



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 59

---

*VERBATIM REPORT*  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Thursday

14 November 1985

[Preliminary Transcript]

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

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

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to inform the House that a tentative agreement has been reached in the labour dispute between Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, Local 7004 and Labatt Breweries of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, by tentative agreement I mean that the Bargaining Committees representing Local 7004 and Breweries Industrial Relations Association Limited have signed a memorandum of settlement on the four remaining issues in dispute. These were the four remaining issues, Mr. Speaker, that have brought the brewing industry to a close since early April. The full agreement package will be put before the employees of Labatt's tonight for a ratification vote.

This tentative agreement was achieved as a result of a marathon bargaining session which began at 10:00 a.m. in the Department of Labour yesterday and lasted throughout last night.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the employees of Labatt's will ratify the settlement tonight and that it will help pave the way for final settlement of this very difficult labour dispute which, as I said before, has brought the brewing industry to a close since

April 1, 1985.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, further negotiations are taking place in the Department of Labour to try to settle the two remaining disputes at Molsons and at Carling O'Keefe. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the minister-

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Where is the critic?

MR. BAIRD:  
Are you happy over there?

MR. BARRY:  
Well, for members' information, the member was not in the House when the minister started to read the announcement so the minister was kind enough to pass the statement over to myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, could we have a little silence please?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we are happy to see that this strike appears to be finally coming to an end. We hope that there will be a ratification by the employees tonight. We have to say that too much time went past in this strike. I think we had at least three demonstrations by workers in this building, and we had employees having to resort to a hunger strike that was too

long, Mr. Speaker, before we saw action on the part of this administration. We are now happy to see that the minister and government have finally moved to become involved, and I am sure that the intervention by the minister led to and was helpful to the parties getting to the stage where they have signed a memorandum of agreement.

I would just like to reiterate again that a strike of this nature, going on since April, is not necessary, and it is unfortunate that these employees and their families have had to suffer as long as they have because of lack of action on the part of the Department of Labour of this Province.

MR. DINN:

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, November 7, the Department of Mines and energy presented, to the mining community, its ninth annual review of activities. The presentation was made in conjunction with the thirty-second Annual Meeting of the Newfoundland Branch of the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, which concluded on Saturday, November 9.

The Department's review covered all aspects of the field programmes being carried out in support of mineral exploration and development, including those done under the Canada-Newfoundland Mineral Development Agreement. Projects undertaken by Canada through the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources were also on display.

The highlights of the review were the programmes related to gold potential in the Province. "Gold" was also the theme of the C.I.M. meeting.

Exploration company representatives were present from across Canada, and there were more from junior mining companies in Vancouver than in any previous year.

The number of new mineral claims recorded as of November 5, before the meeting, totalled 12,115 and the total in good standing was 27,072, which is a record for Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker. As of this morning (Thursday), these numbers have increased by 117 to 12,232, and, therefore, the claims in good standing total 27,189. We believe there will be more new claims staked this week in various parts of the Province, as a result of the information gained at the meeting last week. We expect the total for the year to exceed 13,000 and maybe even beat the previous record high of 13,661, for any one year, which was set in 1981. Some of the most interesting parts of the Province include the West side of White Bay, the Sops Arm area, along the South Coast; on the Northern part of the Burin Peninsula, near Hickey's Pond, and Central Newfoundland.

We are forecasting exploration expenditures this year of about \$12 million, but because of continued staking and drilling, this figure might also be exceeded.

Mineral production for 1985 is also expected to be comparable to 1984 and could even top the \$1 billion dollar mark.

In summary, things appear to be looking up for some sectors of the mineral industry. The enthusiasm shown last week for the gold potential of the Province is being reflected in a very active exploration sector which I believe may result in the discovery of other significant deposits. The Chetwynd discovery by B.P. Selco started it all in 1984. As Chetwynd proceeds towards likely development, indications of gold potential in other parts of the Province are keeping the interest high.

It is encouraging to see the field projects being carried out through joint funding by our government and the federal government being translated into major exploration activity and, hopefully, some of the projects, into new mines.

Mining has grown from a production base of some \$25 million at the time of Confederation to a current level - and most people in the Province do not know this, Mr. Speaker - of \$1 billion. It is apparent that we have the potential for continued growth which will generate more jobs and additional revenues.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:  
I defer to my leader.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) was so pleased when he saw the minister convey the information that the record mining claims set in this Province was set during my last year as Minister of Mines and Energy in 1981 that he wanted me to have the opportunity to get up and point that out. I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to see that after four years the minister is finally getting the department back to where I had it in 1981.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the Gobots are active today. I wonder could we keep them quiet.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member has asked on a number of occasions since he got up for silence. I ask that he be given that courtesy.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see that mining exploration is picking up again and the staking of claims is picking up again. This is, to a certain extent, due to the increase in the price of gold which has occurred. Improved economic conditions generally has

also led to some of that increase.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. BARRY:

No, gold went up from where it was there approximately a year ago, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see that the increase in economic activity, as the recession recedes, has led to improvement in mineral markets and has resulted in keen interest in this Province's potential. The gold discovery at Chetwynd, as the minister has pointed out, is, of course, something that would be a catalyst and would bring companies into this Province with added interest.

We hope to see this positive trend continue. However, we should ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, not to forget, as the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) pointed out yesterday, the active mines that we have in this Province. Let us see the minister make sure he does something to preserve that zinc mine at Daniel's Harbour by intervening with the Government of Canada. They failed to intervene sufficiently on FFTs, let us see them intervene to protect the existing mines that we now have, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that on Tuesday I advised them that the hon. the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) and I were meeting with the Labrador Inuit Association and the federal government for discussions preliminary to comprehensive land claim negotiations.

With the agreement of all three parties, these talks were held to discuss items relating to process, administration, structure and organization. They were designed to expedite the tripartite negotiations when they commence.

I am pleased to announce to the House today that these preliminary talks were successful and were conducted with an air of cordiality and co-operation. Agreement was reached in a number of areas. Those which would be of interest, I think, to hon. member include:

That the Government of Newfoundland, the Government of Canada and the Labrador Inuit Association will be the three parties represented at the negotiating table.

Each party will determine the composition of its negotiating team. Each team will be headed by a chief negotiator. Provincial and federal governments will be appointing each of them. One chief negotiator will be their principal spokesman and the LIA will be appointing two co-chairpersons or two co-chief negotiators.

The meetings will take place in three locations - St. John's, Northern Labrador and Ottawa. The schedule of rotation will be agreed upon by the negotiators.

The negotiations, correspondence and documentation will be confidential between the three parties. Communiqués to the public or to the media will be issued jointly by all three parties when the official tripartite negotiations formally begin.

All parties recognize the need for adequate translation and interpretation into Inuktitut during the negotiating process. So a translator/interpreter will normally be at present negotiating table.

We have agreed to schedule further preliminary meetings in the new year to build on on this process and to continue to lay a firm foundation for the tripartite process.

I am pleased with the atmosphere of co-operation and cordiality which was present at those meetings and feel confident that we will be able to build on that so that the negotiating process will be brought to a successful conclusion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister has shown an example of how to keep this House informed with respect to negotiations.

It is too bad that the Premier did not see fit and still has not seen fit to so inform the House with respect to the negotiations on factory freezer trawlers. We compliment the minister on the way in which on two days in succession he has kept this House informed with respect to the progress of these negotiations.

We also compliment the minister on the ingenuity of his approach, Mr. Speaker. It just goes to show that with reasons sitting around the table all things are possible. It is an interesting device that is being used here where we have a co-chairperson Inuit on the federal team, as I read this, and a co-chairperson Inuit on the provincial team, so that in one sense, well, two co-chairpersons will be the principal spokesperson for the LIA. Now is this a co-chair on the federal side and a co-chair on the provincial side?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Both governments have one chief negotiator. The LIA wish to have two to co-chief negotiate.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Okay, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister for that clarification. It appeared for a while that the LIA would be negotiating with

itself, having a co-chair on either side of the table. But that would not be bad, Mr. Speaker, because the main thing is not how it is done, Mr. Speaker, it is getting the process moving. I compliment the minister for bringing about progress. Now I would only ask the minister that he do what he can to see that the parties get to the table for the actual negotiations, as contrasted with the preliminaries which is what we are talking about here. The actual negotiations have been waiting since the Premier's promise in 1979 to commence. They still have not commenced and we urge the minister to do what he can to get the parties to the bargaining table for the actual negotiations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the gallery, four students from Northern Lights Academy in Rigolet with their teacher, Marie Riche.

Before calling Oral Questions, I would like to inform the House the Hansard Office has told me there will be somewhat of a delay today in getting Hansard to us for some technical reasons. It will be here in about an hour. I would like to take this opportunity of, I am sure, expressing our thanks to all of them for the excellent co-operation we have had. Almost invariably they have had the Hansard here for us before the House starts so that we have the opportunity to look at it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

## Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. It concerns the Come By Chance oil refinery and last night's announcement on NTV that Peninsula Refining had withdrawn all interest in their earlier bid to reactivate the refinery. Now, on Tuesday of this week I presented a resolution regarding the Come By Chance Hospital and in so doing, I used several "Whereases" one of which said, "Whereas the likelihood of the Come By Chance oil refinery being reactivated is appearing to be a reality much more as each week passes," and that was my sincere belief on Tuesday of this week but the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) interjected, and I quote, he said, "Oh, you believe that now, do you?" Well, I actually did believe it on Tuesday, but I am not so sure Mr. Speaker, what I can believe today. I want to ask the Premier to give us a progress report. Yesterday morning he was on the phone to Captain Morrissey Johnson, he tells us. I want to know if the Premier was on the phone this morning to the other M.P. who represents part of the district of Bellevue, the Come By Chance area. I want to ask the Premier to give us an up to date report on what the status is now of any future for Come By Chance as it pertains to a reactivated refinery. Where does it sit now?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon.



member for his question. The hon. gentleman is right that one of the companies that had put a bid in on the invitation of Petro-Canada has withdrawn, that is, the Shaheen interests. As I understand it, the estate of Shaheen, or the family, have now withdrawn their bid. Over the last forty-eight or fifty hours or so, we have been in touch, into discussions with Petro-Canada. These discussions continued through yesterday and today and will be continuing, I suspect, for the next several weeks. So that is the only information I can give the hon. gentleman right now, that the Government of Newfoundland and Petro-Canada are into discussions over the future of the Come By Chance refinery, the bids that are left and what the future holds for that facility. As soon as we have completed those discussions, then, of course, we will be letting the hon. member know.

MR. CALLAN:

A quick supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier a couple of weeks ago said the same thing, you know, he talked about various bids. Now as I understand it, as of the first week in July all of the other bids were more or less discarded and Petro-Canada officials announced 'there are now two remaining active bids that we are considering,' one was Peninsula Refining to reactivate and the other was Greenspoon in Toronto to scrap.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Would the hon. member pose his question?

MR. CALLAN:

What does the Premier mean? Does the Premier mean now that what Petro-Canada said in July is no longer true, that the only remaining bid is Greenspoon from Toronto to scrap, there are others being actively considered as well? Is that what the Premier is saying?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, yes. Under the formal part of the process, I think there is only one bid left, although I might have said 'bids' in my answer a few minutes ago. But perhaps I should have said the various alternatives that are available for the future use of that refinery is what the discussions are on. That one bid is still there and we are in discussions with Petro-Canada now on the final decision relating to Come By Chance. So, yes, the hon. member is right, there is only one bid left formally and we are talking to Petro-Canada now about what is going to happen as a result of the Shaheen interests withdrawing and what will be the future of that facility.

