



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 48

---

*VERBATIM REPORT*  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Tuesday

29 October 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. MITCHELL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose to this House that a letter of condolence be sent to Mrs. Dorothy LeGrow, whose husband, Dr. Charles L. LeGrow, died on September 25, 1985.

Dr. LeGrow was born at Broad Cove, Conception Bay, and started out, like many young Newfoundlanders, in the teaching profession of this Province. Dr. LeGrow taught school in Jackson's Cove, Green Bay, and Horton's Harbour. After three years of teaching, Dr. LeGrow returned to the university at McGill and graduated in 1934 with a degree in medicine.

Conscious of the needs of this Province Dr. LeGrow returned to Newfoundland to practice medicine for nine years at Old Perlican. Following that he had a brief stint with the Department of Health, and then moved on to take up a position in Channel - Port aux Basques, serving the residents of that area until 1970 when he retired due to health reasons.

People like Dr. Charles LeGrow built the foundation for health care in this Province. They served beyond the call of duty and looked upon their responsibilities as a calling and not just a profession or an occupation. I am sure that all members of this House will join me in extending our sincere sympathy to Mrs.

LeGrow.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
I am sure all members of this hon. House would wish to be associated in an expression of sympathy to the family of the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward). His mother-in-law, Mrs. Clara Stead of Kilbride, died tragically over the weekend in an automobile accident and burial was held today. Mrs. Clara Stead of Kilbride. It is a very sad occurrence, obviously a very quick and tragic death, and I know all members of the House would wish to be associated in an expression of sympathy to Mrs. Aylward, the member for Kilbride and their family.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we on this side would join with other members of the House in expressing condolences to the family of the late Dr. LeGrow and to the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward) and his wife and her family on the tragic accident which occurred. So we join with the members opposite on both of those motions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Before calling Statements By Ministers I would like to deal with the point of order raised by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) on Friday last in connection with remarks

made by the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons).

I have checked Hansard. The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage did say to the Chair, 'Smarten up.' And speaking to the point of order raised by the member for St. John's North, he said, 'Now, Mr. Speaker, I make an appeal to you to allow the process to go forward, the normal exchange here where the Leader of the Opposition and other people can ask questions without having interference from the Speaker himself. Mr. Speaker, that is what we ask, fair play on both sides of the House.'

Now both of these comments are derogatory and reflect on the impartiality of the Chair and, indeed, on the competence of the Chair.

The hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) was in order in raising the matter. I make mistakes, but they are not made because of any partiality on my part. I would like to point out that the rulings of the Speaker can be challenged. I also want to point out that I will be happy to discuss in private a concern any hon. member may have. The position of Speaker is a difficult one at times, but next to impossible if his impartiality is not accepted and upheld.

I now call upon the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) to withdraw without equivocation his remarks 'Smarten up' and those commencing with, 'Now, Mr. Speaker' and ending with 'fair play on both sides of the House.'

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Come on, boy, withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now call on the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage for the second time.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I was making a fairly determined effort to respond to the first time, Sir, there is no need for a second time.

I wanted to see, Mr. Speaker, from checking Hansard what it was that I was being asked to withdraw. You make a reference to 'Smarten up'. I spot that. But the second bit of phrasing.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have read it for the hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of satisfying the requirements imposed upon me by the House, I withdraw, first of all, the statement, 'Smarten up.'

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I have now found the second reference in which I am quoted in Hansard, and by you, Mr. Speaker, as saying, 'I make an appeal to you to allow the process to go forward, the normal exchange where the Leader of the Opposition and other people can ask questions without having interference run by the Speaker himself. That is what we ask, fair play on both sides of the House.'

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to say I am not in favour of fair play.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am not prepared to listen to any

explanation. I want a withdrawal from the hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I will make an unequivocal proposition to the Chair, that I will abide scrupulously by the practices and traditions of this House, without equivocation, and I expect all others in the Chamber to do likewise.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now call on the hon. member to withdraw these comments without equivocation.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the game. I intend to stay in this Chamber and I will not play into the hands of those who would like to find a way to flick me out of here. So if you want me to withdraw, if that satisfies anything, I withdraw, but it does not address the main problem here.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

We need fair play, Sir. Fair play, that is all we are asking.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now ask the hon. member to withdraw those last comments. There was the clear implication that he is not getting fair play from the Chair, and I ask him to withdraw that.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that we need fair play. We do not need fair play.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have asked the hon. the member to withdraw the last comment he made implicating that he is not

having fair play.

MR. SIMMONS:

I withdraw that. I withdraw the last comment I made.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thank you. Having disposed of the matter raised by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), I rule there is now no prima facie case to the point of privilege raised by the hon. the President of Council (Mr. Marshall).

### Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be able to inform hon. members of the activities of the Fisheries Loan Board for the first half of the fiscal year 1985-86.

During the period of April 1 to September 30, 1985, the Fisheries Loan Board approved 388 loans with a total value of \$6,200,000. Mr. Speaker, this represents a twenty-eight per cent increase in a number of loan approvals compared to the same period in 1984-1985.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The actual loan amount involved in those approvals was \$4,400,000 which is an increase of ninety-two per cent over the same period last year. The balance of \$1,800,000 comes from down payments, provincial bounties and federal subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, the fisherman of Newfoundland and Labrador used these loans to obtain 34 longliners, 123 smaller fishing boats, as well as 231 purchases that fall in the category of engines or other fishing equipment.

The previously mentioned figures include eight loans approved under the Bank Loan Guarantee Program, which deals with loans that are in excess of \$50,000. Under this program, qualifying fishermen obtain fisheries loans from chartered banks in their area and the provincial government subsidizes the interest on those loans where the interest rates exceeds the rate charged for loans at the Fisheries Loan Board. These eight loans funded by the chartered banks involved total expenditures of \$2,600,000 and actual loan amounts of \$1,600,000.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. members that the Loan Board has fifty-eight applications on hand as of September 30, 1985. These applications were awaiting confirmation of federal fishing and vessel licences, technical assessment or financial review. The applications, valued at \$1.1 million, include 5 for longliners, 26 for smaller fishing boats and 27 for engines or other fisheries equipment. Outstanding applications are processed by the board as soon as possible so that fishermen can purchase the equipment they need quickly, this enables them to continue prosecuting the fishery with as little delay as possible.

During the same period, Mr. Speaker, from April 1 to September 3, there were 96 provincial

bounties approved. These bounties or plants assist fishermen in the purchase or construction of new boats suitable to the Province's fishery. Total bounty approvals of \$380,000 went for three vessels in the 35 foot to 65 foot category and 92 vessels in the 25 foot to 35 foot category, which was 17 foot to 35 foot in Northern Labrador, and one bounty to rebuild a boat over 35 foot in length and over eight years old.

Mr. Speaker, these figures on loan and bounty approvals give a clear indication of the demands for assistance coming from the inshore fishery as well as this government's continuing commitment to that fishery and to the fishermen who pursue it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I had a question, Mr. Speaker, so I will defer it for the response.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, this statement represents what the minister thinks is good news and, of course, the minister has had enough bad news that he wants to come into the House whenever possible and give a little bit of good news. It is a grasping for good news and that is exactly what the minister has done.

He goes on to give us a factual

account of what has happened with the Fisheries Loan Board and then in his last paragraph tries to tell us that the provincial government in this Province has a commitment to the inshore fishery. The people of this Province know different.

Let me say though that we too are glad to see people demanding things from the Fisheries Loan Board. I would ask him a couple of questions which he might like at some point in time to put out another statement on, and that is how old is our present longliner fleet? What is happening to that? Are we covering it even with the amount of loans that we are issuing? Are we taking care that those will be replaced? Will they indeed be replaced or will they fade off the scene? So would he perhaps at some point in time come in and give us a real analysis of what is going on with the Fisheries Loan Board rather than coming in and giving us a list, which I suppose his Deputy Minister prepared for him this morning.

I would also ask him to take a look at the Fisheries Loan Board and find out why it is that people when they go to the Fisheries Loan Board for certain pieces of information cannot get it and are told that they have to ask the minister. Do we have a closed shop down there now? I understand that the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), for example, went to find out the number of boats that are in Newfoundland. He tried to get some information on that and was told that he would have to go back to the minister himself.

MR. FLIGHT:  
What!

MR. TULK:

Let me point out to him also, despite all the noise that we have heard from the Minister of Fisheries in the past month, loans in excess of \$50,000 are still with the chartered banks and there is no 15 per cent or 20 per cent being taken out by those people as there is with the Fisheries Loan Board. The payments are set and in spite of the fact that the minister, I understand, is turning over the interest into the capital part of that loan, I tell him that those fishermen are still going to be pushed and pushed very hard to pay up that money. Mr. Speaker, we would have liked to see the minister, along with the programme that was announced - and I would hope that at some point we can get some statement in this House on that - come in and tell us that he was going to defer many of the loans this year for fishermen because of the hardships that they have had. That would have shown, Mr. Speaker, a real commitment on the part of this government.

#### Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I would like to ask him whether he is prepared to tell this House, as I requested from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on Friday, how much money is the Province making for every day that the brewery workers stay out? The Liquor Commission, the government, is making money by importing US beer and having a greater markup on that, when it is sold, that

they would on local beer. How much is the Province making on that?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to remove those signs.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I would ask the Premier to indicate how much are you making every day that the brewery workers stay on strike? Are you trying to cure the deficit problems of this Province on the backs of the brewery workers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

Applause from the galleries

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

We can not have any applause or any comments from anybody in the gallery, nor can signs be produced. If there is any problem we will have to clear the gallery

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, the government of Newfoundland is not trying to cure the deficit on the backs of the brewery workers.

MR. BARRY:  
Is it not time you settled the strike?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not say a word when the Leader of the Opposition got up and asked the question but I see that the Leader

of the Opposition sees fit to break the rules to comment on something, from his seat, while I am trying to answer. So I would ask the Leader of the Opposition, if he could not follow my leadership while he was over here, he had better start following it while he is over there.

Mr. Speaker, we are not trying to cure our deficit on the backs of the brewery workers, and I think the majority of people in Newfoundland know that. Neither did we try to cure our deficit on the backs of the teachers or other people in this Province who had a dispute or an argument with this government. So I want to reject outright any such suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else. We are not curing our deficit that way. As a matter of fact I do not know exactly where our deficit would be from what we projected, but it is no better than what we projected. The last information that I had is we are not making any money as it relates to the beer over what we would be making if there was no strike on. It breaks out to around the same amount in the last information that Finance provided me, because I asked that question specifically. We are at about the level of revenue as we would be if there was no strike, that is where we are.

MR. BARRY:  
Come on!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I am trying to answer a question and the Leader of the Opposition does not want to hear the answer because the answer is not in line with what he thinks it should be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I cannot help that, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition asked me a question. Now, if he wants an answer, let the Leader of the Opposition keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

All I can say to the Leader of the Opposition, whether he believes me or whether he does not - that is his problem not mine - is that the revenue that we have coming into government from beer sales and the like is around the same as it would be if there was no strike. We are not making more money than we would make if there was no strike, it is around the same. As a matter of fact, in the last number of weeks there has been a decided drop-off in the sales of beer, as I understand it. So that is the answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question.

Secondly, may I suggest that we have been working very hard behind the scenes to try to solve this dispute. It is not a dispute between the brewery workers and Treasury Board. It is a dispute between the brewery workers and their employers. But, through the Department of Labour and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), who is today in Toronto on other business, but who has been out of the Province the last few days on the matter of the brewery strike, we have been working behind the scenes with both the leadership of the union and the leadership of the employers to try to bring an end to this dispute. But it is not a dispute between Treasury Board, or the government directly, and the

brewery workers. It is a dispute between the brewery workers and employers in this Province.

Yet we have an obligation as a provincial government to try to solve it on behalf of everybody. That is what we are trying to do behind the scenes and hopefully we will be successful in doing that. We are using our best efforts to solve the present dispute.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I have to point out to the Premier that on June 11 the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said, "The markup on the imported American beer is slightly higher than the markup on the previous beer". The markup is higher. If you are not making more money it is because people cannot afford to buy the beer because of the state that you have the economy in.

Now I would like to ask the Premier whether there was some reason for bringing Canadian beer into Labrador other than that the government wanted to intervene on the side of management in this dispute?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, number one, that was a supplementary question as I understand it, and it is not supposed to be prefaced by any comment and yet it was. Mr. Speaker, whilst the Minister of Finance indicated in June that there was a larger markup, there



is also a larger transportation cost, which the Leader of the Opposition did not mention, so one offsets the other. The transportation cost that is involved is higher than it would be for local beer, so therefore the increase in markup is absorbed by the increase in transportation costs. That is why the amount of revenue we are getting is no greater than if there was not any strike.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, we are in a position where you cannot win for losing, because if in the Labrador part of our Province there were not sufficient supplies of beer they would say that somehow the government is discriminating against them, Winter is coming on, it will be frozen up there soon, and we will not be able to get any supplies in. Every year we have arguments when the Minister of Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) has to try to make sure that there are food stuffs available. Then they will accuse the government of being treated like second-class citizens, that they are not being treated the same as other people in the Province on the Island. So we are in a no-win situation on it, Mr. Speaker. What we are trying to do is do the best we can.

We are not trying to take sides in the dispute. We are trying to service the greatest number of people we can in the most reasonable fashion and we will continue to do that. Unfortunately, the dispute has dragged on longer than any of us had anticipated or thought it would, but we are trying to do the best we can in a very difficult situation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my recollection that as part of the settlement with the one union that has reached an agreement with the employer, there was an undertaking by government to establish an industrial inquiry with respect to the impact of cans in the Province. I wonder if the Premier would indicate where that stands right now? I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether government has received any information with respect to the impact that cans may have upon jobs in this Province? There is a very serious concern that jobs may be lost.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Is this a supplementary?

