the conversations held between the Minister of Fisheries and a member of the bargaining, was there a breach of Cabinet secrecy and did this breach of Cabinet secrecy result in a lack of agreement which might otherwise have been there and an extension of the period when we had no agreement between Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation and its employees?

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I presume anybody, who wants to can construct any scenario he wants to and insulate himself with any kind of information he wants to. If the hon. gentleman wants to live in sort of like a dream world and build up his own dreams and his own castles, that is certainly his prerogative to do. "On the basis of information," he says. Now the basis of the information was what the hon. gentleman hypothesized to the hon. Minister of Fisheries and the hon. Minister of Fisheries said it was not so. So that being so, if they acted on certain information as alleged by the hon. gentleman, and I do not know definitely myself if that was the reason, they obviously did so incorrectly. So the hon. gentleman is inventing his own scenario because he sees some ulterior motive behind it, or some

ulterior happening that did not occur. There is no instance here, there is no question here with respect to any breach of Cabinet secrecy or what have you.

Now, as I repeat once again my original answer to the hon. gentleman, that the matter is in the collective bargaining process. An offer had been made, the offer was rejected, the matter is in the process of conciliation, and for me to make any further comments, and I do not intend to make any further comments beyond that, would be, I would think, construed and rightly so, as an interference in the normal collective bargaining process and I have no intention of doing that.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. BARRY:

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) just said it had nothing to do with Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER:

When?

MR. CALLAN:

He just said it then. I heard him

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries whether he had discussions with this gentleman in Deer Lake airport concerning government policy with respect to the application of the government wage freeze to the Marystown Shipyard, its applicability to Crown corporations or to the university, and its applicability to CFLCo Corporation? In the light of the settlement that had

been carried out at the university, and in the light of government policy with respect to Marystown Shipyard, did the minister have discussions with this gentleman with respect to the Shipyard, the university and CFLCo?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I think the record is very clear. I just answered that question. I told the hon. gentleman that, in fact, I did talk to a friend of long-standing of mine in Deer Lake airport, when I was Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, about the fairness or otherwise of a wage freeze against Crown corporations that make money on Crown corporations that do not make money. I do not know if we talked about the university or not, I do not recall, but I know Marystown Shipyard was held up as an example of a Crown corporation that makes money, and CFLCo was another. I have talked to the gentleman since it was brought to my attention and I already said to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) at no time did I say that I supported or did not support government policy, we were just talking in general terms about the fairness or unfairness of having a wage freeze apply to Crown corporations that were profitable against Crown corporations that were not. At no time did I oppose government policy, did I give any hint that I was against government policy, did I give any hint that it was discussed in Cabinet because, to tell you the truth, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not it was. It was just a general conversation between two people who have been friends for a long time, who talked politics, who

talked *government policy as it related to the wage freeze and so on. There was no Cabinet secrecy, no nothing as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, I was just sitting down talking to an individual. I asked him after I heard this scenario about it being used at the union meeting and he flatly denied it. That is all I know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

Where did they get the idea?

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not know. I do not deny talking to him.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, last week we discussed a number of appointments by the P.C. administration over there with regard to ex-members of this House who had lost their seats and ended up with some government sinecures.

I would like to extend some more questions along that line. My question today will be for the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn). There is a position in his department, in my district, as a statistical officer. I understand this is a temporary position; I understand also that it has not been advertised through the Public Service Commission, that it was filled approximately a year ago and has been extended just recently. I would like to ask the minister if he has any knowledge of the qualifications of the individual concerned and any knowledge of the actual hiring of that individual?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many people in the department who are in - is this a temporary position? -

MR. FENWICK:

It certainly is.

MR. DINN:

- A temporary position in the hon. member's district. I will certainly have a look at it and check the information for the hon. member, get the information for him and report it to the House as soon as I possibly can. I do not know what the status of it is right now.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am not sure, actually, if I should ask the minister, because the position was filled when there was a different gentleman as the minister of that particular department. Would the Minister of Transportation, (Mr. Dawe), who was involved at that time, be willing to answer the question if I direct it to him?

MR. DAWE:

No.

MR. FENWICK:

No? In that case, I will give you another question, a supplementary. As I understand it, the individual who now fills the position is a former electrician who was laid off by Iron Ore Company of Canada and, as

near as we can make out, the only qualification he has for this particular government job, which I remind you, did not go to public competition but was selected just within the department -

MR. SIMMS:

Nor does it have to.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, but the only qualification that we can find to date that this person has for this statistics job is that he happens to be the brother-in-law of the Premier. Could you tell us whether or not this is indeed true?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this has kind of gotten me a little bit off guard in that I am not aware of everyone who works in the department, but I will certainly find out for the hon. member and supply the information.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). The fishing industry, the inshore fishery along the East and Northeast Coast, is presently at a standstill because of ice conditions. Because fishermen's unemployment insurance has expired, the normal regular unemployment insurance, and because the federal level of government recently announced a \$5.3 million programme to help

these fishermen, I would like to know, Sir, and the fishermen in my area, what are the details whereby the fishermen can avail of these funds now allocated by the federal level of government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

Over the last several weeks the Department of Fisheries and the Premier, through his office, have been working very diligently with the federal government through the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Fraser), through the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Ms MacDonald) and through our representative in the federal Cabinet (Mr. Crosbie) to have a programme put in place to assist our fishermen should ice conditions dictate that they could not get fishing once the regular unemployment ran out on May 15. The announcement was made a few days ago that the programme had been approved for \$5.3 million. I am pleased to tell the House that it is my understanding that the programme will be administered by the federal Department of Employment and Immigration and the amount of money payable to each fishermen on a per week period will be the same as they had been receiving under regular unemployment insurance and it will be paid directly to the fishermen through the Department of Employment and Immigration.

I am also pleased to tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that it is different from the programme that the previous administration announced last year to assist fishermen who were hampered by ice

conditions in Newfoundland and, as a result of representation that this government made to Ottawa, that programme this year will not finish in Southern Labrador. The programme this year will include fishermen from Rigolet to Nain so that every fisherman, Mr. Speaker, in the Province, where they are hampered by ice conditions will be treated equally no matter whether they live on the Island, live in Southern Labrador or live in Nain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, Hear!

MR. MORGAN:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, would the hon. minister indicate whether or not the fishermen will have to complete forms similar to unemployment insurance forms? Because yesterday, in enquiring with the Manpower office, they did not have the proper forms to send out to the respective fishermen and by the time they get these forms and send for payment they may not get a payment until sometime later in June, which would mean they have no income at the present time.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, we certainly hope that there is not that kind of delay, but I will have my officials check with Employment and Immigration Canada and I will let the hon. member know as soon as I have the information.

MR. HISCOCK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK:
I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. The minister has said that it will be extended not only to Southern Labrador but up as far as Nain. My question to him is last year and this year we have these special programmes brought into effect mainly because of fishermen on the Northeast Coast. Labrador continually has this problem each year, so next year and the year after, when fishing starts in Twillingate and the Fogo area, the fishermen will not be able to start fishing up in Labrador. So the question I am asking to the Minister of Fisheries is when the fishing season starts for Fogo and Twillingate on the Northeast Coast and UIC is cut off will the Minister of Fisheries assure this House that the people from Labrador will be exempt, not only for this season but continually exempt each year, and that regulations be changed to reflect that climatic condition of the farther North you go the more ice there is? Does the Minister of Employment and Immigration in Ottawa know that?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, after seven or eight months in power in Ottawa the present federal government has already shown a degree of co-operation and a degree of flexibility never shown in

fourteen years when the hon. gentleman's party was in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is correct that it should not take ice conditions in Fogo or along the Northeast Coast to dictate the different climatic conditions that exist year after year in Labrador but this government in Ottawa, and the present Minister of Employment and Immigration, have already shown that they know that ice conditions are a problem on the Labrador Coast when they are not necessarily a problem anywhere else in this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. We have done it the first seven or eight months they are in office and we will continue to support that kind of policy. It happened just like that with no confrontation, just a request from this government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle, I would like to welcome a number of people to our gallery. Mr. S.L. Malik, Consul General of India, and Dr. Reddy visiting the Province on official business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Twenty-five students from St. Marks High School, Kings Cove, with their teachers Majella Aylward, and John Adams.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

And forty-six Grade V students from Holy Redeemer School, Trepassey with their three teachers Sister Seana Lee, Mrs. Waddleton, and Mrs. Hartery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I must say whoever sends me up these notes are always very helpful, they always have little note with the pronunciation, and I see for Sister Seana Lee they have S-h-a-w-n-a. I would like to assure them that my first official language was Irish, so I do not have any difficulty in getting around that word.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn). Yesterday the hon. minister told this House that he has in his possession documented proof of political harassment in schools. I take it the minister is not prepared to table these documents but will he describe to this hon. House the type of documentation in his possession? For example, does he have letters or does he have signed affidavits? Could he just explain to us what he means by documentation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the issue concerned was discussed at length yesterday

and it is a very touchy issue. It* is an issue of concern, as I said before, to the employer, the professional association, etc., as well as ourselves, and I think the less said about it in a public forum the better. I do have documentation which I will be presenting to the appropriate people at the appropriate time and hopefully it will be dealt with then in the appropriate manner. I was not the one, as the member mentioned, who raised the issue. I would rather deal with an issue such as this in the proper way and I do not think discussing it in public is the proper way to deal with it.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, could I ask, did the minister have those written statements before going to the press or was his going to the press a solicitation, a plea for letters to back up statements that were made by his colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)? Was it an advertisement, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, for clarification, for the edification of the member opposite, I will just relate how the whole thing came about. It was raised in the House by my hon. colleague, my friend from Torngat Mountains. Following that I was questioned by the press at that time. A few days ago, while being interviewed

by the press on another issue, the lady from The Telegram who had acutally interviewed me originally on it but had been away, asked, "What has happened?" So I just mentioned, as I always do, the information is there to be given, I do not try to hide anything, that I have had some reports and we will be dealing with them properly. I did not realize it was going to make the front page of The Telegram and maybe I should have said that we would rather not have this out in public. But, of course, the press has its own way of dealing with things. So consequently -

MR. BARRY:

How come you are launching your witch-hunt now?

MR. DAWE::

Do not be so silly.

MR. HEARN:

Nobody ever mentioned a witch-hunt except the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and his colleagues.

MR. DAWE:

And nobody knows more about witches than the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, from the press the media picked it up and it went form there. As I say, we have our own way of dealing with these things and we will deal with them properly. Even though the members opposite want to make a political issue out of it, we do not want to make it a political issue and I have no intention of doing so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister tells us about an investigation which is going on. And the suggestion yesterday came across that the NTA and the Department of Education were both concerned over this matter. And one would infer that the NTA and the Department of Education were working hand in glove to get to the bottom of this thing. If this is the case, can the minister explain to this House why the President of the NTA, on radio this morning, denied that the NTA was conducting any investigation? He said there was no basis for an investigation only rumours and hearsay. Would the minister care to explain why this discrepancy? Could he tell this hon. House who he is dealing with in the NTA? Could he explain the extent of the co-operation? Is there some sharing of information? Let him throw some light on it. What is going on? Is there a joint investigation or is there not?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, certainly I would be glad to clarify for the hon. member. The word 'investigation', I am not sure where he got it in connection with a joint investigation. I said that the NTA and ourselves were concerned about the matter. I spoke to the President of the NTA, I told him I had some documented evidence in and a number of other verbal reports, I said at the

appropriate time when I get, because I do not act upon hearsay or telephone calls or rumours or innuendoes as some members opposite do, when I got documentation on the number of cases that had been indicated to me were forthcoming, I would sit down with him, as President of the Association, and with the employers or the school boards or their representatives, and at that time and only then would I present to them something that is substantial, I would not run to them with rumour or hearsay. And he expressed his concern because they are a professional association with a code of ethics and he also expressed that concern on radio this morning.