So perhaps I said 'bids' when I should have said bid in the sense of the formality of the invitations that were asked for, but there are various alternatives being discussed now between us and Petro-Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I just passed over to the Premier several documents and I would like to table those

documents. I would like to ask the Premier whether before receiving these documents he was aware of the involvement of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the Government House Leader, with the owners of the Bell Island ferry?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I just got the documents to scan them and I just cannot give the hon. member an answer. I am not aware of the various interests of the law firm that the hon. member for St. John's East is involved in. I am not aware of all the interests that they have, but I will take a look at the documents that the Leader of the Opposition passed over.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, it is public knowledge that shortly after the date of the document, which shows that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was acting as solicitor for the Vanguard Paper Box Limited, which is now the owner of the Bell Island ferry, there was a contract awarded to that company for five years. Would the hon. the Premier indicate whether he has a letter in writing, pursuant to the Conflict of Interest Guidelines, whereby the minister disqualified himself with respect to this matter?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, as I said, I will

take a look at the documents and then be able to answer the hon. gentleman, after I have looked them over.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, that does not have anything to do with the documents, but I would like to follow this up with a question. We have tabled before this House now, Mr. Speaker, a Loan and Guarantee Bill showing that there was a government guaranteed loan provided to this company. Would the Premier indicate whether the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) filed a letter in writing pursuant to the Conflict of Interest Guidelines disqualifying himself from any involvement with the decision relating to the awarding of that government guarantee?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I have indicated in this House on numerous occasions over the last three or four weeks, in answer to allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition, that in every single case where the member for St. John's East's law firm was involved in any businesses around Newfoundland that he has always absented himself from any decision making power and absented himself from Cabinet, Cabinet Committee meetings or the like. In every single case the member for St. John's East has done that and has not participated in any decisions

relating to anything that his firm has been involved in.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

The Premier did not indicate, Mr. Speaker, whether there was a letter in writing as required by The Conflict of Interest Guidelines. If there is any such letter, we would ask if the Premier would table it. I would like to ask the Premier about a letter that is tabled, a copy of which I received from the Ocean Ranger Foundation, where that foundation is seeking a judicial inquiry on behalf of the family of a seaman on the Bell Island ferry who drowned. They have written the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) seeking a judicial inquiry and there were indications that there was difficulty in obtaining an inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member pose his question?

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Premier to indicate whether there have been discussions in Cabinet relating to this matter and whether the Government House Leader has disqualified himself in writing from any decisions relating to that matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated,

I can just say again to the Leader of the Opposition, in every case where there has been any involvement of the member for St. John's East's (Mr. Marshall) law firm in any company which was involved with government at all, that the member has absented himself and so informed me and so informed Cabinet. As far as this letter goes from Mr. Newhook, the Executive Administrator of the Ocean Ranger Foundation, it is a letter sent to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) and I am sure that the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General, will deal with it in due course.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, another supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Maybe the hon. Leader would ask his final supplementary as there are a number of other members getting up regularly.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are two other matters related to the Bell Island ferry, one of which I have asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), which is an attempt by the operators of that ferry to limit their liability and I asked whether government would investigate this. I would like to know whether the Government House Leader has been involved in any decisions of Cabinet with respect to dealing with this company on that matter. Also, I would like to know whether the minister exempted himself in writing from the choice of the Commissioner who is now involved in reviewing the rates to be charged on the Bell Island ferry? Would the Premier so state specifically, not in those general terms of saying anytime there has been discussion

he has disqualified himself? Has the minister disqualified himself in writing on any of these matters or all of these matters in writing? Would the Premier answer the question directly?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition twice before in this Question Period, I will just continue to do so. Obviously the law firm for the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is involved in various transactions with hundreds of companies, I suppose, around Newfoundland, some of whom are doing business with the government, and some of whom are not, and in every instance where that has happened the member for St. John's East has not been party to any decision relating to any company that has been a client of his law firm and has so informed me on every particular case. That is the answer to the question.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Conflict of Interest Guideline Number 7 states in essence that a minister should not hold any employment including self-employment, outside of his duties as minister that conflicts or interferes with the performance of his duties as minister. I would like to ask the Premier, does he not consider the activities of the Deputy Premier, Minister of Energy, President of

the Council he has various titles - as an active and senior partner in a major law firm which does business with Petro-Can, Fairview Investments, Universal, and the Bell Island ferry, does he not consider that this is in conflict with the performance of his duties as minister? Has he obtained any particular opinion from the Department of Justice regarding this matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, when the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) became a minister, he informed me at that time that his law firm was involved in innumerable transactions for companies and so on. I reviewed that with him at the time and indicated that in every such case, where a decision had to be made through a given department or agency of government, obviously the member for St. John's East could not be party to that decision or involve himself in any way, shape or form in it. That was the terms under which the member for St. John's East accepted appointment to the Cabinet. Therefore, there has been no conflict of interest, no violation of that. That was discussed with the member at the time of his appointment. He made it quite clear to me that there were many, many things that his law firm was involved in, some of which he would know about, others which he would not, because obviously he spends most of his time operating as a minister, but in every single case where there was work being done by his law firm, obviously he would absent himself from that decision and not influence ministers or anybody else in the government. And he

has scrupulously and ruthlessly kept to that, Mr. Speaker, over the years that he has been a minister.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has indicated innumerable occasions, and they must have been innumerable according to the connections of the hon. minister's law firm, and on all these innumerable occasions the minister has absented himself from any decision and so on. This Conflict of Interest Guideline I referred to -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member pose his question?

MR. BAKER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will.

The Conflict of Interest Guideline I referred to refers to interfering with the performance of his duties as minister. I ask does the Premier consider that these innumerable exclusions that the minister must have made from Cabinet decisions, the innumerable times that he must have had to leave the Cabinet Room and not take part in decisions, does he consider this an interference with the decision-making duties that the hon. gentleman has as a minister?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker. No.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the hon. the Premier. Like my colleagues, I too have been reading The Conflict of Interest Guidelines. I say, Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with the intent of this document. It is not unlike the Ten Commandments in theory, Mr. Speaker. It is unfortunate when men try to put them in practice they do not abide by them.

I should like to direct the Premier to Guideline No. 10, where the minister shall not accord preferential treatment to organizations in which he has an interest financial or otherwise.

Now there has been evidence, documented proof today-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Would the hon. member pose his question.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will ask the Premier in view of the fact that the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has been acting as solicitor for the company which operates the Bell Island ferry, and since that company has been awarded a contract on several occasions without a tender, does the hon.

the Premier consider that the hon. House Leader is in a conflict of interest, in breach of Number 10 of The Conflict of Interest Guidelines?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have satisfied myself over the last number of years about the activities of the Government House Leader, the member for St. John's East, that in every instance where his firm has been involved he has absented himself from Cabinet and has not participated in decisions which would therefore put him in a conflict of interest situation.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. the Premier: When the decision or decisions were made to award those contracts without tender - whether it was once or twice or five times - did the President of the Council notify the Premier in writing, did he excuse himself and gently slide out, or none of the above? Would the hon. the Premier tell this hon. House exactly what the Government House Leader did when those contracts were awarded without tender?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have answered that question and other questions along

the same lines from other hon. members. As I have indicated, and I can repeat again, the member for St. John's East has been scrupulous in his behavior as a Minister of the Crown. In every particular instance where a conflict of interest could arise, the member for St. John's East absented himself and had nothing whatsoever to do with the decision or anything leading up to the decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me. I would like to direct a question to the Premier, in particular with regards to The Conflict of Interest Guidelines, specifically Guideline fourteen. It is very brief, Mr. Speaker. I would like to read it: "A minister shall notify the Premier in writing of any matter in respect of which he has disqualified himself from acting."

On Thursday, October 24, according to Hansard, in response to questions, the Premier made a statement to the effect that ministers do submit to him any time they are involved which would therefore involve conflict of interest situations for them. My question is: Would the Premier please confirm that all ministers conform with the guidelines and that the procedure detailed in guideline fourteen is always followed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have answered that question 100 times over in the last few weeks.

MR. KELLAND:

What is the answer, please? Mr. Speaker, I would like to know the answer.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have answered the same kind of question many times, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:

Could I have an answer to the question, Mr. Speaker? Would the Premier confirm that that is always carried out?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question 100 times over in the last couple of years, and in the last couple of weeks many times.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. the member have a supplementary?

MR. KELLAND:

I have a supplementary, yes. Based on what the Premier said, that ministers always do - and I have to take him at his word as an hon. member of the House, the Premier of our Province - how can it be then or how would he perhaps explain to me the statement by the Government House Leader as follows, on Wednesday, I believe it was October 23: "I am glad to advise the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Will the hon. member ask a supplementary instead of reading -

MR. KELLAND:

I beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER:

I am asking the hon. member to ask his question.

MR. KELLAND:

This is my question, Mr. Speaker. I am now wording it. "I am glad to advise the hon. gentleman, no, they do not take place in the form of written memos to the Premier. My practice has been to go the Clerk of the Council -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not a question.

MR. KELLAND:

This is my question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am directing the hon. member to ask his supplementary.

MR. KELLAND:

In view of what I have just said, Mr. Premier, how do you explain the directly opposed views of yourself and the Government House Leader on the policy of reporting under Conflict of Interest item 14?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question a hundred times over, that when the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) entered the Cabinet we sat down and he informed me that his law firm was involved with many, many companies and so on, registering company transactions and so on; I informed him then that it would be my intent and his intent to both inform me and inform anybody else he wanted to. Very often he will call the Clerk of the Council and

say to the Clerk of the Council, "I will not be attending Cabinet meetings today, the Premier knows the reason why, because I cannot take part in this decision." The Government House Leader had done that many, many times in the past and he has always cleared it with me, and cleared it with me first when he became part of Cabinet.

MR. KELLAND:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

The Premier a number of times refers to innumerable situations in which the Government House Leader has made it known that there were possible conflicts of interest. How would the Premier then explain the Government House Leader's statement 'that these come from time to time but they are very infrequent'? Again it appears to be a very sharp conflict and contradiction in both statements.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, infrequent in the sense of the number of Cabinet meetings that we have and the number of decisions that we make. Every week we make I do not know how many decisions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I suppose we have made, since the member for St. John's East was a

member of Cabinet, thousands of decisions and out of those thousands of decisions I suppose there may have been twenty or thirty decisions where the hon. member had to absent himself. So I suppose that is what 'infrequent' means there.

I would like to get a question on forestry or on farming or on fishery. I would like to get a question on something that is going on, on jobs in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You know, if the hon. members just want to smear the character of a certain member of Cabinet, then they are pleased to do it. But I am sure the people of Newfoundland would like to hear what the Opposition has to say about a whole bunch of things which are important to the economy of Newfoundland.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am sort of disappointed that I do not have a question for the Premier on conflict of interest, unfortunately. However, I do have a question for the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), I guess at this point, and it has to do with School Tax Authorities. Since we have information that he tabled so generously several days ago that approximately \$3.5 million last year has been spent to cover the administrative costs of School Tax



Authorities, and since we have just seen now that virtually the entire Province is covered with municipalities which also now collect taxes, my question for the minister is: Is he considering removing the School Tax Authority as sort of an extra level of taxation that we now have and allowing that function to be played by municipalities, which are now widespread throughout the Province? I was not sure whether to ask this question of the Minister of Education or the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), and I will accept answers from either of them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the hon. member for his question. Finally we have got a question dealing with some other issues in the Province besides trying to run down some of the cabinet ministers. Mr. Speaker, to the question on School Tax Authorities, the hon. member for Menihek, when he introduced the question mentioned the amount of money that the administration of School Tax Authorities took. What he did not spell out was the fact that that amount was about fourteen per cent of the total amount of money taken in by School Tax Authorities. I think in the administration of any business, especially in areas where we have a number of new School Tax Authorities coming on stream, where you have the original plant being put in place, the cost will be even higher. Even now it is only fourteen per cent and I think that is quite respectable. When we also realize that last year over \$20 million was raised by School Tax Authorities for the

good of education, not only in the Province generally but in the specific areas where the taxes were collected, because they go back into the schools of that area. Certainly, then, there is a positive side to School Tax Authorities. Also, to answer his question directly, because we have School Tax Authorities and School Boards spread over many areas where we do not have municipal governments, it would be very premature and impractical, I think, at this time, to say that the municipal authorities in the various areas could collect taxes both for municipal problems and funds needed at the school level. It is something undoubtedly that could be looked at in the future, but at this time I think it is practically impossible to do that.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just one, and it is again to whichever minister cares to answer. I have had correspondence now with the Mayor of St. John's, who was recently returned to office by acclamation, and he indicates much concern about the fact that the School Tax Authorities are now in an area which should be exclusively the jurisdiction of municipalities, since it is their primary means of raising revenue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. FENWICK:

My question is: In view of these concerns - I agree there are some areas where you will still have to keep School Tax Authorities where municipalities do not exist - are you and the Minister of Municipal Affairs willing to look into what the situation would be if School Tax Authorities were abandoned and their function were handed over to municipalities where it could be done by only one institution rather than two?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister for Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, in relation to the question asked by the hon. gentleman, in education, as in any other field, I presume we will always come across problems, we will come across concerns, come across cross jurisdictions. Concerns are being expressed in larger area, St. John's, Corner Brook, Gander and Grand Falls, perhaps, moreso than in smaller areas where the School Board covering the area ties in along the same line as the municipal government. Certainly if there are problems there, the way to solve them is to get the various jurisdictions together, the various groups together as we have done in other areas. We found out that if you get the right people together to discuss common problems usually you come up with a common solution.