MR. BARRY:

If I could just finish. The Premier had his say, now I would like to have mine.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am talking about the rules of the House now.

MR. BARRY:

Well, the Speaker, as usual, will see that the rules are adhered to, not the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask could the Premier inform us whether they have received information with respect to the impact of cans upon jobs in this

Province, the threat to the loss of jobs should cans permit the easier and less expensive importation of beer than has been the case previously? And also, with respect to the ecology, would the Premier indicate what the position of the government is with respect to the adequacy of the refunds available and whether that is sufficient to eliminate the litter problem, which has been observed, I think, in many places around the Province this year as a result of the numbers of cans that are being utilized?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we made an offer a long time ago - I do not know how long it is now, but quite a long while, months and months ago - to Mr. March, the leader of the union, to establish an industrial inquiry. As a matter of fact, I think we went so far as to be governed by the results of that industrial inquiry, which would include a study of the whole aluminum can situation, as well as bottle sorting. There are some members in the union who are concerned about bottle sorting. There is also a concern in the union about pensions for six or eight or ten individuals who, under the old company, before it was taken over by the new company, did not have the seniority to get a decent pension. And we have been most sympathetic to what the union has said on those matters. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) has communicated with Mr. March on a number of occasions, and Mr. March, on a number of occasions, has indicated that cans was the main issue. Then, we said, 'Well, let us put cans to an industrial inquiry and

we will be bound by what the industrial inquiry comes in with.' In the next meeting we had with Mr. March, we discussed bottle sorting, and it was not cans. The next issue was pensions and we tried to solve that. So we have had difficulty in dealing with Mr. March because the number one priority issue seems to change. But, in any case, whatever the issues are, we were prepared and are prepared today to put that to an independent industrial inquiry.

MR. GILBERT:

Well, let it go to an inquiry. What are you waiting for?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What we were asking Mr. March was whether he would agree, while the industrial inquiry was ongoing, that all the workers would go back to work, and that we would be bound by the results of the industrial inquiry so that we could get people back to work. But, at the same time, this inquiry would be independent and would bring in an objective report on the situation. We were prepared to do that yesterday, today and tomorrow to try to solve the dispute and get people back to work.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I have a question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker, and I would be grateful for your consideration of a short preamble because it is an

issue that is very sensitive to a town in my district.

I would ask the Premier, in view of the special works programme that was announced by the Premier and Mr. Crosbie for fishermen - and it is understood that the provincial government and the Premier were very instrumental in convincing Ottawa to implement such a programme - has the Premier attempted to exert the same type of influence or that of his government on the federal government to deliver the second phase of MILAP, a programme that was promised us almost a year ago and that, if delivered, would rescue approximately 120 miners over the age of fifty-five from facing welfare for the rest of their lives?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) read the letter in the paper today, which was not very complimentary to the member for Windsor - Buchans, nor to the MP, Mr. Rompkey, on this whole question of Level 2 MILAP for Buchans. One of the members on the MILAP Committee in Buchans has taken issue with the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans, and with Mr. Rompkey, the MP who have been attacking Mr. Crosbie, who has been working to try to get that Level 2 for Buchans. We have, as well, been attempting to do the same kind of thing.

I thank the hon. member for recognizing that myself and other people in this government had something to do with the \$9.2 million that was approved yesterday to help people who

cannot qualify for unemployment insurance who were in the fishing boat or in the fish plant over the last Summer. But I can say to the hon. member we are doing all we can as a provincial government to convince Ottawa of that Level 2 categorization for the Town of Buchans. But I would refer him to one of his own constituents who takes issue with the way he has been dealing with it himself.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, does not the Premier agree that it is no less tragic for a hundred miners to face welfare -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Deprivation.

MR. FLIGHT:

- deprivation, than it is for fishermen or any other segment of the population? Does the Premier not agree that it is no less tragic?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who wrote the letter in **The Telegram**?

MR. FLIGHT:

It does not matter who writes letters.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I agree it does not make any difference who writes letters. I am just saying to the hon. member that there are people in Buchans who are not satisfied with the way he and his cohort in Ottawa has been handling this issue of late. Mr. Speaker, as I

have indicated to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) on many occasions, I was in an area where four mines closed down in the early 1960s. I experienced that hardship, I know all about it. When the Gullbridge Mines closed down, most of the workers came from Roberts Arm, South Brook and Springdale. When the Whalesback Mine closed down, just about all of them came from the Springdale area. Then when Little Bay Atlantic Coast Copper closed down and Tilt Cove closed down, so there were four mines closed down in the matter of a year and a half or two years. It is not easy and it is hard. I agree with the hon. member that the hardship is no different because of the produce that they happened to be producing at the time, or whatever. And I agree that Buchans has particular problems and we are trying to address them as best we can as a provincial government. We will continue to do so on behalf of the people of Buchans and on behalf of the people of any place, in the same way as we tried to do what we could for the people of Baie Verte and the asbestos mine, in the same way as we are now in the process of reactivating St. Lawrence and bringing back a mine that was put out of existence. We will continue to help wherever we can. Look at the millions of dollars we put into Labrador West to help the miners. So we are trying to do the best we can, Mr. Speaker, and we have demonstrated that.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Premier will know that a

decision was made in Ottawa this Spring to deny the second phase of MILAP to Buchans. Now on finding this out, Mr. Crosbie gave the undertaking to the people of Buchans to use all his clout and all his influence in Ottawa to have this decision reversed and to deliver the programme. He obviously has been very unsuccessful to date.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please put his question?

MR. FLIGHT:

In view of the fact that our federal representative has been unsuccessful, would the Premier tell the House if he is prepared to undertake to use his immense influence? What has he done to date to guarantee Buchans gets MILAP, the programme that was promised and delivered during a provincial election, announced by the man who ran against me whom the people who were writing the letters supported? Now what will the Premier do and what has he done to guarantee that the 100 miners in Buchans get MILAP, get the pensions they are entitled to? They are fifty-five years old and over. What is the Premier going to do?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is a funny thing, I have all kinds of influence today now. If something comes through the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans will give the credit to himself and the MP for

the riding, Mr. Rompkey, with no influence from the Premier whatsoever, none. But when he gets in trouble, then the Premier has all kinds of influence. As soon as something succeeds and works, then it had nothing to do with the Premier or this government, it had to do with the member for Windsor - Buchans and the MP for Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador. I like the way the hon. member changes his tune and the members opposite. I have all kinds of influence when they are looking for something. As soon as they get something I have no influence at all.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
I yield to my colleague.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to get on with -

MR. FENWICK:  
I would like to make a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Menihek, a point of privilege.

MR. FENWICK:  
I have been standing up continuously since the beginning. The member for Fogo stood up, not the Leader of the Opposition, you recognized him and now you have allowed him to defer to another member. I think that is a violation of my privileges, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of privilege. In question time the Speaker has the discretion as to whom he will recognize. I am now recognizing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier is aware of the fact that today there are representatives of the Cumberland Crescent Tenants' Association appearing before the Landlord and Tenant Board of this Province, and I wonder if the Premier is aware that representing the landlord is a representative of the Government House Leader's firm? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Premier would indicate whether he considers that to be appropriate when the Landlord and Tenant Act says that the Cabinet appoints members of the Landlord and Tenant Board and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is a member of Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Leader of the Opposition and I will table an answer to allegations he made on Friday when I was not here. Of course, he indicated at that time that I was not here because I was afraid to be here to put up with all these questions.

MR. GILBERT:  
You were moose hunting, were you?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

When I am shooting for moose I do not want to get sidetracked by rabbit tracks.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the low road and to enter into the smear tactics that the Leader of the Opposition obviously has. It is rather ironic that the new Leader of the Opposition is now following the tactics of his former leader, Mr. Neary, and Mr. Neary is following the tactics of the former Leader of the Opposition. One is now going to law school while the other is taking up the other's tack here in the House.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that I am not familiar with the low road. I have no intention of becoming familiar with it and I shall stay on the highroad. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to try to destroy the credibility of a very decent and honest man in this House, then let him go right to it and I will let the people of Newfoundland decide.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like the Premier to get up in this House and answer this question: Does the Premier really think that we in Opposition should not bring to his House the questions which are submitted to members of this House by tenants who are concerned that there is clout, Mr. Speaker, that they do not have before that

Landlord and Tenant Board? And would the Premier in responding to that indicate whether he considers it appropriate that the Cabinet appoints members of that board as sufficient reason to enquire whether there is something amiss? The fact that the campaign manager for the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is a member of the Landlord and Tenant Board while the representative of his firm is there arguing before the Board, does the Premier consider there is anything amiss with that?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I can respond. This is a continuing cycle that the hon. gentleman is on, a web he is trying to spin. Are these the ground rules in this House that a person can, through insidious innuendoes and direct charges, take one's character?

MR. BARRY:  
What about the facts?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Let us take facts. I will give you an example right here in this House about the way the hon. gentleman dealt with facts. He tabled here in this House last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, a share list. That share list was tabled in this House and showed my name on it as being a shareholder. Now, anyone outside the law profession, ladies and gentlemen of the press as well, that would mean, obviously would expect it to mean somebody owns a share. But to anyone, Mr. Speaker, six months after he has articulated and his admission to the Bar, if you see

one share listed in a lawyer's name in a company the first thing that triggers in your mind is it is a qualifying share.

Now, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, on Friday, what the hon. gentleman was about then and what he is about today is to try to get imputations in the paper that have the most dire consequences and effects and impinge upon the honesty and integrity of myself, and it is not really fair. What the hon. gentleman did when he tabled that share list, and I believe he fully knew that it was a qualifying share or a share held in trust - or he certainly ought to have known - was emblazoned between St. John's and Vancouver in every paper on Friday, the fact that the Minister of Energy in Newfoundland owned a share in a land development company. We saw the headlines, that I owned a share in a land development company, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Answer that question. We will debate that afterwards if you want to.

MR. SPEAKER

Order, please!

I must remind the hon. President of the Council that he is straying from the answer to the particular question that was posed.

MR. MARSHALL:

All right then, Mr. Speaker. I will just end it by saying this, that I stated in the House unequivocally on Friday that I had no financial interest, explained what a qualifying share was, that I had nothing to do with the management of that company. What happens, Mr. Speaker? We had an

interview afterwards on CBC and the hon. gentleman was asked, 'Mr. Marshall says he has' -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Answer the question.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am answering the question, Mr. Speaker, because it touches on what the hon. gentleman is doing. What the hon. gentleman was asked was -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think the hon. the President of the Council is straying a bit from the question.

MR. MARSHALL:

All right, Mr. Speaker, I will rise on a point of privilege after the Question Period is over.

But I will just say to the hon. gentleman that the hon. gentleman is being quite insidious. It is another attack on my integrity and my honesty. And I think, if these are the ground rules by which this House is conducted, obviously I have to comply, if this is the way that politics is conducted in Newfoundland. But the hon. gentleman is putting a twist on facts and he is giving the facts a significance that are not there, and I think really and truly that this has gone far enough. Surely to God, any fair minded person would.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. I will do it briefly to let the member for Menihek get a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the Premier is not going to answer the question, would the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) indicate that there is some reason for concern? Would the member for St. John's East consider that he might possibly have a blind spot with respect to what individuals who are coming to me are saying, 'Look, here is the board appointed by government. Here is the campaign manager of the government minister sitting on the board, and here is the government minister's law firm arguing before that board'? Is the member for St. John's East going to say that there is nothing that requires an explanation in that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is really, really insidious, this type of thing. The board is set up. The board is an independent board. Mr. Speaker, I have never in my seventeen years representation, in Cabinet and out of Cabinet, attempted to influence in any way any decision that may affect clients or people associated with me.

MR. BARRY:

That is not the point.

MR. MARSHALL:

'That is not the point,' he says. Well, if that is not the point, Mr. Speaker, why is the hon. gentleman getting up and spewing out this innuendo? The whole point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there is no conflict of interest.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, just because you say so.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

I have never, in my seventeen years in practice and in the House of Assembly, sought a client, have acted for government in any particular way, and neither has any of my firm acted for government in any particular way. Mr. Speaker, I have not proffered the case of any client.

MR. BARRY:

Justice should not only be done, it should be seen to be done.

MR. MARSHALL:

Seen to be done by the hon. gentleman! I have not, Mr. Speaker, at any given time advanced the interest of any client in Cabinet at all. I have not profited from a client, as the hon. gentleman attempted to say last Friday. He gets on CBC the other day, Mr. Speaker, and he was asked the question, "Mr. Marshall says he has no financial influence. What do you say?" He says, "That is not the point. The point of the matter is he is getting legal fees." But the point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, he depicted me as having an interest in a company that gained, as he said, "a benefit" from the government of this Province. In other words, he called me dishonest. Now, if the hon. gentleman does not believe me in this and other answers I have given, I cannot help that.

MR. BARRY:

Raise your point of privilege and I will answer that.

