



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 46

---

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

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Wednesday

4 June 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, the iron ore segment of our mineral industry comprises, by far, the largest percentage of the value of mineral production in this Province. Last year, 1985, it was approximately 90 per cent or some \$836 million.

Each year we watch closely the developing market for pellets and concentrates and we have just been informed of Wabush Mines' revised production allocation for the current year. The capacity of Wabush Mines is six million tons of concentrate, all of which is converted to pellets at Point Noire. The tonnage figure for this year has just been revised downward, by the partners, from 5.8 million tons to 5.4 million tons of pellets because of a reduction in the requirements of the United States partners. These are LTC, Inland Steel, Interlake, Wheeling-Pittsburg and Moore McCormack. The production of concentrate at Wabush will be just over 5 million tons.

The reduced output requirement will translate into a suspension

of the Wabush Mines operation for a period of seven weeks and this down time will begin at the end of June.

The work force in the operation is currently stabilized at around 600. A number of the employees will be able to take their regular paid vacation during the down time but most workers will be unemployed for at least part of the seven weeks.

The Newfoundland iron ore industry has been weathering the troubled times that affect the ore and steel industry world-wide. Although the end of our difficulties is not yet in sight, the companies, Wabush Mines and the Iron Ore Company of Canada, have made great progress in cost cutting and other measures to ensure their competitiveness in the world market place. The valuable contribution of the work force in this process, at both operations, has been an important factor in these companies' ability to remain competitive.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his statement, a few seconds before the House opened. It is amazing to see, Mr. Speaker, the minister concerned with Mines in the Estimates Committee and in this House and at various places publicly continue to paint a rosy picture of the mining industry generally around the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. This statement today and statements

concerning Daniel's Harbour and other places around the Province are disappointing, particularly in light of the comments made by, I think, the Premier and the minister earlier, that the situation in Wabush was indeed stabilizing and improving.

We hope the minister will monitor this situation closely. We note the bottom part of that statement says a number of employees will be able to take their regular vacations, but most workers will be unemployed at least part of the seven weeks, and we are talking about 600 workers.

So really we are not seeing a rosy picture, as the minister has stated so many times in this House, in light of what has happened in Buchans in years back, and just recently Daniel's Harbour, with the 165 miners laid off there, and the miners laid off by the Iron Ore Company of Canada in the last number of years. We continuously hear the minister talking about the Chetwynd gold mine and the St. Lawrence fluorospar mine, we hear a lot of talk, but we hear of very few jobs being created in this particular sector, Mr. Speaker. What we have heard from this particular minister in the last year or so has been a domino of negative events which have impacted negatively upon miners and their families.

So, Mr. Speaker, we see this statement as a disappointment. We call upon the minister to pay special attention to it, and to monitor and focus in daily on this situation to get these people back to work as soon as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any further Statements By Ministers?

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, leave. No.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is leave from this side, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

We have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

The one comment I do want to make on it is it shows us the need for the Labour Standards Act to stay the same way it was about a year and a half ago, or so, when it would have provided enough decent lead time for this so that the people in Wabush would have a chance to make their plans properly this Summer. We are looking at approximately three to three and a half weeks between the time of this announcement and the time that the layoffs and the vacations are expected to start, and we are talking about 600 people, their wives and their children who have to make plans for this Summer.

Under the previous Labour Standards Act, they would have had a considerably longer period of time. That infamous Bill 37, rammed through the House by the government opposite, has taken away this major advantage they had to plan out their lives and, as a result, we are now going to see a tremendous amount of panic and inconvenience on the part of these individuals. I deplore the idea

that we have to take the down time, but, at the same time, we should have had the strong labour standards regulations that we had before in order to protect these miners.

The fact of the matter is, there is very little protection left. The mining company could have done its job a little bit better and a month ago we could have known when this situation was arriving. Instead, they just procrastinated and procrastinated because there was no penalty against them. Unfortunately, the people who are going to pay the cost of this are the people of Wabush, and I feel that is a horrible thing to have been done to them by this government.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, the inshore fishery is off to an earlier than usual start this year as a result of favourable conditions, and the industry is currently gearing up for its peak period. In connection with this activity, I would like to inform the House that as of June 2, my department's inshore fish distribution programme has begun operation throughout the Province.

My department operates this programme during the peak of the inshore fishing season in an attempt to find markets in the Province for surplus raw fish which may result from glut situations in particular areas.

Programme co-ordinators monitor landings in their region, and when a surplus to local processing capacity is deemed to exist, they attempt to co-ordinate the movement of this surplus to plants where there is a deficiency of supply. This process is actively monitored and solutions are sought to any problems which arise. In addition, departmental personnel are actively involved with other agencies in determining the most effective utilization of over-the-side and over-the-wharf sales arrangements with foreign vessels.

As in the past, seven programme co-ordinators will be stationed around the Province: One each in Harbour Grace, Bonavista, Lourdes, Gander, Port Saunders, Marystown and Happy Valley. These co-ordinators will be on the job eight hours a day from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., six days a week.

The co-ordinators are now visiting all plants and meeting with the chairmen of all fisheries committees in their regions. The purpose of these visits is to provide details of the programme as well as to assess the mechanisms, such as salting facilities, that would be available to deal with glut situations, normally between June 15 and August 15. Co-ordinators will be contacting plants in their respective regions on a daily basis, and regular contact will be maintained even during non-glut periods. If a processor requires the service of the programme during a non-glut period, he or she is requested to contact the programme co-ordinator immediately.

Mr. Speaker, my department has operated this programme for the past eight years, a programme, I

might add, that was begun when the present member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was Minister of Fisheries, and over that period it has proven to be effective in working with fishermen and processors to alleviate glut situations. I am hopeful that the co-operative effort which has existed in the past will prevail again this year since, in effect, it is the processor and the fishermen who benefit by being able to retain income which would otherwise be lost. In particular, I urge processors who anticipate a glut, or who require fish to contact their programme co-ordinator as soon as possible. The office locations and telephone numbers of the various co-ordinators, Mr. Speaker, are attached to this statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for having given me a copy of his statement prior to reading it in the House. Naturally, I agree with the programme. It is a good programme. The cod fishery in Newfoundland, the cod trap fishery especially, Mr. Speaker, is the big harvest and it is as important in Newfoundland as the wheat harvest would be to the Prairie Provinces. And that is the reason why Newfoundlanders, and the government of course, must strive to utilize the tremendous potential that exists during the cod trap fishery. Dumping fish,

Mr. Speaker, and we have done a lot of it in our time in Newfoundland, before this programme came into effect, is, in my view, a crime against humanity. When you realize there are people in Third World countries actually starving, begging for protien, it is unacceptable, to say the least, that Newfoundlanders should ever, ever have to find themselves in a position of having to dump fish. I think we must aim to guarantee that the fish caught by our fishermen, especially during the cod trap season, be fully utilized. I think we must aim, too, Mr. Speaker, for the day when over-the-side will not be necessary. While now we know they are necessary, it certainly does very little to provide jobs in the processing sector. I would certainly ask the minister to join with members on this side of the House in a determined effort to aim for the day when over-the-side sales will not be necessary.

I believe also, Mr. Speaker, and I think the minister shares my view, that since plants in Newfoundland operate by leave and by license of the minister and his department, it should be a condition of that license that inshore plants gear up and provide the necessary facilities to enable them to salt fish during the glut period. If that were the case, Mr. Speaker, then the problems that are created by this glut period almost every year would be lessened. We know that there is a good market for salt fish, and maybe that is one of the answers. I think some companies are doing it. In fact, in my own district of Twillingate the new operator, Beothuck Fisheries, are gearing up now to put surplus fish under salt. Again, I would strongly recommend

to the minister that in setting the conditions for processing licenses that that be one of the conditions, that all fresh fish processing companies and plants put together the necessary equipment and infrastructure to handle salt fish.

Mr. Speaker, naturally I support this programme and I wish the participants well during the forthcoming fishing season.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling for Oral Questions, I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Jan Frederick Breman, Ambassador for the Netherlands, and Consul General Hendrick Van Pesch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

#### Oral Questions

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In view of his statements on public television last evening, where he said quite clearly that he gives jobs to people who politically work for him, would the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) tell the House if this particular hiring practice is the policy of the present government or was the minister simply stating his own personal hiring practice in order to reward political

friends?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. gentleman had listened to my statement last night he would have found that I said that the person who worked for me politically, his son and daughter had a better chance of getting a job than the son and daughter of a person who worked against me. I did not say it was the policy of the government. It was my hiring practice.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman made that statement last night, and I have to say to him that the constitution of this country was put in place to protect the political rights of Canadians, and I assume Newfoundlanders are Canadians. I want to ask the minister, since in view of his statement last night on public television they have to sell their political rights to him personally in order to gain employment in this Province, will he not now do the honourable thing, apologize to this House, apologize to the people of Newfoundland and tender his resignation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, probably I should answer the three questions with three words, no, no, no. But, Mr. Speaker, no one has to vote for me to get a job. I get letters of application every day, 600 or 700 of them, seeking employment. I have a letter from the hon. member himself, asking for a job for someone in Seldom, or somewhere in his district.

MR. TULK:

So what! Big deal!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no, no!

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, yes, yes! I get phone calls from the wives of hon. members opposite looking for jobs for their sons. Every day I have someone out behind the curtain looking for jobs for their sons. So, Mr. Speaker, if that is not political involvement in, looking for jobs in the public service, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point. We know that in order to get justice for our people we have to send letters to the hon. gentleman. That is part of what is wrong with his department. Let me ask him in all seriousness as to what he said on television last night: Where does the minister get the right to treat the

Department of Public Works as his own personal kingdom or his fiefdom? Has he not broken the trust of the people of this Province in his ministerial responsibility and does he not now consider that he should immediately go to the Premier and tender his resignation in view of the fact that he has taken this Province's taxpayers' money to buy his way into his own seat in Harbour Grace?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I must say that since 1944 the Department of Public Works has been served well by a member from Harbour Grace. Not only that, but the first Minister of Public Works was a member for Harbour Grace, probably ten years ago another member from that area was the Minister of Public Works, and I am now. Mr. Speaker, I will just say this much, was it by prodding, asking questions or interceding on behalf of his constituents, that the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), who does not do anything for his district-

MR. EFFORD:

I did not even ask the question!

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, that a resident of his district got a job with the Department of Public Works last week?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. gentleman that I will give him a little book to read by George Orwell called Animal Farm, where he said that all animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others. Is the minister's guiding principle, his philosophy in running the Department of Public Works, that all Newfoundlanders are equal but Newfoundlanders who are Tories are more equal? Is this the quiding principle of the government? Are we hearing again what we heard from the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe)? Resign, boy!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Never mind, 'Resign, boy.' Mr. Speaker, if I had to give a job to the person the hon. member wrote me a letter about, probably he would not ask the question today. I have it under consideration and it is a possibility.

MR. TULK:

Do not be so foolish, boy!

MR. YOUNG:

Never mind! Do not be so foolish, boy!

MR. TULK:

You cannot buy me, boy! Blackmail, eh?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Blackmail.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) when he was in government, Mr. Speaker, when he wanted a job for someone in his district, when he wanted his offices repaired - he had four offices in this town -

MR. BARRY:

And did work in every one of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I will do everything in my power to get a job - that is what I was elected for - for someone from my district, and I am not ashamed of it, Mr. Speaker, if they are.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Let me say to the Minister of Public Works and Services that the gentleman who got a job in his department this week, would it have anything to do with the fact that his father is on the PC directorate in Port de Grave district?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

What I saw, Mr. Speaker, on television last night in the news was a total disgrace to any department and to any government. I would like to ask the minister in his confession on abusing his rights in the hiring practices of



his department, and especially in his confession last Friday here in this House about awarding his campaign manager rental space in Harbour Grace, is he doing the same thing with rental space in government offices all around the Province of Newfoundland?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG:  
I challenge the hon. member - he is only new and green in this hon. House - to look up the Auditor General's Reports since I became minister. In the last four years I have not been mentioned and the Department of Public Works and Services has not been mentioned, Mr. Speaker, as doing anything wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
Go on, 'Haig.' You are gone.

MR. YOUNG:  
Never mind, "'Go on, 'Haig'."

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

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to show favours and to do wrong things by the hon. members opposite. While I am Minister of Public Works and Services, Mr. Speaker, and should the Premier asks for my resignation, there will be nothing found wrong done in Public Works.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, by what the hon. minister is saying, he is trying to portray the image today or trying to clear up the errors and the abuse and the total the Mafia-type way in which he is running his department. I would ask the minister to give this House some indication of how many people from his district have been hired since the election of April 1985? How many people from the district have got jobs in his department without going through the Public Service Commission?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Right on, right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, I could not answer that for the hon. gentleman except this way: All I possibly could place have been placed. But I say to the hon. member he had better be careful, because one of his own constituents was in the week and had a little chat with me. And the first thing he said was, 'For God's sake, go down and tell' - calling him by name, which I am not allowed to repeat, the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) - 'him to sit down because he is doing harm to himself in getting up and asking foolish

questions.'

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works and Services last night stated on public television across this Province that senior bureaucrats in this government were hiring family and friends and that rather than have them do that he might as well hire his own friends in the Tory party. Now, my question to the minister is this: Will the minister table examples of senior bureaucrats who have abused their positions by hiring family and friends to substantiate the allegations he made last night on television?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, there, again, they were not watching the same programme I was watching.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
We were! We were!