MR. DOYLE:

We provide the assessment for your people.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the previous line of questions, I wonder if the Premier could explain how - and he said the same thing today as the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) said a few weeks ago - if there are many transactions, as the Premier has indicated, which the Government House Leader would not know about, that his law firm is acting on how then can (a) the minister, (b) the Premier, (c) anybody in Cabinet, or (d) anybody in this Province know when the minister is or is not acting on a matter where his law firm is involved? If he does not know what his law firm is involved in, how can he avoid being in a conflict of interest when matters come before Cabinet dealing with the clients that he does not know the law firm is acting for?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the hon. member for St. John's East does not know about it, therefore he can not be in a very serious conflict of interest situation to be able to argue on behalf or against anybody at all if he does not know about it. It is a question of knowledge. If an hon. member has knowledge, he can bring together that knowledge to get a decision that he wants, but if he does not know about it, obviously, it is all theory, it is foolish. How can you have a conflict of interest if somebody does not know about something? How can you lobby about something you do not know anything about? How can there be a conflict? That is foolishness, silliness!

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
We recommend that the Premier go  
and consult with the Minister of  
Justice (Ms Verge) on that  
definition of conflict of  
interest. But I ask the Premier,  
has he ever heard the good old  
Newfoundland expression, "Turning  
a blind eye"? Is this what The  
Conflict of Interest Guidelines  
mean, that any member of Cabinet,  
Mr. Speaker, is entitled to turn a  
blind eye to what a law firm might  
be dealing with, to what a  
relative might be dealing with, to  
what anybody connected with  
members opposite might be dealing  
with? Is this the way The  
Conflict of Interest Guidelines  
are intended to work in the  
Premier's Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I now another good  
Newfoundland expression which  
says, that from time to time  
people like to tear other people's  
characters down. I think that is  
what the Leader of the Opposition  
is trying to do and I am not going  
to engage in it all. I have no  
intention whatsoever of engaging  
in that kind of foolishness.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has  
now elapsed.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture,  
Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to  
present and table the annual  
report of the Newfoundland and  
Labrador Arts Council for the year  
1984-85.

Notices of Motion

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I  
will on tomorrow ask leave to  
introduce the following resolution.

WHEREAS the injury that will  
inevitably be wrought on the  
Newfoundland inshore fishery by  
Mr. Mulroney's decision to license  
not one but three factory freezer  
trawlers (FFTs) will be  
devastating; and

WHEREAS the callous manner in  
which Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Nielsen  
have treated the Premier of  
Newfoundland and Labrador and the  
Government of Newfoundland and  
Labrador shows an utter disregard  
for the dignity of the office of  
Premier and the Newfoundland  
Government; and

WHEREAS the Prime Minister pledged  
to co-operate and consult with the  
Premier and his government and has  
broken that pledge in the most  
violent manner conceivable; and

MR. PATTERSON:  
You killed the fishery. Wash the  
blood off your hands, boy!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

WHEREAS the Prime Minister, in order to inflict prosperity on a private Nova Scotian Company has broken the agreement whereby the Government of Canada agreed not to permit factory freezer trawlers on the Northern cod stocks;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House unanimously condemns Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, Newfoundland cabinet representative John Crosbie, and all who participated in this horrendous decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask members opposite for unanimous leave to have this resolution debated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no, no!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think it impossible to hear the hon. member. So I will ask all to please give him the courtesy that he is entitled to.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Would you like to repeat that last piece.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could read it again:

BE IT RESOLVED that this House unanimously condemns Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, Newfoundland Cabinet Representative John Crosbie, and all who participated in this

horrendous decision.

I would ask for leave -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave. No leave!

MR. BARRY:

- of members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to have this resolution voted upon unanimously now without debate, so that we can show, Mr. Speaker,-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- there is unity in this House. We will see whether members opposite, Mr. Speaker, have been serious or whether they still want to continue the little political games, the play-acting, Mr. Speaker, that they have been engaging in on this issue?

So with unanimous leave, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to present this resolution now to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Do we have leave, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave, no!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

### Petitions

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition. It is from approximately 600 petitioners in the communities of English Harbour East, Terrenceville, Burin, Grand La Pierre, Monkstown -

MR. PATTERSON:

You should have read it before you came in here, boy, and not wasted the time of the House.

MR. CALLAN:

He has five minutes regardless, eh? Whether he wastes it at that or doing something else.

MR. SIMMONS:

There is one other community, Mr. Speaker, the community of St. Bernard's. About 600 persons in those communities that I mentioned, Mr. Speaker. Principally, as you will see, the petition was circulated in the areas in my district, but they were obviously individuals from Burin, in the one case, and from Monkstown in the other case who were in the area at the time. I put my friends from Grand Bank and Burin - Placentia West at ease.

The prayer of the petition is as follows: "We the undersigned strongly oppose the allowing of the Morgentaler-style abortion clinic to be established and to operate in our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the prayer of the petition and I take note that my -

MR. SIMMS:

Is it an original?

MR. SIMMONS:

Let us not get petty, fellows, let us not get petty.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I will continue, if it is not, somebody can vet the petition first. I understood I had the floor.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has the floor.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Chair and my beloved cousin from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) can assume that when I stand to present a petition it will be a petition, not a copy of a petition. He can assume that.

MR. SIMMS:

It has happened before. That is why I questioned you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition and I salute the efforts of the minister, my good friend from Exploits (Dr. Twomey). I call to the attention of the House the statement that he made I believe some time last Spring on this particular subject.

MR. TOBIN:

I presented a petition with 1,300 names.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I can certainly salute the efforts and particularly the statement of the Minister of Health which he made to the House last Spring in which he spelled out his stance and, more importantly, the government's stance on this issue of the Morgentaler Clinic. I salute him for the initiative he has taken on that matter and I ask that the petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the appropriate department.

DR. TWOMEY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I too support the prayer of the petition that was signed by about 600 people in your constituency and elsewhere. Yes, this has been an ongoing and contentious problem among all the provinces of Canada. I think to put it clearly and succinctly, we are governed by the federal statutes 251 and 252. We have conformed with these statutes in all respects. I have announced in this House when questioned, or outside it, we were going to abide by these statutes. We have no intention or not plans for the future to change our views on that particular statute.

Thank you very much.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise to support a

petition signed by sixty people from the community of Postville in my district. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this petition I assume was originated from one of the two parties opposite, either provincially or federally.

I would like to read a letter that is attached to the letter. The people in Postville do not know where it came from. However, it says, "Please find enclosed a petition against the de-indexation of family allowance that was introduced in the May budget." It goes on to say in the last sentence, the last paragraph, "It would be my pleasure to do my share in presenting your name to the signed petition."

Mr. Speaker, on top of that it says "all presidents of the women's groups and, if not, to board members, where there are no organized groups." So it was concocted by some party opposite against the de-indexing of family allowance.

However, the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker goes, "We, the undersigned, ask the Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney, to restore full indexation of the family allowance and child tax credit -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! Acceptable petitions in the House are a prayer to this House but not to the Prime Minister.

MR. WARREN:  
That is right, Mr. Speaker. I realize what you are saying, however it is signed by sixty people in the community of Postville and I wish to advise the hon. House that the petition was addressed to me, Mr. Speaker. I

want to relay it to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and he can pass it along to the Prime Minister or to any other member, which is ordinarily what happens in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! It does not appear that that petition is in order. I would like to have a look at it.

I must rule this petition is not in order. It is not a prayer to this House, so the petition is not in order.

Are there any further petitions?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if by leave the petition could be tabled?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

You can not table a petition after it has been ruled out of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

By leave.

MR. TULK:

If the Speaker has ruled it is out of order, it is out of order.

DR. COLLINS:

We are masters of our own rules.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Not to challenge your ruling in no way but I would like to just relate to the hon. House, Mr. Speaker, that it was a petition signed by sixty residents in my

district. It was sent to me, Mr. Speaker, and it does concern the lives of those sixty people. Whether the petition originated from some other party or not, I think the people signed that petition not realizing that it probably should not have come to me.

However, I think that if leave could be granted on both sides of the House, it could be presented. We have done it before when petitions have come to members. It gives members on both sides the opportunity to speak to a petition when, in particular, it refers to their particular district.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the hon. gentleman that Your Honour has ruled, without interjection from anybody - as you should have the right to do - that the petition is not in order and to ask for leave to do anything with a petition that is not in order is ridiculous.

The hon. member should, before he comes into this House, have his petitions in order. There is no point in him trying to come in here and make political points or little Brownie points about the fact that a petition will not be accepted by this House. He should get any petition that he gets ready to bring into this House in order. He should be doing his work and get his petition in order so that when it is presented to this House it is acceptable to

this House and not come in here weak-kneed like he did this afternoon. That is the whole point to be made to the hon. member. He should be ashamed of himself.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to that point of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the Chair has ruled that the petition is not in order and obviously that is that. If there were unanimous consent, obviously the petition could be tabled. There is not unanimous consent, so that is that. I will be glad to forward the hon. member's petition to Ottawa with copious notes thereon.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Orders of the Day

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

#### Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. DECKER:

At the close of the last session of this Committee I was going through a few words and I was trying to point out their meanings to hon. members, and I tried, to the best of my ability, to throw some light on the meaning of the words 'co-operation' and 'prosperity' and the infliction thereof.

Today, Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring to hon. members' attention the word 'negotiate'. Now, negotiate is a fairly simple word. I am sure hon. members are familiar with the normal meaning of the word negotiate. When I think about negotiate, Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of two people, or two parties who have somewhat of a disagreement and they sit down as equals and they try to come to a satisfactory solution, a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen in recent days where the word negotiate again has taken on a different meaning from that which we would normally associate with 'negotiate'. For the benefit of hon. members I should like to break down this word and throw some new meaning on it. In the word 'negotiate' we have ne, n-e. Now, as hon. members of this House all are aware, it is important for us to have some knowledge of French if we are going to be successful politicians in Canada, and I am sure that they are aware that the word 'ne' is part of 'ne pas', in French, which means 'no' - no, no, no - and negotiate, Mr. Chairman, has taken on that connotation in recent days - we



have seen it in the factory freezer trawler debate, we have seen it in the negotiations with the Upper Churchill, we have seen it in negotiations for a secondary roads agreement, we have seen it in practically every attempt at negotiation that the hon. the Premier has tried to enter into, 'ne', an absolute no. No matter what he tries to negotiate, before anything is settled the word 'no' stares him straight in the face. When 'negotiate' is discussed with our hon. Premier, the word means no, 'ne', 'ne pas', no negotiation, Mr. Chairman.

If we break this word down a little further, Mr. Chairman, we see the word 'go', 'ne' go, g-o.

MR. PATTERSON:

Go, Johnnie, go.