MR. MARSHALL:



Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman does not believe me, that is one thing. But the fact of the matter is, surely to God the hon. gentleman can now, if this thing does not matter, if it is beside the point, as he said on CBC, get up and do one of two things, either say he is calling me a liar, that he does not believe me, number one; or else he can get up man-fashion and turn around and apologize for casting inuendo on me, which he did last week and is doing again today.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I intended to ask a series of questions but I have a feeling that I am running out of time, if I am not mistaken, so I will compress it all into one. My question is for the Premier. Mr. Premier, in the last year or so I have been repeated asking about the Elections Act, the Act that would force full disclosure of all expenditures that are made during elections and, more importantly, all revenues that have accumulated. You, as far back as 1979 have committed yourself to putting it in. I have now gone through the files that have been presented to the Department of Justice and have established, after looking at and adding up forty-eight of the fifty-two candidates the PC Party ran, that approximately \$570,000 was spent by the local candidates. This is not at all touching any of the money that was run in the central campaign. I have two questions for the Premier. The first is: What are your intentions with regard to putting in an Elections Act so we can find out where this money came from? In front of the people here, I would like to ask

one direct question. There are three breweries in this Province. Can you tell us how much money they contributed to your election campaign, the PC Party in full, in the last election on April 2?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have been communicating back and forth with the Leader of the New Democratic Party and the member for Menihek, and I have indicated to him that the Election Act is before Cabinet at the present time. I have just written him back this morning to indicate that, obviously, we have some problems with it. I do not know how much the member got from wherever he got the money for his campaign. If you look at fifty-two candidates at \$500,000, that is about \$10,000 per district. So however many they have on the other side, I guess it was about \$180,000 or \$200,000 for the Liberal Party. I guess they had \$10,000 per candidate, so that would work out to over \$500,000. I do not know how many candidates the hon. member had. I think if we are going to table who contributed to what party, I think we better do it for everybody here in the House and do it now.

MR. BARRY:

That is right. Bring in that act.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

How much did the brewing companies give? I do not know if they gave us any money or not, I am not familiar with that. I do not know how much money they gave us, I do not know how much money they gave the Liberal Party, or

how much money they gave the NDP Party, provincially or federally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Bring in the act!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are committed to bringing in the new Election Act. At the present moment we are reviewing the Act.

MR. BARRY:

You have been reviewin it since 1979.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, not since 1979, we have not been reviewing the Act. We had a Select Committee on it. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to answer a question and I have said nothing to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

When he gets up to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, I keep quiet. When I get up to answer the question, he cannot keep quiet. Now what is the problem here? He does not like the answers!

We are committed to bring in the Election Act as soon as we have decided on the approach and the way we want to go, but there are a lot of pros and cons to different provisions in the Act and they are being looked at right now. So I can ease the hon. member's fears in the sense that we are going to bring in an Election Act but the kind of an Election Act we bring in we do not know yet. We have had the benefit of the Select Committee and we are still debating it as to which way we

want to go. We are not at all sure because we have checked with a lot of the other provinces and there are having problems with some of their provisions now and so on, and we are trying to learn from the other provinces and the other jurisdictions.

MR. BARRY:

We will bring it in after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

'If you can dream and not make dreams your master!' That is the next election for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

You have been dreaming so long they have become nightmares.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Leader of the Opposition is the one who has the nightmare, Mr. Speaker. He thinks that he is over here already.

MR. TOBIN:

Tell us what happened to you in the 1975 election when you got the big boot you deserved.

MR. SPEAKER :

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, please!

#### Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have two notices to give. The first one, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of further Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty. That will be Bill 49, No. 2 Supply Bill. The other matter, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider resolutions relating to a tax on the users of tobacco and a revision of the law in relation thereto.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the notice just given by the Hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with respect to Bill No. 49, it is the wish of the government, and the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), representing the official Opposition, - unfortunately I have not had an opportunity to discuss this with the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) - to leave this in as the first order of business today because it relates to the Fisheries Employment Opportunities Programme and we need the money that is to be voted there from the provincial treasury in order to be able to meet the commitment of that programme with the federal

government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

To that suggestion, I have no problems. We would hope that the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) in asking for this would give us a brief outline of just what the programme is within the House and then we could certainly see that matters are expedited rather quickly for the sake of the fishermen of this Province, not for the sake of the government.

Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I just wish to deal, again, with two additional conflict of interest allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) against the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). In answer to questions that were asked by the Leader of the Opposition last week, one had to do with the President of the Council being listed on the share list of Fairview Investments. Mr. Speaker, this is not at all uncommon for a lawyer involved in an incorporation. The President of the Council has indicated that this is his sole interest in that company - he neither helps direct it or profits from it. Such a situation does not even require a declaration under our Conflict of Interest Guidelines. Therefore, I fail to see where the President of the Council is in conflict of interest in this matter.

The President of the Council has not, in his position as President of the Council or Minister Responsible for Energy, used his office to try to do something for Fairview Investment in dealings with government or government agencies. There is no record, and I have checked in everything that I can find and I find no minute, no record, no letter, no evidence whatsoever. The President of the Council is only a qualifying shareholder, which means he does not get profit from the company, or does not sit on the board of directors or whatever, it has nothing to do with that. There is no evidence to show that the President of the Council indeed used his office in government to help Fairview Investments. There is just no evidence. And without that evidence there obviously is no conflict of interest. I cannot find any evidence.

With regard to the Universal Helicopters situation, that company won a government contract through public tender. It was tendered. There was one tender a few years ago, Sealand won, another tender which Universal won. As a matter of fact, if I am not mistaken - I am not sure - last year in tenders to Hydro, for which the minister is responsible, Sealand got the contract. So, I mean, if the minister is using his influence as a member of government, Universal should have gotten the contract.

There is no evidence whatsoever, in any of the dealings I had with the President of Council, directly or indirectly, that he has used his office, as a member of Cabinet, to influence decisions with the Minister of Transport as it relates to the awarding of a tender to Universal Helicopters.

It was a public tender, everybody tendered and the tenders were publicly opened, and the lowest bid got the work. One year it is Sealand with government, the next year it is Universal; in Hydro one year it is Sealand, the next year it is Universal, or vice versa, and that has been going on.

In the same way, Mr. Speaker, I mean, the proof of the pudding has to be in the eating on this matter and it is extremely important. The President of Council's law firm has acted for the Bank of Montreal, who were the bankers for the government of Newfoundland, not for the PC Government, since 1900 or 1890. We went to tender. We are the first government in the history of Newfoundland that went to tender for banking services. And when all the tenders came in the best tender was the Bank of Commerce. And we switched, the first time in our history in over 100 years, from the Bank of Montreal, and it is the President of the Council's firm which acts for the Bank of Montreal, to the Bank of Commerce because it was the best tender, they had the best deal.

So, Mr. Speaker, in anything that I have seen I find no evidence that the member has used his office to influence something to help clients in his law firm. There is no evidence to show that. There is no evidence to show that there is any conflict of interest here. The only thing that the four matters that I have investigated show is that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to smear the character and integrity of a very decent and honest man. I think that is incredible. Mr. Speaker, I want to table the information here on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Now I have sat here on a number of such occasions and I am not going to sit here, Mr. Speaker, any longer and have the Premier or anybody else in this House accuse me of smear tactics. I let it go when the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was up because I knew he was highly emotional and distraught when he raised it, Mr. Speaker. But when the Premier gets up and accuses me of a smear tactic, let me point out a couple of facts. Fact one, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier came in having investigated this matter on the first occasion, and did not even know that Fairview Investments Limited was involved in the investigation, despite the fact that I had tabled the deed. That is how much he looked into it, Mr. Speaker, that is how much he looked into it. If he had looked into it, Mr. Speaker, at all, if he did any investigation at all -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
What is the point of order?

MR. BARRY:  
Yes, you are darn right it is a point of order, because I am being accused of a smear and I want to point out a few facts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:  
You are!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:  
You are!

MR. BARRY:

Go crawl back under your rock now and let me finish here. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Premier did not do any investigation or he would have found Fairview Investments Limited on the document I filed. He did not even read it, Mr. Speaker, or he would have seen the name Fairview Investments. He did not read the document tabled in this House. It is an insult to this House. He did not go down in the Registry of Deeds, Mr. Speaker, to check who were the shareholders of Fairview Investments Limited, Mr. Speaker. He has not dealt at all, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is acting for this company and is obtaining legal fees, Mr. Speaker. If the member stands up, Mr. Speaker, and says he is not getting a profit, we have to -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:  
I believe this has gone far enough. I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is misusing the powers of this House and the protection of this House to raise these kinds of points. I have here Saturday's Globe And Mail and on page 3 is an article about the goings on in this House and the foolish charges that the Leader of the Opposition has been making and they are portrayed here as serious charges. Now the Globe And Mail goes all across Canada and, as far as I know, it goes well into the United States as well. I think that is just

shocking.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

At what point does the point of privilege come in?

MR. J. CARTER:  
The point of privilege is that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is misusing the protection of this House to make scurrilous and silly accusations against the President of the Council.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that when the moon is full the distraught become that much more distracted but, still and all, I think it has gone far enough and I call upon Your Honour to bring it to an end.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of privilege, there is no prima facie case made.

To the point of order, I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition if he would come to his point.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I think, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that what is being said out here are facts, straightforward facts requiring investigation by the Premier, Mr. Speaker. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to instruct the Premier, to demand that the Premier withdraw the use of the word smear. It is an imputing of improper motives, Mr. Speaker, to a member of this House and would not be allowed in any parliamentary gathering in the British Commonwealth. I ask that the Premier be demanded to withdraw that term 'smear'. There are legitimate questions involving influence or the perceived

influenced. Now that has got to be dealt with, Mr. Speaker. The propriety of a minister of the Crown having an active practice of law is a legitimate question to go before this House, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you have the Premier withdraw that term 'smear'.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier to the point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, let me deal with that point of order. That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Look, the long and short of it is that any time there is even the remotest connection - triply, quadruply, indirect - that the President of the Council or any other minister has, when it relates to a Cabinet decision they absent themselves from the Cabinet. There is no evidence - I have checked! - there is no evidence that the President of the Council used his office to influence a decision of government relating to companies that happen to have one of the President of the Council's partners as a lawyer. There is no evidence of conflict of interest. That is the bottom line on it: Is there evidence, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has used his position to influence? There is none. Because in every case we can show just as many cases were companies have lost tenders and lost work who dealt with the President of the Council's firm as those who have won tenders with the President of Council's firm. There is no evidence on the books, there is no evidence in Cabinet or

in Cabinet committee meetings or meetings with me that the minister has never used his influence. Anybody who knows the minister knows that to be true, in any case. Anybody who knows the minister knows he is careful on that score.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
If the press wants to start asking questions, let them answer the question that I put to the House the other day, Mr. Speaker, and that is: Why did the Petro-Canada Products leave the firm of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry)? Answer that one.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I would like to reply to that point of order. At the present time, as I understand the point of order raised by the hon. Leader, it was in connection with the actual phraseology, if you like, or words used.

MR. BARRY:  
The word 'smear', Mr. Speaker, is not proper.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I would like to study the context of that. I will rule on that point of order tomorrow.

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

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

MR. BARRY:  
The Premier has asked me to explain why a file that had been

dealt with by the firm of Halley, Roberts, Barry ended up being dealt with by the firm of Marshall, White, Ottenheimer? Mr. Speaker, I had no idea that that had happened-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:  
- until I went down to the firm -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:  
- Mr. Speaker-

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
- until I called down to the firm and checked. And do you know what I found, Mr. Speaker? Do you know what I found? I found that our firm asked Petro-Canada to pass on that file because of a perceived conflict of interest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Now we have it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:  
Ed Roberts (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Now I was quiet when the hon.

Leader was up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) knew nothing about that, yet he is asking questions on the other side of the House saying that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) knows everything that is going on in his law firm, but the Leader of the Opposition is okay when he does not know everything that goes on in his law firm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Too bad. Too bad.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Too bad. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition wants it both ways and he cannot have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just have a few moments on a little point of order of my own.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

I hope I will not get the hon. gentleman as upset as he was a moment ago, a little bit tipsy again. But, Mr. Speaker, what he said during his point of order, he said what he has used here is facts. That is what he said. One of those facts, Mr. Speaker, presumably was the fact that I held an interest in Fairview Construction, beneficially owned it, so, therefore, I got an advantage from whatever government did, from whatever the government order was. Now that was the fact. That was the fact that the hon. gentleman put through that went from here to Vancouver and back again in the papers.

Now, on Friday - I will just read this briefly from the transcript - a reporter from CBC, "Do you believe his," that is my explanation, "that he has no financial interest and has never participated in the affairs of the company?" "Barry, 'Let us assume that that is correct!'"

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us assume that is correct and let us look for something else. Now the most base kind of fact that the hon. gentleman brought out in this House was the fact that I had a share in this development company and that I was profiting. That is the fact of the hon. gentleman. Now he says on the programme, 'Let



us assume that that is correct." Now, nobody said, 'But, Mr. Barry you took the man's character on the basis of that statement. It was not just an assumption, you brought it forth. And you brought it forth, Mr. Barry, knowing full well that Lawyers, when they hold one share in companies in this way, normally hold them as qualifying shares or as trustees.' So he does not confine himself to fact. Now he wants to get into the propriety of it. Look, as I say, I have never sought a favour for a client from government, I have never sought a client because of my position in government, I have never profited because of that, from the point of view of profit in the true sense. You know, the rules happen to be that lawyers can be elected to the House, that they can be members of the House and they can be in Cabinet. Now there was one lawyer who sat in this House for whom I have unbounded admiration, from 1951 to 1970 when the Liberal government was defeated, and he recently passed away, the Hon. P.J. Lewis. And, Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to get up when I was on the other side of the House, and every day paint pictures of Mr. Lewis having a qualifying share and take the man's character like that, I could have, but I would not do it, Mr. Speaker, because, number one, the man had the highest character of anybody who ever sat in here. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there were certain rules of the game then and there certainly should be certain rules of the game now. If this House and the press, because the press have to report these things, I am not complaining, I mean, when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) makes a charge like he has the press have to report it, but if this House

and the press is going to be used for character assassination and to attack integrity, it is all very well. I am a veteran in this game, I have been in it a long period of time, but I would like members of this House to consider the effect that such a thing has on a person's family or the effect that it has on one's friends and the effect it has on one's associates. On Friday, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who talks about facts got up and asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in this House about that particular contract. The Minister of Transportation very, very concisely indicated there were public tenders, so what was the point?