Certainly when I get the properly documented cases, and only then, will I sit down, let the association and the boards know, and at that time we will see what happens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Which of the minister's answers are correct, the one he just gave us or the previous one? They both cannot be correct. He just said when he gets the documentation, but he confirmed in his earlier question that, he had the documentation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HEARN:

When I get all the documentation.

MR. SIMMONS:

Okay, I understand that much that you are waiting for all of the documentation. All right. Then my question is if he is not prepared to run to the NTA with it, why is he so anxious to run to the press with it?

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Right on! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, once again I am not sure what I have to say to spell it out clearly for the individuals over there, but the words I used were 'all of the documentation'. I do have in my possession written documentation of some of the cases that were brought to me verbally. When I get the rest - and this is what I said to the President of the NTA - when I get sufficient documentation, and I have an indication that there are many more cases forthcoming, I will meet with him. If not, I will say to him, I have X number and do you want to sit down and discuss these? I think that I will have more in my possession so then we will be able to deal with it all at the one time. When that comes to me I will then meet with these people.

Now in relation to running to the press, as I mentioned, I was not the one who ran to the press. I have not given the press any examples of what have gone on whatsoever. In fact, I have declined to give any examples. That is not the place. The public

forum is*not the place to deal with issues like that. You as a former teacher should know it, and I as a former teacher respect it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

There is a way to deal with it. It should never had surfaced publicly, it has, and consequently we are dealing in a public forum. But we still have to try to deal with this in a very responsible manner without negatively affecting the many people out there who would be negatively affected if we are not handling this problem properly.

MR. DAWE:

Hear, hear. A good answer.

MR. SIMMONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with the minister the kind of thing that would have been best sorted out privately, but for that he has to point the finger at the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), not anybody on this side or anybody else. The issue became public as a result of some comments made by his colleague from Torngat Mountains, let us understand that. Having become a public issue, the onus in on parties on both sides of this House to address it in a responsible manner. We are suggesting to the minister that in talking to the Evening Telegram, without examples, without taking it through its proper process, he himself was being irresponsible.

*

Now he cannot undo that. He indicated just now he was sorry for doing it, but he cannot undo it other than apologize to the teachers. What he can do now is, with the examples he has, give them to the NTA and let them adjudicate. Will he do that?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I think I have mentioned on a number of occasions, and it has been mentioned by many Speakers in the past, that in a supplementary it is not necessary to have a long, or indeed any preamble.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I was just making a sincere effort to bail the minister out. Would he now try and undo the damage he has done by giving to the NTA the examples he has? Then if others are forthcoming, we are fairly near the NTA building, we can get the other examples over to them. In the meantime, would he put up or shut up?

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are in the wrong forum, perhaps. Once again, for the benefit of the hon. member, I would like to point out a number of things. Number one, I did not run to the Evening Telegram with stories or statements. It was in answer to a question as to what has been happening. It was a very brief answer about what has been happening and, if you read the Weekend Telegram, that is all was mentioned - no cases involved, no documentation whatsoever. On the other part of what I should do about it, now I realize the hon.

member is the former boss of the Premier, I believe; however, he is not my boss and I do not take orders from him, so I have my own way of dealing with the matter. I have also discussed it with the President of the NTA and he has agreed that when I get proper documentation we will sit down and discuss the matter. If I feel that there is no further documentation forthcoming within a reasonable time, I will certainly go with what I have. But if there is more coming, I do not want to run to the NTA every day, both of us have much more important things to do. And I would suggest to the hon. member and all members, if they want to be responsible about that, if they want to sit tight, when all of this documentation comes in and when we have made our approaches to the proper associations involved, then we will fully inform them as to what was involved and what is going to happen from there on. But, in the meantime, all they are doing is making a proverbial nuisance out of themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like to welcome to the galleries Mayor Peter Gibbons and the town clerk, Edward Goodyear, from the town of Lumsden.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 32 (2) of the Financial Administration Act I would like to table certain documents to complete the requirements in regard to certain special warrants issued before the Interim Supply bill was brought down.

Notices of Motion

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, because the 1983 Auditor General's Report was available prior to dissolution, there is some question as to whether or not the Public Accounts Committee can consider the Auditor General's Report, so I move that the Public Accounts be authorized to enquire into and report to this House with respect to the 1983 Auditor General's Report, and that that be the subject of its deliberations for this session.

On motion, it was agreed that the 1983 Auditor General's Report be subject to deliberation by the Public Accounts Committee.

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question put to me by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) in Question Period today, as a result of the task force report on Western Labrador, which my department, at the time, the Department of Labour and Manpower was involved in it, of the several recommendations that came out of that report, one of the recommendations was to see what the needs of each department were with respect to employing people in Western Labrador. As a result of that, the Department of Mines and Energy saw a requirement for a statistical officer who, with an economist down there, would provide statistical information to the Department of Mines and Energy.

As a result of that, then, on February 1, 1984, we hired a gentleman on a temporary basis. In these situations they do not go, necessarily, to the Public Service Commission. On February 1 we hired a gentleman in Western Labrador on a temporary basis, and in February 1985 his term of employment was extended for another year.

The hon. gentleman also asked questions about his being related to the Premier, or something like that. Mr. Speaker, I think the know the gentleman the hon. member is talking about, and he is a very smart individual. If he has just half the drive of the hon. the Premier, he is probably one of the most valued members of the people employed in the Department of Mines.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I would like to present to the House a petition from a group of citizens and representatives of the town council of Gander who have been working for some time now on a situation that confronts the town of Gander.

As most people are aware, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk recently about Air Canada planning to move international flights from Gander to St. John's. There has also been talk concerning, and presentations made by the St. John's Board of Trade, full international status for St. John's Airport. This committee has been working, obviously, to prevent this from happening.

The town of Gander has been under some strain recently. We had EPA move out with the loss of 350 jobs from the community, and the town has been struggling along, pulling itself up by its boot straps, and recovering from this shock fairly nicely. However, on top of this we now find a concerted move to remove the very lifeblood of the town, which happens to be the major employer there, the International Airport.

The movement of the Air Canada flights is the beginning. It will mean the loss of eight direct

jobs, and the loss of \$3 million a year to the economy of Gander. The reason given is that it is inconvenient to fly from St. John's to Gander to catch a international flight, and this is why the flights should be moved to St. John's.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my position, and the position of these people, that most of the Province of Newfoundland has been inconvenienced since settlers came here. They have had to come to St. John's for everything. We have to send our students here to go to university from most of the Province, and there are government offices and so on, and we have been inconvenienced an awful lot from the point of view of having to come to St. John's for things. And we kind of resent the fact that now, because there is a concentration of population, that everything is going to be moved in here and we are afraid of this kind of attempt.

I would like to go through some of the letters of support for this position, Mr. Speaker, that we have received: From The Grand Falls Advertiser an editorial, 'Leave Gander alone.' A letter from Brian Tobin, MP. A letter from the Mayor of Grand Falls: 'The town of Grand Falls wishes to voice its objection to a proposal to move any of Air Canada's services from Gander to St. John's. At present St. John's is served well by the International Airport in Gander when compared to the capital cities of other provinces.'

A letter from Joseph Price, MP: 'I support your concern and those of the people in Central Newfoundland.' The city of Corner Brook: 'Also concerned that such

a move should even be considered and unanimously supports your efforts to oppose the transfer.' The town of Springdale: 'It is with shock and dismay for the town council of the town of Springdale to hear of the move being even considered. To further depress the economic state of any part of Newfoundland outside the Avalon Peninsula is something that the town council of the town of Springdale did not feel the elected officials of Newfoundland would even consider.' Support from the town of Stephenville and the Transportation Commission, support from the town of Baie Verte, 'Our council wishes to go on record as being totally against any move whatsoever to downgrade Gander International Airport. The possible move by Air Canada would certainly downgrade Gander International Airport.' A member of the Fortune town council strongly support the efforts of the Gander town council and their International Airport Impact Committee. Channel, Port aux Basques, at a regular meeting May 7th, passed a unanimous resolution supporting the town of Gander in its efforts.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on and on. The town of Burin, the town of Botwood, Point Leamington, Dover, the town of Twillingate and the town of Bonavista; 'We fully support you and your committee in its endeavours.' The Mayor of Gambo writes 'the town of Gambo is disturbed to hear the proposal to move Air Canada International flights from Gander to St. John's and, indeed, St. John's is forgetting that there is a Newfoundland outside the overpass.' 'The town council of Labrador City extends our full support in your efforts to stop the removal of flights.' Hare

Bay, Valleyfield, Pool's Island, Indian Bay and, Mr. Speaker, it goes on and on. Letters from Chambers of Commerce from all over the Province and I will table these documents along with the petition.

Mr. Speaker, I would, obviously, give my strongest support to this particular petition and I would also suggest that it is the kind of thing - the removal of jobs from an area that is being hard hit economically - it is the kind of thing that most members of this hon. House could easily support. So, Mr. Speaker, I table this petition before the hon. House.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to support my colleague's petition. I was waiting to see if the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) would get up seeing that the Grand Falls town council has supported it, but in view of the fact that he did not I felt that -

MR. SIMMS:
I never had a chance.

MR. GILBERT:
You are getting up? Good.

MR. SIMMS:
They allow one from each side.

MR. GILBERT:
I was waiting for you but I will go ahead.

I certainly support the petition and I feel that the silence of the other side says something about

this move. We, those of us who live outside of St. John's, realize that there is some services still out there which should remain. It is nice to say we are going to move them into St. John's to the convenience of the people who live in St. John's, but outside we feel there is still services that we should have. This airport has been established in Gander. It has international status and recognition the world over since it was the first airport that was established in Newfoundland.

I feel that to move the international flight would be unfair to the people of Gander and certainly would be inconvenient for the rest of the people that live in the area there that have to use the services of that airport. Albeit that it is inconvenient for the people from St. John's, they say, to fly out to Gander, but we have to fly into St. John's, those of us who live out there. If they lived in North Bay they would possibly have to fly to Toronto to make a connecting international flight. So we have an international airport. I think any move or any support for this government to move an international airport was already established in the Province is grossly unfair. I feel that it should not be given any consideration at all by this government and there should be strong representation made that the status quo be maintained and that the airport still be established in Gander for the service of all of Newfoundland. If it is inconvenient for the Mayor of St. John's to make a connecting flight we do not feel too bad about it. He will get overseas if he wants to. So, we would like to say that we want to

keep this service in Gander.

Thank you.

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not being in the House when the petition was presented. I was speaking with your colleague but I have had a chance to look at the petition.