MR. YOUNG:  
No, Sir. I said the policy was when I came into the Department of Public Works that senior civil servants had the responsibility for hiring practices, but I cannot name them because I did not know the people when I came there. But I am telling you something, Mr. Speaker, that the hiring practices in the Department of Public Works and Services is open and

aboveboard and I challenge any member on the opposite side to name something I did wrong in hiring people. I know people on the other side have asked me to give jobs to relatives of theirs, their sons and their daughters. I get phone calls from their wives. I get letters from the Leader of the NDP, "Give So-and-So a job." I try to do that, Mr. Speaker, with all the power in me, Sir, but, naturally, why should I, as Minister of Public Works and Services, blacklist the people from my district? I do not think that is fair and proper.

MR. FUREY:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister's statements clearly showed last night that if it was wrong for the bureaucrats to do it and he made a change, it surely must be wrong for the politicians to do it because two wrongs do not make a right. Will the minister do the proper thing now and tender his resignation because of this blatant abuse of ministerial power?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, when I do something wrong in the Department of Public Works, like other hon. members when they were ministers in Cabinet, I will gladly resign if I do anything wrong. But until I do something wrong, Mr. Speaker, I do

not feel I should resign. Every now and then you will hear members resigning because they did something wrong. I did nothing wrong by the laws of this Province, Mr. Speaker, and I have no intention of resigning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. BAKER:

I yield, Mr. Baker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe, a final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Public Works silly and foolish enough to believe that changing from bureaucrats making these decisions to politicians making these decisions is an improvement, as he said last night? When is he going to remove this cloud of suspicion that he has cast over the senior bureaucrats of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

A question like that I do not think deserves an answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

You do not know how to answer it.

MR. YOUNG:

I know how to answer the question, Mr. Speaker. I took a position. I think I was interviewed for about thirty-five minutes by the CBC. I brought, iinaugerated a policy down in the department only last Fall that no more hiring would be done unless the person which we inaugurated could pass a course in security offered by the College of Trades and Technology.

MR. EFFORD:

You have been hiring who you like for years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, tell the hon. gentleman to stay quite. I thought he was cooling down. Johnny should go in and talk to his people in Shearstown and I would not receive any more letters from the hon. member's district.

MR. EFFORD:

Table them! Table them!

MR. YOUNG:

I cannot table the letters. I cannot table them, Mr. Speaker, because they are personal letters and I have no intention of tabling them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:

Let the hon. gentleman come behind the curtain and I will name some

of the people the hon. gentleman is intact with. Mr. Speaker, I think it is just a hullabaloo about nothing. I am sure that I will receive many letters of thanks from the members opposite when their sons, their daughters or their relatives get jobs for the Summer.

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
My question is also for the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works is also responsible for the Public Service Commission. I believe in the Public Service Commission Act, Section 14 says that people who are hired for the Public Service of this Province should be hired on the basis of merit. Since you are the minister responsible for this department my question to you is this. Bearing in mind that you are supposed to uphold the principle of merit hiring, how can you reconcile that with your actions on television last night, and should you not feel that you should resign because you have contravened all the basic principles of the department you are responsible for?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:  
I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that I will resign from my seat, not after the next election like the hon. gentleman who will be defeated, but I will resign when I feel it fit, because the people of Harbour Grace are going to elect me forever more on

while I want to run.

MR. PATTERSON:  
How many elections have you won now?

MR. YOUNG:  
I will challenge any member on the other side to report winning five elections without a defeat, not switch and come back and stuff like that. To answer the hon. gentleman's question, I made statements on temporary employment.

MR. TULK:  
When?

MR. YOUNG:  
Last night.

MR. TULK:  
How do you conduct your office?  
That is the question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:  
Never mind about my office.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would ask hon. members on my right to please give the minister an opportunity to answer.

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, during my estimates, the Chairman of the Public Service Commission was sitting over where the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is sitting now. I challenged the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, when there was a question asked me, to get up and say if I ever wrote him a letter, or if he ever received a phone call from me

since I have been Minister of Public Works asking for a person to get a position. It is all done open and aboveboard, I have nothing to do with it, and that is it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

What about temporary positions?

MR. YOUNG:

Temporary positions?

Mr. Speaker, I will be around for a long, long time and so will temporary positions.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary on the same topic, and it is to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Premier you have heard what he said. Do you condone his actions and do you condone those actions for other ministers of the Crown?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the member for Menihek is alleging that there have been hirings of temporary employees who do not have the merit or cannot do the job, and that is not true on temporary employment.

MR. FENWICK:

What about merit?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Merit has a very important part to play in it, obviously. If the hon. member is saying now that there were people hired in the Public Service of Newfoundland on temporary employment who do not have the qualifications, he better

put his money where his mouth is and put on the table of this House some examples of people who have been hired who do not have the qualifications for that position. I do not know of any.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The attitude of the potentate from Harbour Grace is disgusting with regards to political patronage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

I thought, Mr. Speaker, we were bad enough off with the Minister of Transportation and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like to ask the minister a direct question, a very simple direct question. He admitted last night to hiring people on the basis of political patronage, political work done for him. How many jobs did he pass out in the last three months in this way? How many people from his district have been hired here in temporary jobs in the last three months?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, just a little preamble to my answer. I wonder after the last election did the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) get his job through political patronage?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. YOUNG:

It was not done by political patronage? Oh, no. None of that!

MR. FUREY:

Answer the question.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, when a people have temporary employment, they are always called back through the rules and regulations of the union, they are called back on seniority, Mr. Speaker. I presume that everyone who has seniority will be called back through the Summer.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander, a supplementary.

MR. BAKER:

In relation to that, the minister is trying to deflect the questions onto all kinds of nonsense that has nothing to do with this situation, with him hiring his friends out in Harbour Grace, or in that district, to come in here and work purely on the basis of politics and nothing else.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

Now, I would like to ask the minister another related question. In the next couple of months, how many jobs that could be done by students is he handing out to his own private Tory employment agency?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

That is purely speculative.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, there is in the Department of Public Works an open vote, and we also hire some students. I think there are about thirty-five to forty positions for students now, Mr. Speaker, and they are all over the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I am sure that these thirty-five or forty positions are not being filled by people from the district of Harbour Grace.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been around for about fifteen years and I will probably be around for another fifteen, and it is my decision when I decide to quit. But, Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. gentleman that when I came in here in 1972 one of my objectives, one of my commitments was that I would look after the people from my district. Mr. Speaker, I am doing that, like the hon. members opposite who write letters on behalf of constituents from their districts looking for jobs. That is going to go on until eternity after I am dead and gone.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works also. After the statement that he made last night, would he tell this House whether the young people of this Province who are

out searching for work, would their chances be enhanced if they had a Tory membership card? Would their chances be enhanced for employment for the future? Can you get up and answer that question after what you said last night?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I answered a specific question last night. Mr. Speaker, if some student has earned temporary work over in Stephenville, do you think I know if these gentlemen are carrying a Tory card or a Liberal card or how they voted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Corruption! Corruption!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Many questions are being put to the hon. Minister of Public Works, but he does not have a chance to answer them. So I would ask for some silence at least when he is answering.

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, it is quite a job. When someone wants to be hired for the vocational schools around the Stephenville area, I do not know these people. But, Mr. Speaker, I guess one of the greatest reasons a lot of Tories are being hired in this Province is because there are more Tories, and I cannot help that, Mr. Speaker. If the people want to vote for this government I cannot help that, Mr. Speaker. And that is probably why there are

more Tories being hired than Liberals.

MR. FLIGHT:

He had insulted every Newfoundlander.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I thought that he, like, I would say, most of us in this House, got into politics in 1971 and 1972, to do away with the system that is now being highlighted by the actions of the Minister of Public Works.

MR. PATTERSON:

You were the worst one in government.

MR. YOUNG:

You were the worst offender. That is why we brought in those rules and regulations.

MR. BARRY:

I notice the Premier has had his back turned to the minister all throughout Question Period. Would the Premier indicate whether the statements by the Minister of Public Works and Services, are statements of government policy? Does the Premier support the statements made by this minister?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

We should table the list you put in when you were over here.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, when I am accused that the way I sit in my seat casts some reflection on a minister in the ministry, it is getting pretty low.

MR. SIMMONS:

You were keeping an eye on 'Ron Dawe'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, I think it is more to keep an eye on the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) over there. From my experience with the hon. member and the people of Newfoundland's experience with him, you have to keep an eye on him.

MR. SIMMONS:

That was the last good experience you had.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, sure. I wish the hon. member would do what I asked him to do a few years ago when we got into a political tussle here, when I said why does he not resign his seat and I will resign mine and come out where the people know him best and see who will win. But he never took me up on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The stories are still circulating out there. So that is enough of the member for Fortune-Hermitage. He has already been dealt with by other people.

MR. FUREY:

Answer the question!

MR. SIMMONS:

Smear all you want to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the cap fits, wear it.

Mr. Speaker, in 1972 -

MR. SIMMONS:

I will take you on next time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage, I will bow if he will get up and say he is going to take me on the next time in Green Bay. I will do it today if he wants.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I already took him on in Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir and won when I managed the campaign.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He is backing down now, Mr. Speaker, he is backing down. You will not take up the challenge, will you? You will not take it on head to head, will you? Not where you are known best, 'Roger'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You would not dare, where the



people know you best, Mr. Speaker, The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage will not do it where the people know him best.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He will run all around the Province where the people know him least to get elected, Mr. Speaker. He will not run where he is known best.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

You can squirm all you want. The problem is that idiot of a minister over there and you will not deal with that.

MR. YOUNG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

I would like for the hon. member to withdraw that. I assure the hon. gentleman that I am no idiot. I know the rules and regulations and the criminal law a lot better than the hon. gentleman. I would ask him to withdraw that remark.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would ask the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage to withdraw that term he referred to.

MR. YOUNG:

No, no, Mr. Speaker, on another point of order. Does the hon.

gentleman thinks that I am idiot enough to accept the way that he withdrew that, by waving his hand? I ask him to stand in his place and to withdraw it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, he is not an idiot, it is his abuse of power we are questioning today. And that is what the Premier is trying to skirt around but we are not going to let him. He can make all the personal attacks he wants.

MR. YOUNG:

I was not asked to resign.

MR. SIMMONS:

hat minister has abused his power and we are going to zero in until he admits it.

MR. DAWE:

He did not withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG:

I would ask him to withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I understood the hon. member withdrew the term that the hon. minister was an idiot. That is my understanding.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to answer the question, but the member never even stood in his

place to withdraw. Is a member supposed to stand in his place and say, 'I withdraw,' Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY:

There is no point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Now this is very serious for the conduct of this House.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier is stalling. I withdrew. I will now say again for his hearing, I withdraw. I withdraw. Now answer the question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was trying to say before I was rudely interrupted by the member for Fortune - Hermitage -

MR. SIMMS:

'Leo' told him to sit down.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, 'Leo' told him to sit down.

Through the 1970s a new system was put in place in this Province through the Public Service Commission. Now people who are applying for permanent positions are interviewed, the Public Service Commission makes a recommendation, and 99.9 times out of 100 the person who comes in number one is selected and the ministers know nothing about it. It is done by the head of the department, who is the Deputy Minister. That is the new system that is in place. If, in fact, somebody other than number one is chosen, because there are usually three names come in and sometimes they are very close, and it goes to number two or number three, say it went to number three, number two and number one can grieve. There is a grievance procedure

there before an independent panel, nothing to do with the ministers, nothing to do with the Premier. That independent panel, outside of government altogether, will decide whether in fact an injustice was done. If there was, then these other people, one and two, have to be hired. Now that is a pretty, pretty fair system, Mr. Speaker. That is as good a system as they have anywhere in Canada for hiring people.

So when we start talking about the hiring practices of this government and the system that is in place for the vast majority of the people who work for the government, then that is the system. It is a fair, democratic system for hiring people for the various departments of this government. That was not done before 1972, or whatever year it was after that, that the Public Service Commission was reorganized. In the days of the Liberal Party you could not even get a liquor license unless you belonged to that political party. That has been changed, Mr. Speaker. Everybody knows the fear that we lived under during those years. That is no longer so.

Then when it comes to hiring, there are thousands and thousands of people who are looking for temporary work and all of the ministries hire on so many students. The applications come into the departments and then people are hired on the basis of seniority, sometimes because they worked there other years, on the basis of merit, all of it. All of it goes into the mix in the hiring.

The Leader of the Opposition asked about the policy of this government. The policy of this government, through the Public

Service Commission for permanent employment in this government, is as good as any hiring system and as fair as any hiring system in Canada, if not the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works for this Province has stated publicly and he has repeated in this House that the sons and daughters of his political friends have a better chance of getting employment than the sons and daughters of his political opponents.

MR. YOUNG:

No, I did not.

MR. TULK:

Yes, you did.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

As a member of this House I have had occasion to seek jobs for constituents. I have no idea whether those constituents were PC, Liberal or some other strange party, of which there is one representative in this House. If a constituent comes to me and asks me to intercede for a job and I can do anything for him, I will do it and I think that is a very fair and reasonable practice. I found

the minister to be very co-operative.

MR. YOUNG:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this is an abuse.