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. the minister state his point?

MR. MARSHALL:

The point of the matter is that the hon. gentleman is conducting an attack in an unfair and unreasonable basis. He is using this House and he is using the privileges of this House. If he wants to do it in this sinister and insidious way he can do it and he can get away with it, but if he is going to do it and get away with it surely it ought to be brought to the attention of the public. We have no slander laws in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but it presumes that there is a certain responsibility on people that they will exercise their rights in a responsible way. I do not know what his reason is, if it because of jealousy, because of perceived political advantage, because of many factors; I do not know what his motivation is or why he is doing it. I suspect it is for political advantage, I know it is for jealousy, but surely to

heavens even with the hon. gentleman and his ilk there must be certain rules of ordinary, common decency which he has transcended day after day in this House and derogated completely from the parliamentary institutions on which this House of Assembly is based.

MR. SPEAKER (Mc Nicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could deal with the point of order raised by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the hon. minister, I would just like to ask the minister, before he leaves, did he ever consider, from the perspective of clients looking for a lawyer, whether clients might consider there to be an advantage in having a member of the Provincial Cabinet acting as a lawyer, regardless of what the member's motives may be or the member's actions may be? Did the member ever consider what the reaction might be on members of the Landlord and Tenancy Board as they look down and see a member of the minister's law firm who is involved in appointing them? We know that the minister's mind is pure, Mr. Speaker, maybe that is the problem. Maybe the minister has a blank spot on this, Mr. Speaker, that he cannot see what I would submit to the hon. minister that everybody else on that side of the House can see, that the minister has transcended the line, Mr. Speaker. The minister has transcended the line.

The minister talks about qualifying shares and I invite anybody to go and ask lawyers, 'Is it common, Mr. Speaker, for there to be qualifying shares for over

twenty years?' or however long it was the minister was acting for this company. And why is a qualifying share needed when there are already three shareholders in the company? Does a qualifying share create the minister a director and secretary of the company? Is there anything, Mr. Speaker, that we should ask questions about when a government decision improves the value of a piece of land owned by a company of which the minister is a director? which he has not denied, Mr. Speaker. Whether or not the minister has shares which are beneficially owned, that word was never used by these lips, Mr. Speaker. I said the minister owned shares and that is what the share list of the company says. Now it is up to the minister and it is up to the Premier. If the minister does not beneficially own those shares he must explain, but he must go further and he must explain, Mr. Speaker, not just that he is not getting a share of the profits of a company; he must explain how is it that if he gains legal fees from that company that that is not an advantage, Mr. Speaker. How is it that he is not gaining an advantage from a company where he receives, if you look at the Registry of Deeds there are something like in one year and a half, Mr. Speaker, there are something like 147 real estate transactions down there in the Registry of Deeds, 147 with respect to this company for which the minister's firm receives a fee. Are we entitled to ask about that? What is the fee? How much? Are we entitled to ask why is it now, Mr. Speaker, when we go to Pippy Park and ask for information we are told, "No, we have been told not to give you information. You must ask the minister," when the Minister of

Public Works gets up in this House and says that is an autonomous body. What is this, an order for a cover up?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Now we want answers, Mr. Speaker. We want answers. And there will be another Question Period tomorrow and we will be following up on these.

And it is not going away until it is dealt with, 'Brian', and you know that and you may as well deal with it.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is getting into the realm of debate at the moment. I did allow him to carry on because I allowed the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) a fairly lengthy period. But there is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
The time has come, Mr. Speaker. We heard the emotional and juvenile outbursts of the Leader of the Opposition, but the time has come for the Leader of the Opposition to put up or shut up. Now will the Leader of the Opposition table evidence which shows that the President of the Council used his position to influence decisions by this government? Now produce that evidence and, if he cannot produce that evidence, then he is just

flying in the wind.

Now let us have the challenge go out to the Leader of the Opposition. Produce the evidence, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the Council has used his position to gain favour for various people who do work for the government.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! I presume that was a point of order. If it was a point of order by the Premier, I am calling on the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I will deal with it, but first I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier, the minister, members opposite, all seem to be only dealing with one aspect, which I am not prepared to put aside and I am not going to put aside and I will deal with it. But the minister, the Premier, members opposite are just dealing with the aspect, 'if there is no evidence.' By the way, we can ask where should that evidence come from? Should it come from the Opposition, who is frozen out, Mr. Speaker, who is being told by Pippy Park Commission that the information from now on must come from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young)?

MR. YOUNG:  
I will answer that. Sit down, you liar!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, can we get that retracted?

MR. YOUNG:  
I withdraw that. I will deal with

it when he sits down.

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see who puts up or shuts up. Will the Premier agree to table, to obtain from the Pippy Park Commission -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I am speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will hear the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on the point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, these are very important questions. Will the Premier undertake, in response to his challenge, to obtain from the Pippy Park Commission, Mr. Speaker, the names of the owners who have been involved in Pippy Park, Fairview Investments and others - by the way there are others, Mr. Speaker, which I will be laying on the Table of this House. There are others. We do not have them all yet, Mr. Speaker. It is a hard job to get them when we are frozen out of information, but we are getting them.

Will the Premier agree to appoint a Select Committee of this House, Mr. Speaker, to investigate what has gone on?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We are on Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given. The hon. the Premier got up on a point of order and now, as I understand

it, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is responding to that point of order. As I understood the Leader of the Opposition, he was mentioning about responding to a challenge and producing documents. I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is straying from this, but I would like to hear a little more, though.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in order for me to respond to the challenge raised in the Premier's point of order, Mr. Speaker, this House needs -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Give us the evidence.

MR. BARRY:

Not me, Mr. Speaker, not me.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Now, who is following the rules?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, they cannot keep quiet now. They are trying to shout us down now. It should be done by a Select Committee of this House, Mr. Speaker, that we identify who are the owners of land that has been excluded from Pippy Park and was there representation made? The Premier said that the owners were pressuring the Pippy Park Commission, in his own statement.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The owners of the property.

MR. BARRY:

Which owners, Mr. Speaker, which owners? Is it my constituent who calls me up and says that she is

being forced to sell nine and a half acres of land for \$18,000? Is it that owner, Mr. Speaker? No way! No way the little person up there is getting that sort of attention from this administration!

Will the Premier find out who pressured the Pippy Park Commission and how that pressure was applied? Were there law firms involved in supplying that pressure, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, will the Premier identify, was there -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, I got him on the run now!

MR. BARRY:

Who has got who on the run? Mr. Speaker, just look around you. Talk to some people on the streets and find out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Stonewalling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We seem to be straying completely away from Answers to Questions with the point of order raised by the hon. the Premier. There is no point of order. I would now ask are there any further Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given?

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

I do not want to prolong this and I am not going to say anymore. The hon. gentleman obviously has a philosophy in life that somebody is guilty, you know, guilty absolutely without having any response or anything. I do not know why the hon. gentleman is doing it but I find it rather regrettable and I will just once again to all members of this House, on both sides of the House, if this type of thing is allowed to continue where a person's integrity - look, if I did something wrong, if I did what the hon. gentleman has alleged me to do, I tell you the hon. gentleman would not have to bring this up because I would be out of this House so fast it would not even be funny, on my own volition, Mr. Speaker, in shame. What he has done is, in effect, he has assailed my integrity. I have asked him to get up in this House and respond to the fact as to whether or not he feels it is of no concern anymore that I own a share or beneficial interest in Fairview Investments, or whether he is going to let that get on the record. If he calls me a liar, as I say, I cannot do anything about that. But if he is not prepared to get up and call me a liar, is he going to stand up as an ordinary decent human being and retract the inuendo that he caused to be spread from here to Vancouver about me in the press?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, to that point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

If this minister says, Mr. Speaker, that he does not beneficially own, in the sense of obtaining a profit from that firm,

Mr. Speaker, I accept the gentleman's explanation. But I ask the member to be aware that there is still a matter which requires investigation by the Premier of this Province and that is whether it is proper for a Minister of the Crown to have a share which is only a legally owned share and not beneficially owned, in the sense that he only owns it and is there on the company, when that is combined with the fact that the minister is more active in that he is a director and he is secretary of the company. Will the minister will get up in this House and say that he has had no active involvement in the management of that company? Will he get up and say that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is very upset, but on Friday morning I said that quite unequivocally and clearly and it was recorded. I will say this, I appreciate the fact that the hon. gentleman is prepared to accept the fact that I do not legally own a share and have no interest from the point of getting profits from Fairview Investments. Now, is he prepared to apologize to me for vidifying my name, integrity and honesty between here and Vancouver as a result of making the statements that he made, when he knew full well, or ought to have known, that what I had was merely a qualifying share, a share in trust, not a share in profit? The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) can laugh all he like. It may be the Turon of him, his family, friends and acquaintance next time, and that is what this is all about.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, I will not apologize. It is not the practice for a solicitor to stand up and say, "I only have a qualifying share" when that share has gone on through a number of changes of shareholders and has stayed there, when there is a directorship and the secretary of the company involved, Mr. Speaker, then we are entitled to ask whether the minister did obtain a profit. The minister said he did not, that ends that point, but it does not, Mr. Speaker, end the question of whether the minister has been obtaining an advantage from that company, he acts for that company, his firm acts for that company, he himself directly acts for that company. Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to find a document here I will be prepared to file in a moment, which indicates that the minister has been involved to some extent with the company. What I am talking about is an Affidavit of Value which I will find in a minute with respect to property of that company.

MR. MARSHALL:

While the hon. gentleman sits down and recollects himself, I will just say-

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

-an Affidavit of Value is a normal solicitor function that solicitors do from time to time when property is sold for a dollar. Obviously, there are very few houses and land that you can buy for a dollar, so you have to put in an affidavit as

to the true value for registration purposes, only that. Now I am not going to let the hon. gentleman away with this, we must not. He got up in this House and he said that he would accept what I said, he was prepared to accept my word that I had not interest. Now is he prepared to do the decent thing and get up and offer an apology to me for giving an entirely different impression, which the hon. gentleman did on Thursday last, when the hon. gentleman got up and filed a share list showing me with one share when he knew, or ought to have known, that I did not have a beneficial interest? Now the hon. gentleman can save time. I tell the hon. gentleman down in the Registry - look, you are looking through all of your papers. How many transactions, sixty or seventy - there are probably sixty or seventy affidavits that I signed. How many solicitors around have signed Affidavits of Value after there clients have told them what the value is for registration purposes? Now, here again, the hon. gentleman knows it and, you see, he is in a corner now, and you see what desperate lengths the man will go to. The hon. gentleman, I do not know why he is doing it, because I used to have an admiration for him and I look at him now in an obviously different way. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there must be something inherently unstable and inherently sick in a person who will take the character of an individual and is not human or man enough to get up and apologize after he admits the fact that he accepts that what he said before on which he based his allegations against my character is unfounded.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could have a moment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I found the document, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that this be tabled, first of all. This is a document relating to a legal transaction between Fairview Investments Limited and some private individuals where there is the affidavit dated April 25, 1984, of 'William W. Marshall, St. John's Solicitor, make oath and say that to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, the value of the property passing herein does not exceed \$5,000.'

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, I have the floor. The minister can get up afterwards.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, you notice the hon. gentleman said, William W. Marshall of St. John's, Solicitor. It was not William W. Marshall, Director of Fairview Investments.

MR. BARRY:

This is exactly, Mr. Speaker, the point. The minister is asking me to apologize when we still have, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the company for which the minister admittedly acts and receives legal fees, Mr. Speaker, receives an

advantage, that that company, in turn, obtained an advantage from the Cabinet of this Province of which that minister is a member. That is the point. Advantage in the hands of the minister through legal fees, advantage in the hands of the company through getting the land excluded from Pippy Park. Also, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget, where is that Outer Ring Road going? Mr. Speaker, along-side that property. Another decision, Mr. Speaker, involving government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to apologize to the minister until that minister stands up in this House and has the guts to support a motion to have a Select Committee investigate the facts that surrounded the exclusion of property of Fairview Investments Limited from Pippy Park. When the minister does that and when that select committee finds that there is no evidence, then I will apologize and not a second before.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

To that point of privilege raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), I am going to look at the transcript and I will rule on whether it is a prime facie case tomorrow.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, you are cutting me off. I can finish.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I have been listening to both sides, I thought, very carefully and at length. But if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has a few -

MR. BARRY:

I would like to table this document as soon as I can get some copies.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I am speaking to the hon. Leader. If you want a few more minutes, I am quite happy about it.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I really would.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, look, if the minister is acting in all innocence, the minister should have nothing to hide, the minister should have no reason to object to the setting up of a Committee to look into the matter. Because, Mr. Speaker, if we all accept in this House that the minister is as pure as the driven snow, Mr. Speaker, that his soul is unsullied and pure, let us all accept that, but we still have, Mr. Speaker, the fact that is not explained, that is not dealt with by the Premier or anybody else, that that company, for which the minister and his law firm acts on a large number of legal transactions and gets large legal fees, does not gain advantage from government, from Cabinet? Mr. Speaker, we have not seen the letter from the Premier where the minister disqualified himself, as he is suppose to under the Conflict of Interest Guidelines. We have not had the Premier deal with Guideline No. 5, which says that 'a minister should not own' -

DR. COLLINS:  
Beneficially.

MR. BARRY:  
It does not say shall not



beneficially own - and the minister was involved in drafting it - it says that 'a minister shall not own shares in a land development company.'