There are a couple of inferences in this whole thing. There is an assumption that somewhere along the line Air Canada has made an official application to change airports or that there is some kind of an official move afoot to do this. For the past number of years, as I understand the history of it in speaking with a number of people who have been involved - as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am meeting with a delegation from Gander this week relative to this situation; this has sort of been an ongoing discussion over the years - I am somewhat surprised at the numbers that we have been looking at relative to the employment impact on Gander. I am somewhat surprised at the magnitude that this hypothetical move has caused in light of the very little resistance and objection that came from that particular community when it was notified, officially with regard to EPA's move, not from Gander to St. John's, but from Gander to Halifax. It is somewhat ironic in that sense. It is not to say that the people in the area should not be concerned about any potential loss of employment in their area,

and certainly, Mr. Speaker, without question, members on this side of the House and government -

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that when a person gets up to support a petition that that person speaks in support of the petition and not start taking pot shots at the people who presented the petition.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

I would like to remind the hon. minister that he has now spoken for five minutes.

MR. DAWE:

If the new member for Gander (Mr. Baker) had not been so excitable and gotten on his feet, he would have heard me complete my statement in saying that members on this side, and government certainly, is very supportive of the international status which Gander has maintained over the years. It is also very supportive of any moves that will enhance the capabilities of that particular airport and the town of Gander in attracting additional international flights and additional international traffic, and that is certainly a stand which we have taken and will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker. So, when and if the issue comes to a position where this government

will have an input, we will certainly do everything we can to make sure that the international standards and conditions in Gander are indeed upgraded over the coming years, as I hope, Mr. Speaker, all airports and all airport activity in other communities that depend largely on airport infrastructure will also be enhanced over the years to come.

I would like to assure the member for Gander and point out to him that the air regulations - and this is not by any means abdicating any responsibility that we might have - but certainly the air regulations and the control of that is handled by federal agencies and federal control boards, both with regard to applications from Air Canada and what happens with regard to international status, which, by the way, goes beyond the airport administration and into areas concerning External Affairs and bilateral arrangements with other countries and so on. So it is not a simple issue. It is not an imminent thing that is going to happen within the next few days, but I would like to go on record again as assuring the people of Gander that we are very supportive of the international status that has been established - and the good international reputation with regard to the airport - and we will do everything that we can to make sure that that international ability of that airport continues in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right on! Right on!

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Motion 1.

The hon the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands has a few minutes left.

MR. SIMMS:

How much time do I have left, Mr. Speaker? I wonder if I could ask the Clerk? Two minutes.

I will just summarize, Mr. Speaker, what I said yesterday afternoon.

I spent most of the time yesterday, of course, pointing out how weak was the attack of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in this Budget Debate. There was reference to it in the local newspapers, The Evening Telegram. There was no reference to anything he said. It simply said that the Leader of the Opposition spoke in the debate for four and one-half hours, as was pointed out by my friend from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). The content of his speech, Mr. Speaker, was very similar to the content of speeches of his predecessors, Mr. Stirling and Mr. Neary. It was all negative. He did not point out any of the positive points in the budget, and there are hundreds. He criticized simply for the sake of criticizing, Mr. Speaker. There was a lot of Rex Murphy rhetoric sprinkled throughout with the big words, the large words, which he understood and nobody else. He spent half his time speaking on the federal budget, which he should have done, of course, by getting himself elected last September if he wanted to speak on the federal budget.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I predict that every member there opposite, every single one of

them, will rise in their seats over the course of the next few weeks and they will lambaste my friend, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), they will lambaste this government, they will criticize everything in that budget simply for the sake of criticizing, Mr. Speaker. They will not propose any alternatives at all. Over the course of the last few days, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was quite straightforward. He obviously could not put his heart and soul into criticizing the government, or criticizing this budget, or criticizing the Minister of Finance, and that is for one very good reason. That reason is, Mr. Speaker, that in these difficult times and the difficult situations that we find ourselves in financially and economically, this budget is one of the best budgets ever brought into this Legislature by any administration. I commend the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for the fine job that he did and support his budget wholeheartedly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased to see the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is in this House today. Because, Sir, I want to compliment him. Now, is this being negative?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. DECKER:

I want to compliment the hon. gentleman for trying to do his best. If I were grading the Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, I would give him an E for effort. You see, the hon. the Minister of Finance means well. He is not an old ogre. He is an honourable old gentleman, Mr. Speaker. He is the type of gentleman that I am sure anybody would be pleased to have visit for a weekend.

Now, he admitted some time ago in this hon. House that everything seems to get on his nerves, Mr. Speaker. That is one of the problems that we find with grandfather figures. It would be an enjoyable weekend to have this hon. old gentleman stay with us. We would have to try to keep the children under control so they would not turn the television up too high. We would have to try to keep the cat and the dogs out of his sight, because everything gets on his nerves. The problem with this hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, is that he belongs to another age. He is a Conservative. There is not an ounce of progressiveness in the Minister of Finance.

When the word 'progressive' was tacked on to the Conservative Party back - when was it? - They were trying to appease a potential leader, I believe, so they tacked on the word 'progressive' and made Progressive Conservative out of it. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that for a brief period of time, a few minutes or so, you had a Progressive and a Conservative combined and, I think, if you combine a Progressive with a Conservative, you should get something pretty close to a Liberal. At some time in history, I do not know when, there might

have been some Liberal policies contained in this otherwise conservative party. The conservative strain was so strong, so strong a gene in that party, Mr. Speaker, that in a matter of a very short time, the progressive element was completely cast aside so that what we are left with today is a Tory, a Conservative Government. All the progressives are driven out and we have a Tory philosophy. And out of this Toryism, out of this harping back on the past, out of this conservatism, comes this excuse for a budget. That is the problem with this budget.

The word 'anachronism' keeps coming to my mind. I am not sure if I am using it exactly right though, Mr. Speaker. I understand that an anachronism is the error of placing a person or thing in a period to which he or it does not belong. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) Mr. Speaker, could well be an anachronism. This budget, Mr. Speaker, could well be described as an anachronism. As a matter of fact the whole Tory Party could be described as an anachronism. It belongs to another age.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, would have been a good budget had it been presented in the year 1785. This budget, Mr. Speaker, might have been a good budget - might have been - had it been presented in the year 1885. But this budget is no good for 1985. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think the members on the opposite side will agree that this is a new age, we are living in a new era. Now I see their ears cocking up. They are going to applaud me when I talk about this new age. But this new age of which I speak, Mr. Speaker, has nothing to do with the Atlantic

Accord. It has nothing to do with Mulroney and Ottawa. This new age started with the splitting of the atom, this is where this new age started. And governments must learn to adapt to this new age.

The governments must learn to adapt a system, they must formulate a system that we can adapt to the age, to the era in which we live, not to try to adapt our age back to some system. A Conservative by its very nature looks back through the past for the solutions to all our problems. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the best things we can say about the good old days is that they are gone and past, they are gone behind. If we are going to look to the past in Newfoundland for solutions we are going to have our older people telling us about the six cents a day restraint, try to solve our problems by restraint. If we are going to look to the past, Mr. Speaker, we are going to find a time when it was inconceivable for anyone who was not fortunate enough to be born into a wealthy family, into the City of St. John's, could ever dream about getting an education beyond Grade IV, or Grade V. This is the solutions that we find in the past, Mr. Speaker. If we are going to look to the past for our solution, we are going to have to deal with a class system, because back in our history which we inherited from the British Isles, we had a class system. Answers to today's questions, Mr. Speaker, are not to be found in the past, they are to be found in the present.

A Conservative Government because it keeps harping on things that have gone by fails to learn the lesson from the past, the mistakes we have made. They try to solve

today's problems by going back into the past and looking for yesterday's answers. Mr. Speaker, they are overlooking the fact, as this budget overlooks the fact, that we are living in a new age, a new era, with new problems, and we must have new solutions to those problems. And a Conservative, by his very nature, is incompetent to deal with a new age, because of his philosophy, because of the way he thinks, and the way he acts. He is totally irrelevant. He is an anachronism, just as the Minister of Finance's budget is an anachronism as far as it relates to today.

Now you are going to want some examples, and why not want some examples. Let us look at employment or unemployment. In the 1950s, Mr. Speaker, just after Confederation, there were some make-work programmes on the Northern Peninsula of Newfoundland. People who worked on those make-work programmes were digging ditches, they were building roads, they were building bridges, and the likes of this had never happened before to some of the smaller villages on the Northern Peninsula. And it was good, it was good to see those roads built with picks and shovels, and see wooden bridges built.

In 1983, Mr. Speaker, I watched a make-work programme in a town in the Strait of Belle Isle district. There were fourteen people who had twenty weeks work. First and foremost, the purpose of the work was to get twenty stamps and had nothing to do with the actual production. And those people were installing a water line. Fourteen people were installing a water line. Come November, the sponsors of this

programme were beginning to get a bit uneasy. They were afraid that the frost was going to set in and the water line would freeze up. So they hired a backhoe and a tractor. The fourteen people had just more than half the job done, the backhoe comes along with the tractor and in two days completed the work, almost as much as it had taken fourteen people almost twenty weeks to do. Those people on this project, Mr. Speaker, they just looked. Nobody said a word. But they were thinking, the uselessness of doing with a pick and shovel what the machine could do in a matter of hours. I do not know what they were thinking, Mr. Speaker, but do you know what I was thinking, I was thinking about Adolf Hitler's prisoners, digging holes and filling them in again, work for the sake of work, Mr. Speaker, is meaningless.

Work must have a quality. Work must have a reason, and the role of government is not to provide meaningless jobs so that the worker can get a few stamps, but the work of government, the role of government, must be to adapt to a machine age, to use the machine to our benefit so that the machine becomes a slave and we become the free men. We have to learn to adapt to this machine age and never, with budgets which are harping back to some age gone by, never - I will speak louder - never, never will we learn to adapt if we are going to harp on the past.

Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) is supposed to be talking about the budget that was just brought down in this House and he seems to be dealing in the past and talking about what the Liberal administration and its programmes have done in his district. When you talk about the make-work programmes and all of the irregularities associated with them it was the administration that was in power a few years ago. So I would like to hear some more constructive criticism about the budget that we are suppose to be debating in the House today, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for members of this House to get up and to clarify points and make points of order. But what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) is doing is just wasting the time of my hon. friend because he was making such a good speech. And he was really getting to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

So the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) should be proud of what is happening. He got him out of his seat, he got to his conscience, keep at it. It is not point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is wasting time of this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order. There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

Right on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Governments, Mr. Speaker, must adapt to the machine age. We must, I believe, Sir, consider the concept of job sharing, a good Liberal policy which an awful lot of Canadians today are ready to accept. After all, Mr. Speaker, when my grandfather tried to make a living for his family, he worked ten hours a day, six days a week, I am sure the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) had to do the same thing in his days gone by. When my father had to earn a living for his family he could do it in eight hours a day, five days a week. MHAs do it, I suppose, in three hours a day, five days a week. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, my son could provide a living for himself and his family by working three days a week. We have to adapt to a new age. We are not seeing any attempt to adapt to this new age. We are seeing a government, a budget which is looking to the past, trying to create a few make-work jobs, and I have no obligation to try to back up any administration in Ottawa or any administration in Newfoundland, I am talking about pure justice, the reality of the day in which we live, Mr. Speaker. I do not have to justify right or wrong, I do not have to justify wrong wherever it takes place. I am not tied up on this silliness because if my party

says something which is blatantly wrong I will not support it, Mr. Speaker. But most of the time my party says things which are right and I will support them.

We must not treat the symptom. This budget attempts to treat the symptom of the age by creating a few temporary jobs. This is treating a symptom. Next year the same problem will be upon us. Next year the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will be wondering why personal income tax is down again.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No one is working.

MR. MITCHELL:

Nobody is going to be working.