MR. YOUNG:

Never mind abuse.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, is there a point of order there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. YOUNG:

I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate does he agree with the practice of hiring the sons and daughters of one's political friends before the sons and daughters of one's political opponents?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the other thing about this whole line of questioning, especially from the Leader of the Opposition as it relates to temporary employment, is he is practicing the most vilest kind of hypocrisy ever you saw practiced in this Province. Because the

Leader of the Opposition, I mean, you have your double standard -

MR. BARRY:  
Go ahead, go ahead!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
- I have seen the Leader of the Opposition in caucus and Cabinet fighting to make sure somebody got that temporary job from your constituency or from your friends.

MR. BARRY:  
Not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
It is true. It is true. It is true. I was present. I was present.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
He got jobs for his friends. Now he stands up as the Almighty. This is temporary employment.

MR. BARRY:  
Answer the question, now!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Public Works and Services has said, there are many things, many factors that go in to the hiring practice for the Summer because there are ten times as many names as there are positions to be filled. All of the factors, including merit and seniority, go into the decision, Mr. Speaker. We have had members from the opposite side asking the Minister of Public Works and Services, the minister responsible for parks,

'Just hire my son, hire my daughter.'

MR. BARRY:  
Answer the question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
It is that party over there that is asking these questions.

MR. BARRY:  
Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
It is not a question of whether it is merit of a question of whether it is seniority; they are students, therefore they should be hired on in this park or in that park. But we go by all of the factors. There is no one single factor, Mr. Speaker, there is a range of factors, there is number of factors that go into how people are hired for Summer or temporary employment. As it relates to permanent employment, as I have said, that is done by the Public Service Commission, completely separate from government altogether.

MR. BARRY:  
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Will the Premier agree to set up an independent inquiry -

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

A point to order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and

Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, the previous question asked by the Leader of the Opposition was misleading because of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that I said on television last night that students in my district have a better chance of getting a job - not all over the Province, that was not the policy - if his father supported me than the person whose father supported the other party. Now, that was my district, Mr. Speaker, and I will try to -

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, so what!

MR. YOUNG:

So what! Yes, so what! Did you not come over and asked me to rent space from you? Have you not been out behind the curtain many times looking for space? Mr. Speaker, if that is not lobbying I would like to know what is. Why can my constituents not lobby for a job, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the Minister of Public Works of this Province admit that he hires the sons and daughters of his political friends before the sons and daughters of his political opponents. We have seen him state that he also gives preference in the hiring of his department to individuals from his own district. Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon the Premier of this Province to indicate how these

statements are consistent with hiring on the basis of merit. The Premier of this Province should agree to set up an independent enquiry and ask that minister to resign while that independent enquiry determines whether in fact it is proper for a minister to engage in this type of discriminatory hiring practice in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Get him out, 'Brian'. Do the right thing, 'Brian.'

MR. SPEAKER:

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

I must announce now that Oral Question time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. BARRY:

Does the Premier of this Province have the courage to appoint an independent enquiry to look into the conduct of this minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

And does he have the honesty to indicate whether he supports the minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Does he have the guts, -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- Mr. Speaker, does he have the courage to indicate whether he supports the minister -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

- in his discriminatory hiring practices?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Has his ideals from 1972 gone out the window?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!! Order, please!

Now I find it very difficult to believe that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did not hear me shouting on a number of occasions.

MR. BARRY:

There was too much shouting from that side, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I was asking for order at the time.

There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

You do not have the courage

(inaudible.)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

An obvious point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. When Your Honour gets on his feet and asks for order, people are supposed to sit down. We saw the Leader of the Opposition there and you could see the spite and the jealousy and the rage coming out when he looks at the hon. the Premier when he was on his feet. I do not really think that this House should be subjected, and the rules, and Your Honour should be disrespected because of the obvious jealousy, rage, pettiness and the lack of self-control of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am assuming the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did not hear me.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, while it is customary to permit members of this House to comment on matters of privilege, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has gotten up and, I do not know, maybe I fail to hear again because of the clamour in the backbenches on that side but I do not think the Government House Leader referred at any point in time to the yelling and the screaming and the hollering that was going on in the backbenches on his own side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Now, as Government House Leader, and I underline Leader, his responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is to control the mob on that side of the House and to make sure that when Your Honour rises in his seat, members on this side of the House can hear Your Honour and also to make sure that when members on this side stand up legitimately, under the rules of this House, they are not interrupted by members on that side and they are permitted to make their points, Mr. Speaker.

What we have seen here today is a concerted attempt by all members opposite to try and protect that sad excuse for a Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker, that sad and sorry excuse for a minister who has, once again, embarrassed many of his colleagues, Mr. Speaker, but as we see very clearly, he has not embarrassed the Premier because the Premier has now adopted the same standard of political morality as the member for Harbour

Grace.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I just have one comment. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition were as good a Leader of the Opposition as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) is Minister of Public Works in the way that he has executed his duties since he has been here - and all you have to do is compare the reports of the Auditor General during this administration when he was Minister of Public Works to other administrations - then the hon. gentleman would be going somewhere.

What I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is for the hon. gentleman who is Leader of the Opposition in this House, of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to try to at least exercise a little bit more stability and control when he gets up and not allow his own personal vindictiveness to get involved in the discharge of his official job.

MR. TULK:  
To that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
I have heard quite enough on that point of privilege.

All I would like to say is that things have gotten a bit out of control and I think we should now move on. There is not any prima facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

We know what the hon. gentleman is trying to do over there and it is something that he cannot condone. He cannot condone the actions of that minister and his statement on television last night. That is what he is trying to do! He should be advising the Premier to ask for his resignation rather than trying to cover up for him!

Let me say to the hon. gentleman, that when it comes to throwing personal invective across this House, he is the master at it! I would ask him to be a gentleman and not because he has such hatred and bile for the Leader of the Opposition does he have to engage in the kind of tactics he is engaged in now. I would ask him to be a gentleman and stand up and withdraw the phrase that he just used, 'personal vindictiveness', and then go out and advise the Premier to do the right thing, to ask the Minister of Public Works, who has stated on television that the department is corrupt, that there are corrupt practices going on, on the basis that if you are a Tory you get hired, if you are not, you do not. Do the right thing, stand up and apologize and then go out and give some good advice to the Premier.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

I shall not respond because the last few people to speak are obviously sick and have personal problems.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

In making the allegation that my comments were based on personal vindictiveness, the Government House Leader, who is supposed to be observing the rules, has broken the rules by imputing a motive and I ask that he be requested to withdraw those specific words, 'personal vindictiveness'.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I am going to check into that and I will rule on that matter tomorrow.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in the questions asked by the Opposition to the Minister of Public Works this afternoon, the minister stated very clearly, in his answer, that he had absolutely no interference with the Public Service Commission on the hiring practices of anybody within his department. The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that in this House on last Friday he confessed very openly to the



hiring practices related to his executive assistant's son in the park over in Trinity - Bay de Verde. Also, Mr. Speaker, they have been talking about students.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make refers to temporary things. I want this to be cleared up. The Minister of Public Works has been talking about temporary jobs. Three elections ago, Mr. Speaker, he hired people from his district and they are still working here today.

MR. TULK:

So he is giving misleading information.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not making a point of order.

MR. EFFORD:

He misled the House Mr. Speaker!

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a couple of times here today in this half hour during Question Period we put some very serious questions to the Minister of Public Works and he did not respond by coming clean with the facts he stated the night before on public television, talking, Mr. Speaker, about political friends -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is

this.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: The minister did not come clean with answers with respect to his political Tory friends.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

His attack upon the bureaucracy, like that of the Minister of Transportation and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, is ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! That is no point of order. I think the hon. member must know that it is not. It certainly is not a point of order.

#### Notices of Motion

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice of a resolution or a motion which I would like to present to this House. Mr. Speaker, when the resolution has been read, I will be seeking the concurrence of all members in this House to deal with this resolution immediately

because of its importance. I would suggest that after the resolution is read that probably another member on our side would speak for five minutes, I will speak for about five minutes, and two members of the Opposition speak for five minutes each. And certainly I would like to see the hon. the member for Menihek also have five minutes to speak on this resolution. Probably we could deal with this today.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is:

WHEREAS the Goose Bay Air Base is being considered for a NATO Tactical Training Centre; and

WHEREAS Canada is competing with Turkey for the establishment of the NATO Tactical Training Centre; and

WHEREAS the health, environmental and wildlife concerns are being addressed by both the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador; and

WHEREAS the vast majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians support the establishment of the NATO Tactical Training Centre in Goose Bay; and

WHEREAS the establishment of the NATO Tactical Training Centre would be of great economic benefit for Newfoundland and Labrador;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly go on record as unanimously supporting Canada's efforts to attract the NATO Tactical Training Centre to Goose Bay, Labrador; and

BE IT RESOLVED FURTHER that this House of Assembly explore the possibility of an all party delegation to visit several of the

NATO Countries to give our support for the establishment of the NATO Tactical Training Centre at Goose Bay/Labrador and to explain the advantages of having this training centre in Canada and to alleviate any of the concerns which NATO Countries might have in the establishment of this base.

Mr. Speaker, I seek the leave of all members of the House to deal with this resolution today so that we will not have to do it tomorrow. I can give notice and we can do it the usual way, but, Mr. Speaker, if I have leave to continue for another couple of minutes, then, maybe -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a look at the resolution. It is the first I have heard of the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, at the same time, I think this is a very important resolution and it should be properly debated. What I would suggest to the House is that rather than deal with it now and take out the time of the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave! By leave!

MR. FENWICK:  
Hold on now.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

It has just gone 4:00 o'clock. So if we are not going to get on with Private Members' Day, it will be by leave of the whole House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave! By leave!

MR. FENWICK:  
I would be willing, Mr. Speaker, to see this as the first item of business when Orders of the Day are called tomorrow so that I would have a chance to look at it overnight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, it is a fair and reasonable request so I would deny leave until tomorrow).

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
To the very reasonable request of the minister, I think it should be understood that there has been consultation originally between the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) and the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) with respect to the development of a resolution along

these lines which the minister is now presenting. We wholeheartedly agree and consent to leave, because I think the point that should be made clear here is we are dealing with hundreds if not thousands of jobs which could be lost by not acting now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, there is nothing complicated about the resolution. There is nothing that has not been made very public before in terms of the issue. We all know that the question is will this House go on record as unanimously supporting the fight to encourage NATO to locate their training center in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, recognizing that there have been concerns raised by the Native people whom we have to be very sensitive to in terms of environmental assessment, and we have to work very closely with them to make sure their traditional lifestyle is preserved, but the real question, Mr. Speaker, and this, I suspect, is what has the member for Menihek in a quandary, the real question is where do you stand as a party on this issue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated, and I think the member for Menihek has indicated that he has not yet received direction from his party and that, in fact, some of his campaign workers, who are a very small minority in Labrador, have indicated disapproval with the move. The member is, unfortunately and regrettably, putting his own

political fortunes ahead of jobs for Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that it is going to be a very sad thing for this Province if we lose this center because the member for Menihek has delayed passage of this unanimous resolution and delayed the opportunity of an all-party delegation. It would have to be the member for Menihek going on that delegation as the representative of his party. If his attempt to delay this resolution would delay the opportunity of members of this House to go over and use their good offices and their best efforts to get these jobs for this Province, and I would ask the member for Menihek to reconsider and give his leave today, this afternoon, so that we can pass this resolution and get on with the job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. FENWICK:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

To that point or order raised by the hon. -

MR. SPEAKER:

I was not aware that it was a point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I guess we all remember that one of the NATO ambassadors were here in the House today and that is one of the reasons I would like to have this dealt with today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the ambassador for the Netherlands was here today, we have a large group of NATO ambassadors now touring Canada, North Bay and Cold Lake, and I would like to get this dealt with today so that the word can get out from this House of Assembly to all of these NATO ambassadors, Mr. Speaker, that the whole House in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, representing all the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, are very supportive of attracting this NATO base to Goose Bay. That is the main reason why this should be dealt with now, today, so that the word gets out.

Mr. Speaker, there is only a small minority of even Innu people who are opposed to this. Ninety-nine point nine per cent of the people in this Province would like to see that base established in this Province, and word should go out from this House of Assembly that the elected representatives of the people also support it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As it has become quite obvious to the House, the government and the official Opposition are in support of the approach we are taking here. I am one of the four members for Labrador and it disturbs me no end that one of my colleagues, from one of the four seats in Labrador, has enough nerve to stand up in this House and deny the economic future of my district and perhaps his district, too, and the economic future of the whole Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:  
I can tell the hon. member, as he well knows, that a minimum of 95 per cent of the people in his own district support the establishment of a NATO training centre in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. There is no question about it. In fact, the elected representatives at the municipal level in his district -

MR. SIMMS:  
Except for one.

MR. KELLAND:  
- all but one, who is a member and a well-known member of the member's party, have all voted in favour. We have all kinds of organizations in Labrador which are native born Labradorians who have come out in support of it: The Combined Councils of Labrador, for example, the LIA, the Inuit, who have kept an open mind, the

Labrador Metis Association and, I guarantee you, 95 plus per cent in Naskaupi district are in favour of it.

Now, I challenge your right to get up and deny us the right to an economic future, and I ask you to reconsider and give your leave to this House to have the thing discussed today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, the question today is not whether or not we endorse this resolution, the question being asked of me is do I give leave to the House to suspend the orders of business to deal with the resolution that I have just been handed by the minister. Now, since it is obvious that the official Opposition and the government side have been spending some time preparing the resolution, and it is obvious that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), when the subject was first brought up by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) indicated that there would be people sitting down to prepare a three-party resolution on it, and that has not been done, all I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, is that it is appropriate, I think, to at least read the resolution and look at it closely before we debate it. That is all I am asking for.