MR. DECKER:

Go, 'Brian', go might be more appropriate. It may not be parliamentary to use that, so I will withdraw it. Go, Mr. Premier, go. This is the retort, I would venture to say, that the government in Ottawa has accepted for everything that the hon. the Premier comes up to Ottawa with - go away, man; go sit down; go jump in the lake; go climb a tree. There are an awful lot of expressions that start off with 'go' which are being devised daily to tell the hon. the Premier where to go every time he comes to negotiate something on behalf of this Province, Mr. Chairman. The word 'go' has taken on more priority in the word 'negotiate' - go, go shut up. And why is this the case, Mr. Chairman? I will tell you why it is the case, it is because the hon. the Premier has blown every attempt at negotiation that he has made on behalf of this Province and he has blown it

because since the last election, the hon. Premier is in the pocket of Ottawa. He was sewn up, Mr. Chairman, and he was put in the pocket of Mr. Mulroney and now he has to do exactly what he is told, when he is told, he has to take what he is given, he has no say in the matter. The word 'go' is predominant in the word 'negotiate' and our Premier is told where to go every time he tries to negotiate with Ottawa. We have in the word 'negotiate' the word 'ne', which is the beginning of ne pas, which means absolutely no. We have in the word negotiate, the word 'go' which tells the hon. Premier where to go whenever he tries to do something on behalf of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, that is very, very unfortunate as the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) knows. In his desperate desire to have a forestry agreement consummated with Ottawa, when he is trying to enter into a forestry agreement with Ottawa - I notice the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands seems to be extremely interested in what I am saying and I am glad that I am going to shed some light his way. The word go, Mr. Chairman, in negotiate is telling the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands where they can go whenever they try to negotiate with Ottawa. Be it a forestry agreement, be it a roads agreement, be it factory freezer trawlers, be it money for whatever you can think about, the word go, Mr. Chairman, comes to the forefront and the hon. the Premier and all his hon. ministers are told exactly where they can go.

In the word negotiate, Mr.

Chairman, I want to stress the word 'ate', a-t-e. That word 'ate' is also contained in the word 'negotiate'. When you talk about something being eaten, I think about the word 'devour'. The hon. the Premier and his ministers have been completely devoured, they have been eaten up, they have been ignored. Think about the Minister for Housing (Mr. Dinn) some months ago. When some offices of Central Mortgage and Housing were closed out in Newfoundland, the hon. the Minister for Housing was asked in this hon. House which offices were to be closed and which were to remain open. He did not know the least thing about it, Mr. Chairman. It was obvious from the way he tried to answer the question, tried to skirt around the question that he did not have a single clue as to what was going on. Because in the word negotiate, Mr. Chairman, the 'ate' has come to the forefront and the hon. the Minister for Housing has been devoured, he has been gobbled up like the hon. Premier who cannot negotiate, like the hon. the Minister for Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) who cannot get a forestry agreement, and like the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) who cannot get a transportation agreement for secondary roads. They have all been gobbled up, eaten up, Mr. Chairman. The word 'ate' in the word 'negotiate' means they are eaten up, they are in the pockets of the Prime Minister of Canada, they have to do exactly what they are told, Mr. Chairman, and that bodes a bad, poor, dismal future for Newfoundland. The word negotiate has taken on a completely new connotation, a complete, new meaning, and whenever we hear the Premier or hon. ministers over

there talk about negotiating any agreement whatsoever with Ottawa, we do not have to wait for the outcome of the so-called negotiations, Mr. Chairman, we know exactly what they mean, they mean no, they mean go shut up, they mean you are eaten up, you are all gobbled up. So the word 'negotiate' has taken on a completely different connotation.

There is another word that I am sure members opposite would want me to elucidate on for their benefit, the word 'accord', Mr. Chairman. The general word 'accord', we tend to associate that with the Atlantic Accord, the general phrase. Let me zero in on something within the Atlantic Accord, Mr. Chairman, Clause 54. There are hon. members in this House who would have us believe that the Atlantic Accord is absolutely perfect for this Province. Except for that one little Clause, Clause 54, I would have to agree with them. Clause 54 negates every bit of good that is in the Atlantic Accord. Surely goodness, Mr. Chairman, we should have learned by now that there is no great gain in giving away our natural resources until they are processed. Processing is where the answer lies, Mr. Chairman, processing is where the money is.

Clause 54 states, Mr. Chairman, "There shall be no oil refined in Newfoundland until the refineries in Quebec, the refineries in Nova Scotia and the refineries in New Brunswick are all back in full operation."

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the House, I will come back to Clause 54.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman, we cannot let the hon. member make those statements. He is not the only one who has made such a statement, but if you allow something that is not correct to be said often enough, a proportion of people will believe it. Even though something is totally untrue and totally incorrect and totally inaccurate and totally spurious and totally foolish and totally silly and every other adjective you want to put to it, if you allow it to go by, people will say, "My gosh, there must be something to this." You know, the old saying, where there is smoke there is fire.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Clause 54 means nothing whatever like what the hon. member says. It does not mean that we cannot have supplies if it is economically advantageous to the Province and so on and so forth. It does not mean at all that we cannot have supplies until everyone else is satisfied. If the hon. member reads the clause that way, he really should get instructions in the English language, he should get a dictionary, he should get some assistance from teachers, or perhaps a tutor or whatever. It means nothing whatsoever like that. It is not even the faintest glimmer and resemblance of it.

Clause 54 has full protection for this Province as long as we have a

facility in the Province capable of receiving supplies from offshore, if it is in the best interests of the Province to so receive. So to portray it as some way of giving up something to the detriment of the Province, like the Upper Churchill River, where we gave away in perpetuity almost the benefits of the flow from it so that we were left with a pittance, with almost a miniscule amount of return to the Province, to portray Clause 54 in that light is totally inaccurate, totally nonsense, completely erroneous and we cannot allow, for those gullible people who might believe it, that this government would ever contemplate for one single, solitary moment putting anything so stupid and silly into an agreement. This Province is protected with this administration. We have made it the hallmark of this administration to protect the Province, to stay away from agreements with anyone, presently living or in the distant future, which will in any way compromise the future of this Province. And to portray any agreement we got into as going beyond that or against that policy, is so stupid and so silly and so cynical that it just cannot be allowed to stand on the record.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just let me comment for a moment on the hon. member's remarks about negotiations and consultations. We are in a new type of relationship with the federal government, new in terms of what the relationship was during the Trudeau years. In the Trudeau years it was impossible to get a sensible word, just about, out of the administration in Ottawa. They totally ignored this Province. Very seldom any of the

ministers in that Ministry visited the Province. When they did visit the Province, they came in and got out as quickly as possible. When there was a proposal put up from this Province in view of our dire straits, or our needs, or whatever, it got the shortest type of shift, it was very seldom responded to in anything like an expeditious manner. If there was another interest in the country that had any small side interest in the matter they usually got the benefit of the consideration of the federal government. Even though our vital interests were at stake, we were totally ignored. Now that was during the Trudeau era.

Now when the Mulroney government went into Ottawa there was such a fresh breeze through federal/provincial relations that it was incredible. The gloom and the suspicion and the cynicism was so changed to one of assistance and help and accommodation and understanding that it was absolutely and totally incredible. Anyone who has had anything to do with federal/provincial relations in the two eras, you can say night is different from day, black is different than white, clear is different from murky. It was those sorts of differences.

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Land (Mr. Simms) thinks I being too weak in making these comparisons, and I should make them stronger. But I will just leave them stand as they are.

Now that is not to say that there will not occasionally be differences between two levels of government, or the two orders of government, that is the more proper term, not levels. That is

not to say there will be serious differences between two orders of government. That is not to say that the feds will sometimes lose on their positions and it is to say that sometimes we will lose on our positions. I mean, that is what a Confederation is all about. If we were a unitarian country there would only be one order of decision-making and that would be the end of it. But we are not that sort of country. We are a country that is a Confederate country, that there are orders of government, and there are responsibilities in one order of government and responsibilities in the other. So there will necessarily in Confederation be tensions, there will be differences of opinion, there will be decisions made which favour one side and the other side.

That is not to say that the whole thing is back to those gloomy, God forsaken days that were present during the Trudeau era. We are bitterly disappointed about the factory freezer trawler decision. We have seen the arguments put forward in its favour. We do not agree with them. We will argue against them. We will make sure there is a continual flow of facts to try to get that decision reversed. But at the present time, the decision stands. We are not in favour of it. We are at odds with the federal government over it, but that is not to say that consultation and negotiations are gone down the drain.

For the hon. members opposite to say that we are back into a Trudeaulike situation is ridiculous. It is a misrepresentation of the facts that just cannot be allowed to stand. We will do our part for the Province. We are doing our

part for the Province. We are being listened to, not always to our liking or to the extent we want, but nine times out of ten we are. And the one time out of ten where things go against us, we are not, by any way, giving up the struggle, as it was so often given up by the hon. members opposite or their associates in Ottawa when a decision was made against the best interest of this Province and there was absolutely no way of getting a word through, once the decision was made, there was no way of getting it reversed.

That is not the case now. We just have to work at it. We will work at it. I personally am confident that there will be some good come out of this whole situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make certain other points but it is just about impossible to forego the temptation to latch on to a couple of things my good friend the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has just said, and so I shall not forego the temptation. He said in his introductory remarks 'that if you say an untruth often enough it gains a certain currency.' Then he proceeded to demonstrate what he meant by talking about Clause 54.

I say to him the whole country knows, not only me and Newfoundland, the whole nation knows, the oil industry will tell

you very clearly and explicitly what Clause 54 says, and it is opposite of what the minister says it says. Clause 54 was the ultimate sellout. It will go down in history as the ultimate, most scandalous sellout of resources in Canadian history.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with him on another issue. I agree with him there is a change. Negotiations now with the federal government are not what they were when the Trudeau administration was in power. He is right. He is absolutely correct on that. The relationship now is not what it was then. The relationship then was hard bargaining, a bit of politics on both sides, as is the nature of the game. None of that now, no hard bargaining, no politics, but a lot of kowtowing, an awful lot of kowtowing kowtowing these days. That is the essential difference I say to the minister that there is a lot of kowtowing kowtowing now to Ottawa which there was not before, but that is just a brief and good spirited response to his comments. And if I could restrain

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I realize that it is an offence to deliberately mislead the House but I would argue that it is also offensive certainly to mislead the House unknowingly. Now the hon. gentleman should know that Clause 54 does not work to the detriment of this Province and yet he has persisting in the debate to make

this position. I do not know what we should do. Perhaps we should ask him to remove himself from the House. But, Mr. Chairman, it is wrong to allow misinformation to be spread around by any hon. member.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I was hoping the Minister of Finance would stay close at hand because I had a couple of questions to put to him. Does the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) have a parliamentary secretary?

MR. TULK:

I do not know. He has some people working at something. I do not know.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, it is an unusual circumstance that we have here a Supplementary Supply Bill and we do not have in the Chamber anybody who is directly responsible for that bill, either a minister or a parliamentary secretary, or even the junior Minister of Career Development. Do you have some responsibility for this?

MR. POWER:

I am definitely responsible for (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister in introducing the supply bill back on October 25 indicated that once the resolution is through the Committee and through the House, "We would then," he says, "close out the budget process for 1984/85." I am not sure that is

the case, Mr. Chairman. I submit to him that once we pass this bill the process is still unfinished because the House has no accounting which would assure it that the process has been complete. I am looking at the estimates for 1985/86, the first statement in the forward part of that publication which gives a summary of borrowing requirements and sources of funds.

I would submit to the minister, if he had taken the interest to drop into the Chamber for this particular exercise, I would submit to him that before the process is complete he owes it to the House, he owes it to his accountability to the House, to give the House an updated statement, a statement which reconciles the additional amounts, the amounts have been acquired by the government through Special Warrant and for which the government now seeks parliamentary approval. Before the process for 1984/85 is complete, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have to have a revised statement of the summary of borrowing requirements and sources of funds. That is one of the issues that I would like to put to the minister if he were in the Chamber. And I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, that it is even appropriate to continue this particular discussion without the responsible minister in the House, Mr. Speaker.

If it is in order, Mr. Speaker, I would move we rise and report progress. The motion is always in order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the

Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I am not sure on this. I think the Chair will need to check it, whether the procedural motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, which is essentially what it is, whether it is in order or it is a procedural motion which can only come from a House Leader. I do not know. But I think it would be a matter the Chair might want to check. I recall it came up once before but I do not know what the ruling was.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage, on a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, on the point raised by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, I am not wanting to put the Committee into any kind of a procedural hassle. I think perhaps the objective was achieved, I now see in the wings the distinguished Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and I would graciously and on the good advice of my dear friend for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) withdraw the motion without prejudice and proceed.