These are a few examples, Mr. Speaker, in the unemployment or the employment sector.

Let me give some examples from what I would call services, the infrastructure. Let me take a small town in my own district, Raleigh. Raleigh, Mr. Speaker, needs a water and sewer system. Raleigh deserves a water and sewer system. If Raleigh, Mr. Speaker, were in a Tory district instead of being in the heart of Liberalism, that great district of the Strait of Belle Isle, it is quite possible that in this budget speech we would have heard \$2 million or \$3 million allocated to Raleigh for a water and a sewer system. In other words this government would be using an engineering design for New York City and trying to apply this to a Newfoundland outport. As a result of this kind of thinking, you will see three or four communities in Newfoundland this year who will get water and sewer services. And because of this great expense, all

the future residents of Raleigh - if this \$3 million or \$4 million were spent - all the future residents of Raleigh and the Raleighs around Newfoundland will be confined to a fifty foot building lot for the sake of economy.

When you take Raleigh, when you take Conche, when you take Burgeo or any outports in Newfoundland, and confine the people to a building lot of fifty feet, you have destroyed Raleigh, you have destroyed Newfoundland. You have taken away the freedom that we have cherished through the years. This is what happens when you try to take a water and a sewer system engineering design for New York City and try to apply it to the Newfoundland outport. Number one, you waste an awful lot of money. Number two, you destroy the very basis of Newfoundland culture, and that is what this budget is doing, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Raleigh and all of the Raleighs in this Province are good places to live. A good place to retire. And around the year 2050 when I decide to retire, and around the year 2050 when I am going to stop being the Liberal member for the Strait of Belle Isle and let some other Liberal take over, Mr. Speaker, when that happens I might well decide to retire to Raleigh. The government is supposedly committed to rural Newfoundland. We are this side are certainly committed to rural Newfoundland. But where are the engineers in the Municipal Affairs Department who are trying to design infrastructure that is relevant to rural Newfoundland? Where are the

engineers in the Department of Transportation who are trying to engineer roads which are relevant to Northern Newfoundland? This budget, Mr. Speaker, and this government are harping on other people's ideas, transferring engineering knowledge that was for other parts, larger cities, and trying to make it work in rural Newfoundland. It is totally irrelevant, Mr. Speaker.

If this government were really committed to rural Newfoundland, instead of trying to use engineering which is irrelevant, they would be making solutions that can work. Let me give you an example: We can put water and sewer systems in Raleigh. We can put water and sewer systems in Conche. We can put water and sewer systems in St. Anthony Bight, because we have the know how, we as a people living in 1985, not 1785, we have the technology available whereby we can make a system that can work in Raleigh and a system that can work in rural Newfoundland. We could install a central water system. It is being done by those supposed make-work programmes. Mind you, it is being done manpower instead of by machine power. We could do it with our machines. We could install water only for probably \$200,000 or \$300,000 in each village. With water, Mr. Speaker, you do not have to get the elevation the same as you would a sewer treatment plant. You do not have the same concern with the grade. Water will run up hill if you have a high enough elevation for your source.

So we could put central water supply systems in all of our outport Newfoundland.

And for the sewerage facilities,

Mr. Speaker, there are variations of the electrical toilet and the humus toilet which could be used in outport Newfoundland. I was hoping that some one on the other side would try to give me a rise out of that one because if they believe, Mr. Speaker, that the water and sewer systems are not important, if they believe that it is a frivolous matter, if they believe it is something to throw back their heads and laugh at, let me tell them, Mr. Speaker, that there are an awful lot of Newfoundlanders out there who are concerned with the level of services that they are getting in outport Newfoundland. They are concerned and they are upset, and they are looking to their government to devise a system that is relevant to the age, something that they can use, because they are bent, they are determined to live in outport Newfoundland.

I have heard the hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker, so many times, profess his conviction, his commitment, to outport Newfoundland, to rural Newfoundland. Any Premier, Mr. Speaker, who would be a part of a government that would force Newfoundlanders to live on a fifty foot building lot in rural Newfoundland does not know the least thing about Newfoundland culture. If you try to push a system on them which was designed for New York city or Toronto or Ottawa, you are crucifying the very culture which spawned us all and this is what this budget is doing. It is trying to solve the problems of 1985 which solutions that belong to 1785 and, in so doing, you are completely destroying a way of life and you are completely destroying a people. The budget is very important in this regard, Mr. Speaker, and it is related because

had that budget been written for today, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) could have proudly got up and announced water and sewer systems probably for fifty outport villages in this Province. Think about the kind of governing that would be. Mind you it would not have cost anymore than the few which they are going to place in a few Tory districts around this Province.

If this government had been in tune with the reality of 1985, Mr. Speaker, we could have seen designed a system of roads concentrating on the towns and communities first in this Province. And then the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), when he finally makes his mind up as to whether it is \$180 million he has, \$181, \$175, or \$108 million as it is on the last report, when he finally gets down to signing this agreement, could have seen practically every town in this Province and every village in this Province with their main roads being paved, the government section. And then the town council could have paved their roads when the highways equipment was in the area. This could have been done. And, think, Mr. Speaker, think about the improvement and the quality of life to our Newfoundland people out there; 85 or 90 per cent of the people in Newfoundland rarely make long distant travels away from the village or town in which they live. If we were to pave all our towns and all our villages we could enhance the quality of life for all our people. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that that would be a much better way to approach the problems of this Province, much better than using public money to pay-off a few friends in a Tory district. I

believe, Mr. Speaker, that that would be much more progressive, a much more progressive form of administration. I have given simply a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to monopolize the time of this hon. House. I have given an example in unemployment, I have given examples in transportation, in infrastructure, I could give all kinds of examples. I am pleased to see that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) listened to my suggestion about tourism when I gave my famous, outstanding maiden speech, Mr. Speaker. I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that if we were charging 12 per cent sales tax -

AN HON. MEMBER:

I read Hansard (Inaudible)

MR. DECKER:

I am more interested in this getting to Hansard than I am in you listening to it. I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that by putting 12 per cent sales tax on tourists it would be the same as if we had taken a sheet of plywood and on a white background painted in black letters, a big sign saying, 'Tourists do not come to Newfoundland,' if we paraded all over God's creation with that sign and told tourists not to come here. I believe that got through to the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) because in his budget, in his own worn-out, tired way, tried to adopt a little bit of Liberal progressiveness, and he did try to do something for the tourists. I cannot blame the man for trying. I believe he went right down into the debts of his being, Mr. Speaker, and he tried to his utmost to come up with some solution to this problem that the tourist industry has with the 12 per cent sales tax. He tries his best. But if he were to try from

now till doomsday his best would not be good enough because he does not have it in him, he does not have the ability, because he is branded with the Conservative philosophy, which is a retroactive philosophy. Which is okay in 1785, which is okay in 1885, maybe, but which is totally irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, to 1985. So the hon. gentleman, as likable as he may be, as cuddly as he may be, as fine a gentleman as he may be, Mr. Speaker, does not have it in his ability to come up with a system with a budget which is relevant to 1985. That is bad, Mr. Speaker, and it is even worse when we realize that he is surrounded with a group of Conservatives, he is surrounded with a group of Tories, he is surrounded with a group of people who continually harp on the past for their solutions. And who is going to suffer, Mr. Speaker? The people of this Province, the majority of whom voted against a Tory administration. They are the ones who are going to suffer as a result of the inaptitude, the inability, the irrelevance of the hon. Minister of Finance (Ms Verge).

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

The problem in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is not that we have elected a malicious government. That is not the problem. I could tolerate any single one of the individuals on the other side of this House to spend an hour or so with me. Mind you, I would probably have to keep my mouth shut, I would probably have to learn to wear a muzzle if I were

sitting with a certain member on the opposite side of the House. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I could spend some time with any member from the other side of this House because, as individuals, they are not bad, malicious, evil people. No, they are not that! The problem is, Mr. Speaker, they are outdated, they are out of tune with the times, and they are bringing outmoded solutions to a new age! And we have, Mr. Speaker, a Province which is straining at the reins, straining at the seams, a Province which is trying to leap ahead, and it is being kept back by a government which is totally irrelevant to 1985, a Province which is living in the atomic age, saddled with a government, Mr. Speaker - and I will conclude - saddled in the atomic age with a government that goes out with bows and arrows and tries to solve the problems of our day.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have sat here now for several days. I was missing yesterday, and I was informed by some of my colleagues that the hon. the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) gave an outstanding speech in the House of Assembly, and that is one

of the regrets I have about missing any time at all in the House of Assembly. But I will take the opportunity to get a copy of Hansard and go through it in fine detail, because I know the hon. member put forth the positive programmes that are going on in Forestry this year in reforestation, etc..

I would like to approach this debate with some of the more positive things that the government is doing in the Province with respect to housing and with respect to mining. And, Mr. Speaker, to refer to some of the comments made by hon. members opposite, as they referred to housing and housing problems in Newfoundland - there were not too many. Not only in this debate, but during Question Period or in previous debates, some remarks were made with respect to housing, and I would like to just clarify, if I could, some explanations as to what hon. members were talking about. As a matter of fact, the hon. member who just spoke, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), spoke here in the House several days, as a matter of fact, a week or so ago, and he talked about a person in his district who is being thrown on the street by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. He did not mention any names, Mr. Speaker. I wondered about it, because I get concerned when I get information of that sort and I generally have it checked out to find out the rights or the wrongs and try to correct what is wrong and basically explain to hon. members those things that happen surrounding a case. But the hon. gentleman got up much like Billy Graham, much like he just did, and indicated that the dirty

Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation was going to take one of his constituents out of his house and throw him on the street. And I said, 'My God Almighty, surely, as minister responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, I am not allowing that sort of thing to happen!' So I talked to the hon. member and I got the information from him. I do not like to mention people's names in this House, because people who are not in this House really cannot defend themselves, nor do they really have the opportunity that we have, as public people, to explain to the press, to give our side of the story. They do not generally get an opportunity, so I do not like to mention names. But the hon. member was kind enough to give me the name of his constituent and I had it thoroughly checked out.

Basically what happened in this case was that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, in co-operation with the federal government Crown Corporation, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, have a programme called Rural and Native Housing, and in 1981, they built a house for this gentleman, who is on social assistance, and put him into the House. He lived in the house, and while he was on social assistance, the Department of Social Services, through one of their employees, one of the social workers in that area, assisted the gentleman with his finances and took the money that was required from the social assistance cheque to pay towards the house. Now, basically, the programme is such that 25 per cent of your income is put towards accommodations, your house, and that is what happened in this case. The social worker took 25 per cent and submitted it

to Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, on a 75/25 basis with CMHC, pay the remaining part of that mortgage. So the person living in the house pays a very small portion and that was being paid by the Department of Social Services, and the remainder of the mortgage was being paid by CMHC and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. Well, the gentleman came off social assistance and he went to work, and he did not pay anything towards the house at all; 25 per cent of his income was not paid towards the house. That went on for a long period of time, Mr. Speaker, and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, when the gentleman got in arrears by something like \$1,700, which was a very small portion of the person's income - because, as I indicated to hon. members, the remaining part is paid 75/25 by CMHC and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing - he did not pay that portion that he was to pay, which was 25 per cent of his income. Now, if his income was \$100, it is \$25, and we pay the remaining part of that mortgage. Well, Mr. Speaker, that went on for quite some period of time and one of the employees at Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation checked this out, went up to the individual, tried to help him out, tried to make arrangements for him to pay part of his arrears, and could not succeed in any way, shape or form to get any payment from the gentleman.