What I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, is that if the argument is that the decision has to be

made today instead of tomorrow, I am not sure where the urgency comes into it.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The decision was made six months ago.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, if it was made six months ago, then it is up to the government to bring it in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

His handlers have not told him what to say, yet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

I must also say, Mr. Speaker, that this House of Assembly is the chief debating forum on public issues in this Province. What is being suggested here is that a billion dollar project that has a severe impact on the entire Province, and very much so on Labrador, is going to be dispensed with by a resolution that we get one minute before we have to debate it and five minutes of debate on it.

Mr. Speaker, I can also say to you that I have spent a lot of time looking at the issue from both sides, and looking at the concerns on it, and I have a number of concerns on it. But my decision today is that if the minister really wanted this to go through without political tricks and he had come to me this morning and given it to me, I would be in a position to say, 'Yes, let us have leave and let us debate it'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. FENWICK:

But since he has not done that, I do not think it appropriate to debate it today. I am, however, as a representative of my party, willing to give leave to have this as the first item of business after the orders of business are called tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I just want to say just one word to the hon. gentleman and it is this: The hon. gentleman mentioned about the Ambassador to the Netherlands and we have met with him today. This is not a difficult resolution, so let there be no debate about that or no mistake about it. The fact of the matter is, by his very questioning before this House the immediate entertainment of a resolution that has immediate impact on such a large number of people in this Province, all of the Province but Labrador in particular, he is doing a disservice to his constituents and the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is right! Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is serious business. We know an ad appeared in the paper this weekend signed by a number of people with all sorts of good intentions, who want to lead the lives of other people, and I have no doubt about the theoretical intentions of those people who are not up there, who

happen to have been candidates of the hon. gentleman's party in the last election. That is probably the reason why he has hesitation, because he has to respond to a party.

I have to say to the hon. gentleman that I am surprised. Any other person in Newfoundland would have the interest of Newfoundland and Labrador at heart knowing the situation, knowing Goose Bay is a military center up there, that it has been in a depressed condition for a number of years, that this is the first real ray of hope for a long term future for that area, and the hon. gentleman is exercising his position as the member for Menihek now to show there is hesitation in this House to adopt this resolution.

This resolution is purely and simply one that says, 'The elected representatives of the people of Newfoundland on behalf of the people of Newfoundland unanimously endorse the establishment of a NATO base at Goose Bay.

Now, I see the hon. gentleman is reading it over. The hon. gentleman should understand it, it is a simple resolution. The hon. the minister has led it in, he has made a very simple request; there will be two speakers from the government side and two from the Opposition. But we even go further, we say, 'Alright, let the hon. gentleman speak for five minutes.' So there will be three from the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this is most regrettable. Surely the hon. gentleman is going to reconsider his leave, allow this to be debated and, I might say, partake in the debate, and now, because he

has made these words, vote on the resolution itself. It is non-partisan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker -

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, if I can preclude any more of the beating around here.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, I have been recognized. If the member wants to give leave I will yield.

MR. FENWICK:

Could you yield to me just for a second?

MR. SIMMONS:

If the member is giving leave I will yield.

MR. FENWICK:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage has been recognized.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will yield to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) if he will give leave to introduce the resolution. Because, I say to him, this is not a complicated matter, you are either for this or you are agin it. It is not something that exactly just came out of the blue, because the

Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) decided he was going to wade in here whether a resolution is surprise everybody, this issue I heard on the radio a few days ago. This has been talked about by some people. I hear some people in Labrador actually heard about it. As a matter of fact, with his preoccupation with such great economic boon to the economy as the encyclopedia, I am surprised he was not in with the same resolution himself several weeks ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, the resolution is here and it is very clear. If it is time he wants to make a phone call, we are stalling on points of privilege so he can go out and call Tom and call the boys.

MR. EFFORD:

Call who? Call who?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Or, Mr. Speaker, if he is squirming a bit, let him just absent himself from the House. There are all kinds of excuses; the washroom is there, the coffee mug is in there. Go out of the House for a moment and let the record show he did not give leave, that it was done in his absence, that it was sneaked through. I am prepared to sneak, Mr. Speaker, on this one. I am prepared on this particular issue to see something -

MR. BARRY:

His party is meeting tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ah, ha!!

MR. SIMMONS:

The leader says his party is

meeting tomorrow, if the telephone booth is available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple, straightforward issue, you are either for it or agin it, and all we are asking the member to do is allow leave to have the matter debated tomorrow - today, he says tomorrow. I say to him the phone call that he wants to make can be made while the other four people are speaking and he will know where he stands on this issue, he will know what his instructions are by the time the twenty minutes have elapsed in terms of the other speakers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that he has not been off the bus or the train or whatever it was long, but he has been here long enough to know that this issue seizes the Newfoundland people, it seizes the people of Labrador and it seizes them for very good reasons.

MR. HODDER:

We will recess for five minutes to let him make his call.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have given him twenty minutes, I say to the gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). We will speak, we will allow him to go last to wrap up the debate. While the other four are speaking, he can be on the phone talking to his handlers, getting his instructions and we will dispense with this matter today. I appeal to him to allow it to go through today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:



Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, to the request for leave, quite frankly I think that this is a trap, obviously -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

- put forward by the government and the official Opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, there is some substance to the arguments that have been made. Obviously this question has arisen, I have looked at it and I have consulted widely with members of my party. This weekend we do have a convention at which the policy of our party is established. I would have preferred that the party itself debate the issue and establish a policy at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

Come on now!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, the argument put forward by the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), that he wants a clear signal now to the NATO ambassadors, has a degree of validity to it and it is one of the few arguments that has had any validity in this particular debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am prepared to say is that if that is what is requested of me, in about a half an hour's time, if he

wishes to start the debate now and have the vote at about 4:45 o'clock, I will have had a chance to look at it, to gather my thoughts, to make my comments on it, and I will be perfectly willing to vote on it in this House. I will not absent myself in any manner.

So, Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, I just want a few minutes to have a look at it, to prepare my own comments that I wish to enter into the record, and at the end of that time period I will be perfectly happy to vote on the resolution itself. As long as it is about a half hour's debate, at the end of that time you can put the question and we can vote on it.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is my understanding that the hon. gentleman is now giving leave.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, I am.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I can say the two members who will be speaking from the government side are the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let us get the thing clear here. I think the two people we would want to speak on this side - it is ten minutes each, is it?

MR. MARSHALL:

He said five minutes each.

MR. TULK:

Five. Okay.

MR. MARSHALL:

Five and five.

MR. TULK:

We would like for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to speak and, of course, the member for Naskaupi.

MR. MARSHALL:

Okay, that is fine.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I guess most people involved have a copy of this resolution now, so it is not necessary for me to read it again. I do want to emphasize the fact that I do appreciate leave being given by all members of the House of Assembly. It is a very important issue, Mr. Speaker. It is extremely important to the Province. It is for an economic activity, no doubt.

From my last couple of visits to the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, and from conversations with a lot of people from the Labrador area, it is important, yes, for us to get this message out to the NATO ambassadors while they are here. The feeling, I guess, that exists or is starting to prevail in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area and some other parts of Labrador is that the elected representatives were not doing enough to encourage this base.

We were doing it, Mr. Speaker, behind the scenes. The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Department of Environment and even the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), had briefings from my department. There was an offer of briefings to the hon. the member for Menihek from my department. Unfortunately, we could not get the timing set up, but this is still going to be in place. But the people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and Labrador generally want to see something up front, something that the elected members are doing, something the House of Assembly is doing so that they get a feeling that we are really trying to bring this NATO Tactical Training Centre to Goose Bay. We have now, as they are aware and, I guess, most people in the Province are aware, low level flying activity in the area, Mr. Speaker. We have memorandums of understanding signed already between Canada and the United States, the United Kingdom, which has some activity in Goose Bay, the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Speaker, and in the near future, which I would expect to be within the next four or five months, I think we will also have a memorandum of understanding from the Netherlands. The ambassador who was here today indicated that there are some very positive talks in that way. So, Mr. Speaker, the low-level flying activity is actively being pursued now. There is activity in Goose Bay right now and it is increasing. We also want to get the NATO training centre, the base itself, to go to Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker.

I must say, I do apologize to the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) for not giving him a copy of this today. I did not do that

intentionally but, Mr. Speaker, when I became minister of this department some year and a half ago, four or five months into my ministry, I guess, I had discussed it with the hon. the member for Menihek. This was before the environmental study and the health studies were put in place; and to be honest with you, Mr. Speaker, I was left with the impression - I apologize if I misunderstood him, but the member for Menihek said to me at that time that if the health studies, the environmental studies and the wildlife studies were put in place, he did not see that he would have any problem with it. Now, I know that is not his party and maybe that is the reason why I did not consult with him today, because I figured everything was in place and he would be happy. And I had not talked to any members except the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) from the Liberal Party. So I assumed that we were all in agreement. We all know that this is very beneficial to Labrador, not only Happy Valley - Goose Bay. This will benefit Coastal Labrador.

MR. TULK:  
It was announced two weeks ago.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Oh, yes. Well, it has been on the go for the year and a half that I have been minister, and we have been trying to attract this. But, as to the importance of it today, and to clue up, because I know I do not have much time, we have to get the message out to the NATO Ambassadors that everyone, all elected people in this Province, want to support this training facility for Happy Valley - Goose Bay. We have an excellent facility there. It is underutilized now. Happy Valley - Goose Bay exists because of NATO

military activity sometime in the past, when it was built. The environmental studies are not finished, but Canada has some thirty years experience in low-level flying and international training facilities in Cold Lake, in North Bay and other parts of Alberta and Canada, and I visited them myself.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution that has been presented, following consultation with all members of the House, by the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) that although he does not have recognized status as a party in this House, I believe the intent of the minister would be to have - and we would support this provided, of course, the member supports the resolution, which would mean he gave his support for the establishment of the centre and that he would be prepared to explain the advantages of having this centre - I believe the intent would be that we would have the

member for Menihek as a member of this delegation.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. There is one thing I left out.

MR. BARRY:

Sure.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The last part of our 'Be it further resolved' states that this House of Assembly will explore the possibility of sending a delegation. I would like to have had it worded saying 'yes' or 'no', because I am sure everyone wants to know. Obviously, this has to be checked out with External Affairs and that is why it is not worded so definitely.

MR. BARRY:

That makes sense.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I, myself, have already an opportunity to visit several of the NATO countries in July. I had intended to take that opportunity to attempt to express our party's position on this issue but it is much better if we have a unified, co-ordinated approach as we did at Goose Bay where the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk), I asked to attend, at the request of the member for Naskaupi. Both members attended the meeting with the NATO representatives, Mr. Speaker. The reason I asked the Opposition

House Leader, as well as the member for Naskaupi to be there, was to show our party's support for this attempt to see jobs established on a reasonable basis for the people in this part of our Province, in Labrador.

Now, we all know that there are concerns in the establishment of this center as in the case of any development. We know that the concerns of the Native people have to be met and we have to be sensitive to their concerns. We know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a peace movement. It is a growing movement in this country. But those of us who have been involved in the past with the military - I spent three years myself while at university under the officers training plan. I had the opportunity, as a matter of fact, to spend a Summer in Germany in a NATO facility as part of my training. Basically, it is not because you want to be a warmonger, it is not because you are against peace, it is because history has shown that there is a greater prospect for peace, there is a greater prospect for avoiding war, if a country has a reasonable degree of defence and if there is cooperation with other like-minded countries in the co-ordination of a defence capability.

It is not to encourage war. It is not to encourage the establishment of an offensive capability to go out and start pushing your weight around, it is to ensure peace through co-operation amongst all the NATO countries that we would support this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We do not see an inconsistency,

Mr. Speaker, and we do not see where anybody, being a supporter of the peace movement, which I believe I am, or anybody being a supporter of Native rights and environmental concerns, which I am, there is no inconsistency between this and trying to ensure that the base, which is going to be established anyhow, be established in Canada and that we see the investment, the business opportunity and the employment come to this Province, if at all possible.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to put the support of our party behind the efforts of members opposite and I would hope we will see the support of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) in encouraging External Affairs to have an all-party delegation from this Province go to express our support for the establishment of the NATO Tactical Training Center at Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

I think it would be a marvellous opportunity for this Province and I think it is completely consistent with those other concerns which I have mentioned.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Before I begin I would like to get up on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, this is very serious and it ties into what we are debating. On today's front page of The Evening Telegram there is in big bright read letters, "Inuit In Labrador ready to pay price to keep NATO base out of Goose Bay." That is incorrect, Mr. Speaker. This is completely wrong. They are talking about the Innu people. They are talking about Ben Michel and two or three others and here they have them labelled as Inuit people which is completely wrong altogether, Mr. Speaker. So I would ask The Evening Telegram to apologize to the 3,000 Inuit people in Labrador who are not supporting Greenpeace, as Ben Michel is. I just want to make that clear at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) did rise on a point of order and I would like to speak to it very briefly. He is quite correct in what he says. It shows a lack of understanding on the outside world, when I say that I mean outside of Labrador. There is a lack of understanding about the ethnic make-up and the other considerations in Labrador. They do show a Innu gentleman from the Indian race and they are referring to the Inuit which could be quite a insult if you happen to live in that part of Labrador and are part of either one of the

ethnic groups originally. I think what is happening and the whole purpose behind why we are here today and why we have been given leave of the House is to point out the differences and where the concerns are. The media has been getting a very, very one sided-sided view of the real situation which exists in Labrador. This here only compounds the fact that the media has not been given the correct information and is not getting the total view.