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I am trying to determine whether there is a prima facie case to the point of privilege raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). I have heard enough on that matter. I will study it and bring in my decision tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Your Honour, if I may, I will not waste Your Honour's time.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
I will not waste Your Honour's time. You might have said it was a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen the week before last, but maybe now it is a difference of opinion between one hon. gentleman and another individual.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. We have Conflict of Interest Guidelines here and,

these Conflict of Interest Guidelines set out certain things: that the minister shall file a letter with the Premier when he disqualifies himself from a Cabinet decision. We have the admission from the minister that he gains an advantage from the company, he acts as a lawyer and gets fees. And we have the admission that the value of the company's land went up as a result of the decision of Cabinet. Now, surely, Mr. Speaker, somebody, if not the Premier, if not the minister, somebody opposite has to get up and say: Is it proper that there was no letter filed with the Premier? Somebody has to get up and say: Is it proper that the minister owned a share?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) got up on a point of order to suggest that there was no prima facie case of a breach of privilege and I recognized the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) after that. There is no point of order.

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker. on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:  
Some time ago, Mr. Speaker, during debate on a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) intimated that I told the people in Pippy Park not to give any answers, but to contact me. I said he was a liar, and I withdrew the remark, and withdraw the remark again, Mr. Speaker. But, Sir, I have not been asked one

question on any land pertaining to who owns the land or what land was sold in Pippy Park. I do know, Sir, that I got a call from someone in Pippy Park who said he was being harassed by the executive assistant of the Leader of the Opposition, and asked what they would do.

I said, Sir, 'On anything pertaining to Pippy Park, you can answer the questions. On anything pertaining to me as the minister responsible for Pippy Park, direct it to me. To date, I have not received a question concerning land or anything. I must say, CBC called me and I will get the answer for them. Unfortunately, yesterday, I was busy, this morning I was at a funeral, and today I am here, but I will get back to the CBC with the answer to their query.

I asked the Pippy Park people, with respect to anything for which I am responsible in the House of Assembly, to refer it to me. I do not care if they go over and spend all day with the Pippy Park people. The man, Sir, told me that he had been asked a lot of questions and he did not know what to answer. I told him anything pertaining to Pippy Park, answer it, and anything pertaining to me, as a minister, refer it to me.

MR. FLIGHT:  
That is everything.

MR. YOUNG:  
It is not everything. I told you yesterday that Pippy Park is an autonomous body and I have no access to the Minutes and that sort of thing.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

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

MR. BARRY:  
We called and asked for information with respect to all the owners of the land excluded from Pippy Park and what representation had been made by the owners. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the word from the individual concerned, whose name I will not mention, he is not in this House, was that he had been advised not to supply information. When he was asked, 'Advised by whom?', he changed it to 'The Commission has decided not to release information.' Would the minister agree that the names of the owners of land excluded from Pippy Park is something that the Pippy Park Commission has the freedom of the minister to release - would the minister agree to that - and those people who represented them before the Commission?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

There is no point of order, just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:  
You are not Premier (inaudible.)

MR. BAIRD:  
And you never will be.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. YOUNG:  
You are just harassing people

like you did last week.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order. please!

### Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, I present a petition on behalf of seventy individuals who have been on strike for the last five months.

The petition reads: "To the hon. the House of Assembly: We, the undersigned, petition the House of Assembly to stop importing local brands of mainland beer to Labrador".

It is signed by members of the Molson's local and the Labatt's local, NAPE Local 7006 and 7004.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to it, I would like to thank the hon. the Leader of the Opposition for putting forth a series of questions that I would have asked if I had a chance but, unfortunately, I did not. I thank him for taking up the cause at this time.

There are a lot of things you can say about it. The fact is that the government in answers on Friday indicated that they were neutral in this particular dispute. I think now, looking at the fact that they are allowing the breweries to continue to sell for at least part of the Province, that that neutrality is at least somewhat suspect.

I do not want to belabor it too much because, as I said, it has

been said before, but I want to address one or two questions. Unfortunately neither the Premier nor the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) is here.

Since the Federation of Municipalities, in their convention several weeks ago, went on record asking for a deposit on all aluminum cans that are distributed in the Province, since, as I understand, and I stand to be corrected here, that the PC Party in convention in Corner Brook even passed the same or something similar to that in terms of a resolution, and since I have written to the Minister of Environment asking him why he is not asking the people bringing in these aluminum cans to perform the kind of evaluation of the impact on our environment that is necessary to determine whether or not this is a total mess - and I think most of us have seen this Summer it has become a tremendous mess throughout our entire Province - it is not a question I have but a desire to ask why nobody on the other side is responding to this Province?

The Minister of Environment is there. Thanks. I hope that he will answer the question. But, quite frankly, we have now gotten ourselves into a situation where there is an infinite number of beer cans being distributed throughout the Province and it is making a tremendous impact.

I ask, as part of what I am saying to this petition, why is the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation or whoever is responsible for bringing the aluminum cans in, why are they not asked, like everybody else is, to show what impact the importation of aluminum cans will have on our environment and why

are not the breweries asked, since they intend to put in these lines to processors, to do the same kind of study?

We ask people who are putting little hiking trails to the woods to do an impact study. Surely we can ask these corporations to show us why this will not deteriorate our environment tremendously because the evidence this Summer indicates it will tremendously.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I have the questions the hon. member asked in presenting the petition and I will certainly endeavour to answer them.

You are quite right in that aluminum cans do present a real problem to the environment. We recognize it. I am not in disagreement with you. In fact, I would say that aluminum cans, soft drinks and beer cans, represent about 15 per cent of the litter in the Province. So, obviously, as an Environment Minister that causes some concerns.

I would also like to point out as well though, by the way, that it is just not beer cans, it is Coke cans and Pepsi cans and all the other kinds of soft drink cans that find their way on the sides of streets and in the woods and so on.

As a matter of fact we feel that soft drink cans represent a slightly greater problem in that most alcoholic beverages, for the

most part I am saying, are drank indoors. They are drank in a pub or a club or in one's home or a cabin or what have you. But you have outdoors people who are do not have a good environmental conscience, obviously, and for that reason they discard those cans in an indiscriminate way along our countryside. Yes, that has caused us some real concern.

We, as a government, have not taken a position on banning the can but as the minister pointed out as late as today we were in agreement in putting forward to the union a position that we would have an industrial enquiry.

Now I could, by way of responding to the petition, Mr. Speaker, just point out to the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) whom I know had some concerns about this - I received some correspondence from him - that I am presently in the process of having these non-refillables if you like - it is not only aluminum cans by the way, there are many other kinds of containers that are causing environmental problems and that is the way I am addressing it, in an environmental way - we are having a thorough review of it. In other provinces in Canada, with the exception of Prince Edward Island because Prince Edward Island is a bit unique and I want to point that out to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the petition. Prince Edward Island is a bit unique in that it is a very small land mass and they can get these non-refillables into a few collection stations and brought together and then shipped to a recycling plant where it can be reused over again. That is in the plastics, those kind of bottles.

In Nova Scotia and in New

Brunswick, because I have just recently met with their ministers, they are having all kinds of problems with their rules and regulations and legislation.

I would like to, if we are going to address this aluminum can issue in meaningful way and a comprehensive way, then I would hope that we will learn from the misfortunes of others. There is no quick fix to it, there is no easy solution to it but I want to make the member aware, and the House aware, that -

MR. FLIGHT:  
(Inaudible) the environment.

MR. BUTT:  
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), Mr. Speaker, is obviously not listening to me because if he were he would find out exactly what I am doing.

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

MR. FLIGHT:  
(Inaudible) acknowledge the problem.

MR. BUTT:  
Yes, I acknowledge. Any time a container is put on a shelf and then bought by somebody and discarded, it presents a problem for the environment. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that you have to take into consideration marketplace demands, consumers rights and who will pay for it in the end.

I mean the long-term solution to this problem is obviously a good educational programme but, in the short-term, it is presenting a big problem. We are grappling with it now, Mr. Speaker, and at the earliest opportunity, as soon as

we get our survey completed of the shortcomings of other places and taking the best of what a place like PEI has in place, where it is working well, then I am sure that the government will act in a very responsible way.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
I would like to stand and speak in support of the petition. I do not think that the minister's response was satisfactory. I think that we are going to have to see some action from the minister and his department rather than these high flown words.

They indicated, Mr. Speaker, they were prepared to appoint an industrial enquiry when Carling O'Keefe settled. They should not be putting the pressure on the other union and let that problem fester. That industrial enquiry, once they committed themselves to doing it, should have started and should be going ahead. We could have the report by now.

You might have the strike settled if you had gone ahead with the enquiry, had it done now and brought in the decision as to whether or not there are harmful effects to the ecology and whether jobs are threatened in this Province by the lighter weight container being employed, Mr. Speaker.

Why is it that months have gone by now when government has not done anything on this industrial

enquiry? Mr. Speaker, the reason is because they are trying to pressure the people on the picket line to go back to work. They are not staying neutral. If they were prepared to stay neutral they would be going ahead with that industrial enquiry now, Mr. Speaker.

We ask the minister to make strong representation to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) to get off his behind and get that industrial enquiry going so that we can get an answer to this very, very difficult problem.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mc Nicholas):  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of some 5,459 residents of the communities of Windsor, Grand Falls and Bishop Falls representing the electoral districts of Grand Falls, Windsor-Buchans and Exploits. The prayer of the petition reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, call on the appropriate authorities to take immediate action to rectify the serious water problem being experienced by the residents of Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop Falls; and endeavour to get qualified medical expertise to determine the source of the contamination; and take definite steps to purify the water supply in our area."

This petition, Mr. Speaker, was

presented to me last Thursday, about four or five days ago, and, of course, with 5,400 names it must be one of the largest petitions, I suppose, ever presented in the Legislature. As I indicated to the concerned citizens committee last Thursday, I am privileged to be able to stand in my place today to support the prayer of this petition and to support the residents in their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly describe the background for the benefit of hon. members of this particular situation. A boil order has been in place since late July, more than three months ago now, and in an attempt to find the solution to the problem, the Exploits Regional Services Board, which administers the water supply system on behalf of the three communities concerned, had engineers doing an assessment of the problem and present recommendations to try to resolve the difficulties.

On August 29 I arranged for a meeting to be held between the board and town representatives with my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) to present these particular recommendations. The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) was also in attendance at that meeting and, my colleague, the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), who was out of the Province at the time, was represented.

Subsequently, following a cost analysis of those recommendations, Mr. Speaker, a request was formally received from the board to undertake a number of immediate actions; cleaning and refurbishing; flushing and disinfecting the entire 107

kilometres of water main, something which had never been before for the entire system; replacing filtering screens; providing some fencing and signing up around the water shed area for control purposes; replacing and improving the technical instrumentation to provide improved control of chlorination; and a study of the feasibility of providing a water treatment plant, both a technical assessment and a cost analysis.

The cost of those recommendations, Mr. Speaker, was \$327,000 and I am pleased to say the government responded quickly, in fact, within a matter of a week or ten days, and provided 100 per cent of the funds to undertake those recommendations and requests.

I want to add that an amount of \$75,000, Mr. Speaker, was included in that to engage consultants to do a study of the type of water treatment plant that might be required, because there are several types. The terms of reference also included that the consultants take a look the source of the supply and at alternate sources of supply to do an assessment of the capital costs associated because, obviously, it could be anywhere around \$5, \$6 or \$7 million. Nobody really knows. And, of course, to do an estimate of the cost of the operations after such a system was installed because the communities themselves would have to incur that expense. That is gestimated to be about \$400,000 to \$500,000. That is a very serious and important consideration.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the proposal for that study have been called and, in fact, will close next week. I expect my colleague,

the minister, will respond quickly to award a contract as soon as possible.

In the meantime, all the other recommendations and requests that were made in that initial report have been or are being carried out. In fact, I was advised today that all of the swabbing and disinfecting has been done in the three towns. I think that everybody is optimistic that the matter might, in the short term, be resolved sometime later this week or the early part of next week.

I want to add, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) who is also the Minister of Health and myself, as government members have worked with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) on the issue. We provided the residents of the communities with quick action in all instances where requests have been made. I feel certain that whatever the recommendations of the study are, with respect to a water treatment plant, we will work to the best of our ability to find a resolution.

I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the people of these communities have been very reasonable in their demands and made their views known at a public meeting held just a few weeks ago in no uncertain terms.

I also want to say that the business community in the Grand Falls area, in particular, Browning Harvey Limited, Abitibi Price and, in fact, the Provincial Beothuck Park, Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth have been able to provide water to the people on a regular basis. I want to commend those groups.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that ever since the beginning of life, I guess, water itself is a very vital part of our daily lifestyle and our daily existence but we can no longer take it for granted. Obviously, these kinds of situations occur from time to time. That is because our health and the health of our children and the health of future generations depends so heavily on it. That is why I think we must exert all the effort we can possibly muster to ensure that people do have a good pure water supply.

I want to assure to the residents who presented this petition to me that I will support them strongly in their efforts to try to find a satisfactory solution to this whole problem.

I table this petition, Mr. Speaker and ask that it be referred to the Department of Municipal Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to defer to the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) who got so involved and so concerned with the petition that I would have just as soon that he made his representation.

Mr. Speaker, I want first to association myself with the petition and I want to confirm that practically every statement that the minister made with regards to the kind of co-operation that the people of

Windsor, Grand Falls and Bishop Falls got from both ministers and from the Cabinet. There is no question about that Mr. Speaker, and I want to confirm that. I want to, on behalf of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, pass along my thanks in that sense.

But, Mr. Speaker, you see that begs a question. Let the minister who just presented this petition and the Minister of Health be aware that the appropriate authorities referred to in that petition is the Minister of Health and the Minister of Forestry. The people from Windsor and Grand Falls, from which I have had many concerns expressed this past two months, knows full well that I will support, as I have, the minister and the Cabinet in whatever they will do to cure the disastrous situation in Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop Falls.