So, as a last draw, they had to go to the courts. Because, I mean, it is part of the rules and regulations that a person in the house has to pay that 25 per cent. So, finally it went to the

court. The court said, 'Well, you have not paid anything. Are you going to pay?' He said, 'No, I am not going to pay, because I know another person who lives fairly close to me, who is not paying anything either. If he is not going to pay, why should I pay?' And they said, 'Well, look, if you do not pay, you are going to get thrown out of your house.' And he said, 'Well, I do not care. I am not going to pay anyway.' So Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation then had to evict. I mean, it is part of the rules and regulations of that Rural and Native Housing programme. But, in the meantime, they did not say, 'Well, out on the street, old man, that is it for you!' They went and got an accommodation that the gentleman could move into and, Mr. Speaker, he still would not move out. So, eventually, when he got \$4,000 in arrears and had not paid anything on his house and had no intention of paying on his house, there was no option but to have the gentleman evicted. He informed the people at Newfoundland and Labrador Housing that he had no intention of paying even his 25 per cent. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the explanation and the hon. member got up in the House of Assembly and waxed eloquently -

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:

When this gentleman was taken to court, the court was held in Corner Brook, 285 miles away from

where he lived. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it would have been just as easy for that man, with his finances, to have gone to Moscow as it was for him to go to Corner Brook to defend himself.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. Now, the hon. gentleman, who is new to this House and speaks with such fervour when he is on his feet, should understand the rules. When an hon. gentleman is up, just because an hon. gentleman makes a statement that the hon. gentleman does not agree with, what he is doing is breaching the privileges of the hon. member and the privileges of this House by getting up and interrupting him. The hon. gentleman is just as entitled to make his speech within the purview of the rules without being interrupted because somebody does not agree with what he says. If everybody got up like that all of the time, Mr. Speaker, we would just have a shouting match in the House and there would be no order to it at all. So the hon. gentleman is out of order, he has breached the privilege of the hon. member and he has breached the privileges of the House.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, what the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is saying may very well be right but I would advise him to take out his new member from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) and give him a lesson in parliamentary procedure so that he does not start that kind of ball rolling.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I can understand the hon. member, he is new, he does not know the rules and he will learn after a little while, although I have my doubts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get to some of the positive things that are in the budget. We are talking about the excellent budget that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brought down a short while ago.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:

Can I apologize to this House, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Yes.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize, because being a new member, I was taking my cues from people on the other side of this House who were interrupting me when I was speaking, Mr. Speaker. It was certainly in ignorance that I did this and I apologize that I have done it and I will try not to let it happen again but you are going to have to set a better example for this freshman, Mr. Speaker. Ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) if he could do that because I can learn.

MR. SPEAKER:

Apology accepted.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the hon. House that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, this government, in cooperation with the federal government is going to spend \$125,500,000 this year in housing, \$67,500,000 will represent the capital account. Now that, the hon. member will understand, will be what we are going to pay during the year for administration, for paying the 25 per cent under the Rural and Native Housing Programme that will go on for as long as the mortgages go on. That is what we will use to pay for poor people in this Province who cannot afford the mortgages themselves to buy houses. That is what we will be paying, Mr. Speaker, this year to assist rural Newfoundlanders under the Rural and Native Housing Programme, under the Rural RRAP programme and under the other programmes that we have in housing, the provincial home ownership grant that we have in housing, Mr. Speaker. That is what we will be spending this year

for housing in Newfoundland, \$67,500,000 on capital account. That is for new houses this year, Mr. Speaker, under the Rural and Native Housing Programme under the subsidized rental housing that we are going to be building in Newfoundland this year, Mr. Speaker. So that is \$67,500,000 in capital account expenditures and \$58 million for current account.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with that we are going to construct 400 housing units under the federal/provincial subsidized rental and mortgage lending schemes and these are valued at \$32 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is for people here in St. John's, Corner Brook, Gander, St. Anthony, Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Labrador City, Marystown and Burin. We will be spending \$32 million this year for 400 units of subsidized rental and mortgage schemes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are there any in St. John's?

MR. DINN:

One or two units obviously will be built in St. John's, Mr. Speaker.

We will be spending \$32 million for 400 housing units under the subsidized rental and mortgage lending schemes this year in the Province.

The hon. member will be disappointed here, I know, but the gentleman who could not afford his mortgage up in Roddickton will probably be able to get into the subsidized rental units but he will have to pay part of his income for rent. That is the name of the game. It is 25 per cent of their income they will have to pay for rent. Now he could have owned his own house under the Rural and

Native Housing Programme for the same 25 per cent of his income but, Mr. Speaker, he indicated that because he knows somebody who was not paying he had no intention of paying. Mr. Speaker, we just could not do that. We would be in breach, I suppose. As a matter of fact allowing it to go to \$4,000 arrears, that is about twenty-eight months of no payment, is carrying it a little bit too far.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to hon. members that we are targeting some dollars this year also for social housing programmes. We are going to build an emergency shelter hospital here in St. John's with my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). I believe that will be run by the Salvation Army for the Department of Social Services and, Mr. Speaker, that is another good thing. It will accommodate something like fifty needy individuals in the city of St. John's.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Will single parents be included?

MR. DINN:

Yes, we are having a look at single parent accommodations in the Province and as a matter of fact the hon. member might be interested to know that we are seriously considering building another twenty units, much like the thirty we did last year, on the Coast of Labrador in the Native communities, in Nain, Postville, Makkovik, Hopedale and Rigoulet, and I am doing that in cooperation with my colleague the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Aylward) who has a heart of gold when it comes to providing social housing for the people in the

Coastal communities of Labrador. Also, Mr. Speaker, it shows a little bit of cooperation with the federal government who has approved this funding under the Native Peoples Agreement for those communities. I do not know what the total cost of that would be but it must be a sizable amount of money anyway for something like twenty new units.

MR. WARREN:

Almost \$3 million.

MR. DINN:

Three million dollars, about \$70,000 per house, and they are energy efficient houses and they obviously need them in Coastal Labrador. The people up there, my colleague the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development up there, my colleague the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) was up there visiting the communities with the member and met some of the people who were living in the units, one or two of the units from last year's programme are not quite complete yet but they will be completed before the end of this Summer and some more families in - they are delighted I understand, the minister came back and reported to me that the people on the Coast of Labrador who received some of these units that we built last year which are energy efficient, they have a porch, there is nothing worse than having a house in Labrador with no porch. It is the worse thing you can have a house with no porch. But they have porches and they have double insulation. The floors are double floors with double insulation and the walls - these are better I understand than what we call the energy 2,000 units that we are building here on

the Island part of the Province for the Native people in the coastal communities on the Coast of Labrador.

And, Mr. Speaker, that programme was started when the hon. member was on the other side of the House. And he was so enthusiastic about that programme and so full of vim, vigor, and vitality that he just jumped up from his seat and he said, "If the Tory Government can do that for my people then I should be over there with them."

MR. WARREN:

It had something to do with it.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, we are also starting a development. I remember during the election that we had a press conference announcing a development for Mount Pearl and Mr. Speaker, quite a number of the press people came out but they did not report it because they said, "Well, that is a political thing. We are not going to announce that during the election because that is political." Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you how political that was, that was this political: Last year the programme from Mount Pearl, the hon. the Minister of Development was Minister of Housing at the time, he got a letter from CMHC indicating under the former administration that the next phase of Mount Pearl/New Town, the Mount Pearl development would go ahead, Mr. Speaker. And as the year went on and the engineering was done and everything was ready to go ahead and we wanted to go to tender, lo and behold the hon. the Minister of Development found out from the federal government that the programme was cancelled. Now here we had a letter from CMHC saying,

"Yes, it is a good project. We are not going to lose any money on this project."

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:
Last year, last February. The hon. the Minister of Development was Minister of Housing - not February past, the last February, when the former administration was in Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:
That is okay. Well the hon. member will know that they approved a project for Mount Pearl at that point in time, a letter from CMHC obviously approved by Federal Cabinet that it was approved and it could go forward. And the hon. Minister of Development was ecstatic because, Mr. Speaker, it was another big step forward for the Town of Mount Pearl and Mr. Speaker, it is probably the best housing project put off by CMHC and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, better than any housing project or housing development in Canada from what I can determine as told to me by CMHC officials.

Anyway we went on during the year and they got a little bit short of money and CMHC and the feds cancelled it. The hon. Minister of Development was devastated, but lo and behold we had an election in September and shortly after election I had a meeting with the Minister of Housing and I indicated to him how unfair this thing was, that we had approval from CMHC and then it got cancelled during the year and he said, "Well if CMHC said it is

going ahead then I can assure you that it can go ahead."

Now I happened to find that out and I got approval for that right during the election process. It was probably a coincidence but it got approved -

MR. TULK:
The federal?

MR. DINN:
No, the provincial election, I happened to get it approved and I had to get the papers because I do not like to announce things unless I got approval from the federal minister with his signature on the dotted line. So I got that from the hon. Bill McKnight, he approved that project and I had my press conference, all the press came in and lo and behold they said, "It is political and we are not going to report it."

Right after the election I get calls from the news media saying, "Listen, is it really true that you are going to spend \$14 million in Mount Pearl?" And I said, "Yes".

AN HON. MEMBER:
How much?

MR. DINN:
\$14.5 million in Mount Pearl. Oh we are going to do exclusive residential areas, we are going to put the capability there for shopping centres and so on. As a matter of fact when this development is complete it will cause, and it will be complete over the next few years, when the development is complete and the shopping centres and the houses and all the rest of it is built and the roads and the water and sewer, when all of it is complete, most of the money from private

enterprise, I know the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), every time you mention private enterprise he nearly throws up, but the private enterprise will involve themselves in about \$268 million when the project is complete and it will be about three or four years. So the hon. the member for Mount Pearl is delighted again. And not only that but we have gone to contract now, it was not one of those things where it was approved but it was tentative, it is approved. We have gone to tender. Some of the tender documents are received and as a matter I believe there is an award on two areas for that project.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:
Well, Mr. Speaker, while I was away the hon. member brought up the idea of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, that terrible corporation is issuing these little things to tenants. Now what we have set up in Newfoundland, the hon. member may or may not know, but in most areas of Newfoundland now, it might be a lesson in how you operate a corporation and how you get input from your people, they have tenant committees now, and these tenant committees meet and they send in information and we have officers that go out and sit down with them and if they have complaints we try to iron out their complaints. It is a very innovative idea that the hon. the former minister started and of course I will continue because I think it is an excellent idea, contact with your tenants.

And, Mr. Speaker, one of the things, one of the big problems, the hon. member may or may not

know, when you have these closely knitted, almost communities within communities, housing that one of the big problems is dogs. Now I happen to be a dog lover. I like the hon. member for Menihek too. But I like dogs. I do I like animals, but when I moved, I have a little dog now named Fluffy, and the hon. member, you know, probably saw my picture all over his community with pictures of myself and Fluffy. But anyway, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER:
Which one is your picture?

MR. DINN:
But I will tell the hon. member that - I get little questions sent in, which one is the dog? Yes.

But the hon. member may or may not know, but when I moved from the house that I had before I got this new house I moved to Hillview Terrace Apartment, and in that interim period, it was about a three month period that I had to build the other house that I had this collie dog, it was a purebred collie dog, I mean I just loved the collie dog, but I had this collie dog in my house down on Mount Cashel Road and when I moved to my new house, I had a sale for my old house and I had to move into an apartment in the period when my new house was being done and I took my dog to Hillview Terrace Apartments.