DR. COLLINS:

Where are the media now?

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, where are of the media right now, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) mentions.

I would like to support what the member for Torngat Mountains says. Indeed there is a lack of understanding and it is up to us to make sure the concerns of the Native people are addressed but, in the meantime, we should ensure the economic future of the Naskaupi District, Labrador, our Province and the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it was a matter of clarification.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the five minutes that I have left, as a member for one of the districts in Labrador, I might say a member who is representing 80 per cent of the Native people in

Labrador, I will support this resolution put forward today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I am satisfied to say to the member for Menihek, the Leader of the New Democratic Party in this Province, that I would put my seat on the line against him or his party anytime for the sake of jobs for the people of Labrador!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the Leader of the NDP Party in this Province today trying to not only delay, but trying to cancel altogether a potential of thousands of jobs directly and indirectly for Happy Vally-Goose Bay, also my district and the hon. member's district. The member was more concerned today about Ern Condon, Dorothy Inglis and about Gene Long whose names were in the paper on the weekend against NATO in Goose Bay. That is what the member is concerned about. He is concerned about members of his own party who placed an ad in The Weekend Telegram against low level flying and NATO in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I am very doubtful if Dorothy Inglis ever went to Labrador and has ever seen Labrador, other than through a picture. I am very doubtful if Gene Long has ever been up on the Coast of Labrador.

MR. SIMMS:

Party before people.

MR. WARREN:

The member got up here today and

said that he has a party convention this weekend and he is hoping we will come up with a policy. I would ask the member if his party elected him or did the people in Labrador City and Wabush? Who elected the hon. member?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

He should first and foremost stand up for the people who elected him and not play politics on such an important issue!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be interrupted. I only have five minutes. I had the opportunity, along with the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) and the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) of flying low in Cold Lake not too long ago and, Mr. Speaker, talk about the wildlife being effected! They were coming out of the woods looking at the aircraft as we were flying over them. We were attracting the wildlife. Mr. Speaker, talk about people working! Everybody was working there, Mr. Speaker, because there were jobs for everybody. I would strongly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while the hon. member will be given five or ten minutes in this debate, I hope he will come clean, come clean with the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, in particular the people of his district. Do not listen to Ern Condon, a councillor in Labrador City or Wabush.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting last week with the Town Council of Wabush and, again, I was told - and talking to the people of Labrador City and Wabush, the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) was there - do you know what? I bet if you can find 5 people out of 9,000 that are there, you would only find 5 that are against NATO going into Goose Bay! You may find 5, and they may be all in one family.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time for the member to forget about his socialist ideas, forget about - probably I should not say it but I am going to say it anyhow - we do not want members in this House who come in and get elected, whether they are from another Province or not, to come in here and stop a development from taking place. If that is what the hon. member has in mind, I would strongly suggest he go back to Ontario where he belongs!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have people in my district who have to live on \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year. Some of those people, with the developments in Goose Bay and with the commitment from Colonel David, will be employed. Native people will be employed. The opportunity will be there for Native people to get employment, and Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to support this resolution knowing that not only the district of Naskaupi will benefit, but the district of Eagle River and Torngat Mountains and the hon. gentleman's district. I call upon hon. gentlemen to come

clean with the people.

AN HON. MEMBER:

All over, all over Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, all over Newfoundland and Labrador, but mainly I believe we all realize that Labrador, especially Naskaupi district, needs the influx now. They need the help now and now is the chance for us all to unite and give help to that district which desperately needs it, along with all of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

It is certainly a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to be able to stand and speak on a resolution that is so important to the people of my district, indeed, as has been said by the previous speakers, the residents of the entire Province, and much wider spread than that if we are talking about the national scene and our role in the international scene as well.

I would like to make a couple of initial comments and confirm what the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward)

mentioned a little earlier in that a lot of the electorate were viewing the House of Assembly, and I mean collectively, both sides, as being just a little too complacent on the issue. We had an interest group here going in favour, an interest group going there in favour, and all of us have spoken in favour of the Tactical Training Centre in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, but the House was not seen as being very forceful, or very militant in making our case. We were considered to be complacent. Based on that, a number of things happened.

One, of course, is the fact that we now have this resolution which we hope will see the unanimous support of the House. Members will recall that just a very short time ago I wrote each of them a letter seeking their individual support as individual members of the House of Assembly. My motive was tied to the same thing that this resolution is. My idea was to be able to say to people who complained about the fact that the House was being perceived to be too complacent, I could say, 'Look, we have fifty-two members who have, in writing, committed their support.' Now that was sort of an initial step as an individual member of the House to other individual members. Now we have this resolution to talk about. So I want to give that explanation as to my motives. I have discussed it with some other members individually, and I must say I thank the ones that have had the time so far to give letters of support for the establishment of the Tactical Training Centre in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. I would expect that the rest will follow shortly.



MR. TOBIN:

You have it all in the resolution now.

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, the resolution also covers it, but I would like to follow through on a step that I have already taken.

I think a lot of the important points have been touched on but I really am a little concerned about what happened here today.

I am not unfamiliar with the member for Menihek's position. Now, I do not mean his position on whether or not he supports NATO, but the position he has taken that he would not give his personal opinion as an individual member of the House, and in his party's case, he is an individual member - he is the only member, so he would be voting on behalf of his party - until the annual meeting of his party. He seemed to imply in my mind that he had a position of his own that might be in support of NATO. He sort of hedged his comments, in my opinion, that way. He made it appear that way, 'but I do not want to give that to you guys yet, because I would rather get the position of my party.'

Now, we all know when we are talking about Menihek district, and government members have been up there, they have talked to people, I have talked to people who have telephoned and corresponded with me about the question of NATO, and whether or not they should be in Labrador. I must say that I have not received directly any complaint from Labrador West, the Menihek district, against NATO. Maybe there are some, but they are very few.

I give as evidence of that the fact that Ern Condon, who has been mentioned a number of times here, did call a public meeting and invited some of the Innu people from Sheshatshit and perhaps Davis Inlet into Labrador City to explain their position on how they felt about NATO. I was told that there was perhaps less than twenty-five people in attendance altogether out of a fairly large district and there were no transportation problems for both communities in the Menihek district to get to the meeting. It seems to me that twenty-five people, maximum, some of which came from my district to explain their case, would not be a very good showing. I would think that if the member for Menihek is politically aware, he will have to address the fact that he is perhaps in a position which is against better than 90 per cent of his district.

On the other hand, the converse of that, the member for Torngat Mountains, the member for Naskaupi district, and the member for Eagle River may well have the exact opposite, they are on the same side as 90 plus per cent of their electorate when it comes to the question of whether or not Happy Valley - Goose Bay and indeed Canada should get the economic benefit -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, a little leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. KELLAND:

- of the establishment of the facility. You know, as a representative who has a Native or Innu community within my district, one of my five communities, I am deeply concerned that their concerns are addressed.

I will make another point in that regard too. I was Mayor of Happy Valley - Goose Bay for ten years, as the House knows, and in that time I had a position on the expanded or extended military use of Goose Airport. It was clearly and publicly stated many, many, many times. Now, keep in mind that my position did not change when I offered myself for election back last year and I still received the majority of the vote in the village of Sheshatshit, which might be an indication that not every single soul down there are against my views with respect to the establishment of the NATO Tactical Training Center. I think it is a point worth considering.

The Innu people in my district have been concerned about their traditional way of life. Interrelated, of course, with the traditional way of life, are concerns about their health, the environment and the effects on wildlife, which, of course, are interrelated, as I have already said, with their traditional lifestyles.

Studies have been instituted to address these concerns and, in the outside world, through the media, people seem to visualize the fact that all these low level aircraft are continually flying over Native encampments.

Now, I can tell this House, without fear of contradiction whatsoever by anybody inside or

outside the House, that there are more aircrafts flying over or close to a section of our town known as Spruce Park, close to the end of the runway, than ever go over any Innu encampment. Now, that is a fact. With 110,000 square miles and 600 or 700 or 800 Innu people who camp traditionally here and there and travel in other areas, there are just not enough aircrafts to be continually over-flying the encampments. The military has said quite clearly and the federal government has said quite clearly, supported by the provincial government and ourselves, in the event that there are encampments in the interior of Labrador and there is any danger that it might be on a route that the low level training will take, that a simple request to the military commanders will ensure that those aircrafts will not go anywhere near those temporary or permanent traditional camps.

Now, that is a pretty good statement and it is one that has been adhered to. So, if you look at the environmental concerns, we have organizations, as I mentioned already, the Combine Council of Labrador representing every community in Labrador, every community -

MR. WARREN:

Except one.

MR. KELLAND:

With one exception? Are you talking about Sheshatshit?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. KELLAND:

Okay. Every community in Labrador has come out in support of, which would be roughly thirty communities, the establishment of

the NATO Training Center.

We have encouraging support from the Labrador Inuit Association who says that if it can be shown that there will be no ill-effects on the health, environment and wildlife, they will certainly give consideration to the economic benefits.

MR. WARREN:  
They are pro-development.

MR. KELLAND:  
That is right. They are not anti-development. I might just briefly add that a very similar position has been taken by the Labrador Metis Association.

I see we are running very low on time and I have been given the leave of the House to extend a little further and I now, in order to conclude this and give the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) the opportunity to speak in support of this resolution so that we may show a unified front and a very non-complacent attitude with respect to establishing the NATO Tactical Training Center in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, conclude my remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, I also require perhaps a few minutes more than five minutes so I would request leave ahead of time to let people know that that is coming.

The other thing I would like to

mention to the members of the House is that I do have a position on the establishment of a tactical fighter base under NATO in Goose Bay and, at the end of the speech, I will give it to you. It is -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, would you please -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
One of the problems with this particular issue has been the enormous lack of debate which seems to have occurred. When I say lack of debate I mean that seriously.

I was watching on television, I think it was Monday night, what I thought was one of the most embarrassing situations I have ever seen. At some hall up in Goose Bay, there were a number of NATO ministers being entertained by our representatives, and while they were in there being entertained, three Native people were sitting in the porch, Mr. Speaker, sitting in the porch because they did not have a shirt and tie and a coat, at least that is what the -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. WARREN:

I have to interrupt the hon. member because he does not know what he is talking about. Those gentlemen were invited. They were told beforehand, in plenty of time, to wear the same proper attire that the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) had to wear, I had to wear, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) had to wear, and other members, and they had lots of time to abide by protocol. It was their own fault.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman from Torngat is right. The member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), of course, was not there at the meeting and, therefore, has very little knowledge of what went on. Everybody who went to that thing, including myself and the member for Naskaupi and all the other people there, were advised that you had to have a shirt and tie. I would say this, and I think the member for Naskaupi made this point to me after the meeting, that if perhaps those people had come in their ceremonial dress even, the Commanding Officer would very well, perhaps, have said to them, "Sure, come on in, that is your normal wear." But that is a flimsy excuse.

I would say to the member for Menihek that perhaps there were some people who were advising those people to come to that meeting in that condition so that they would have a media issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I think the situation does bring out the point I was making. There is a lack of dialogue here. We are not listening to both sides. I would also suggest, by the way, that if there was a camera crew taking pictures of that and it was used by an organization that was aggressively trying to stop the base from being established up there, by showing those pictures in Europe, we would have an awful black eye no matter what the explanation was. I am just trying to say to you that it seems to me symptomatic of the level of debate that has occurred.

The name Ern Condon has been raised in this debate. I would like to tell you, yes, that Ern Condon was a federal candidate in the last election in Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador.

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. KELLAND:

The point of order is to a brief remark by the member for Menihek. The point of order is simply this. I really do not like to see people attempting to mislead the House. He made reference to the fact that if that film footage went over to Europe, it would do a lot of damage. However, the whole

intent of the resolution and part of the second 'WHEREAS', the main thrust of the 'WHEREAS' is to go over and argue that exact point. That is one side of the story as we have all said. We are going over and giving the other side. So that is what it is all about here. I would ask the member not to mislead the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:  
Back to the question of Ern Condon. Ern Condon is a highly moral, conscientious man who is deeply concerned about very important peace issues. He is one of the most honourable men I have ever seen in my life.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Who?

MR. FENWICK:  
Ern Condon. In the context of the level of hysteria, which is about the only way I can describe it, I think it was extremely courageous of him to make arrangements to allow the Innu to at least put their side of the story before the people of Labrador West. I think it was important that that side be told. Whether or not that is the side that will prevail, I do not know, but I think it is important that we listen to people, even if they are a small minority, even if they are not a large, well established and well funded group, like others.

When I listened to the derogatory comments by the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie)

federally, talking about those individuals and the arguments they are putting forward, I was, quite frankly, embarrassed that he represents a district in our Province.

About the other individuals who signed the proclamation, I believe, that was in Saturday's paper. I think Gene Long was one of them. Dorothy Inglis was another. If I am not mistaken, there were one or two other people who are connected to the party pretty prominently as well.

There are also, by the way, seven or eight Roman Catholic Sisters who signed the proclamation. I am wondering if, by the logic used by the members opposite, this indicates that the Roman Catholic Church is against the NATO base.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:  
I am not sure whether it does or not but I am saying that we should ask the Pope perhaps.