I was saying earlier when I could not see the minister, but I am sure he was hanging on to every word while he was getting himself a cup of coffee, that I would hope he would see fit to supply to the House, before this motion is expedited here in the Chamber, with a revised summary of borrowing requirements and sources of funds so that the House could get an up-to-date picture of where we stand now that these extra

amounts have been approved through Special Warrants, amounts totalling \$56 million and some dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a particular question for the minister and again I repeat that this process tends to be quite empty if you are giving your questions in a vacuum. I understood that this in committee stage would best be served if we had somebody could respond to individual questions.

Now, I could proceed to orate on Clause 54, another subjects, but I would prefer at this particular time to get some specific answers to specific questions. One of the questions I wanted to raise relates to the minister's comments when he introduced the bill. I am looking at Hansard for October 25, page 2515, he made reference to a warrant involving the Department of Development totalling \$3.4 million and there is an amount of about \$810,000 that the minister did not account there for. I wonder if he would indicate to the House what that amount was for? He does account for \$2.5 million for capital funding for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and \$90,000 to meet the Province's obligations under a federal/provincial agreement but there is another \$810,000 that he has not accounted for and I would hope that he would do that.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, if he were in the Chamber, how much of the amounts obtained through Special Warrants, the amount totalling \$56 million, how much of that amount was current and how much was capital? Indirectly in his statement to the House on

October 25 he gives, implicitly you can extrapolate that certain amounts are capital and current but I would like to see a full breakdown. You cannot get it from his statement, even by going through it and trying to add up bits and pieces. I would invite him to tell the House what part of it is current and what part of it is capital.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, for this period I think my friend for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) wants to have a go at matters so I will yield to him in a moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
The hon. member's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There are a number of items I am very interested in with relation to this but I heard something today that maybe I could tell the House about because it is sort of an interesting analogy, I guess, with respect to something that has been a topic in the House for the last period of time. I have heard the comment made that where we generally consider FFTs to be factory freezer trawlers, I have heard the alternate definition, with your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, it stands for Feckless Federal Tories and the rational, I was told, behind that was that these FFTs we are talking about, have, in dealing with Premier, frozen his effectiveness, they have fowled his mind, they have tied his fins and removed his guts all at the same time, just in

relation to that only.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You are bad 'boy' you are.

MR. WARREN:  
Are we supposed to laugh or what?

MR. KELLAND:  
No, that is serious. The hon. member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) is paid not to laugh, we understand that.

We are talking about fairly substantial expenditures of the taxpayer's dollars and over the past number of weeks, in fact perhaps months, I could not help but notice in the printed media a real proliferation of paid newspaper advertising, Mr. Chairman. That is fine because in a general sense that provides an awful lot of information to the citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador. But there is one thing that really stands out about this newspaper advertising programme, and that is it costs quite a few dollars. It is an area in which I have some expertise with respect to the costs of newspaper advertising. And, almost exclusively, when these advertisings appear in newspapers, something like 50 per cent of the available ad space is taken up with a photograph of the particular minister and his name and title.

Now, to put that in more simple terms, let us say a particular ad in one newspaper costs \$100; \$50 of that is devoted to giving the message to the people of the Province, the other 50 per cent is used to portray a photograph of the responsible minister, giving his name and title. I think that is a gross misuse of public funds, no question about it. If someone



said, 'Are you, member for Naskaupi, arguing that we would take some dollars away from the newspaper trade?' I would say no. Because if you had a \$100 ad, \$50 of which is devoted to information to the general public, why not put two pieces of information out, making more effective use of the dollars, and delete the picture of the minister? I mean, it is out and out propaganda. There is no question that it is gross misuse of public money to make some of the ministers look better. I would say some of the photographs require a fair bit of retouching, of course, before they are presented to the newspaper media to use in the first place.

MR. TULK:  
Including the Minister of Forestry.

MR. KELLAND:  
Oh, we would have to include him. The hairdo does it all, you know.

I would like to get some information on how many dollars were devoted to that newspaper propaganda campaign, the total column inches and so on, how much of that actually contained a message of vital importance to the people of the Province, and how much was devoted to the photographs of the various ministers and their names and titles? That is propaganda and a gross misuse of public funds, in my opinion.

Some other interesting things came up during the debate. There were some questions raised with respect to duplication of effort and another waste of public funds in which many times, a minister who will hold a press conference, let us say, in St. John's, and would have a parliamentary secretary

charter an aircraft, with the attending expenses related to that, to make a simultaneous statement, for example, in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Naskaupi district, Labrador.

The response to that from the government side was simply that the idea was to bring Labrador closer -

MR. BAIRD:  
Were you on that trip?

MR. KELLAND:  
No, I was not on that trip.

MR. BAIRD:  
You could not make it.

MR. KELLAND:  
That is quite correct. I stated that in the House already.

You know, the idea was to bring Labrador and Newfoundland closer together by making Labrador feel part of the whole thing by having a parliamentary secretary or some other assistant to a minister go into Labrador and make the statement. However, interestingly enough, if that was the effort and that was truly the real reason and it does not have any political overtones, then I suppose that is acceptable, except that at a slightly later time, in trying to weld the two regions of the Province together by actions like this, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), for example, then destroyed that little bit of cohesion that the other minister indicated they were trying to achieve. He drove a wedge between the two parts of the Province and created some public controversy by deciding to ship the Canadian beer into Labrador.

I can tell you, of course, that

not that many people up in Naskaupi district are going to send the beer back, or anything like that, and I would not suggest that they would. Because, when it comes to that sort of thing, we are talking about the short end of the stick for our part of the Province anyway when dealing with that particular question, because of the long season and the fact that those products have to be shipped in in the Fall and stay there. They are not in very good condition after the first couple of months. But the point is, despite the cohesive effort outlined by one minister that we go to Labrador and make simultaneous press statements, at the very same time, we create controversy and ill-feeling, as was witnessed on many of the television clips that we did see, that a wedge was driven there between Newfoundland and Labrador by supplying one part of the Province with a product that the other part could not have or vice versa, as far as that part of it goes.

I find it difficult to understand still the question of simultaneous press statements. In one particular instance that related to one member of the House, for example, he represents a Labrador seat and like me he has the same number of trips to his district which are cost recoverable and added to that, and for very flimsy reasons, in my mind, he also has many additional trips, or has the potential for having many additional trips into Labrador at public expense.

The recoverable part of the twelve trips that members are allowed to their districts, of course, relates, let us say in my case, to straight airfare and airfare only

and very little beyond that. However, on a so-called "Government business trip" there are many other attending expenses, accommodations, meals and heavens knows what, a particular Parliamentary Secretary might involved himself with as regard to expenses.

So there are those considerations that we would have to look at. There must be more effective use of that money, as in the case of the newspaper advertising propaganda campaign and also in these simultaneous press statements when frequently, perhaps not always for various reasons, the government's information service would certainly do as well and cost that much less for any one particular piece of information.

When I spoke in the debate earlier on I was about to get to housing when my time was expiring and I wonder if I still have a minute or two, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

One minute.

MR. KELLAND:

I did not get to address that particular question. But based on the information the minister gave me at that time or in some Question Period, the annual Fall survey of housing needs - do you have that, if I could ask the minister? Have you received that yet for this year?

MR. DINN:

I do not normally receive them but I could have a look for them.

MR. KELLAND:

Well I was just wondering if there was some accessibility to it, Mr. Chairman, the Fall survey which

would either have been completed or in the process of being completed right now.

I thank the minister, by the way, for promising the small funding grant there for the committee which is now in place and I will be corresponding with the minister within the next day or so about that.

There has been quite a sharp increase in the demand on available housing. Simply I can say that in Happy Valley - Goose Bay in particular there is no available vacant housing. We have a situation now generated in the South side, former base area, in which, I believe, it might be that they are reserving or allowing normal transfers and so on to create vacancies which they are holding perhaps for military use or the expanded use of the airport. But, beyond that, there is no available subsidized housing. We have forty-eight units, I believe, in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. All of them are filled and there is a sharp demand on them over and above the one that was reported back in October, 1984. Beyond that are those owned by the corporation, they are also economic units and none of those are vacant either.

So I would like to suggest that in the course of events and the activities within that responsibility by the minister that a fair bit of consideration is going to have to be given to what they are going to do about, what we call now and are calling, a housing crisis in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak for a few minutes in this debate. I have been anxiously looking forward to having an opportunity to participate but I have been waiting for something to be said. I must admit not much has been said. The general rules of debate would allow for -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
A quorum call.

MR. SIMMS:  
Do hon. members wish to call a quorum?

Mr. Chairman, that is another interesting point. Hon. members opposite are well aware of the fact that in debate people are in the common room and they are well within earshot.

MR. TULK:  
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman's most eloquent speech, but I wonder if the government whip could get his people in to listen to him. We are all going to stay here to

listen to him.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is well aware of a parliamentary fact, and that is that people are in the common room here, in the common room over there, they are within earshot and I am quite satisfied. I speak to put it on the record more than anything else. Now Mr. Chairman, to continue, if I may. Somehow hon. members opposite get all wound up when I stand up to speak. I do not know why. I mean, why do they want to interrupt me and harass me? I am usually very quiet when they speak, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I will rule on that point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

I thought you had. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FLIGHT:

If we have to suffer through this, the rest should have to suffer through it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order we do have a quorum in this hon. House. However, I do think hon. members should be in the chamber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is right! That is right!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister for Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I will not comment on that. It is your ruling so it is acceptable.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, did I just see the hon. the member for Grand Falls shake his head at the chair and say, "No, no you are wrong?"

MR. FLIGHT:

Yes, he did.

MR. TULK:

Is he questioning the Chair?

MR. SIMMS:

Are hon. members getting silly over there or what? This must be the silly season.

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister is becoming arrogant and showing no respect.

MR. TULK:

The arrogance of the man.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. members cannot stand to hear anybody speak but themselves. I would like to have silence, Mr. Chairman, so that I can carry on. I only have a few minutes remaining.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member requests silence, please.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to participate in the debate for a number of reasons over the last few days, because I have had the chance to watch members opposite perform. I looked with some interest at the performance of the Leader of the Opposition in the last few days, in particular, and I thought the analogy in the

newspaper today, when a letter writer compared the Leader of the Opposition to Greg Malone and felt that he and Greg Malone should put on a show at the LSPU Hall, was very well put and very well described the Leader of the Opposition.

I noticed that in that same article a number of members in the House were cited for their behavior. I gather that the member for Menihek has done an investigation and has not been able to find out who wrote the letter. He thought it might be 'Lynn Verge's' mother, or 'Walter Carter's' mother, it was not his. In any event, Mr. Chairman, I think hon. members opposite should pay attention to those kinds of comments that are written in the papers because they are comments that are written by people who watch the parliamentary process.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I also want to comment on the observations of the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) who insists that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) be in his seat before he asks his questions. Well, Mr. Chairman, everybody is aware of the fact that in the common rooms and in the wings there are microphones and P.A. systems and everything else.

MR. FLIGHT:  
And bugs.

MR. SIMMS:  
I think hon. members are paranoid about the bug, by the way. But everybody is well aware that people are within earshot and they can hear everything that is being said, and I am sure that the Minister of Finance will address the questions.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:  
Your Honour ruled a few minutes ago that it was not good enough for people to be sitting in the common rooms and that if they are going to be in attendance in the House, then they have to be in the House. Now, he is indirectly questioning the ruling of the Chair by pointing out that the Minister of Finance or other ministers do not have to be in the House to answer questions on their Cabinet positions or on Bills that they have before this House. Now, he is indirectly questioning the Chair and I would ask the Chair to pay close attention to him.

MR. BAIRD:  
Sit down! Sit down!

MR. TULK:  
The arrogance of that minister is beyond belief!