MR. BARRY:
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:
Well let me tell the hon. member, look the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) should not interrupt I have seen him with friends that are worst than Fluffy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

Okay. So, Mr. Speaker, I took my collie dog and I did not want to give my collie dog away because it was a purebred collie dog, as a matter of fact, I took it to several shows, it did not get -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Have you still got it?

MR. DINN:

No, I have not got it now. I felt it was too cruel to have a collie dog, number one, in an apartment, and even when I moved I kept it for that two month period, I paid the kennel for taking care of it, I took it into the apartment for a couple of days, I knew that could not work, then I brought it to a kennel and had it housed there until I moved into the house. But my house is on a fifty by one hundred, I guess, lot, and you cannot keep a collie dog even in that confined area. I mean, a collie dog likes to get out to run.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is the dog's name?

MR. DINN:

Lady. As a matter of fact, it was Kilbride My Fair Lady, it was what it was called. Lady it was called. But, Mr. Speaker, you cannot not, I tell the hon. member seriously, you cannot really keep dogs in apartments and that is a good rule, not for the dog lovers, and I happen to be one of them. I think it is cruel to keep dogs in apartments, you just cannot look after them the way they should be. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should think before he

leaps -

MR. BARRY:

This is a dogged attempt at a speech.

MR. DINN:

This is a dogged attempt.

But, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I only have a few minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that number one, hon. members should not stand up in the House and make allegations about corporations or about people without their facts. The hon. member could have come to me and gotten the facts. Number two, we are spending \$125,500,000 in housing this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for being so generous to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, both with respect to approving the funding for subsidized rental units, for the housing in the coastal communities of Labrador, for the rural and native housing programme and the provincial share of it, and, Mr. Speaker, for the social housing that he is providing in St. John's with respect to the hostel. And, Mr. Speaker, with respect to all the money that we are providing to the people of Newfoundland under the subsidized rental programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Because, Mr. Speaker, without the Minister of Finance and his generosity I am afraid a lot of people of Newfoundland would not be housed as adequately as they are. So thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to participate in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree that the minister has given one of his more powerful and relevant speeches to date in this House.

Mr. Speaker, in my earlier incarnation in this House I used to love to look at the Budget covers because I thought they told - being big on symbolism - the story of the Budget, and this one is no exception really in that the front cover has a picture of the proposed - now being constructed - Cow Head project being built by good federal Liberal dollars. And the back cover, of course, has nothing. And if you think of this budget as being 47 per cent federal transfer money, and the other 50 per cent or so being provincial dollars then you see the nature of the partnership that while the federal Liberals held up their end the provincial record has been an absolute blank sheet.

MR. LUSH:

Another book you can tell by its

cover.

MR. SIMMONS:

It could have had a picture. I would have suggested the most appropriate picture to sum up the provincial involvement would be chickens coming' come to roost. And as I read through this particular budget, Mr. Speaker, that is the phrase that keeps coming to mind, chickens coming home to roost. The public debt is a case in point. If it is possible to still be shocked about what this hon. crowd is doing to the public debt then there is lots of shock in this particular document.

I remember and many in this House, Mr. Speaker, will remember the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and others who are in politics before the Moores Administration took over in 1972, I remember who they rallied on about the indecently high size of the public debt, how shockingly high it was that this big, bad Liberal Government which had been in power from 1949 to 1972 had taken the public debt to \$900 million. And I remember the now Justice Minister in Ottawa, Mr. Crosbie, going around the Province saying, if he were the Finance Minister, if the Tories were in power how different things would be. Here were the Liberals having driven the debt to \$900 million in twenty-three years or at the rate of about \$43 million a year, \$900 million in twenty-three years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this speech - I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I want no interruption from the gentleman, wherever he is from, where is he from?

MR. DECKER:

St. John North.

MR. SIMMONS:

St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). I do not mind intelligent interruptions from my cousin from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) that is a different manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, in twenty-three years, the public debt was driven to \$900 million by a Liberal Administration. Now where is it gone, Mr. Speaker, since 1972? Since the Premier and his crowd came into office?

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I do not mind the hon. member across using figures, but remember we have lived through an extensive period of great inflation, and \$900 million in 1970 is not the same as \$900 million in 1980. So provided the hon. member is prepared to put inflationary corrections, I have no object to him bandying figures about. But I will not have him insult the intelligence of this House by suggesting that \$1 million in 1970 is the same as \$1 million in 1980.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

You did not understand that when

you put on the freeze.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is right. Good ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, since 1972 -

MR. SIMMS:

A good point of debate.

MR. SIMMONS:

A reat point of debate. It shows that the one member is listening to me, and in debate he can get his opportunity to make his point about inflation and all the other subjects about which he knows so much.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since 1972, since the Tories took over, the public debt has gone up by another \$2700 million. During the Liberal years \$42 million a year increase, during the Tory year \$222 million a year.

MR. J. CARTER:

(Inaudible) inflation.

MR. SIMMONS:

I say to the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), even allowing for a bit of inflation, I am sure the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) will agree that is absolutely outrageous. Instead of the \$42 million a year under a Liberal regime, up to \$222 million under a Tory regime. The Tories, Mr. Speaker, have run up the public debt at five times the rate the Liberals did.

So, Mr. Speaker, the chickens have come home to roost.

MR. MITCHELL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member from the other side, when he is talking about the public debt of this Province, the \$900 million that the Liberals had taken the Province into in the form of debt, if this administration had not had to pay \$45 million a year, or a total of \$500 million in interest payments on that, the debt would not be as great as what it is today.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The hon. member is being foolish. I would ask members opposite not to get into this series of continuously rising on false points of order, because we will just have to point out -

MR. SIMMS:

Spurious.

MR. BARRY:

I was not sure members would recognize 'spurious'. The member's speech is being interrupted, his time is being taken. We know that he is hurting members opposite, but we ask the Speaker to shoot down any further false points of order, outrageously spurious points of order by members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. BARRY:

Shame on you.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that this budget could well have a picture on the back page showing chickens coming home to roost. Because on public debt the chickens are coming home to roost, not only for the Tory members, Mr. Speaker, but for the people of Newfoundland who placed their trust in this particular administration

On jobs the chickens are coming home to roost. We were told what a Utopia we were going to have in terms of jobs, and here we are with the highest unemployment rate in all of Canada.

On federal/provincial co-operation the chickens are coming home to roost. We were told that with two governments of the same stripe it would be absolute Utopia, once again, everything would be hunky-dory, everything would be all right. Well, you only have to read the headlines, Mr. Speaker, about last week's federal budget to see that Tories in Ottawa behave much as Tories in St. John's do. Tories are Tories. 'PM will not make a lot of friends with his budget.' 'Taxes soaring..' 'Middle-class bears the budget brunt.' 'Mr. Wilson disappoints.' Ottawa, Toronto, Calgary, all across the country the view is the same. And, Mr. Speaker, you have to admire the courage of Mr. MacKay, the Solicitor General on this issue. In his own paper in Halifax he is saying, 'Budget not as positive for Nova Scotia' as he would have

liked, and he calls it, basically, 'A Central Canada Budget.' Why do our Tories here in Newfoundland not have the gumption to say that kind of thing?

'Federal budget hurts the poor.' And so it goes, Mr. Speaker. 'Mr. Wilson's false economics.' 'Tax shelter loss will reduce jobs.' Look at this here, in Toronto, 'Ottawa increases the tax load.' And so it goes. Now, that is the government that with lots of good, federal Tory co-operation was going to deliver utopia to us, tax utopia, job utopia. And talking about utopia, Mr. Speaker, the real utopia is to be the offshore. That is the utopia. That is the promised land. That is the promised land, the offshore utopia. What a con job Governor Mulroney did on us on that one. What an absolute con job. In effect, clause 54 nullifies everything else in that agreement. It ensures that we will continue to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. That is what the Premier has signed. Clause 54, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. BARRY:
This is outrageous.

MR. J. CARTER:
No, I cannot help smiling because I know the hon. member opposite is not serious. But it is quite wrong for a member to get up and mislead this House of Assembly, and he is misleading this House of Assembly by suggesting that that Atlantic Accord was anything other than good for this Province. And

I think he owes it to this House to apologize for even suggesting that that -

MR. BARRY:
(Inaudible) debate by members opposite.

MR. J. CARTER:
Okay, let him debate it. But to get up and suggest - now, he will be reported in the press.

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

MR. J. CARTER:
A point of privilege!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House six years, and I have been in another House for five years, and I want to make a speech. Mr. Speaker, you know what is going on. I want to make some points. I do not expect the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) to agree with me, but you know very well, Mr. Speaker, that once a Speaker twigs to the fact that a member is raising a point in debate as opposed to a point of order, he ought to be interrupted. I say to you, Sir, if I cannot have my privileges protected in this House, there is no point in my speaking here at all. I appeal to you, Sir, to do your job.

MR. BARRY:
It is not right, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
To that point of privilege, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to listen to what the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) was saying, and I can understand -

MR. BARRY:

This is an outrage.

MR. SIMMS:

I beg your pardon?

MR. BARRY:

This is an outrage. Members here cannot make a speech in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I assure you, if there was a point of privilege raised on this side of the House the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) would not be long standing.

Now the point I want to make is that I understand what the member for Fortune - Hermitage is trying to say. I do not think anybody over here is quite concerned about cutting him off from his speech, he will do what everybody else does. I was interrupted several times yesterday with points of order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By whom?

MR. SIMMS:

It does not matter by whom, I am

just making the point.

The only objection I have to what the member raises in his point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is his concluding remarks, as he sat down. I am sure, in retrospect, if he would consider what he had to say, he would certainly make it clear to Your Honour that he was not casting any kind of aspersions on Your Honour. Because he clearly said to Your Honour that you should do your job.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned as a member of this House, that is an improper way of presenting a point of privilege. And the member should know it, he is a veteran of this House and of the House of Commons, as well.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

To that point of privilege, there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege. I will listening to a point of order, raised by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). Maybe, to quote the hon. member, I was slow in getting the gist of the point he was making, but he was making a point of order and I was listening to the same. I did not hear the comments that the hon. minister says the member for Fortune - Hermitage made. If the hon. member were questioning or in any way commenting on the Chair, I would ask you to withdraw it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

This is outrageous.

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

MR. BARRY:
There was no comment on the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
There was no comment on the Chair from this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Name him! Name him!

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

I have made the comment that if the hon. member said -

MR. BARRY:
A comment that was not warranted!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Name him! Name him!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
If he had said something to that effect, I would ask him to withdraw it.

To the point of order, I would like to rule on that now. There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I will rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. BARRY:
No, Your Honour, what we have here is a situation - and it just goes to show the concept of fairness that comes from the Government

House Leader (Mr. Marshall), where, having been absent during the incident of which we are now discussing, he comes up and purports to set out for this House the rights and the wrongs of the incident. Now, that is the concept of fairness that applies, and it just goes to show why we need Your Honour's protection in this House.