But Mr. Speaker, the minister when he presented this said there was 5,450 names. Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, in excess of 20,000 in Grand Falls-Windsor-Bishop Falls have been badly inconvenienced this year. The water supply that the Minister talks about, and that the minister who will follow his will also have to talk about has a bigger problem now than just the short term problem they had with the coliform that was in the water. That water has been considered by most of the people in Grand Falls as unfit to drink since day one. The people of Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls and Windsor have lost confidence in that system. The dollars that the minister refers to now, what was spent and what will be spent, are purely cosmetic and it is cosmetic in their eye. The minister can go in next week and he can announce another \$200,000 and build a fence



around a reservoir, he can clean the lines again, but there is no reason in the minds of the people of Windsor, Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls, that the line should ever have to be cleaned.

There are towns in this Province with a water system for fifty years and nothing only normal chlorinization, normal treatment, and never, never was there a coliform, was there any sort of bacteria, never a vile odor, never a bad taste, and never discoloration. The people in Windsor, Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls believe, whether it is right or wrong - that is the minister's problem - they believe that they are drinking out of a bog hole. They are, in effect, drinking water out of a bog hole. They know it and they believe it. No amount of money poured in in a cosmetic way will change their minds.

There are two options this government have available to them, or a government that I were a part of would have available to them and that is either identify a new source that, with normal treatment, will guarantee the people of Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop's Falls a clean, pure water supply or else put a filtration system, a treatment plant on the present source. We talk about a treatment plant costing \$5 million or \$10 million. The government, the Cabinet, with the minister's concurrence, can spend \$10 million over the next ten years in cosmetic ways on that system and they will not satisfy a person.

There are hundreds and hundreds, if not thousands of people who will never drink the water again from that system. There are children going into those schools

in Windsor, being bused in, eight hours a day, no access to a decent glass of water. The hospital is in trouble. Businesses are closing down. It is unbelievable the problems caused by that polluted water, the polluted system and the polluted source. Mr. Speaker, in a day - I want the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) to address himself to this when he stands up - when we can put a man on the moon, all the officials in his department cannot recognize the source of that bacteria. We all know that coliform is supposed to be in most people's minds related to animal or human waste. That bacteria was present and nobody can determine where it came from, how it got into the water source.

Mr. Speaker, no amount of cosmetic approaches to that system are going to get the ministers off the hook. They are going after a treatment plant and they are going after an alternate source. The government of the day had better make their minds up or it is just as well they make their minds up that that is what they are going to have to deal with.

When the results of this survey that has now been announced by the minister comes in, it will not matter what is recommended in that, it will not matter. It will not matter if the report says that if we fence the system or we take away the cabins or clean out new lines, it will not matter. They will say, "Forget it. That is the kind of stuff we have been hearing for the past ten years, ever since the people went on that source it smells, it is dirty and now the greatest insult of all, 20,000 per people in excess of three months have had to drive all over Central Newfoundland to find a decent cup

of water. We are entitled to pure, clean water." That is all the people from Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls and Windsor are demanding. They are not prepared to put up with what they will see as a cosmetic approach to the system.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and I thank the minister for the co-operation that he has given the towns up to this point in time, but I leave him with the message and this message comes from all of his constituents and all of the hon. Minister of Health's constituents and mine, that they will accept nothing less than a new source that will take only normal treatment, or a filtration plant.

So the ministers might as well start convincing their colleagues in Cabinet to look at where the funding is coming from, because in that petition they are the appropriate authorities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. TWOMEY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I take great pleasure in supporting the petition that was so capably presented by my friend and colleague, the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). I think he has enumerated in detail all the facts and it would be repetitious on my part to go over them again.

However, I think that there are a few things that must be clear to

all of us is that we have given a lot of thought and consideration to this. We have had joint meetings between the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Environment and the Department of Health. We have also had discussions with the engineers, who have been participants in the engineering project, trying to access the problems as they are there now in the water supply to Windsor, to Grand Falls and to Bishop's Falls.

I understand that during the last week they have consulted with a Dr. Tobin, who is apparently working in Ottawa and apparently has devoted a lot of his life and his energies on the professional side to municipal supplies of water, not only in the environs of Ottawa, but all over this nation. I am very glad to say that I have heard it reported that Dr. Tobin was extremely pleased and he found that everything that has been done to date has fitted in with the criterion of his scientific recommendations. I know it is going to be carefully assessed. But, unfortunately, it is not the only problem in the Central Newfoundland area. We also have a similar problem in Botwood, also in the district of Exploits, and we have some other problems in a few other towns.

We realize that it is a serious problem and I am sure that everyone in this House would agree, as we do on this side of the House, that one of the most important things for each and every one of us is an excellent supply of good, clear, pure drinking water.

These are our aims. We will obviously listen to the advise of our consultants in all spheres and

we will do everything that is humanly possible, as members of the districts, Exploits, Grand Falls, and I would join with you, Sir, in saying Windsor-Buchans.

You can have my assurance that I will give you and the people of the area as much assistance as is humanly possible for the part I play in this government at this time. I support the petition.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Are there any further petitions?

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:  
Do I have leave or not?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Does the hon. minister have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No.

MR. SPEAKER:  
No, okay.

#### Orders of the Day

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, if I may. My understanding is that both sides of the House have given unanimous consent that we may go now to the resolution that I introduced today that was related to Bill 49. My understanding is that agreement

has been reached on both sides, we can now go to the resolution and Bill 49.

If I am correct in that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to report that I have received a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

"October 29, 1985. The hon. the Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the 31st. day of March, 1986 by way of further Supplementary Supply, and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these Estimates to the House of Assembly.

(Sgd) W. Anthony Paddon,  
Lieutenant-Governor."

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I move that the message, together with the amount, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

#### Committee of Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order!

Shall the resolution carry?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, just a word on the process first.

Hon. members will, of course, understand that the main estimates were brought in last March or April, I cannot remember the month now. But anyway, the main estimates were brought in and, subsequently, the main Supply Bill was passed.

Now, what we are doing here, we are taking a somewhat unprecedented action. I do not believe it has been done in this House of Assembly since 1949. What we are doing now we are bringing in a Supplementary Supply Bill related to the current fiscal year. The reason why we are doing that is that there was not a head of expenditure in the main Supply Bill for the purpose that we want to bring in this head of expenditure. At that time there was no perception that we would need a particular head of expenditure in the hon. minister's department, that is, the Department of Advanced Studies and Career Development.

So, in the absence of a head, and with the House sitting we could not bring in a Special Warrant for this purpose. If the House was not sitting, there is a provision in the Financial Administration Act - it is Section 28, Subsection (3) - which would allow us to bring in a Special Warrant for this purpose. But because the House is sitting we cannot presume to spend money and presume that the House would subsequently ratify it. It has to be put to

the House in the first instance. As long as the House is sitting and as long as we are dealing with Supplementary Supply for the current year.

Now hon. members know that if we are dealing with Supplementary Supply for a previous year there can be Special Warrants brought in for that purpose and then the House can subsequently ratify it. But that is the procedure we are in here now. So it is really it is almost like we are back to the Budget debate, but dealing with this specific purpose. There is a resolution. The resolution states:

"It is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1986 - that is the present fiscal year - the sum Nine Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$9,500,000)."

This sum is broken down in the Schedule attached to the bill to which the resolution applies. Again, hon. members of the Committee will understand that what we do in Committee is debate the resolution, but then when we go back into the House it is presumed that we have already done second reading on the bill, so the bill goes through all readings.

There is a Schedule attached to that bill to which the resolution refers and it breaks down the \$9.5 million. There is \$55,000 for salaries. This is for additional staff required to administer this programme.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I think myself and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) met behind the curtain and we agreed that we would pass this bill rather quickly if the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) would stand and supply us with the details of the programme. We would, perhaps, make a few short points on it and we would pass the bill quickly.

I am just wondering what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), is he familiar that that was the process we intended to use? Or are they as confused as ever over there?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. All Supplementary Supply Bills or all finance bills are introduced through the Department of Finance and through myself as minister.

MR. TULK:

We know that.

DR. COLLINS:

So we are going according to the rules of the House. Now, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) does not understand the rules of the House and does not understand parliamentary procedure, I will be glad to speak to him about it later.

If I may continue, the various items have been listed in the

Schedule and there are Salaries there for \$55,000, Travel for \$15,000, Purchased services for \$20,000, Property, Furnishings and Equipment for \$10,000, and Grants and Subsidies \$9,400,000. So that is the \$9.5 million.

I think it is important to understand that the federal government will be paying into the consolidated fund the sum of \$7.5 million, so the actual expenditures from our Treasury will be the balance, that is \$2 million.

With those brief remarks, and I say those because the Leader of the Opposition opposite does not seem to understand what we are about here, but with those few brief remarks I move the resolution and the bill subsequent thereto.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman, as you can imagine a programme of this nature, which is a reaction to an emergency situation in the fishing industry, all of the details which we all might like to have at any given moment, are being worked out, I guess, on pretty well a daily basis.

I will give you just a little background, Mr. Chairman, and I do thank the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) who says that we do have concurrence to pass this resolution very quickly. That shows a certain understanding of the tragic situation in the inshore fishery during this year.

Just let me summarize, Mr. Chairman, a couple of things that have happened this year in the inshore fishery.

We estimate, and it is very difficult to be accurate, but we estimate that as much as \$50 million worth of valued fish products have not been landed this year because of the reduced landing in many of the Northeastern Newfoundland communities. That means, of course, with that that \$50 million worth of fish value, that an awful lot of fish plant workers and fishermen have received a very, very small, almost insignificant amount of income since May 15, when they actually began the fishing season.

MR. TULK:

Are you talking about landed value?

MR. POWER:

Landed value we estimate to be \$50 million. We estimate, Mr. Chairman, that besides having a very large number of people with very low incomes since May, that as many as 3,000 people, and realizing again that accurate assessments are very difficult to get at any one point in time, but we estimate that as many as 3,000 people have not, as of yet, qualified for UIC. That breaks down to be about 1,500 plant workers and about 1,500 fishermen. So if you combine the fact that we have 3,000 people who have not qualified for UIC and we have another very large section of the population who have a very low UI, if they can qualify at all, when you combine those two problems with the fact that somehow or other fishermen are supposed to have some savings that they have either earned during the season or that they earned from

UI, savings they are suppose to use to start up in 1986, to begin the fishing season again, you can see the magnitude of the problem in many rural Newfoundland communities.

We had a very interesting discussion, both myself, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Cashin from the Fishermens Union, and some staff in Ottawa with the hon. Flora MacDonald to try and find a way to alleviate those problems. The issues that we discussed, especially from the union point of view, was an averaging system whereby you would average UI earnings over the last three years. Of course, Ms. MacDonald and her department finds that pretty well impossible to do without going back to the House of Commons. Again, it would be very difficult to average UI earnings anyway because it is an insurance scheme and you get benefits from the programme based upon how much earnings you actually have. In many places, in many other parts of Canada, in the tobacco industry, in some of the farming, some of these rates of earnings have been very much down this Summer as well. If you averaged UI earnings for Newfoundland fishermen, you really have to say that there will not be a high and a low in UI benefits. You really have to have an average for everyone because there would be no way to do it for one part of the country without doing it for everyone. What we have worked out, Mr. Chairman, to respond to this need, is a \$9.5 million emergency works programme for fishermen and fish plant workers.

Mr. Chairman, I might as well just give the other ideas we looked at. Landing more fish was considered, if at all possible,

but that has caused some serious problems from the fish management point of view. If we allocate a certain amount of fish stocks for the Newfoundland coast this year, you will also have to allocate it for certain parts of the Nova Scotia Coast as well, which causes some problems. Of course, the union and the government also impressed upon Ms. Flora MacDonald at that meeting the urgency to also be a little bit more flexible with the Canadian Job Strategy and the \$38 million.

In many parts of Canada, not alone Newfoundland, there have been problems with the Canadian Job Strategy. We have certainly got Ms. MacDonald's concurrence to be flexible in the job strategy so that the \$35 million which is left there now, which can be accessed by -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:  
Three point five which leaves \$38 million in the Canadian job strategy of which fishermen, fish plant workers, wives of fishermen or spouses of plant workers are eligible to access. We will now be able to have a Canadian Job Strategy programme in Newfoundland in which the training component will not be as rigidly enforced. It will not be as rigidly enforced in Newfoundland as we had planned in the beginning.

I am a very strong supporter of the training component in the Canadian Job Strategy because we have to have training if we are going to make people better qualified to find jobs next year.

MR. FUREY:  
What do you want to train them for?

MR. POWER:  
Well, the simple fact is that in those programmes we can train people. We can give people experience. An apprentice carpenter, for instance, can go to work at a project and get twenty weeks of work at carpentry which makes him a better carpenter the following year when he goes to work. So that kind of training component is a good idea and it is a good concept. I do not apologize for having worked with Ms. MacDonald to get that training component in there because it is a very important and innovative improvement in what was the old Canada Works system.

But, you cannot do it all in one year. Our ambitious plan to change it from old Canada Works - the fence around the graveyard kind of syndrome - to something new and better, we may not all be able to accomplish this year. But the thought is correct and the plan is correct.

The \$9.5 million of work that we are going to have this year is primarily designed for fishermen and fish plant workers. Those are the only people who will be eligible for this \$9.5 million. The application forms will be done the same as the Canadian Job Strategy, through my department and through the CEIC people. So at any Canada Manpower Center, and there is a mailing list there of, I think they have sent out something like 5,000 applications now.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:  
It has been reduced and been made flexible.

We will approve projects in the Canadian Job Strategy based upon the need of the community. Okay? The training element will be in certain places.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:  
The applications are coming in and we will approve them as they come in.