MR. FLIGHT:  
He brazenly chastised the Chairman, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
There is no point of order. The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, hon. members opposite, as I said, cannot stand to hear anybody else speak in debate, they figure they should monopolize it. It is a fact that members do not have to be in their seat, they can be in the common room, they can be

meeting with delegations from the member for Fogo's district, and they frequently do. All the Chairman said was that in his opinion members, if they are here, should be in the House. In the House means the confines of the House, which includes the common room, Mr. Chairman.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, all we have heard in the last two days is a bunch of nonsense from members opposite. Now the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) spent ten minutes, if not twenty minutes - I know he was up on one occasion and all he talked about was 'ne pas' or 'nes pas' or 'neux pas' or whatever it was. I do not even know what it was he was trying to say. I pity the people up in Hansard. Generally speaking, the man uses a good bit of gusto when he is speaking in this House. He certainly did not use it today. His heart is not in it and I suspect that he is deflated considerably by the performance of members opposite, in particular his Leader and in particular, the House Leader, who, I gather, has had words with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) recently over the House Leader's (Mr. tulk) decision to take the Liberal Opposition out of the House the other day during Question Period. I gather that is something that did not sit well with the Leader of the Opposition. I understand that he and the Leader of the Opposition had words. That is the sort of thing that is going on over there, so the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) could not think of anything else to talk about other than the definition of the word 'negotiate' or 'ne pas' or whatever it was. I mean, I do not know what he was talking about, and I am sure nobody else

does, so I cannot respond to those kinds of comments.

The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), what did he get up and talk about? The member for Naskaupi got up and criticized the government for taking out advertisements with a photograph of the minister in them. 'What a waste of money.' That silly, silly comment was his opening speech. The member for Naskaupi talking about a waste of money because ministers have their pictures in newspaper ads or something. I mean, how silly, Mr. Chairman, and that coming from a gentleman who, by the way, owns and operates a newspaper up in Naskaupi district.

MR. WARREN:

No!

MR. SIMMS:

And government takes out a fair number of ads in his paper on occasion, I gather.

MR. BAKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the minister is inaccurate. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) does not own and operate a newspaper in the district. I think the hon. minister should check his facts before he makes statements like this. In his usual fashion, he is simply running off at the mouth, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KELLAND:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On a point of privilege, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I was in the Common Room, as the hon. member describes, and I certainly do not believe that at all. On a point of privilege I would like to clarify his statement which is utterly false, as it happens.

MR. BAKER:

He is wrong, as many others.

MR. KELLAND:

It is not an unusual circumstance.

Mr. Chairman, for your information I am not employed by the company or the newspaper he speaks of. Sometime before the actual election I resigned from my position as editor, which I held at the time, and I also resigned from my position as vice-president of the firm. I resigned from both those positions. Following that, with the assistance of a lawyer I disposed of all my shares and I now have absolutely no connection with the firm whatsoever,

MR. SIMMS:

No connection?

MR. KELLAND:

If you would like to get into some personal information, I could do that for you, if that is your job. I have absolutely no connection nor do I own or have any input into any newspaper in this Province and I would like to make that point clear. I am sure the hon. minister will respect that.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, to the point of privilege, if I may?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMS:

I meant nothing by it in a derogatory sense. I gather his family is somehow still connected with it, operates the paper.

MR. TULK:

What difference does that make?.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, he says he has no connection whatsoever. I mean, obviously if his family operates the paper it is still a connection. I was not trying to make a big deal out of it, but the hon. member obviously is very touchy about it.

MR. KELLAND:

I am not upset in the least.

MR. SIMMS:

I accept the member's word if he says he does not own and operate it.

MR. TULK:

You have to.

MR. SIMMS:

No, because he said he has no connection. Now, I would not say that is exactly correct. If some member of his family is operating the paper, then he has a connection with the paper. There is no big deal. It is a moot point, but it is no big deal.

In the meantime, since he has raised it, maybe he can tell me if he has no connection and no involvement -

MR. TULK:

Is he making a speech or is he asking questions?

MR. SIMMS:

I am speaking to the point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

He is speaking to the point of privilege.

MR. SIMMS:

For clarification, if he has no involvement and no connection at all, would it be fair to ask him whether or not on behalf of the paper he was involved in making some enquiries at the town hall in Happy Valley - Goose Bay about town councillors and their attendance at meetings, and things of that nature, which information was subsequently published in his former paper? Perhaps he could answer that, and then I will believe for sure he has no connection.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I am not sure whether the procedure is that I have to answer questions, Mr. Chairman, in that regard. However, on the point of privilege I would first of all like to ask the minister, he is a gentleman I assume, to withdraw the comment that I own and operate a newspaper.

MR. SIMMS:

I already said I accept your word on that.

MR. KELLAND:

But I would like for you to withdraw that.

MR. SIMMS:

I did not say anything to withdraw. I said I accept your

word.

MR. KELLAND:

I am asking that he withdraw or apologize for a statement that has no substantiation in fact. I have some other comments to make after, but I would directly ask that he withdraw that particular remark because it is not true.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I indicated earlier that I accepted the hon. member's word. I did not say anything unparliamentary, so it is not necessary to withdraw it. It is silly.

MR. TULK:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What a waste of time. What a waste of time!

MR. SIMMS:

They just want to eat up my time.

MR. TULK:

Oh, there he goes!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands categorically made a statement in this House which is false, and it was to the effect that the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) owned and operated - it was not to the



effect, those were his words - owned and operated a newspaper.

Now, if those words are correct, then he should be a gentleman and not just accept the word of the member for Naskaupi, he has a duty as a parliamentarian - it is becoming debatable whether he is or not. We used to think he was at one time, he was Speaker in this House - to stand up and say, "Since it was incorrect, I accept the word of the hon. gentleman and withdraw the statement."

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMS:

A point of privilege is whether or not there is a prima facie case, a prima facie breach of privileges of the House. That certainly is not evident here. I made a statement that I understood to be correct. The hon. member got up and corrected it and I said, "That is fine, I accept your statement." I have no argument with him. If he says he does not own or operate a paper, that is perfectly acceptable to me. But it is silly to ask for withdrawals. That is irrelevant.

MR. TULK:

Sure you should withdraw it. If you were a gentleman you would, but you are not.

MR. SIMMS:

Do not be so silly.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I am not particularly upset with the minister. I came back in, really, to straighten him out on a statement that he made which was incorrect. It is as simple as that. In a similar situation, I believe just a purely personal ethic would make me withdraw that sort of a statement. Having accepted my word, if the position e reversed and I accepted his word, I certainly would apologize and withdraw the statement. But that is just a purely personal ethic which perhaps the minister is not that familiar with.

With respect to the other comments on whether or not I have a connection, we do not generally, in my opinion at least, or my understanding, discuss personal family matters. But if some members opposite would like to get into that particular arena, I certainly have lots of information in that regard not particularly related to this case in question at the moment. You can find out, of course, by going to the Registry of Deeds who the owners are and things like that, but I am not the owner of the paper and I do not operate it. With respect to the question that the minister also asked, was I not in the town hall researching something for the newspaper - was it something like that? - in the recent municipal election.

MR. SIMMS:

The attendance of councillors at meetings, and things like that, which subsequently appeared in the paper.

MR. TULK:

Yes, that it true.

MR. KELLAND:

I can just respond in this regard. In recent times and, in fact, on a number of personal occasions, at least two, I have gone to town council meetings and I have requested certain information from the town council such as, 'Would you please supply me with copies of the minutes, once adopted, from each meeting so I can be better able to represent you in the House of Assembly?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Now, I have done that verbally when I visited the council in session, and I have done it in writing, as well, which can quite easily be tabled if the minister would like to read some good correspondence.

The other point is that recently I raised some questions with respect to housing with the minister responsible for housing (Mr. Dinn). I was in the town office, as I frequently am when I am in town - I do not know how other members do this, but I go there quite often - and I was researching a question to do with some housing information, whether or not the question of housing had been raised because of the crisis that I believe now exists in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, a simple matter. Now, a defeated councillor, as it turned out Tuesday, a former President of the Naskaupi P.C. Association, who, by the way, if I can say so, doubled his popular vote in 1985 - in 1984 he got something like 258 votes in a general election, this time he got 506 votes in the municipal election. I had nothing to do with any research of statistical information for the

paper but was researching a housing matter which I had hoped and will still address with the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn). I hope that is satisfactory to the minister who raised the question.

MR. SIMMS:

No, the hon. member raised the point of privilege, not me. There is no point of privilege.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman, I still think the question of a point of privilege has been brought up before the Committee and it is not resolved. I did not hear all that went on, but it seems to me, and I just offer this as a side comment, that there is absolutely no question of a point of privilege. I think the main point is that a point of privilege cannot be settled in Committee. If there is a point of privilege, it has to go back to the House, it has to go back to the Speaker.

Now, I would like to suggest that things got a little bit off track here and rather than go through all that hassle, perhaps the hon. members who brought up the point of privilege would now agree to take it back and bring it up as a point of order or whatever. But it seems to have been settled because so much conversation has gone on. But certainly if a point of privilege is put to Your Honour, Your Honour cannot rule on it, he will have to call in the Speaker and ask the Speaker to settle it, but that does not seem to be necessary.

MR. KELLAND:

Could I just make one more comment, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I apologize, Mr. Minister, in that I am not familiar with that point you raised there with regard to procedure. However, whether it is a point of privilege or a point of order, I simply wanted to get it on record that what the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands was, if not implying, really stating, was false information and I would like to have that on the record.

MR. TULK:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Let me say this to the hon. gentleman, that he is perfectly right. Obviously the Chairman must have missed the little point but that is fair enough. He is obviously right. Now let me say to my friend from Naskaupi that he too is absolutely right in that he raised this point of privilege at the earliest opportunity. If he wishes to make it a point of order, he has clarified the point, then, of course, we would be prepared to do that in the interest of saving time in the House.

MR. KELLAND:

It does not matter. I am satisfied it is in the record. If the minister does not have the personal ethic to withdraw or apologize, that is fine. Let it go at that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wish to advise all hon. members there are three questions for the Late Show, one by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to the Premier regarding comments made by Captain Morrissey Johnson, one by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) to the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) with regard to FFTs, and one by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) concerning 1,100 temporary positions filled without competition.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First off I want to thank the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) for the report today on the Arts Council. It is very good to see that they have put together a good report which tells about a number of initiatives that they have taken this year. I am very pleased to see it. I will be looking at it very, very closely and probably asking the minister for an evaluation. I am sure that he is looking forward to my questions which I will have for him very shortly.

I must get on to a matter that I think is very important concerning this debate. There is going to be a conference this weekend in Stephenville, The International Year of the Youth Conference, which is probably going to be one of the bigger ones held in recent years. The Conference is going to be dealing with problems with youth unemployment, problems with youth training, etc. and some

initiatives that should be taking place. My first words would be to invite any interested members to get on a good flight to Stephenville and come over and take in this conference, because it would be very educational for a lot of people here in the House of Assembly and a lot of people in Newfoundland and Labrador. The conference is going to have about 150 delegates from all across Newfoundland and Labrador, and it is going to have about fifty resource people who will be initiating discussions and who will be participating in seminars and so on for the two days.

It is going to be a good conference. I have talked with one of the organizers in the last number of weeks, Mr. Neil Tilley, in Stephenville, and they are doing a very, very good job of organizing it and I am sure that all members of this House of Assembly are going to be very interested in finding out the information that comes out of it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Michelle Snow is one of the organizers.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Michelle Snow is one of the organizers. It is good to see that the Culture, Recreation and Youth Minister (Mr. Matthews) is well aware of that. I am very glad to see that. They are doing a very good job over there. I am hoping to see some good initiatives come out of it, some answers to some questions, and, I suppose, some problems that could be solved and some solutions that could come out of it. There is going to be, from what I have heard, a lot of good discussion on a lot of major problems that have affected youth over the last

number of years. It will give a kind of direction to youth in this Province. I want to bring to the attention of this House today, as part of this debate, that as many members as possible get interested in it and try to attend it or to get some information related to it.

Again it is going to be quite good, it is going to be held in that great municipality of Stephenville, one which is now becoming a great host of conferences and which will in the future be even more of a host. I ask any hon. members who would like to come over that they are quite welcome to come to Stephenville. I would also like to thank the organizations that have given grants to the conference because I remember attending a conference in Islington, I believe, earlier this Summer and there was no money given to that one. So it is nice to see that the department has learned its lesson anyway and tried to provide some funding. That is good to see, I like to see learning being done by certain departments.

I think that youth in this Province are starting to take more initiatives on their own to try to get some of the problems that they have solved and this is one of the ways, in having a conference, and listening to people who have been through it all. This is one of the ways that we can help solve some of these problems. As a matter of fact there was a conference in Stephenville a couple of weeks ago, the Youth Advisory Council had a conference there on the West Coast and elected some representatives. It was a very good meeting. I attended, and they were very good. A presentation was made by

a representative of the Royal Commission On Unemployment and he talked about some of the career decisions that young people will have to make in the future. It was quite a good conference and this one here is a follow-up to that. I think it bodes well for young people on this Island that they have a lot of initiative and it is now starting to be shown through these meetings.