Now, I, as Leader of the Opposition, referred, Your Honour, to several comments, unsolicited, with respect to the conduct of myself or members here that were theoretical by Your Honour. We understand Your Honour has a difficult job. It is early in the session. We would ask you, Your Honour, if we are doing something improper, please wait and consult the Hansard if there is any question on Your Honour's part.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
What I am setting out is an attempt to get off on the right foot in this session. What I am trying to set out here is an attempt to get off on the right foot, Your Honour, and we are not moving in a manner now and over the last several days that is going to see this House get on with the business of the Province in an orderly fashion.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:
(Inaudible) at all, except that certainly, in this House, the hon.

the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) says, 'Do it my way or no way.' On the government side, we are aware of that, that is why he is out of the Cabinet and on the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. MARSHALL:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, in the process, and especially with the interjection of the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), we have not lost sight of what this is all about. And I say to you, Sir, if it is implied as criticism or direction or comment, well, sobeit, and flick me out, but just let me say this first, that I was making a speech, not harassing anybody. I have sat here the last three or four weeks and I have not harassed many people, and there is a time for a little exchange across the House, but when a guy or a girl, as the case may be, says that he wants to be heard without interruption, that is fair. If he violates the rules of the House, it is one thing, but we all know that the three so-called points of order were three points of debate. That was clear. In each case, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker, you and your predecessor a moment ago in the Chair, ruled there was no point of order, and certainly, after three like that, then I deserve, as a speaker, some protection from the Chair, or else

this can go on as it has gone on, so that the time allotted to me, in a sense, has expired, which is the very purpose of the exercise by the member for St. John's North (Mr. W. Carter). Now, if that is the way he wants to use his time, having been elected to come here, that is his business, but I should have the protection of the Chair against that kind of spurious tactic, and that is my point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I can assure all hon. members that they will have the protection of the Chair.

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, if there is no point of order, why did it take twenty minutes? - that is my question.

Mr. Speaker, when I was last interrupted, I was saying that on the offshore we were promised Utopia and what we got was a con job, an absolute con job. First, Governor Mulroney in Ottawa, by conning the Premier into signing Clause 54, which nullifies the whole effect of the agreement, and then a con job transmitted along to the people of Newfoundland by the Premier himself. Now, Mr. Speaker, just to illustrate the kind of shell game that is going on. This budget, for example, Mr. Speaker, on Page 17, makes reference to the Offshore Development Fund, and it says: "Government has made a budgetary provision for a gross expenditure

from this Fund of \$40,000,000 this year, of which \$10,000,000 is provided by the Province." You can assume from that, I suppose, that the other \$30 million is coming from Ottawa, a fair deduction - \$40 million altogether, \$10 million, provincial, \$30 million, I would assume, is coming from Ottawa. Now, that is the budget, so we can assume the truth of it. The member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) is an honourable man. We can assume that what he put in here, he will stand by it. There is \$30 million expected, projected from the federal government, according to his statement on Page 17.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let us look at what the federal government is saying on that subject. The provincial government, as recently as last week, a week ago Thursday, was saying \$30 million from the federal government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here a document that came from the federal Department of Finance two days ago, in which they prepared tables for the federal Finance Minister labelled Direct Impacts of Budget Measures by National Accounts Component. And it shows a number of items, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, could I have my last few minutes without interruptions?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, of course, he is entitled to

it.

MR. SIMMONS:

In this case, yes, Mr. Speaker, because I want to make a point that I think members opposite ought to be concerned about, because there are some discrepancies in the figures there, and I am sure they can see I am coming to that point. And when they hear the discrepancy, they might want to do something about it if they are here to represent the people who elected them.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that in the budget, we are told that we are going to get \$30 million this year from the federal government, but a more recent document coming from the federal Department of Finance as recently as two days ago, says otherwise, and not marginally so either, Mr. Speaker, says otherwise in very drastic terms. Under a table entitled 'Direct Impacts of Budget Measures by National Accounts Component, and under a heading entitled, 'Transfers to other Levels of Government', the federal Department of Finance says, 'For the Newfoundland offshore in 1985 - 1986, there will be \$8 million transferred from the federal government.

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, now!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, why the discrepancy? If we listen to the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins), it is \$30 million, if we believe the document from the federal Department of Finance - and parts of this document were referred to elsewhere in the press today, the Toronto media, I believe - if we believe this document, which I can

assure the House and you, Mr. Speaker, comes from the federal Department of Finance, it is \$8 million rather than \$30 million. I could take you through other examples, Mr. Speaker, but the point is made that this document, either in offshore or other matters, Mr. Speaker, is just not worth the paper it is written on. It is out by several hundred percentage points insofar as offshore is concerned, and it is a story that impartial observers of the scene have known for a long time on offshore, that it is a shell game, it is a con game. We are being sold a bag of tricks. Well, I want to say to the government, the people of Newfoundland are not believing the story anymore. Indeed fewer than 50 per cent were believing in the last provincial election.

I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) that all the words after, 'that', be struck and replaced with the following, 'This House condemned the government for their failure to do anything to deal with the real problems of this Province particularly those of unemployment.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the amendment. I have a copy of Mr. Speaker.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The amendment moved by the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) and seconded by the

member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), that all the words after, 'that,' be struck out and replaced with, 'This House condemns the government for its failure to do anything to deal with the real problems of this Provinces particularly those of unemployment.' That amendment is in order and the hon. member has an hour.

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I came into this House prepared to speak for a half hour. I had a very succinct and well prepared speech, however, now, allowing for the interruptions and for the new thoughts that might come to me it might take a little more than a half hour. But that depends on the government does it not?

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the budget, in many respects, connotes the idea of chickens coming home to roost. And I say to the Premier and to the government that on the subject of federal/provincial co-operation already we are seeing the mistake of their ways. We are seeing how misguided they were to rush into bed on a partisan excuse alone. Men like the former Premier of Ontario, Mr. Davis, and the current Premier of Alberta, Mr. Lougheed, no political friends of mine, but men I admire for being men who often put their partisan considerations aside in the interest of their province. We have not seen that happen here, Mr. Speaker. We have seen it all cloaked in motherhood, mind you, and we have seen people who espouse another point of view, who exercise some caution as being traitors of the day. But, Mr.

Speaker, the chickens are coming home to roost, already. Read the headlines about the federal budget or just read the federal budget, read the reaction to it, note the reaction across this country, and all this bag of goods we were sold about a great benevolent Tory government in Ottawa looking after the needs of everybody, especially the needs of Newfoundland. We see what a contradiction in terms and what a lie that was, Mr. Speaker. We see that the people who preached co-operation most, like the Government of Newfoundland, are being ignored most. It was Mr. Buchanan, although a Tory like Governor Mulroney, nevertheless raised some questions because he fought for his province first before flying the partisan flag of his party. And the result is that Mr. Buchanan's province gets looked after, and well looked after, although upon reconfirming I find that the unemployment rate in Cape Breton is not as high as Bay d'Espoir, for example, not as high as parts of Fortune-Hermitage, and certainly not as high as Port au Port or parts of the St. Barbe coast. And yet who gets the so-called sweatheart deal? Cape Breton. Now, we have nothing against Cape Breton, most of them are Newfoundlanders on their way back from Toronto, anyway, who did not quite make it. They are our cousins in a way. I am here to jeopardize their chances but I am here to ask what this government which preached co-operation, preached this pipeline to Ottawa, preached consultation, where is the beef?, as we say. Where have they delivered on this one? They have not delivered, Mr. Speaker, because they are being taken for granted. Mulroney and the boys in Ottawa say, you do not need to worry about Peckford and the gang

down there, they are with us anyway. They will defend anything we do. They will defend cutbacks on the coastal service on the South Coast, they will defend anything, anything at all they will defend. So you take them for granted, do not worry about a fuss from the Newfoundland government, Do what we have to do for Cape Breton to put out the political fires but do not worry a hoot about Peckford and that crowd down in Newfoundland because they will swallow anything. The example I gave a moment ago when I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker, that while they go around preaching to the people of Newfoundland that they are putting in \$30 million of federal money the fact of the matter is the federal government is putting \$8 million alone. Now, Mr. Speaker, \$8 million for this year and I should say for next year \$30 million. So in the two years a total of \$38 million federal. How many jobs will that create I wonder? Remember the Utopia that was promised, how if we could get an accord. Well, we have an accord, the accord that sold us down the river. That accord, Mr. Speaker. Clause 54 nullifies everything else in that accord. This Premier, if he does not weasel his way out of Clause 54, will go down in history as the Premier who sold us down the river on this document, Mr. Speaker, mark my word. And the proof of the pudding is beginning to come through here now, \$38 million measly from the feds, the Tory feds, in in two years. Remember the Utopia that was going to happen the morning after we signed this? Well, 25 per cent of them are still out there walking the roads, Mr. Speaker, and sitting on the wharves without jobs including 40 per cent of our youth or more. Why? Because the rhetoric, Mr.

Speaker, is not being matched by the dollars from Ottawa, the dollars we were told we were going to get, \$8 million this year, \$30 million next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Let them cool off now. They do not get much chance over there to let off their steam, Mr. Speaker, so they have got to use the House, I suppose, for that, they do not seem to know what better to use it for.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You can only read what your leader gives you.

MR. SIMMONS:
My leader gave me an excellent amendment which you, Mr. Speaker, found to be in order and if you are questioning Mr. Speaker's ruling do it in the proper way, do not be a coward about it.

Mr. Speaker, to the amendment, as always, they preached fiscal responsibility, they have given us a public debt of \$3.5 billion. They preached jobs, they have given us bread lines. They preached federal/provincial cooperation, they have given us a con job. We are being taken for granted at a time when a government in Ottawa ought to be particularly sensitive to the needs of a province that has 25 per cent unemployment. Mr. Speaker, they preached an offshore Utopia, another con job. Mr. Speaker, they preached patronage purity, now there is a subject we could spend a lot of time on.

Every time we turn around in the elevators we find people grumbling because they did not get a

patronage appointment because the fellow next to him got one, all kinds of them, patronage appointments coming out of your ears.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Any patronage on your side of the House?