MR. SIMMS:  
Is Lorraine Michaels involved in the NDP?

MR. FENWICK:  
Not actively. Having made those preliminary comments, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker, could I have a little quiet?

Getting to the question of the NATO base itself, the federal party, of which I am a member, in a series of conventions had a look at the position that the Canadian

Government should play in international politics. It has adopted a position that Canada would be better off as a non-aligned nation, rather than a signatory to the NATO alliance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

I say that, Mr. Speaker, because I want to make it clear that within our party, both federally and provincially, we are not without significant differences of opinion on it.

Looking at the arguments for the NATO strategical base up there, one of the arguments that I have had put to me by members of my own party and other members is that we should not be putting \$400, \$500, \$600, \$700 million into a massive armaments base when there are people starving in the world.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

I am sorry, a tactical weapons base. We should not be putting \$500 million to \$1 billion into a tactical weapons training base - have I got it correctly now? - when there is so much need in the world for resources to alleviate poverty, to alleviate starvation, to provide clean water and so on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, if that was the argument, I would find that a convincing argument. The only problem is, it is not. As all the members in the House here know, the question is whether or not the base will go in Turkey or whether it will go in Goose Bay. The question of whether it will be established has been taken. It may be a good decision or it may not be but, it is not for us to debate that at this point.

What we are debating is should it be in Goose Bay and should we encourage it to be in Goose Bay? That is a different kind of a question, and one that I find is not inconsistent, by the way, with the federal party's position that the NATO Alliance is not the appropriate place for Canada on an international basis. But I say that to you because I wish you to realize the problems that I have with it.

There are other arguments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

One of the other major arguments is that we should not have anything to do with nuclear weapons. I say to you today that if there was any intention to put nuclear weapons in there, to store nuclear weapons, or to train using nuclear weapons or delivery systems primarily for nuclear weapons, I would at this point say immediately that I have no intention of supporting the establishment of that kind of a base. I believe that there is no -

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I do not know if the hon. member is aware of this but I think Canada has been an nuclear free zone for ten years.

MR. KELLAND:

And that is the federal position.

MR. FUREY:

And this is the position of all of the members unanimously in the Parliament of Canada some years ago. You may argue that the testing of the Cruise missile makes us not an nuclear free zone. Well, the fact of the matter is that no Cruise missile was tested, rather, the shell was tested.

But, you know, to listen to the hon. member for Menihek get on with his bleeding heart about peace, all members in this Assembly are for peace. We all want peace for ourselves and for our children, but we do not want Greenpeace.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders want peace on our terms. We do not want the Greenpeace that screwed us out of the seal industry on the Northern Peninsula on both side. That is the kind of peace that we want to eradicate from this Province forever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I must rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A good point though.

MR. FENWICK:

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are looking at is a base that will be training airmen in low level flying and other tactics, a tactical weapons base. Springing from my own disagreement with nuclear weapons, I realize that a corollary of saying that a country should not have nuclear weapons is the implication that you actually have to put more of your resources into tactical weapons, you have to be better with conventional warfare because I am certainly not a full blown passivist suggesting that we have no armaments whatsoever. So on that particular aspect of it, I find nothing irreconcilable with my own principles with regard to nuclear weapons.

Other arguments: What about Native people in Labrador? As the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Alyward) has already mentioned, last July I sent him a letter asking for an environmental impact study to be done on the effect of low level flying. At that time, I believe, the NATO base was somewhat less well defined as an objective. I really wish that the government had taken me up on it then because if the study had started in September, we might be well down the line of knowing what the impact of this thing is.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible.)

MR. FENWICK:

Hold on now. We do have a number of studies underway. We obviously have the caribou study or the wildlife study and that is on its way.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Look at Cold Lake. In Canada generally this has been going on for 30 years. It has been studied and we know the results. (Inaudible.)

MR. FENWICK:

We also have another study, Mr. Speaker, that is underway and that is the study on the effects on the Native people in the area. I think that is an important one that was started as well.

We have also been told by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) in the Committee hearings that we held on his estimates about six weeks ago, I guess now, that there is a full-blown FEARO study being organized by the federal government. It is my understanding that this full-blown study will have a panel of people from the Labrador area and from other areas and will be in a position to set parameters for what should be studied; the effect on wildlife, the effect on people and the socio-economic effects. What will happen if the base closes? All bases do eventually.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

In a well ordered world, Mr. Speaker, it would be nice to have seen the panel established, the studies started, the studies completed and us in a position to

make the decision on this base with that information in hand. Unfortunately, given the fact that the decision has to be made, I believe, by December, we do not have the luxury of awaiting all these processes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

We do not have at this point this FEARO study. That is what I am saying. It is unfortunate that we do not.

MR. GILBERT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the member for Menihek waffle on making a decision and coming out and saying he is either going to support this or not. Now he has talked about his party federally and provincially and the feelings they have on it. We know his party is extremely to the left. If this base was going to be established in Russia, I do not think we would have many impact studies done on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

As someone who received my education through the courtesy of the Canadian military, I am happy to have said that. But when I hear someone stand up and make statements like that, waffling, waiting for environmental studies to develop something so that



Newfoundlanders can go to work, I feel that the man is wasting the time of the House and he should get up and either support it or not support it, not be mealy-mouthed about it. Come out and either support it or be against it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:  
So what does it reduce itself down to, Mr. Speaker? There are a number of problems with it. I think we all recognize there are a number of problems with it. I am hoping that the FEARO study will at least address a lot of them and will put us in a position where we will not impact too severely on other things.

It brings me to a number of positive arguments in favour of the base and, quite frankly, employment is one. I would like to say to you that I am not unsympathetic to the idea of creating employment. As a matter of fact, I consider the number one priority of this House, this government and all of us is to make sure that we do create employment. On that basis, it is certainly a positive indicator to say yes to the establishment of this base.

Before I let you know how I will vote on it though, I would like to make it very clear about the relationship between myself, as leader of the party, and the party itself, as opposed to my position as a member for a Labrador

district. Under our constitution -

MR. TOBIN:  
You are one and the same person, 'Peter'.

MR. FENWICK:  
I know I am. But I just want to tell you that there are problems.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
Under the constitution of our party, when I am sworn in as leader of it, I am obligated to support the policies of the party itself. As of this point, our provincial party, because the last convention was over two years ago, has no position on a NATO base in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Shame! Shame!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:  
How can you have a position when you did not even know it was coming? For God's sake be sensible!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

MR. FUREY:  
It has been an issue for a year and a half.

MR. SIMMS:  
(Inaudible) position on the NAPE strike. Did the party authorize you to get jailed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
The fact of the matter, -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is this weekend, on Saturday and Sunday, we will be having a convention and, at that time, I anticipate that this will be dealt with and the provincial party will then have a position on the base itself.

Today, however, I have to speak here as the member for Menihek without instructions from the party at this point, although, I must admit, I have debated with the issue.

Mr. Speaker, despite the heckling, despite the arguments, despite the fact that the debate has, quite frankly, never risen off the ground in terms of dealing with the issues themselves, -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Sure it has.

MR. FENWICK:  
- despite all those things, I cannot see how I can do anything other than support this resolution when it comes up for a vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, let me say something to the hon. gentleman, we are proud to see that in this House he is going to support this resolution but, I wonder tomorrow, as the leader of his party, how can he distinguish when he is goes outside the House. Is he going to do something else then? That is a bit wormy.

Now, in regards to the debate, the debate has been ongoing in this Province for ten to fifteen years. I would say to the hon. gentleman that, if he were concerned about Labrador, he could have himself brought in a private member's resolution to support NATO. He is as free as anybody else in this House so he could have had all the debate he wanted. But indeed he did not.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
The member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) before he goes, should be aware that there is a vote coming up and we want to have all parties represented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Shame! Shame!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, it should be

understood that the resolution reads, "Explore the possibility of an all party delegation." We are not interested in having individual members giving individual opinions. I mean, the member's opinion might not be weighty but what we are seeking is the support of whatever weight we can get, Mr. Speaker, from the representative of any party, small though that party might be. Presumably, it will give a little more weight, just a tad more weight, than the member's personal opinion.

Mr. Speaker, first of all the member has an obligation as a member of this House to be here for the vote, and I would recommend that we adjourn the vote, by leave, if the member is not back and give him an opportunity to come back so that we can see where he stands on this vote.

Thank you.

MR. TULK:  
We have to know.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I think that is appropriate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
I have never seen you so grim, 'Bill'.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Well, I am very grim when I have

to agree with the Liberals, but I have to agree with my Province first, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is here and I say we can call the question and we will have a standing vote on it.

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

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
I must admit that secretly I have a liking for the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). It comes through once and awhile.

MR. SIMMS:  
You are the only one.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. I have, I believe, what you will recognize is the perfect solution to the dilemma the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) finds himself in. Why do we not, in this moment of unanimity, waive the rules of the House and allow him to vote for and against the resolution?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I must say that there is no point of order.

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those in favour of the

resolution, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

### Division

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

All those in favour of the resolution please stand:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

- the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), Mr. Greening, Mr. Hickey, Mr.

Patterson, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Tobin, the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), Mr. Peach, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Warren, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Woodford, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Flight, Mr. Tulk, the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Efford, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Decker, Mr. Fenwick.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the resolution please stand:

None.

Order, please!

I rule the resolution is carried unanimously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development would indicate whether it is his intention to have as a member of the delegation anybody who is not able to communicate the position of a party, and whether we might attempt to establish at the appropriate time, before the delegation leaves, whether in fact there is a position of the member for Menihek's party?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The names for the delegation have not been picked yet. It will be done in the near future. The intention would be to send people who represent groups or political parties which support the establishment of a NATO base and training centre at Goose Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is Private Members' Day. I would like to welcome to the visitors gallery twenty-seven Grade VI students from L.R. Ash Elementary, Leithbridge, Bonavista Bay, with their teachers, Marion Reader, Donna Bennett and William King.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) who had finished his time. The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I beg your pardon. The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not know who got the greater compliment that time. I will take the compliment. The gentleman from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and I have travelled in other climes, at other times and thoroughly enjoyed each other's company. Certainly I enjoyed his

company.

MR. TOBIN:

I doubt it.

MR. SIMMONS:

I can understand your error, Mr. Speaker.

I want to speak for a few minutes on the resolution so ably put down and addressed by my friend and colleague from Placentia (Mr. Patterson), the resolution about universality.

I intend, as my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) indicated last week, to move an amendment to that particular resolution. Indeed I intend to do it straight off the top because I want the House to be aware of what the resolution is, what the amendment is, and so perhaps I should do that as soon as I draw the House's attention to the resolution itself, the resolution moved by the gentleman from Placentia.

Mr. Speaker, the main resolution says, "That this hon. House ought to urge the National Government to review its present policy of universality in the administration of the income security programmes with a view to channelling a greater proportion of funding to those in real and urgent need."

Now, before I get to the substance of the resolution, there is a term in that particular resolve that is very telling. There has been much debate in this House, much question as to whether the gentleman for Placentia was speaking for the government on the matter of the railway, for example. I will not get into that, I call it to mind as an example. There was also some

question as to whether he was speaking for the government in putting down this resolution or whether he was expressing the wish of one member of this assembly. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a telling term in this particular resolution that indicates to me that the gentleman from Placentia did this resolution completely on his own, without any concurrence or collaboration with members of the administration and the terms is, 'national government'. Because he will know that his Premier in other times, when there was another party in power in Ottawa, fought vigorously against the term 'national government'. They disowned that term completely, they denied at the time of the Constitution, when the term 'national government' showed up in some of the phraseology, the Premier in particular, that the government in Ottawa is a national government and they made the point that it was one of eleven governments; it was the federal government, the government with responsibility for matters within federal jurisdiction. But at no time would they recognize, the Premier from this Province, the then Premier of Alberta, Mr. Lougheed, the Premier of British Columbia, Mr. Bennett, the Premier of Saskatchewan at the time, the NDP Premier, Mr. Blakney, the then Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Lyon, the then Premier of Nova Scotia and now Premier, Mr. Buchanan, the then Premier of Prince Edward Island whose name escapes me, the Tory Premier -

MR. BARRY:  
Lee.

MR. SIMMONS:  
- Premier Lee, these seven Premiers together with the then

Premier of Quebec, Mr. Levesque, these eight Premiers fought vigorously and publicly against the notion that the Government at Ottawa was a national government.

I say to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) either he had a momentary lapse or he is telling us something else about which he is at odds with his Premier, that he sees it as I see it, by the way. He and I, we found on our recent travels, have a lot more in common than perhaps we have been prepared to admit. But he and I are again cheek to cheek on another issue, that we see the Government at Ottawa as the national government, the government for all of Canada.

I just wanted to make that important aside before getting into the substance of the resolution which would have us, as a House, urge the national government to review its present policy of universality, which brings me to another term in this resolution, the use of the word 'review'. Now, whenever I have ever seen a regulatory body such as the Water Transportation Assistance Directorate of the federal Department of Transport, or the Public Utilities Board in this Province, or the CRTC, Canadian Radio and Television Commission, use the term 'review', you can take it for granted, Mr. Speaker, that that term is much more a motive than is suggested by the word itself. That term 'review' usually means cutback, raise the cost of, diminish in quality, make harder to get or make more expensive. The term 'review' is a cowardly little term that is meant to look neutral but has behind it a lot of motives.