There are a number of major problems with youth in this Province and as we talk about money being allotted to different departments, I would like to see more money being allotted to youth on this Island, especially with the problems that they have with unemployment and training. I think there are a number of recommendations that were made by the Newfoundland Youth Advisory Council in 1982 on problems on how to solve employment. I think that these should be whole-heartedly taken into account by the present administration and some action being taken on these. I say that whole-heartedly to the minister and to hon. members opposite because you cannot have, no matter what anybody says, an unemployment rate of 35 or 40 per cent for an age group of sixteen to twenty-four. You just cannot have it. People now are becoming desperate and they are becoming, I think, their spirit is starting to be killed so we over here are going to try and bring it to your attention. We are bring it to your attention and we will continue to do so over the next number of years. It is time, I think, that more emphasis was placed on youth employment and youth training in this Province.

The problems are enormous and, as I say, they are becoming major

problems. The initiative being taken in Stephenville this Summer by youth in this Island is a good one. I am looking forward to attending this conference and I will be back in this House next week. I have been invited, as a matter of fact, to attend and I am going to be there. I will be bringing back to this House some of the things that I have learned from that conference for the hon. members of this House of Assembly who have the power to try to solve some of the problems for youth in this Province. I am going to make sure that they are brought to your attention because you just cannot have, as I said, what has gone on over the last number of years with the unemployment rate for that age group going up and up and up. We cannot have that. I think that all members of this House are aware of that. It is time for the administration to start doing something about it.

I again look forward to this conference. The organizers have a great number of speakers who are going to be there. I believe there is going to be there a great number of young people who have taken initiatives on their own. A number of reports are going to be presented, and we are going to try to get as much publicity about the meeting as possible all over the Island so that people are aware of the problems that youth have to face and some of the solutions that will be brought forward.

The Youth Advisory Council will be participating in this, and I have to say, have done a very good job with the funding that they have had. They have not had very much. I am going to be pressing the minister to give more moneys to the Youth Advisory Council.

MR. MATTHEWS:

They do not have very much, do they?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

No, they do not have very much. I do not even want to mention the amount.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A little low is it?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

In response to the minister, to whom I do not normally respond because of his questions, one/twenty-ninth of the funding in his Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, goes to Youth. Well, his department's name should be Culture, Culture, Culture, Recreation, Recreation, twenty times. He should either get rid of the name, put it somewhere else; if you are not going to address the problems of youth or give it enough funding or whatever, you should not have it there. In Culture, Recreation and Youth, one-third is supposed to go to Youth. One/twenty-ninth of the funding goes to Youth. So when the minister asks me how much money the Youth Advisory Council is getting, I say they are getting nothing compared to what they should be getting.

MR. DECKER:

They cannot get any money from Cabinet.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Well, there are a lot of things you cannot get from Cabinet. But there is a number of things. That Youth Advisory Council is a very effective organization. It could be a lot more effective, mind you, if they were given the proper funding.

I have put that to the minister

before and I am sure that he has been looking into it diligently over the Summer, trying to figure out how he can allot more funding to this organization. Because they are a very effective organization and they have spoken out on the problems of youth on this Island. As a matter of fact, they made a very good presentation to the Senate Committee which appeared here this Summer and in Ottawa. I was there at the presentation. I followed their presentation very closely. They had some good ideas there. Again, they encompass the youth of this Island in a lot of ways and I seriously hope that the hon. the minister will consider their views very carefully and bring them to the Cabinet Table where they can be discussed in a proper manner. I do not think they have been addressed, and I would suggest to the minister that he place more emphasis on the Youth Advisory Council and their concerns. They have, again, brought many concerns to the eyes of many people and this conference, I think, will be a good start, a kind of reawakening, I am hoping, for people on this Island to the fact that the youth of this Island have a lot of initiative and that they are trying to do something about their problems, but they are going to need a lot of help.

I will clue up here now.

MR. MATTHEWS:

(Inaudible) go on.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Not only that, it is a very constructive speech, as far as I am concerned. I must say, I am very constructive today, as I usually am. I am just letting the minister know that if he does not give more emphasis to the Youth

Advisory Council and the concerns of youth in this Province, this is one MHA who will be looking for him here in the House of Assembly to ask him some good, strong, pertinent, constructive questions. I will just leave that with him.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Before I start what I want to say, I would like to point out that during the last speech, which was an excellent speech, I looked around the House and it just brought to my mind a comment made in a letter to the editor recently in The Evening Telegram. The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) was listening to the speech. I was listening to the speech. But outside of that, I think that most hon. members were engaging in loud conversation. It gives a bad impression to people who observe the goings on of the House.

I would like to comment on one issue and I would like to make a plea to Cabinet. There are quite a few Cabinet members here now who can provide more money for two particular endeavours in this Province. One of them is the Department of Social Services and the other is the Department

responsible for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. I have recently run into several problems that relate to those two departments.

First of all, I would like to say Mr. Chairman, that there are people in this Province that are starving. As a matter of fact, in the Town of Gander, that was normally considered to be a very prosperous town, there are actually people starving and until you actually visit and see those people, it does not really strike you. It is rather easy for ministers in government to sit back and make their callous and cold decisions, but you go visit some of the people in this Province who are actually starving. There are a variety of circumstances that are leading to this. I know that some of the ministers are very aware of this and concerned about it.

First of all, the Department of Social Services that has guidelines to follow and people apply to the Department of Social Services and they have to go through a procedure in order to get assistance. There is such a thing as emergency assistance to take up an immediate slack, but they have their rules and procedures. One particular family, for instance Mr. Chairman, that I ran into had contacted Social Services and not really knowing the ins and outs of the operation. The man of the family had done a few hours of part time work in the last two or three weeks and he was simply told that before they could be processed and it could be deciding whether they could be funded under Social Services that really he had to provide the cheque stubs for the work that he had done over the

last ninety days.

If that had been me, I would have pushed, but this individual just took that as a rejection simply because he did not have the cheque stubs for eight hours work that he did the week before. He went to try to get the cheque and was told that it would be another week before the cheque was processed. He had to wait for his cheque before he could get his cheque stub and there he was - stuck. I know their rules and regulations but I think that in some cases an attempt should be made to kind to get around or hurry up these rules and regulations. That gentleman had a family, a wife and three children. The woman told me that in the three days previous, all she had had to eat was one slice of bread because any food that they could get from other people and so on they gave to the children, this kind of thing. It was a very serious situation.

I contacted the necessary people and the Department of Social Services responded very quickly when I contacted them, all kinds of co-operation, very helpful, provided the family with a supply of fuel and emergency assistance for food. I found out that several days later they contacted the place of employment and got the cheque stubs, the amounts and got the prospects for the months ahead and that family is now on Social Assistance. The problem is that for a number of days that family was starving - there were people starving.

The connection between that and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is this family was living in a N.L.H.C. house. The house was a duplex and on the outside, I must say, it looks like

a nice house. The problem is when you walk into the house, and when I walked in, they had run out of oil and had no heat, I could feel the wind, the movement of air across the living room. Mr. Chairman, the window was not opened, everything was closed up tight and yet the leakage of cold air into that particular building meant that even if the furnace were on, it would be difficult to heat the house, which is kind of strange. I contacted the Minister responsible for N.L.H.C. and he informed me they are in the process of going around and tightening up these houses. They have not gotten around to Gander yet and I assume, in the near future, they will. But the point that I would like to make to the Minister responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing (Mr. Dinn) is this, that perhaps building large duplexes is not quite what should be done in some areas. Perhaps, in areas where there is a concentration of people who require NLHC houses, what the minister should look at is more, let us say, two bedroom apartment buildings, something along those lines, that are very easy to heat and would not require the tremendous expenditures of money during the Winter. So perhaps a little more stress has to be put on apartment building-type NLHC construction. It is something, I presume, the minister has looked into in the past and has considered.

Anyway, going one step further, this family is now on social assistance. However, Mr. Chairman, that family during the Winter will have to make a choice between being warm and eating. In this day and age for a family to have to make that kind of choice, because to heat that home is going



to take at least \$300 a month in fuel, at least and in order to come up with \$300 a month in fuel they are going to have to stop buying food. That is the only way to do it. Or not pay their light bill in which their power gets cut off and they cannot operate their furnace. So it is a Catch 22 situation.

The reason is that with social services there is no special consideration given to the extra heating costs in situations like that. I think that for people in Labrador there is. But for people in parts of the Island that experience these conditions there is no special heating allowance or an extra heating allowance given. I think that this is something that has to be looked at by the Department of Social Services. I realize that they try to make their funds go as far as they can make them go and that is admirable. Perhaps they need more money. I do not know. Maybe other members of the Cabinet can loosen up the purse strings. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) over there can loosen up the purse strings and find a way to give them a little bit more money so they can increase the fuel allowance because the cost of fuel is horrendous.

MR. J. CARTER:

What about international status?

MR. BAKER:

The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is sitting back there listening. I am not sure if he is listening but he is shouting out, "What about international status?" That kind of response shocks me. It really does.

I am talking about a human problem that should be the concern of

members opposite, that should be something that they worry about when there are actually people starving and freezing in this Province and right away he makes fun of the whole situation, "What about international status?".

I can talk about international status and in my next ten minute segment or my next eight or ten ten minute segments over the next number of weeks I will probably deal with that issue. But right now I think that the people who are starving and freezing in this Province are a much more important issue.

In conclusion, I think that the excellent work done by the Department of Social Services needs to be augmented a bit. I think that they need to consider extra fuel allowance, especially in government housing. It is impossible to heat the place, at least until NLHC can get along to fixing up the houses and making sure that the houses do not require tremendous amounts of heat. NLHC does not allow wood stoves. Some of the people would perhaps use wood stoves and get their own wood but they are not allowed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not down our way. There is no wood.

MR. BAKER:

Well, that is your problem. Out my way there are tons of wood.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Chairman, since I did not get much of an opportunity to say what I was going to say the last time I was up because of the point of privilege that seemed to go on and on and on, I just want to speak for another few minutes before the Late Show and offer some comment or try to offer some comment to the debate.

I listened with some interest to the member for Gander -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
That is unusual.

MR. SIMMS:  
No, it is not unusual as a matter of fact. I have a certain amount of respect for the member for Gander. Indeed I think he is probably one of the more sincere members in the House. I say that with sincerity myself.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
No, I do not. I do not. I think the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) is one of those members who sincerely believes when he speaks about an issue that he is right and that he is correct and that he is expressing an opinion that he has garnered, I suppose, through experiences that he has had as a municipal councillor and now as an MHA. So I do have some respect for what he had to say and I did listen intently to what he had to say.

In fact, I can confirm as a member for the last six or seven years that I have had occasions to deal with situations like that. I would not say they were numerous, I mean, to the extent that perhaps the member for Gander tried to lead us to believe. But there are certainly examples and there are certainly situations such as that that he described.

My understanding of the situation is that the Department of Social Services, while they may not have a specific allowance to allow for an increase in fuel costs or whatever, I think they do consider each case individually as it is brought to their attention. At least that has been my particular experience. I must say there have been some occasions where we were successful in an appeal to the department. There are others where we did not have as much success.

But I agree with you that a certain amount of sympathy should be shown to those people and as much as can be done, should be done by the department.

I would hasten to add, by the way, in listening to the debate though that when the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) interjected and asked if the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) would comment on international status, I do not believe he was in any way, shape or form downgrading or trying to put down what the hon. member was talking about. I suspect, as I felt myself, the hon. member had made your point and now, since he had a few minutes left, perhaps he might like to talk about another subject that I know is very dear to his heart and soul. So in defence of the member for St. John's North, who really needs no defence of

course, I have to offer that as a possible answer to the reason for the interjection.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to get back - I only have a couple of minutes - to the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) and what he had to say in this debate. I accept as I said the fact that he does not own or operate a newspaper. That is fine. I accept that. I have no problem. I withdraw it or I apologize, it does not matter. The point I was trying to make is that the hon. member certainly owned and operated a paper then, let us put it that way. And to criticize the fact that government takes out newspaper advertising and so on -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
Oh, yes. He was talking about the waste. Because of the picture, well I mean it does not cost an awful lot of more money to put a picture. The hon. member is not allowing anybody to speak.