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to say that when I was in Ottawa, the government of which I was a supporter was involved on a day to day basis in patronage, like my family is involved in patronage, like my church is involved in patronage, like every collective entity in the world is involved in patronage, because, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with patronage. It is the use of patronage to justify the appointment of people who are not competent to do a particular job that is wrong. To use the taxpayers money to put a person in a job just because he is a Tory - I have no objection to his getting the job because he is a Tory as long as he can also do the job, I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to his getting the job as long as the rules are not particularly bent for him to get the job but the kind of nonsense we heard from the Premier and the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) the other day about how this job was begging in Buchans because nobody could be found to do the job and suddenly, by absolute coincidence of course, the day the former member for Windsor - Buchans, the former Tory member got defeated, they found the perfect candidate. Then, if you do not believe lightning does strike twice, the same thing happened up in Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker. For years they have been scratching their head, looking

around trying to find the fellow to satisfy the job requirements and lo and behold a couple of days after the election the minister has a brainchild.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Now there is an example to back up what I was saying a moment ago, Mr. Speaker. The former Liberal member for Burin - Placentia West, a competent gentleman, and a Liberal, and not only a Liberal and a competent Liberal, Mr. Speaker, but a person who got the job by going through the system. Never forget that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, for the record - because they have now introduced the name of a private individual who has been out of elected politics for many years, they will not stop at anything in terms of maligning people - let me tell you for the record - and if that gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) or anybody else can say anything to the contrary he can have this seat and I will go out and have a by-election, I will tell him that and I hope he knows what I am saying - I am telling you that that gentleman he mentions went through the system, he was screened by bureaucrats and he was finally hired by a bureaucrat, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, if members opposite can tell me that the former -

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

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

MR. PATTERSON:
I wonder would the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) go so far as to say that Mr. Goudie was not screened, that he has not got the qualifications to act as a development officer for Goose Bay? Would he go so far as to say that the hon. the former member for Windsor - Buchans is not competent and qualified? Go ahead and say it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, that is the difference in the two sides of the House. They want to get their jollies out of smearing people. I was trying to address myself to the issue of patronage used properly as opposed to improperly. Mr. Speaker, I do not know the gender of the former member for Windsor - Buchans very well, I have seen him once or twice so I really cannot comment but I know the gentlemen from Goose Bay, fairly well, and I have great admiration for him as an individual. I have no idea what his competence is in various fields because I have not worked that closely with him but, Mr. Speaker, that is not the point. We are not a committee here to decide the competence for every public servant. That is not the

issue, Mr. Speaker. The issue as I have developed in this speech is that patronage ought to be an instrument we use to reward faithful, yes, but always with the rider that they are competent people, number one, and that other people out there equally competent get the same crack at the job. There are thousands of people out there walking around who would love to be a development officer for Buchans or Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker, but they never got a crack at it. So, Mr. Speaker, unless you are related to someone in this government, unless you have a close - it is not patronage they are practicing, Mr. Speaker, it is nepotism, there is a big difference. Mr. Speaker, remember all the fine speeches about patronage purity. Go back and read the speeches of the early days of the Tory regime here and then look at the reality, look at how they are so preoccupied putting Tories into every job they can find or create that they have not got time to create jobs for the young Newfoundlanders that they are walking around. They do not understand why they were sent here. Mr. Speaker, I want the government to hire competent people and give people a decent chance at those jobs. They are not getting that now. They are complaining to us. They are writing us letters. They are sending us brown envelopes because they do not want to be fired from their present jobs and they are telling us that this government, Mr. Speaker, says one thing -

MR. TOBIN:

Mike Kirby's confidant.

MR. SIMMONS:

He wants to use names, he wants to smear people. Mr. Speaker, I have not mentioned a name in this

debate and I do not intend to use a name.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

That is the only name I have mentioned.

MR. SIMMONS:

Well he can go on mentioning names. I am not going to participate in this smear campaign, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Okay, Mr. Speaker, I think we have hit a few nerves on patronage, so let us go on to the fishery.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, in January or February 1983 when the Premier was in -

MR. MATTHEWS:

He closed her down.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is right. He remembers. The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) remembers that the Premier, with Mr. DeBane went on national television in Ottawa in January 1983 and said, "Some fish plants will have to close." That is what he said. And suddenly he realized, Mr. Speaker, that was not a very convenient thing to be saying and so then he started saying the opposite. He started to change his script a bit. And so the person who was up there aiding and abetting the closure of plants suddenly became the champion of open plants.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I feel obliged to speak on a point of order to this because the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is really trying to mislead the House as to the comment I made across the House. What I was saying is that he was the one who supported the recommendations of Michael Kirby, and he was the one who came down with Mr. DeBane and said, "There must be changes in the fishery in Newfoundland and in particular there must be changes in the fishery on the South Coast." The changes he was talking about was closure of plants, and he supported that, not the Premier of this Province because the only reason the plants are open now is because we stood up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How much longer is this point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is no point of order.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Extend the courtesy of being quiet while I am speaking. I mean the thing is, Mr. Speaker, that the member is trying to mislead the House, that he was the one who supported Mike Kirby in his report and he is the one who supported Pierre DeBane and wanted the plants on the South Coast shut down when he was the Member of Parliament for Burin-St. Georges.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Fortune Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, that is the point I was making three quarters of an hour and now it is my turn, Sir, to use an if. If you continue to tolerate that kind of stuff then I have no protection in this House. You knew ten seconds into his speech it was not a point of order and you allowed him to go on. That is disgraceful. Disgraceful.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman when he is getting up making a point like that to Your Honour on that is really calling into account the impartiality of Your Honour which I know he would not wish to do, and that is not, Mr. Speaker, no matter what the hon. gentleman's feelings may be, that is entirely out of order and calls for complete and immediate withdrawal by the hon. member.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

What we have seen, and what we are continuing to see is a systematic,

planned, interruption by members opposite of my learned friend's, my colleague's attempt to debate on serious issues affecting this Province.

Now the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) as other members, got up and decided to participate in the debate under the guise of a point of order. As the member for Fortune-Hermitage pointed out, within a matter of seconds it was obvious that that was obvious that that was what the member was doing. Now we can do the same thing, Mr. Speaker, and we can bring this House to a complete standstill if that is what it takes for each of us to get up on a point of order, we can take up to twenty minutes, or thirty minutes of each member opposite. We do not want to get to that, Mr. Speaker, but that is what is going to happen if we continue to have members opposite interrupting members on this side when they are trying to make a speech.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not the point.

MR. BARRY:

That is the point.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is the point. Order, please! To that point of order I am prepared to listen to any hon. member when he rises on a point of order and if the Chair feels that he is getting out of hand I will certainly rule to that effect. There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Okay, Mr. Speaker, what is sauce for the goose is sauce of the gander.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for

Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

If there are going to be spurious points of order, aided and abetted by the Chair I will take part too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

If there are, I will take part too. If there are I will take part in spurious points of order -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

If there are going to be spurious points of order, aided and abetted by the Chair, I will take part in them. I will do it too. Two can play this game.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is not a spurious point of order. The hon. gentleman said, "If there are going to be spurious points of order, aided and abetted by the Chair, I will take part in them as well." Now that can only be construed to be a dispersion on the impartiality -

AN HON. MEMBER:

A dispersion?

MR. MARSHALL:

A dispersion, aspersion on the integrity of the Speaker. Now what the hon. gentleman is doing

is he is saying that one hon. member got up on a spurious point of order and that is in order, fine, but if the hon. gentleman gets up and says aided and abetted by the Chair he is directly saying that the Chair is partial and Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. gentleman wishes to give that impression but if he does and he persists in it, Mr. Speaker, there is only one remedy unfortunately because Your Honour's authority in this House has to be respected or there is no order.

MR. BARRY:

It should have to be respected by both sides.

MR. MARSHALL:

All sides, everybody.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order I will rule on a point of order as it is made and both sides can rest assured that my judgement will be as fair as I can make it in every case.

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hemitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, every one of the points of order raised opposite in the last hour were points of debate. I do not expect those members to agree with me because they engage in Orwellian type news speak where they send the message out as is written for them today. And I remember, Mr. Speaker, and millions of Canadians can remember, and I am prepared to table a transcript of The National Broadcast in which the Premier participated and, in which he said in February 1983, 'Some fish plants in Newfoundland will have to close'. He said that. He may not like the fact that he said it. And they may search the House

rules to find ways to interrupt me in saying it. But that does not unsay what the Premier said. The Premier said in February 1983 'Some fish plants in Newfoundland will have to close.' Now they might not like that, but he said it. He said it it is on the public record.

MR. MATTHEWS:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, you hear the gentleman for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) under the guise of a point of order get up and talk about it was you, the old not I approach, not I. Well, Mr. Speaker, when I was up there fighting for those fish plants and trying to stop the former member of Fisheries from signing the document, where was the member for Grand Bank? Where was the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin)? How come he let that guy go up there -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Where you in Cabinet then?

MR. SIMMONS:

- and sign that document? How come, Mr. Speaker? How come? Why were they not doing their job at that particular time?

MR. TOBIN:

You sold the fishery (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) will get his chance one of those days to make his maiden speech in

the House. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue and say that if we had less confrontation, less partisan aspiring down here, and little more co-operation you would even have a better Fisheries agreement than you have, although the Premier himself belatedly in September 1983 said it was one of the best things that happened since Confederation. And on that point, you know, we were down or we were up, wherever it was, up there in the press room, the next floor, I guess, and the reporter from CBC, actually Ann Budgell, in the press conference late September 1983, when the Premier was there and Mr. De Bane was there and other representatives, including the gentleman from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and others, and the Premier had lauded this as the best thing since Confederation, Miss Budgell said, "Well, by the way, Premier what is the difference in this than what Mr. De Bane announced in July?" And that was the point. The item that he had cursed up and down the country in July was the best thing since sliced bread in September. And that again, Mr. Speaker, shows the Jekyll and Hyde nature of this government that whatever is appropriate to say today, whatever news speech depicts today that is what the boys get out and run with, Mr. Speaker. If big brother says, say this, they go out and say it, because big brother is watching him.

When will they realize, Mr. Speaker, that the real big brother is the electorate of Newfoundland? That is the people that they have to answer to. They tried to answer in April and over half the people came back and said, we do not like your answer.

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
We do not like your answer.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, on fishery, offshore, patronage, federal/ provincial co-operation, all the chickens are coming home to roost. Boy, are they ever coming home to roost. What a record, Mr. Chairman. Still they can, I suppose the only thing that they have left is a bit of bravado. They have no shame left, they cannot have any shame left. They sit there every day and defend this empty thing they call a government.

MR. TOBIN:
You are not talking about shame again, are you?

MR. SIMMONS:
Twenty-five per cent unemployment.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Oh, Mr. Speaker, if they want to pursue this particular line, Mr. Speaker, if they want to pursue this whisper campaign, if they want - Mr. Speaker, what I have done since I got here three or four weeks ago -

MR. BARRY:
(Inaudible) extent of his input into this debate, is it? A little whisper campaign, is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:
I will deal with him on Thursday

in the debate.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, yes, and I think the important point to keep in mind, I have done it since I have been here three of four weeks, and again today especially, including today. I have tried to address the issues. I find nobody over there -

MR. WINDSOR:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

No, I agree with the gentleman for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) that he might not agree with, I can understand that, but that is not what I am saying. And I just want him to hear me man to man for a moment, that it is one thing to address the issues and I will say things that he does not agree with and vice-versa and I will respect him for that. But, Mr. Speaker, this temptation to get personal and heave snide remarks and innuendo and so on does not belong on either side of the House. And it is not,

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I cast no aspersions on the former Tory member for Buchans. I address the system, Mr. Speaker. I address the system, asked if it was proper patronage, asked if the person had gone through the system. At no particular time, Mr. Speaker, at no particular time

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. SIMMONS:
- and unless we establish -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, they are determined to reduce this to an absolute beer pit. Because, you see, as long as they do that, Mr. Speaker, they do not have to address the issues.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Right.

MR. SIMMONS:
That is the tactic. It is clear to me after three or four weeks here that that is the tactic. Now, Mr. Speaker, he can be as personal as he wants, I give him my undertaking now so it will be in Hansard, so he can throw it back to me. I give him my undertaking now that if I am in this House another day or another twenty years, he will get no personal remarks from me except in fun.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) innuendo?

MR. SIMMONS:
No, no! Hold on now! The man has just given his word and, on that very happy note, Mr. Speaker, I would adjourn the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment, I will advise the House that the Resource Committee will examine the estimates of the Department of Forest Resources and

Lands tomorrow morning at 9:30 in the House. The same Committee, that is, Resource, will consider the estimates of the Departments of Mines and Housing on Thursday morning at 9:30 in the House. So that is two days notice.

Here is another that is two days notice: The Government Services Committee will meet tomorrow evening at 7:30 P.M. in the Colonial Building to review the estimates of the Department of Public Works and Services.

Having given that information, Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M., and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 29, 1985 at 3:00 P.M.