I do not, Mr. Speaker, buy for a

minute that those who want to review our universal access programmes have as their first motive the care of the needy. I really do not believe that at all. I am not saying I do not believe the gentleman from Placentia. I believe on this one, as former Premier Smallwood used to say about many people at many times and perhaps about him, the member for Placentia at various times, his heart is in the right place. I believe the gentleman for Placentia has a genuine concern for people of limited means from his own experience with people over many, many years. That gentleman has seen many people in need. I do not speed for him, but I think I can presume he has known need himself over the years, if he is an average Newfoundlander. He can identify well with need, with people who do not have the wherewithal at times to keep body and soul together.

I do not at all for a moment disbelieve the sentiment which this part of the resolution conveys to us, but what I am saying is that those, and I am thinking of people like the Finance Minister at Ottawa, Mr. Wilson, the Prime Minister, Mr. Mulroney, and others, when they try and package this idea of review in terms of better meeting the needs of people, it is important that we look at their record in that particular respect. It is important that the people who would better address the needs are the same people, Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Wilson, who have already, through budgetary cuts in the only two budgets that the Tories have had in recent years, except for that abortive exercise in December, 1979 which Mr. Crosbie will remember with some pain to his dying day -

MR. BARRY:

The grey power one?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes. Those two budgets of Mr. Wilson's together have cost or will cost the needy. Now remember it is the needy they are concerned about, Mr. Speaker. I used to have here in my well organized drawer a sheet of paper which documents - it is a document which was leaked from the Department of Finance in Ottawa a year or so ago - it is a sheet that documents the impact on the needy across this country, and in sum, since I do not have the document at hand, it would take out of those programmes \$2 billion by 1990.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is that figure which puts the lie to the well-intentions articulated in this resolution. The same hon. crowd in Ottawa which says, all we want to do is take the money away from the bank managers and the people who have \$60,000 income, we really want to take it away from them and give it to the poor widows and give it to the people who, through no fault of their own, cannot earn an income. That is what they say. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that were the reality, one would assume that between now and 1990 the aggregate amount budgeted for social programmes would not go down. At the very least you would have to assume that. The pot would remain the same size, the pie would remain the same size except that it would be cut up differently. But, of course, the reality is quite different. While they are telling you that, they are going out and in their budgets, not in their statements of intention, but in actual budgets over the last year or so, they are actually taking out \$2 billion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can play all the checkers you want with the few bucks that the guy on \$60,000 gets and he sends back through his income tax form anyway these days, but you can play all the checkers you want by taking it directly from him by not giving it to him in the first place and saying you are going to give it to some particular widow. That is one issue. But if with the other hand you are taking back in aggregate \$2 billion, I say to you, Sir, that \$2 billion is a lot more than those few bank managers are getting anyway. There is a sleight of hand there somewhere.

So, Mr. Speaker, are we against the needy on this side? No. We have a lot of constituents who are in real need. We would like to see the best distribution of scarce funds to meet those needs. And if something about the programme is inequitable now, we have to find ways to make the programmes more equitable. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be party, and I tell you for my colleagues on this side of the House, we are not going to be party to any sleight of hand on this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

We are not going to be party to agreeing to a review which will give Mulroney and the boys in Ottawa licence to do what they have already started to do, to cut back on social programmes, even while they talk about sacred trust. And while they do that they are creating their own sacred twist, they are twisting the knife a little more, they are taking back \$2 billion. I, Mr. Speaker, am not going to be party to that

foul game. I am not going to give them, by putting my name to this resolution, the excuse for them to be able to say, Well, the Legislature in Newfoundland said we should be reviewing. No, Sir! I will do it on one condition I say to the gentleman for Placentia, and if his heart is in the right place, as I suggest it is on this issue, if his overriding concern on this resolution is not the review but the needy, then I expect that he will find some comfort in my amendment. I would ask the page if she would help me do him the courtesy of letting him have a copy of my amendment. Because, Mr. Speaker, my amendment would allow for a review provided there is a very important caveat, condition honoured in the meantime. My amendment does not deny a review, it only says, Since we have seen that Mulroney and Wilson are operating in terms of cutting social programmes, let us copper fasten this one. If we as a Legislature are going to give our permission to a review, let us do it on our terms - our terms would be terms to defend the needy. So, Mr. Speaker, I am proposing and I now move that everything after the last 'and WHEREAS' be deleted and replaced by the following - we do not have any dispute, Mr. Speaker, with the preamble, the several WHEREASes that the member has proposed; we agree with him on all five of his WHEREASes. We would like to add one other WHEREAS as follows: 'and

'WHEREAS the national government has committed itself to the principle of universality to income security programmes as a sacred trust;

'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House urge the national



government to implement a guaranteed annual income for all Canadians to ensure universal income security and to avoid tinkering with family allowances, unemployment insurance or any other national income security programmes until such a universal programme guarantees annual income in their place.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that outside of motherhood itself -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I wonder would it be possible for us to have a quick glance at the amendment to determine whether or not we feel it is in order, and perhaps have a minute to check the amendment before the hon. member proceeds to debate it? Because Your Honour may decide to rule it out of order.

Mr. Speaker, now that I have a copy and I have had an opportunity to consider it and look at the wording -

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, he wants his old job back.

MR. SIMMS:  
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:  
He should, too, for what he is doing in Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, any member of this hon. House has the right to rise

on a point of order if he feels that something incorrect is being proposed to the House and, therefore, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK:  
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:  
I am on a point of order.

MR. TULK:  
A point of privilege.

MR. SIMMS:  
A point of privilege?

MR. TULK:  
Of course.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
My point of privilege is this, that the member cannot usurp the Chair. The Speaker decides whether something is in order. While the hon. gentleman is a former Speaker and may want his job back, as I said, and he should because of the lousy job he is doing in Forest Resources and Lands, I would say to the hon. gentleman that Your Honour has a copy of the resolution and if he wants to decide whether it is in order or not, he will. But the hon. gentleman cannot stand up and say, 'Could I have a copy so I can decide whether it is in order or not?' That is crazy.

MR. SIMMS:  
To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:

I did not say I wanted a copy so I could decide, but I am sure Your Honour would be prepared to hear some arguments as to whether or not the amendment is in order before he makes his decision. That, too, is a normal process. Mr. Speaker, all I am asking is for an opportunity to rise on a point of order to express an opinion with respect to this amendment, whether or not it is in order.

So there is no point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before I rule on that point of order, I will ask to recess the House to review this amendment before I make a ruling on the point of order and on the amendment.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, is Your Honour going to rule on the point of privilege raised by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) first?

MR. TULK:

Let him decide. He is in the Chair.

MR. SIMMS:

I would like to ask a question.

MR. FUREY:

We has recessed the House, he said.

MR. SIMMS:

No, he has not.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before ruling on the point of order, I will let the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage finish his remarks. Then I will recess, and then I will rule on the amendment that was presented by the hon. the member for Fortune

- Hermitage.

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order then, in that case.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has proposed an amendment to the motion and I would assume that he is now -

MR. SIMMONS:

Are you questioning the Speaker's ruling?

MR. SIMMS:

No, I am seeking clarification now. I would suspect that he is now about to debate the amendment to the resolution which would be rather awkward if Your Honour is about to, in ten minutes time, come back and rule it is not in order. So what I am submitting, Your Honour, is to have an opportunity to make a proposal to Your Honour for consideration before he retires to consider the amendment as to whether or not it is in order. I have an argument to make that it is out of order. I would like to be able to make that presentation to Your Honour. That is all I am suggesting. That is perfectly normal and natural.

MR. TULK:

Your Honour has made the ruling that he is going to allow the member for Fortune - Hermitage to speak. Nobody in this House knows whether he is going to speak to the amendment until he has spoken. Your Honour has said he will then take a recess. There is nothing wrong with that and the member for Grand Falls, the

Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, cannot stand up in this House and do through the backdoor what he would not do through the front door. He cannot stand up and question Your Honour and then say, 'Now will you change you mind because I say so as a former Speaker?' Your Honour is in control. He has made a decision that the member for Fortune - Hermitage speaks and then he is going to recess to see if the amendment is in order. It is perfectly legitimate.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

The member for Fogo, who is the House Leader for the Opposition, knows full well it is perfectly natural for members on both sides to get up on a point of order and to argue whether or not an amendment that is being proposed is in order.

MR. TULK:

He has already made a ruling. The House is in recess.

MR. SIMMS:

That is all I am suggesting to Your Honour. I want to make an argument to Your Honour before he retires to consider the amendment as to whether or not it is in order. It is normal.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have not ruled if the amendment is in order or not in order. If any hon. member wishes to get up on a point of order and plead their case, you may do so, whether it be for or against.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

With respect to the amendment proposed by the member for Fortune - Hermitage, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, Page 155, paragraph 437, sub-sections 1 and 2, both. Mr. Speaker, when you retire to consider the body of the amendment to this resolution I submit, first of all, that the amendment the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage is proposing raises an entirely new question to the question that has been proposed by the member for Placentia in his original resolution. Paragraph 437, sub-section 2 says, "An amendment may not raise a new question which can only be considered as a distinct motion after proper notice has been given." I submit, Your Honour, that if Your Honour reads this particular amendment carefully he will see that it is, in fact, a new question compared to the question originally presented by the member for Placentia and, I suggest, the amendment is out of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman quoted from Section 437 of Beauchesne which also says, "An amendment setting

forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved." I would suggest to Your Honour that what is involved in the -

MR. SIMMS:  
That is not it..

MR. TULK:  
You read from it.

MR. SIMMS:  
Sub-section 2 I read.

MR. TULK:  
Sub-section 2. Well, let me read from sub-section 1. Let me say to Your Honour that what we are talking about in the resolution, first of all, is the universality of certain programmes in this country, and the hon. gentleman from Fortune - Hermitage is also saying that the proposition involved here is universality. The difference in the two motions is a matter of delivery, it has nothing to do with the principle and, therefore, the amendment is in order. That would be my submission.

MR. SIMMS:  
Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Further to that point of order, the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. the member for Fogo is trying to do, but what he was arguing had nothing to do with the point I made. He referred to paragraph 437, subsection (1). I am not talking about subsection (1). It had nothing to do with

that. I said subsection (2), which says it should not raise a new question and I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment, if you read it carefully, is totally foreign to the resolution proposed by the member for Placentia. It certainly raises an entirely new question and for that reason, according to Beauchesne, it should not be permitted, it should be ruled out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. The House will now recess before I make a ruling as to whether the amendment is in order or is not in order.

MR. TULK:  
I thought you were going to let the member for Fortune - Hermitage speak.

MR. SPEAKER:  
If the hon. the member wishes to speak, I have no problem with that.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I have -

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
May I raise a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Let us call spades spades. You do not spend all your twenty-nine

years being a cousin to the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) without knowing something about him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

That is totally irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, totally irrelevant.

MR. SIMMONS:

We all know what is going on here. We have put an alternative. If I were to have spoken to the point of order, there is ample ammunition in Beauchesne to say that a member can, in the amendment, put another alternative to the proposition. If I were proposing to do a straight negation of the resolution, then, of course, you could achieve that by voting against the main resolution. I have not done that. I have introduced another alternative within the umbrella of universality, so there is no question that the motion is quite in order, in my view, or I would not have put it down. But that is not my point in raising the point of privilege.

My privileges are now, Mr. Speaker, being breached in that the member for Grand Falls has interrupted me four times - I have only got a very limited time frame and I think it is about run out - and he has done it because he knows his crowd are skewered on this one, that they have either got to go with Mulroney and vote for dismantling the programme in the name of review, or they have to go on record in terms of guaranteed income and they are not prepared. Because like the NDP crowd down there, the crowd of one, they do not have a position on this, they want to stand on both sides of it. Well, that is tough for them!

I believe, Mr. Speaker, my privileges are being breached by this exercise, four points of order from one member in a space of about five or six minutes. It is not fair! It does not allow us to have good debate in this House and I ask for some protection from the Chair so I can conclude my remarks, and I can do so in a couple of minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no prima facie case. If the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage wishes to continue, he may do so.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe what I have proposed in this amendment is a fair solution to the problem. Those members in the House who have a dilemma that I do about giving credence to the idea of review -

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, just a very brief point of order. I mean, clearly one can only speak in this House if there is a motion on the floor. I would just ask, is the hon. member speaking to an amendment? If so, the amendment is not on the floor. Or is he speaking to the main motion? I think that some clarification needs to be brought in here for the benefit of all members of the House. The member obviously cannot be speaking on an amendment if an amendment is not accepted.

And if he is speaking to the main motion, I think it should be made clear to members of the House that he is speaking to the main motion.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Mr. Speaker, that is a backdoor, typically 'Collins' approach to questioning the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if he wants to question the Speaker, I am now going to give him an opportunity to question the Speaker. I therefore move that Mr. Speaker's ruling that the member for Fortune - Hermitage be heard be upheld. I move the Speaker's ruling be upheld.

MR. SIMMS:

Further to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

You cannot speak to a point of order and make a motion as the hon. member did. He should know that, he has been in Houses of Commons and Houses of Parliaments here and everywhere else.

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The point that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) makes is a very legitimate point.