MR. KELLAND:  
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. KELLAND:  
I hate to see a minister go through life as misguided as the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) appears to be. I think he is much more knowledgeable than he tries to pretend in the House of Assembly. He has to be, of course. In actual fact my complaint was not with the fact that messages were being given and money being spent with newspaper, which is a viable

industry here in our Province, I did not say that at all. I said that approximately 50 per cent of all the ad space was taken up with pictures of ministers either, pre perm days or post perm days, it does not make any difference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:  
And quite a bit of space, you know. I said at that time that if you were to consider, as an example, a \$100 ad-

MR. SIMMS:  
The time is up, Mr. Chairman, it is 5:30.

MR. KELLAND:  
- \$50 was being spent for valuable information to the electorate and \$50-

MR. SIMMS:  
You did not mind soliciting them, did you not?

MR. KELLAND:  
- for the perm, you know. Come on now, \$50 worth of curls.

MR. SIMMS:  
You did not mind soliciting them.

MR. KELLAND:  
That is all I was saying, you understand. If you multiply that by the many hundreds of ads and say perhaps fifteen newspapers in the Province, you are getting an awful lot of hair and in some cases none for an awful lot of money and you have to keep that in mind. That is a gross waste when you can use the same space to get more information out to the deserving electorate.

MR. SIMMS:  
To that point of order with twenty

seconds left.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMS:

May I say to the hon. member, that certainly did not stop him from soliciting the same kind of ads that he now describes as a waste of money.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

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

On motion Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

It now being five-thirty a motion to adjourn is before the House.

There has been a little bit of confusion about the questions for the Late Show and the confusion is my fault not the fault of the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening). I gave him three questions out of five but my attention was drawn later to the fact that the question by the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) was out of order because his

question was one that he had not asked today but on some previous day. I must rule according to our Standing Orders Number 31, Section (g), he is out of order.

MR. FENWICK:

By leave if there is unanimous consent of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

There was one question that I wanted to call on today. It was by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) but as the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is not here I had to put that off.

I call on the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). This is a question that he was not satisfied with the answer he got from the Premier on a comment made by Captain Morrissey Johnson.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I assume you are watching the clock. I have five minutes. Perhaps I will have ten. If the Premier is not here to answer I can carry on for ten.

Mr. Speaker, when I asked the Premier yesterday that question, let me read the question as well as the answer. I said, "I have a question for the Premier, supplementary to the questions that were asked just now about FFTs and consultation and lack of it and so on. I want to ask the Premier when he was talking to Captain Morrissey Johnson this morning," - that was yesterday - "did he ask Captain Johnson to

explain what he meant and how this jibes with what the Premier said earlier when he said there were all kinds of meetings and consultation? Captain Morrissey Johnson on the Open Line programme" and I said on Friday, actually Mr. Speaker, I made a mistake. It was on Thursday morning - the announcement on the FFTs was made on Friday morning, last Friday, but Captain Johnson was on Open Line the previous day. But anyway when I asked the Premier the question the Premier said, "I think the hon. the member will have to direct that question to Captain Morrissey Johnson." What a silly answer, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier was talking to the captain yesterday morning and he asked him some obvious questions and here was the most obvious one of all, what are you doing phoning long distance from Ottawa to Open Line the day before we planned to make the announcement that there will be three FFTs for Newfoundland? What are you doing the day before letting the cat out of the bag, number one?

MR. PEACH:

He is allowed to use the phone.

MR. CALLAN:

He let the cat out of the bag. Captain Johnson on the Open Line programme, Mr. Speaker, and I will not be heckled by the likes of the impeached member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), who was impeached from the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, the captain said, in other words the captain was admitting -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is your captain.

MR. CALLAN:

He is yours as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, on the Open Line programme when he said there has not been enough negotiation on this matter, he was admitting a day before the announcement was made what was imminent. He was admitting that the decision tomorrow will be against the Premier and his government so Captain Morrissey Johnson on Thursday morning's Open Line show was doing two things, Mr. Speaker, he was, number one, twenty-four hours before the decision was made, he was letting everybody who listened to him know that the decision tomorrow will be against the government, that is number one, even though the Premier tried to suggest to everybody in this Province that he did not know what the decision was going to be until it was made in this House, or the Hon. John Crosbie made it at his press conference. But Captain Johnson let the cat out of the bag the day before, Mr. Speaker.

The second aspect of this matter is what Captain Johnson also did on that Open Line programme is he agreed with what we have been saying in the Liberal Party for six and a half years, that this Premier does not know how to negotiate. He did not negotiate with regard to the FFTs, he was to interested in public debate, that is what Captain Johnson said. And when I asked the Premier to respond to it -

MR. REID:

(Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid)

who is not in his own seat but who is interrupting says he did not say any such thing. I invited him a week ago to go to the VOXM studios and get a transcript of the word for word verbatim of what Captain Johnson said. I invited him to do it. I invite any member of the House of Assembly to go to the VOXM studios.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, since the Premier is not here to respond, we will see what kind of nonsense we will hear from the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

From the wisdom that comes from the hon. gentleman I am sure that it will be difficult to strike a new ingredient of nonsense because if there was ever an example of nonsense, we have heard it. We have heard it from the hon. gentleman and I know when one replies to him like that he gets very excited. I am going to be very brief. I am going to reply very briefly to the nonsense because it is nonsense what the hon. gentleman said.

The hon. gentleman apparently listens a great deal to Open Line and he is now taking his political cues from Open Line. Most of what I heard was about what the hon. gentleman heard on Open Line. Then the hon.

gentleman got on to say that Captain Johnson agreed with the Liberal Party. I did not hear Open Line myself but the hon. gentleman was, no doubt, listening to Open Line as he was driving in to St. John's from Bellevue. That is fair enough, but I am sure that Captain Johnson did not say that he agreed with the position of the Liberal Party. Even without hearing Open Line I am sure that Captain Johnson did not say that the Premier of the Province could not negotiate. So really, Mr. Speaker, it would be unfair to take up any further time of the House in replying to such nonsense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I will now call the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). He has a question about FFTs.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I raised a question in the House yesterday.

MR. YOUNG:

You raised it practically every day.

MR. FLIGHT:

I think the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) should take his guests and go back to his office and do what he was doing for most of the afternoon. He would make a lot more sense if he did maybe.

MR. SIMMS:

That is unbecoming.

MR. FLIGHT:

That minister is unbecoming and the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is unbecoming to.

MR. YOUNG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Can the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) safely say, I know what he is insinuating I was doing in my office this afternoon, but can he prove what I was doing in my office this afternoon? It is any of his business what I was doing in my office this afternoon or is it just the dirt and slime that comes from the hon. member all the time in this hon. House?

MR. FLIGHT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I suggested that the minister take his guests and go back to his office. That is all I said and that is all Hansard will show I said. If the minister wants to put insinuations on his own actions, that is his problem. That is not my problem.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this hon. House I raised the question on the lobbying effort of our

opponents in the factory freezer trawler problem and I asked the Premier what we had done to counteract that lobby. He realized obviously we were being outmaneuvered, we were being outflanked by our opponents. His answer added up to a big nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not stand here and pretend I understand much about the fishing industry per se. I do not represent a fishing district. There obviously is interest all over Newfoundland. Obviously in Newfoundland today all the people involved in the fishery are very concerned about the technology. Let me tell the Speaker and let me tell the Premier something that is probably more overriding to all of Newfoundland and that is the atmosphere that is going to be created in this Province for the next four years as a result of the actions of Prime Minister Mulroney and Mr. Crosbie in that caucus. The people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, for seven years, leading up to 1982, were cowed, their spirits were broken, their morale was gone because that Premier decided to carry on a seven year fight with Mr. Trudeau. Nothing could be done. Nothing could be accomplished. He even ran the risk, Mr. Speaker, and it might be a costly risk before it is all over, of breaking off negotiations on offshore with Trudeau and told the people of Newfoundland, "I will wait until I have a Tory Prime Minister so I can negotiate an agreement."

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland went through the spectacle a couple of days ago of our Premier, that same man, being made a fool of, practically being called a liar. If one has got to compare what Mr. Crosbie said with

what Mr. Mulroney said and Mr. Peckford said, then one can only deduce that one of the three was lying, if not all three.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is demoralizing to the people of Newfoundland to hear Mr. Crosbie say, "We are not in Ottawa to represent the views of Brian Peckford." That must be great for the morale of the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, that is the same John Crosbie who two weeks before a provincial election met with the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and called it a coalition of equality. Equality for who? Equality for the fishermen of Newfoundland? Equality for the fishermen of Newfoundland with the fishermen of Nova Scotia? The same John Crosbie, Mr. Speaker, that that Premier went around this Province and said, "Now vote for us. A Tory government in Ottawa, a Tory government in Newfoundland and things will be good. We will get our way."

Remember this famous quotation, "One day the sun will shine and have not will be no more." Was that meant for the fishermen of the North East Coast? Was the sun shining for the fishermen of the North East Coast a few days ago? The same Crosbie, Mr. Speaker, that Premier put his faith and confidence in said this: "In power or in Opposition, the test of a strong and dedicated MP, what is it? What is the test of a strong and dedicated MP in power or in Opposition? If he can stand up and be counted." Well, did he stand up and be counted in Ottawa? He tiptoed. Mr. Speaker, he was smarting from being called on the carpet by Mr. Mulroney and publicly reprimanded and he said,

"I cannot afford to take that kind of reprimanding again, I have to sell out the Newfoundland fishery and I have to do it in spite of Brian Mulroney. I am not here to represent Brian Mulroney." Now, Mr. Speaker, tell me, what do the people of Newfoundland have to expect, four more years of the Peckford War with Ottawa? Is that the message that goes out to the people of Newfoundland from the FFT fiasco?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Do the people of New Harbour now have to worry about four more years of Peckford War with Ottawa? Is there any co-operation?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. members time has elapsed.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The hon. member has elapsed, too, I dare say.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Or. Speaker, this is another five minutes of nonsense we have been through this evening. Let me say to the hon. gentleman for Windsor - Buchans, Mr. Speaker, 'war if necessary but not necessarily war', that is the motto of this government. We do not care who it is we have to fight if we have to fight for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. The hon. gentleman talking about-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:



The shadow boxer.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, the shadow boxer. We saw him a couple of weeks in the House, Mr. Speaker, down on his knees looking for mice, shadow boxing with the mice. We see him, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, hallucinating every time he gets on his feet. The hon. gentleman talked about spirits being broken. The only spirit that has been broken in this Province is the spirit of the Liberal Party and that spirit deserves to be broken. The only people out of all of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker, who refused to stand up and be counted for the fishermen and the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador was the Liberal Party and let them take that shame to their graves. Mr. Speaker, you are damned if you do and you are damned if you do not. If you stand up and fight for Newfoundland and Labrador you are a confrontationalist, you cannot negotiate, you cannot do anything right. If you sit back on your haunches and do not do anything, you are incompetent, you are complacent, you are something. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen should know better than to raise such foolish questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has a question to the Premier concerning the deceptive attempt to conceal the lack of action on FFTs and his loss of credibility with the Federal Government. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, with the Premier

being absent and with nobody over there having a clue, I will not bother to waste the time of the House.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the few words uttered by the hon. gentleman constitutes his question and therefore a response is in order.

MR. BARRY:

A point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have a series of 'gofers', a series of 'Gobots' and a series of 'transponders' jumping up and down. I had a question to put to the Premier and the Premier is showing disrespect for this House as he did a couple of days ago when he walked out and went to give a press release rather than answer questions. He chickened out and would not answer questions on factory freezer trawlers then and he has not got the guts to be here now.

MR. RIDEOUT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You talk about a bunch of hon.

gentlemen whistling as they walk past a graveyard, well, they have dug their grave, Mr. Speaker, and now they are trying to get out of that grave but, I tell you, they have hauled the hole in with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is right.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. All those in favour "Aye", all those against "Nay". The House stands adjourned until tomorrow.