So the CEIC and Career Development will have application forms both for the Canadian Job Strategy and this \$9.5 million that we are doing today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. POWER:  
Wait now. Are we talking Canadian Job Strategy questions or are we talking about this \$9.5 million? I am trying to put the two of them together to show you that fishermen's wives and other persons in the community who do not have UI, or have very low UI, have a \$35 million fund that can access. There is a \$9.5 million fund which only fishermen and plant workers can access. The rules for the \$9.5 million are different than the rules for the \$35 million. At the same time the rules for the \$35 million are reduced and flexible compared to what they were originally announced. Okay?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No.

MR. POWER:  
All right. Let me do the \$9.5 million first and we will do them piecemeal if you want.

For the \$9.5 million, a

three-person committee has been established. Mr. Kevin Carroll has been appointed in the Fishermen's Union, Mr. Ed McCann will be on for my Department and I am not really sure if the CIC has designated a person yet in their group who is going to be the contact person. These three persons will be outside the regular bureaucracy of the feds and ourselves so these things can move very, very quickly.

We want to have the concurrence that we have from the Opposition to pass this before six o'clock. It will make it that much more prompt to deliver these programs to fishermen and plant workers who are in very great need. We would hope that by today we will have this passed and within three or four days we will start receiving some applications.

My colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and his staff has done an excellent job, they have been monitoring this situation since August. They have projects which they have identified and we will have projects in certain communities which have very great need, some are fisheries related and some are municipal and other are related in other ways. But certainly the Minister of Fisheries has projects there that we will be able to -

MR. TULK:  
May I ask a question?

MR. POWER:  
Yes.

MR. TULK:  
Who has the final decision on what applications are approved, the three-member committee, you, or the federal government?



MR. POWER:

The three-person committee will have the say.

MR. TULK:

The final decision?

MR. POWER:

Yes. Well I guess the format would be that both Ms. MacDonald and I will sign the form which officially approves the projects but this three-person committee -

MR. TULK:

But once they say, "You sign them." you will sign them.

MR. POWER:

That is done on regular applications anyway.

MR. TULK:

Sure, tell me all about it.

MR. DOYLE:

You would not accuse us of political pork-barrelling, would you?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:

Yes we are, as we have done in the past.

The three-person committee will have the say in recommending to the ministers who obviously, will have final and parliamentary or, I guess, a legitimate say in approving different projects. So the three-person committee will be there. The Department of Fisheries has been very active in identifying projects so we have projects available, we have the committee available, we have the money available after today so we should be able to move very quickly with getting persons who have no UIC on these projects

first.

The order of priority for employment on these projects will be fishermen or fishers, if you want, and fish plant workers-

AN HON. MEMBER:

What?

MR. POWER:

Fishers, I had a very active lady who fished in Petty Harbour for a while as a very active fisher.

The priorities will be fishers and fish plant workers first, who have not qualified for UI, then it will be fisherpersons and fish plant workers who have very low UI for this \$9,500,000, and realizing the other \$35 million Canadian Job Strategy is there for the other groups in the Province who do not have their requirements satisfied.

One important part to note is that although the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has done a excellent job and I am sure Fishermen's Committees around the Province will be able to have projects in a fisheries-related sector, all the money does not have to be spent in fisheries projects.

If you have a community where they do not need a slipway or a wharf or do not need gear improved then, obviously, it is possible for a municipal project to be funded from this \$9,500,000, as long as plant workers are there.

One of the things we will be working on in this program is that because of the situation which I described that fishers are going to have a very hard time getting involved in the fishery in 1986 because of their low UI and low earnings, that we may be able to

use some of these programs to actually improve fishing gear.

MR. TULK:  
(Inaudible.)

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

MR. POWER:  
I have said it two or three times but your colleagues are talking around in circles, as mine are now.

MR. TULK:  
No, I heard what you said. Will this be a revolving door policy that once a guy or lady gets his or her Unemployment Insurance Benefits then they will automatically come off that project and someone else will go on, is that the way it will work?

MR. POWER:  
Well, to tell you the truth, Mr. Chairman, we really have not worked out that detail but that is the way we envisage it happening in many places. Albeit, there might be a set of circumstances where in order to have a viable project you have to have a project that goes on for ten or twenty weeks. If you are going to start a piece of a slipway, you have got to finish and there may be people who may satisfy their UI requirements, but who will stay on to complete that project, okay?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
But, on the other hand,  
(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:  
Yes, and if we have forty people in a community, but we can only keep one project there for twenty weeks, then, obviously, we will rotate them and take people off as they satisfy the requirements.

So, Mr. Chairman, again the programme is in response to a very emergency and drastic situation in rural Newfoundland. All things are not perfect, but we do have \$9.5 million here. We have \$35 million in the Canadian Job Strategy, and we are pretty hopeful as a government that we will be able to satisfy the needs of these people who are having a very difficult year. We look forward to having these projects announced within the next week or ten days.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Will that employ miners in Buchans?

MR. POWER:  
This does not apply. In regard to the \$35 million, obviously, anybody unemployed or with low UI benefits anywhere in Newfoundland can apply for projects under those guidelines that are there.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are delighted as a government and we thank many persons, especially, Ms. Flora MacDonald and Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Cashin in the Fishermen's Union, people who are very receptive to this kind of an arrangement and certainly who contributed to its being announced and being put together very, very quickly.

So we are hoping that we will be able to have these projects alleviating the need that is in many rural communities in Newfoundland in the next ten to twelve days. I am sure that many persons will be delighted to hear of this programme today. I guess if there are any other questions -

MR. TULK:  
(Inaudible) many fishers, fisherfolk and fisherpersons.

MR. POWER:

Many fishers. I just mentioned fishers, it is a word that maybe coming into vogue. As I mentioned in my district I had a very active fisherwoman, and when you say, fishermen, she always got upset.

MR. TULK:

Do you call her fisherwoman?

MR. POWER:

Well, fisherwoman or fisher makes it a little bit easy sometimes. Fishers. Fishers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:

Sometimes.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, some of the questions I know are said in some humour, but the programme is very serious. The problems are very serious. We certainly hope that during this Fall and Winter we will be able to make the lives of the fishermen who contribute so much to this Province just a little bit easier.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, with regards to this Interim Supply money, the \$9.5 million that is allocated for emergency help for our fishermen and fisherwomen in this Province, as the minister has pointed out there are 3,000 who do not qualify for UIC, approximately 1,500 fish

plant workers, and approximately 1,500 fishermen.

My own immediate concern when I heard about the \$9.5 million was why it was coming so late when the pointed was pointed out so early? The minister in Ottawa said, wait until the Fall fishery. Then the Fall fishery passed. Of course, we found out that there may be 3,000 people who are not qualified for UIC, but there are a lot of other people who are qualified for UIC but are only getting \$110 every two weeks or so. It is very, very low. In actual fact it would be better, and the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) will surely agree with me, for some of these people to go on welfare than it would be to get support from such low UIC.

The other part that was pointed out, and I hope the minister will take note of this. We have seen time and time again with different regulations under Canada manpower, that if a person now only needed two stamps to qualify they have to get on a project and work for the full fifteen or twenty weeks because manpower said, our job is not just qualifying for UIC, it is carrying out the full project. So if it is going to be fifteen to twenty weeks, then these people have to stay on it. So I hope the minister takes note of that.

If this is emergency help that there will also be more relaxation on the rules and allow more people to be hired on these projects. Of course, again this side agrees that the main aim is not only to help people get their stamps and be able to benefit and not go on welfare because the Province would have to pay 50 per cent of welfare, whereas these projects see the federal government pay 100

per cent. I would hope that on these projects that we would make sure that the project is carried out but there would also be flexibility.

Another thing that I am rather concerned with is why was there not a change made in the UIC rules to round out the past three or four years of benefits for fishermen. And the minister tried to pass that off and say it would be very, very difficult for the minister to enact legislation in the House of Commons. But what we are seeing, Mr. Chairman, is the hawks, the capitalists, in Ottawa, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), Mr. Nielsen, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans from that great port up in White Horse, having the say and basically saying to the Minister of Employment and Immigration, Ms. MacDonald, "No, we cannot afford to change the rules in Unemployment Insurance because if we do it for one group we will have to do it for the other." Hence, we have this emergency part.

I would also like to point out that the other thing is, as was pointed out in the Liberal caucus committee that went around the Province, what representation was done to the minister and to the other members in Cabinet which basically ended up saying that fishermen should be able to qualify for UIC as soon as they stop fishing and apply and be treated like construction workers or like anybody else who was finished a job. Why are fishermen being discriminated against that they have to wait until November. Mr. Chairman, that was not addressed and that should have been addressed.

The other thing that has to be

pointed out, with this \$9.5 million we are seeing now the federal government cracking down on trying to collect outstanding money, overpayments, by the Department of Fisheries and also the fishermen themselves owing back taxes. Why has not the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) been in charge of this programme? Why has not representation been made to freeze the amount of money? These fishermen for the past three or four years have had hard times and the federal government now, even if it is a Tory Government, realizes that \$9.5 million - is not enough but it is a help - that it is an emergency. But in the meantime another department, the Department of Revenue is saying, "Okay, you owe us money, you had a bad fishery the year before and the year before and now again, now you owe us money and you have to pay it." They cannot afford to pay it, interest is going up all the time. Why do not the federal government put the freeze on that instead of owing \$2,000 maybe back in 1983 it is now up to \$8,000 or \$9,000, and that I think is criminal. I hope the Minister of Fisheries will address that because it is a major problem.

I have people in my district who owed money, could not afford to pay it and now find their bill doubled, not because of capital but because of the interest.

The other part I have to say with regard to this \$9.5 million and how different department contradict each other is their UIC premium. It is going up in January. The fishermen have to pay more for the UIC, the employee of the plant has to pay more and other industry and the end result is that it is doing to our system,

people are not hiring people full-time because they do not have to pay UIC or give them any other benefits and so what the Tory Government is doing in Ottawa is raising its premium, more people are hiring more people on part-time and as a result we see it in the nursing profession, we see it in the service industry, we see it in the fishing plants and things, not having permanency.

Mr. Chairman, this Committee of three people, it is good. I hope that these three people have the final say. I hope that political influence will not be brought in to bear, that these people will treat all districts equally. I will say to the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), I remember again when I was being elected we had a problem again with the fishery, so we had emergency supply and so much money was given to the Department of Fisheries. I still do not know why this money is not given to the Department of Fisheries to handle even though when it was handled the other time there were problems.

One of the problems that came into being was there was only a short notice given for cutoff and everybody had to get their applications in on time. Who did that hurt? That hurt Labrador. That hurt the Northern Peninsula and other areas where they had to get the applications out to the communities, Mr. Chairman, and apply and then get them in. Some of it was done over the phone, but the end result, Mr. Chairman, was my district got one project because the money was coming in and being spent so fast that the ones who got it were the ones who could drive into St. John's with their application and pick it up

and bring it back instead of putting it in the mail.

I hope that the minister will take note of this. If he knows where these 3,000 fishermen and plant workers are and that projects are coming in from other areas, that these are the 3,000 people who will be targeted. I can tell you that I have fishermen and women down in Lodge Bay, Labrador and down in Cartwright and down in Black Tickle - and we will see the example up in Rigolet where the make-work projects are on the go by the Department of Social Services - that I hope that some money is kept for rural areas and for isolated areas. I hope that the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) will also make sure that it takes place, Mr. Chairman.

The other part that I would like to point out is that the minister said that this programme has a job training element and that he is very pleased to be identified with the job training element in it. Well I would go so far as to say that I think the minister in many ways is losing a little bit of touch with reality, that instead of bringing in a programme geared towards that, Quebec made the changes. There is nothing wrong with training our people but, in the meantime, more notice should be given.

The \$35 million project was only announced less than a month ago and now we have this announcement of \$9.5 million. Then the federal government says there is a job training element. If you are going to give the job training element there should have been more notice given and more people realizing that. That is going to be a major problem for rural areas of the Province, whether it be

Isle aux Morts, whether it be Torngat, whether it be Black Tickle or whether it be Cow Head or wherever.

So, Mr. Chairman, this programme itself is good. We recommend it. I would hope and I would say that this is because of the caucus committee that the Liberals sent around the Summer, because of the representation by the Fishermen's Union, also the vocal opposition of the fishermen themselves - and they are to be commended. I remember hearing the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) saying the reality is now. People have not got gasoline. They are cut off and they cannot go because they have not got any money to pay for the gasoline. They are cut off at the grocery store because they have overshot their limit. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) could get up on that, why do you think the people down in Rigolet ran the manager of the Hudson Bay Store out of town? Did they do it for the sake of doing it or did they do it from the point of view that their fishery had failed? They wanted to extent their credit. They would not give them credit. What did they do? They then ended up rising in their community. Then, after the fact, other projects were brought in.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a disastrous fishery. We have had, Mr. Chairman, the result that has been brought in, but I hope compassion will be used. I hope flexibility will be used. I hope those 3,000 people are not just statistics that you know where those 3,000 people are. Those will be the people to get those jobs, not the first ones who brings in a project. Be careful of that because that happened three or four years ago, the ones

nearer the centre could get them in.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will find that this government still has to address the problem of the fishermen and the plant workers who are going to get low UIC and have to pay high energy bills, high fuel bills this Winter. Will the Department of Social Services, perhaps, we will be asking the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) some question on that. I will ask the Minister of Social Services now will his department undertake to top up those who are drawing low UIC to bring it up to the level of criteria that his department has. I hope he will get into that.

MR. BRETT:  
(Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK:  
Okay. Well, that is up to the media and members of the House to get that out.

The other thing that I would like to say in closing, is that, if those people can get it who apply, and I hope the media does pick that up, that those who are receiving low UIC and do qualify, they can apply to the Department of Social Services and they will top up the amount.

So, Mr. Chairman, in concluding I support the idea of passing it and we will pass it as soon as we can. But the fact still remains that we only got \$9.5 million. We do need more. Also, flexibility has to be given. I hope there is going to be no political interference by those projects. I will caution that because we have seen it with the roads in the Province. We have seen it in the Department of Municipal Affairs.

We have seen it in development grants of Rural Development. We have seen it in the Department of Development where preference has been given to Tory friends and Tory communities.

We hope, Mr. Chairman, that those who are hungry, those who cannot pay their food bill or their fuel bill will be treated with justice, compassion, understanding and flexibility.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Shall the resolution carry?

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just want to have a few brief words to say concerning this particular bill.

I was very pleased to listen to my friend, the Minister of Everything, as he made his presentation. I was interested for a couple of reasons. The first reason was, I was kind of interested that he was making the presentation at all. I see according to his title that he is Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies. This is neither further career development nor advanced studies. I was wondering why it did not come under the purview of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) whom I thought would more properly be able to handle this kind of programme. There must be a reason, Mr. Chairman. Maybe, it is the same reason that had the Minister of Fisheries sitting in

the backbenches and not allowed to speak at the opening of the Fisheries College very recently.

MR. TULK:  
That was scandalous, boy. That was scandalous.

MR. FLIGHT:  
There is a message in that, Mr. Minister.

MR. SIMMS:  
Are you aware that training takes place in the college?

MR. TULK:  
Are you aware that it is called the College of Fisheries and Marine Technology?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:  
It shows the commitment to the fisheries of this government.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Chairman, the second reason why I was very interested in what the minister had to say and I wish he were here now because I need some clarification. I hope we get it before the House closes this afternoon.

The minister referred in his introduction of the bill to the fact that there would be a relaxing of the restrictions that are placed on the programme that now replaces the Canada Works Programme. I think that this is a very significant announcement as well, Mr. Chairman, because communities all over the Province, including the communities in the fishing areas of the Province, have had the understanding that this Fall programme had to be very largely tied to training. Deadlines are fast approaching and

many communities that I know of, and I have talked to people in a lot of communities, many communities have decided that they cannot develop a training programme to take advantage of the money that is available this Fall. So they have not submitted their applications and kind of given up on it.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could get the minister to answer the questions of my colleague from Gander (Mr. Baker).

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Chairman is not there to run around for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

All of a sudden, just a couple of days before the deadline for applications, just a few days before the deadline for applications the hon. minister announces, quite off handedly, that these restrictions are now being lifted, that in actual fact of the applications that are submitted that not much attention is now going to be paid to the training element. There is going to be a relaxation in the requirements for the training element.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I find it really strange that this is done so close to the deadline for applications and I know for the minister's benefit and I will just

repeat it again, that there are many communities, Mr. Minister, that have not submitted applications and have decided not to submit applications simply because they could not really understand the training element to start with but could not really fit a programme to the training element. So you have a lot of communities out there, many of them fishing communities, that have just given up on this Fall programme.

There are a couple of things that can be done but it seems to me that the most sensible thing now would be to relax the time limits, to move the time for consideration of the grants ahead a little bit to give these communities now time to develop their programmes with a little less training involved and so on so they can take advantage of the money. However, that creates -

MR. TULK:

They might also spend some money advertising to tell people about this.

MR. BAKER:

Yes, well the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dawe) spent a fair amount advertising himself recently and maybe the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) would like to see his picture in the newspaper a few times. My suggestion, in case the minister was not listening, was that perhaps an advertising programme could be undertaken. The Minister of Municipal Affairs recently had quite successfully ran an advertising campaign with his picture front and centre and maybe the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies could take advantage of this opportunity to have his smiling



face throughout the Province for a couple of weeks.

Mr. Chairman, there is a problem with my suggestion, as probably the Minister of Career Development would immediately recognize. If, in fact, we now slow up the process to allow these other communities time to now make out their applications we are, in fact, slowing up the delivery of this money to communities that already have their applications in.

MR. POWER:

No, some are (inaudible).

MR. BAKER:

Okay, so I would not want to slow that process up. However, I would further suggest to the minister that perhaps an amount of money out of the programme be set aside for people who submit late applications and to ensure that the money is not all allocated before the communities that now might qualify get a chance to put their applications together.

MR. POWER:

Could I make just one point?

MR. BAKER:

Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:

One was October 17 which we expected to have an initial flood of applications where we might use most of the money and the other date, I think, it was sometime in December, but we will accept applications all through.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I understand that what the minister is saying is correct. I know the process however there was never any guarantee that the application that came in in December would ever get funded so I am just making the request that a certain amount of money be set aside for delayed funding.

I have a great deal of concern for the kind of general attitude that this Fall we are going to introduce this training programme, because, Mr. Chairman, we have heard year after year members opposite complain about make-work programmes and the fact that they have to be stopped and that they are going to stop this kind of process. They made an attempt to do it this Fall. They made fun of the Canada Works programme even when, Mr. Chairman, I suspect that the majority of recreational facilities in this Province were built using Canada Works funding. The town halls, the fire halls and so on were built using Canada Works project funding and a lot of fun was made of this. Now there seems to be a backing away, there seems to be an admission by government that in Newfoundland, at least, and Newfoundland is a special case, in Newfoundland at least, that kind of works programme is necessary until we can come to the point where we can create permanent jobs for the people.

MR. TULK:

You know that crowd spend years belly aching.

MR. BAKER:

Absolutely years belly aching

about the Liberals and their works programmes and so on and obviously now they find the necessity of such a programme.

So I am kind of concerned about the attitude that the training component is there but we will kind of relax it a little bit, and I am wondering why. The minister said that they have made strong representations about this particular programme to the minister and the fact that it needs to be suited to Newfoundland's needs and the training component has to be relaxed.

I wonder why the minister could not get a commitment from the federal minister to specifically design a works programme for Newfoundland. I understand that the province of Quebec had a programme designed for them, specifically for them, and I am wondering if indeed we could not have gotten a programme that is particularly designed to our Province? I am thinking in terms of in areas where there is no private enterprise, for lack of a better word, in areas where there is really nothing to train people for and there is no possibility of training people, in these areas that we go back to the Canada Works type programme until we can create the permanent jobs and maybe in some of the larger centers where it is easier to get into training that we get into the training component.

I would also like point out that it seems to me that this training component, in this particular programme, is in one sense an incursion of federal responsibility into provincial responsibility. If, in fact, we are going to go with a training

programme, then this should be a total provincial responsibility and instead of the feds being tied to the money that this be simply passed over to the Province and that after that point they have nothing else to do with it because if it is training, then it comes under this minister's responsibilities and not under the federal responsibility at all.

One final point that I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, and that is that we have now, and I am very happy to see it, come out with a special allotment of money, and taken some money from the present allotment, and we have made an exception for the fishermen who are in trouble this year in our Province. I, for one, have said that that is needed and we have to do it until we can straighten out the problems in the fishing industry, if ever.

But I would like to point out to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) that there are many other groups of people in this Province as well that are experiencing just as disastrous conditions as the fishermen. There are 3,300 fishermen, by the minister's estimates, that will not be able to receive UIC but I would put to the minister that there are far more than 3,300 young people in this Province who maybe can get a weeks work here and a weeks there but never, ever get enough to qualify for UI. They are living from hand to mouth. Some of them are married and some of them have kids and they are living from hand to mouth, off other people, on welfare or whatever. There is a vast world of people out there. There are thousands and thousands of people who do not have access to a special program and it is

just as much of a disaster for these young people. It is just as much a disaster for the Buchans miners. It is just as much a disaster for the people in Glenwood who got laid off when Bowaters pulled out and nothing was done for them - just as much a disaster. They have been years now trying to scrape a few weeks work here and a few weeks work there and while there was a make-work project, at least some of them could survive fairly well.

However, there is no special allowance made for these groups of people and I really think that if by making the strong representations to the federal government, if we can get an exception made in the case of the fishermen, then I am sure that we can also get an exception made in the case of these other groups of people.

Mr. Chairman this is probably for our Liberal caucus as well as well as for members opposite. A suggestion could be that if the task force on fisheries initiated on this side could bring this issue to the floor and initiate this kind of action on it, then maybe we should initiate our task force on our young people and our one-industry town people who have been displaced from jobs and so on. Maybe we can set up our task force and then that might stimulate the members opposite to push their federal counterparts even harder to get a special program for these people who are in need.

One final thing in concluding, Mr. Chairman, this announcement that the minister has made of the relaxing of the conditions, whether it be that ten per cent of

the applicants are going to be processed without training or whatever the process, when the press announces this today as an announcement from the minister, can communities, I think they should be allowed to, can they phone in to the Department and say, "Look, we are now preparing a grant" and inform the appropriate departmental officials that an application is coming so that everybody is in the know as to how many of these applications are coming in, and that basis perhaps deciding how much money you could put aside for the late applications. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Chairman we just have a few brief moments before six o'clock. I will just respond to some of the questions that were raised.

There has been some confusion in this afternoons debate although I have got to say that it is at least a debate with some substance to it, where there are some good suggestions from the Opposition in a fairly positive manner to make this program work and work quickly. Now that is the way that the House of Assembly should work, not as in the first hour and a half of todays proceedings, from my point of view.

Certainly some of the suggestions made are quite valid. There has been some confusion in the debate as to about this special program, \$9,500,000 where there is a different set of rules and a different set of guidelines and the \$35,000,000 job creation program which we have in place for

the rest of the citizens in Newfoundland, whether they be in Glenwood, Buchans, Tors Cove or anywhere else, that those persons can apply under that \$35,000,000 project.

I think, Mr. Chairman, you have seen here today an agreement of what the government of Newfoundland and Labrador is trying to do for fishermen is acceptable to the Opposition and to other persons in the Province. The Fishermen's Union are supportive. The fact that we had this year a \$7,500,000, as the member for Gander mentioned, youth program for youth employment, \$2 million came from this government. We had a \$3.5 million commitment, this Province had, to the \$35 million Canadian Job Strategy. We now have \$2 million from this Province committed to this special fisheries programme. We have done a whole range of things in the Department of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

\$4 million extra UIC.

MR. POWER:

Four million dollars as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) mentions. We have a serious employment problem in this Province that this government is dealing with as best we can. This programme that we are announcing today we are delighted to be able to do. It is not perfect. It does not satisfy all the needs. But we are convinced it will go a very long way to solving most of the problems in Newfoundland.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution and a bill consequent thereto, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress to the effect that the resolution has been carried and that the bill consequent thereto be introduced.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that it has adopted a certain resolution and recommends that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, report received and adopted.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty A Certain Sum Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The 31st Day Of March, 1986 And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: -

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 30, 1985, at 3:00 p.m.

**Index**

**Answers to Questions**

**tabled**

**October 29, 1985**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

I WISH TO DEAL WITH TWO DIFFERENT CONFLICT OF INTEREST ALLEGATIONS LEVELLED AT THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL BY THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.

FIRST OF ALL, WITH REGARD TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL BEING LISTED ON THE SHARELIST OF FAIRVIEW INVESTMENTS, THIS IS NOT AT ALL UNCOMMON FOR A LAWYER INVOLVED IN AN INCORPORATION. THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL HAS INDICATED THAT THIS IS HIS SOLE INTEREST IN THAT COMPANY - HE NEITHER HELPS DIRECT IT NOR PROFITS FROM IT. SUCH A SITUATION DOES NOT EVEN REQUIRE A DECLARATION UNDER OUR CONFLICT OF INTEREST GUIDELINES. THEREFORE, I FAIL TO SEE WHERE THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL IS IN A CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN THIS MATTER.

WITH REGARD TO THE MATTER OF UNIVERSAL HELICOPTERS, THAT COMPANY WON A GOVERNMENT CONTRACT THROUGH PUBLIC TENDER. THEREFORE, WHICH LAW FIRM HAPPENS TO HANDLE ITS LEGAL AFFAIRS IS MERELY OF ACADEMIC CONCERN. THEREFORE, FOR THE FOURTH TIME IN A ROW, I

MUST INDICATE I HAVE FOUND NO EVIDENCE OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

WHAT I HAVE FOUND COMMON TO THESE FOUR MATTERS, IS THE ABILITY OF THE OPPOSITION LEADER TO USE HIS OWN TECHNICAL LEGAL KNOWLEDGE TO CREATE IN THE MINDS OF THE PRESS AND THE PUBLIC A PERCEPTION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST. IN THE WORLD OF POLITICS, PERCEPTION CAN BECOME REALITY, AND THIS IS WHAT I FIND TRULY INSIDIOUS ABOUT THE BEHAVIOUR OF THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. WITH THE RECENT CHANGE IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE LIBERAL PARTY, I HAD HOPED THAT THE POLITICS OF INUENDO, SMEAR AND CHARACTER ASSASSINATION WAS BEHIND US. IT APPEARS I WAS MISTAKEN. IT REMINDS ME OF THE INFAMOUS QUESTION: "WHEN DID YOU STOP BEATING YOUR WIFE?" NO MATTER WHAT THE ANSWER, SOME DAMAGE IS DONE BY THE QUESTION ITSELF. HOWEVER, I CAN ONLY TRUST THE PEOPLE OF THE PROVINCE TO SEE THROUGH THESE SORTS OF TACTICS. AFTER ALL, COULD THEY REALLY HAVE FAITH IN A SO CALLED LEADER WHOSE AIM IS TO USE LEGAL TECHNICALITIES TO DESTROY THE CREDIBILITY OF A SOUND AND HONEST MAN?