MR. SIMMONS:

He is questioning the Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Your Honour stood a few moments ago to recess, to consider whether

the amendment was in order. I understood Your Honour was leaving to determine whether or not the amendment was in order. Then Your Honour gave the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage, I thought, an opportunity to add something to the debate to help Your Honour make his decision. That is what I thought he was doing, but the member proceeded to say, 'I have proposed an alternative to this motion', therefore, he is speaking to the amendment which has not yet been ruled in order, Mr. Speaker, or out of order. Your Honour might need to take a couple of minutes to consider it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before I made the ruling I did say that I would give the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage an opportunity to speak to the motion, if the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage wishes to speak to the motion.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this is the most incredible exercise in the past few minutes. They are a great bunch of hale and hearty men, and woman, when the time comes to have the Speaker doing things that they agree with, but as soon as the Speaker does something that is at once fair and, secondly, in opposition to what they happen to believe or which does not suit their immediate political ends, they then start to warp and twist and undermine.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you, Sir, that if one of us on this side had done what the gentleman for St. John's South has just done, or the gentleman for Grand Falls, we

would have been jumped pretty quickly by people on that side, we would have been told very quickly that we were questioning the Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Are you going to speak to the main motion, or what?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have the floor. I have some latitude.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I do not expect the member for St. John's South to understand what I am saying. He does not understand finance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have proposed in this amendment, on which I understand Mr. Speaker is going to give a ruling, but on which he has invited me to make my comments in advance. I understand that to be the case.

MR. SIMMS:

You know that is not correct.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if it suits the niceties and the sensitivities of the gentleman from Grand Falls, let me phrase it differently so that he does not lose any sleep tonight.

Mr. Speaker, if there was an amendment before this House right now, a motion which would, if it were before this House, propose a guaranteed annual income, then, Mr. Speaker, I would see that as the perfect alternative to this resolution which would have us

rush out and review.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now you understand, Mr. Speaker, such an amendment is not presently before this House but, if it were before this House, Mr. Speaker, if we could only have instead of this review which would give Mulronev and the gang an opportunity to go out and gut the programmes completely, if only we had somebody imaginative enough to think up a resolution which proposed a guaranteed annual income - why did I not think of that? Why did I not have an amendment like that, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The House will now recess for a couple of minutes before I make a ruling on the amendment.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I wish to rule that the amendment is in order but, according to our own Standing Orders, the hon. member for Placentia now has the right to close the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

If it is in order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield five minutes to the hon. the member for Carbonear?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. FLIGHT:

Sit down 'Milton'.

MR. PEACH:

It is disgusting! You would not let me speak. It is disgusting!

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave is not granted.

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, it is very, very disgusting indeed that the Opposition would not give the hon. member for Carbonear the right to speak on this motion. You sat over there and you twisted the resolution; it was a rose by any other name. You profess to want the poor people to have something, yet you do not want to vote for it, you want to twist it and get a guaranteed annual income? I would like to know who -

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can tell me all he wants to tell me, and I do not think he needs the member for Carbonear to tell

me. All we are saying to the hon. gentleman is that we are not going to give leave every time they want us to give leave. Our Standing Orders are clear: At twenty minutes to six, the person who introduced the resolution closes the debate. I invite him to stand up and throw his eloquence across this House, hit me between the eyes, bowl me over in my seat, do whatever he wants to do, but please do it yourself, do not trust to the inexperienced member for Carbonear. The hon. gentleman has been here long enough to do it himself. Come on, let us have it, 'Bill'?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I do not want anybody to do anything for me. I can tell you that. Now, if your leader had any guts he would be here this evening, and the man who is representing your leader should be standing there. Who was representing the leader over there today?

MR. MATTHEWS:

There is no leader.

MR. PATTERSON:

It has been twenty years, Mr. Speaker, since a Liberal Government was elected in Newfoundland, twenty years since they won a general election, and I can say with all sincerity that it will be another twenty years if the present leader stays in place. Because the people of Newfoundland are fed up with him. His own caucus is fed up with him. I quote to you from The Evening Telegram of the other day



where the member for the Strait of Belle Isle wants Premier Joseph Smallwood to come back, he is so disgusted with the performance of the Liberals over there. He is saying, 'Bring back Premier Smallwood.'

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I understand why the hon. gentleman wanted the member for Carbonear to speak. I understand that he only had seven or eight minutes left in his speech.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is not correct.

MR. TULK:

Well, as a matter of fact, I understand that the hon. gentleman invited some people on this side, if they wanted to, he would give them leave to speak. But if he has only seven or eight minutes, give us the seven or eight minutes and then we will vote on it.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. the member for Placentia is making a few moderate, quiet, well-thought-out remarks and he has been viciously attack by the hon. House Leader opposite. I think the hon. member should be reprimanded.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

From the very beginning of this resolution we ran into trouble; we lost an hour last week, we lost an hour today. I did mention to a couple of your men over there, men whom I know to be genuinely interested in the resolution, that they might say a few words. I was prepared to give ten minutes of my own time to do that. But you people are not interested in it. I hope you will have the guts to sit over in your cells there and vote against it but you have not got the guts to do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this resolution last week the Leader of the Opposition went snarky, he went berserk and he danced around. Why was he so upset? Why was he upset about this resolution? What was in it to hurt him? Anyone who can do anything to help the underprivileged Canadians -

MR. PEACH:

He did not think about that in the Ocean Ranger case.

MR. PATTERSON:

No, he did not. Anything that can be done to help the underprivileged Canadians, it is up to us in this Assembly and other Assemblies across this great land of ours to do it.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the

member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The member for Placentia just now used a word g-u-t-s, 'guts'. I would refer Your Honour to page 107. It has been ruled unparliamentary to use it. I would ask Your Honour to direct the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose you cannot talk about guts of fish or anything like that.

MR. TULK:

No, he said the hon. member has not got the 'guts.'

MR. MARSHALL:

The word 'guts' now! The hon. gentleman wants to -

MR. FLIGHT:

He referred to a person.

MR. MARSHALL:

- take things in the context of which they are said. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the member for Placentia when he introduced this resolution introduced it with a lot of feeling and he introduced it extremely well. He is doing the same thing when he is closing debate. He is getting under the skin of the hon. gentleman. He is just trying to take his time and he is obstructing the process of the House.

MR. TULK:

Further to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman did use the phrase, 'has not got the guts'.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who?

MR. TULK:

The member for Placentia. On page 107 it is clearly stated not only is the word 'guts' not in order but 'has not got the guts' is and he should withdraw it.

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Placentia, to that point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:

I withdraw that.

MR. TULK:

Sure he will. He is a gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Not like the gentleman for St. John's East.

MR. PATTERSON:

Getting back to the performance of your leader last week, I told him why he was opposed to this resolution, because of the amount of money he made. He made \$750,000 off of the Ocean Ranger and probably another \$1 million. He has something to lose and he does not like poor people. Yet he is over there masquerading as a leader of the toiling masses. He is not the leader of the toiling masses. He slithered out of the House this evening because he knew

he was going to get a tongue lashing.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt the flow of the gentleman from Placentia. I want to hear what he is going to do on the amendment. But, Mr. Speaker, the rule of relevancy is one thing but, Mr. Speaker, he is breaking the rules now on two grounds. First of all, he is talking about something that has nothing to do with the rule of relevance. Secondly, I realize that their real polls, not their putative polls, are telling them the same things ours are telling us or else they would not be on this continuing vicious attack on the leader. If he is the nobody they paint him to be, why are they so psyched out by him?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Why do they not, Mr. Speaker, get that very, very present fear, a very justifiable fear, of his following the Province, out of their minds for a moment long enough to debate this resolution and this amendment, Mr. Speaker?

My point of order is that the gentleman is not only irrelevant right now but, he is also attributing motives. He is saying that a member of this Chamber, the Leader of the Opposition, has taken a position on this issue for monetary reasons. Mr. Speaker, that, if you check almost any page

of Beauchesne, it is writ full, Mr. Speaker, of this business of what you cannot say about another member, that he is doing something for a particular motive. At the top of the list of vile charges you cannot make of a member, you cannot say he is doing something for monetary reasons. We have to assume, whatever the reality, Mr. Speaker, that every member of this House votes for or against a resolution for the best of motives. Any member who stands in this House and suggests otherwise is breaking the rules of this House and must be asked to rephrase or withdraw and apologize.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is not a point of order. The rule is you are not allowed to impute, well, the words are 'base motives.' I mean, everybody who speaks has got a motive, he has got a purpose and what have you. It is base motives that are out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Actually, I understood the hon. member was speaking to that motion when he got up and said it. Then the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) got up on a point of order and I had only just come into the Chair. I was not quite sure how it was going at the time. However, there is an amendment before the House and this is what we are debating at the present time. We will vote on

the amendment and then vote the main motion.

MR. PATTERSON:

My time is running out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

You people do not want this resolution debated. I am telling you do not want it. You do not want it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

Let the message go out from here this evening that these people are against the poor, the underprivileged and the orphans of this country.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, number one, before I state my point of privilege, if the member for Placentia does not like the medicine, he should talk to his member from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) who started this whole charade.

MR. PATTERSON:

You do not want to hear about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I recognize and respect that you ruled a moment ago, Sir, on a matter of relevance and invited the member to continue. I raise another more serious issue and I would hope Mr. Speaker would take it under advisement and, having checked Hansard maybe, rule tomorrow or some future day.

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) very distinctly said, I cannot recite his exact words but, the substance of what he said was that he knew why the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was taking a position. It had to do with the money he was making because of the status quo. Now, Mr. Speaker, if -

MR. PATTERSON:

He is twisting it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- I will stand by Hansard on this - if he indeed said that or that in substance, then clearly, Mr. Speaker, he has attributed a pretty base motive to a member of this House. I do not expect, Mr. Speaker, who just came into the Chair a few moments ago, to have heard that but I ask him if he would -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Where is the great concern for decorum now?

MR. PATTERSON:

You are scared, you do not want (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I would ask, before ruling on my point of privilege, to determine whether indeed the facts I have cited are accurate in so far as -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON:  
You are afraid (Inaudible). You would scurry under the bed.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, if the member for Placentia calls forth his unique ability at personal vilification, I may well crawl under the table or leave the Chamber for that matter but that will be more a reflection on him than me, Sir.

MR. PATTERSON:  
Is it a reflection on you (inaudible)?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

To that point of privilege, I will certainly look into that matter and will rule either tomorrow or the next day.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Thank you, Sir.

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

MR. PATTERSON:  
Mr. Speaker, time is limited and I think the Liberals have now established themselves that are opposed to this resolution, they are opposed to putting the money

into the pockets of the poor and the underprivileged of this country.

Let the word go forth from here that they are opposed to helping the poor of Canada. Now, if you want a few reasons why you should vote for the resolution, I am going to give them to you in the few minutes I have left.

MR. WARREN:  
How about the amendment?

MR. PATTERSON:  
The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development has indicated that Canada apparently spends far less of its national wealth on social security programmes than any other Western nation. Apparently, we spend 11.8 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product compared with 25.8 per cent in France, 12.1 per cent in the U.S.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is obviously reading from some journal or something so I would ask Your Honour to direct him, after he is finished reading from it, to table it.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:

I suppose the other hon. gentleman got up -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fight your own battles 'Bill'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

He is quite capable, Mr. Speaker, of speaking with notes or speaking without notes. What obviously has happened, the hon. gentleman just had twenty minutes and he has been interrupted at every stage by points of order. The hon. gentleman is making positive points now in his speech and he only has five minutes left. He should be allowed to continue without these spurious, unnecessary points of order, like the hon. gentleman's.

MR. PATTERSON:

It is absolutely disgusting here. I have notes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Let him rule! Let him rule!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

This is just a display of ignorance by the Liberals. You people do not have the guts, and I will emphasize guts, to get up here this evening and support this resolution. You are over there masquerading as leaders of the toiling masses in Newfoundland. My God what has liberalism come to in Newfoundland!

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman has already withdrawn the words once, he should be asked to withdraw them again.

MR. PATTERSON:

I will withdraw your guts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seems to be for some reason or other -

MR. PATTERSON:

(Inaudible) the rest of this session looking for your guts.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Chair has heard the hon. - I have no quarrel with the hon. gentleman as a person, as a matter of fact, I like him. I know he is upset that the Premier has passed him by but I would ask Your Honor to protect me from the threatening words of the gentleman opposite and I would ask Your Honour to ask him to withdraw the word 'guts'. I hope he does not start running across the floor because if he does, I am sure we will scurry from the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, some of these words depend on the context in which they are used.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would see the day, and I have waited forty years for this day, when the Liberals here in Newfoundland were masquerading as leaders of the toiling masses, and here it is seen today that you

people over there will sit like hens on eggs, you have not got guts enough to give me time to make a speech here today. You just have not got it and I am going to tell you that you people are going to pay the price for this. You will pay it at the polls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

I was down at the Newfoundland Hotel last night. I was talking to fellows down there who were putting money into the Liberal Party and they say that they are getting rid of you and your leader. And here we have over here the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) who got up the other day and wanted Smallwood back. He is prepared to resign to bring him back. You know the mess he made of this country. Now I am not going to keep you people here for the -

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, that member is maybe unwittingly, but certainly, badly misrepresenting the situation. We would like to hear him, if he would talk about the resolution. If he wants to call to mind a recent example of where a member could not be heard, call to mind the period during which I tried to make a speech, and what the gentleman for Grand Falls tried to do to me during that twenty minute period. Mr. Speaker, what is

sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander.

My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is this, and if he wants to be heard he has to talk to his own crowd and get them in line or he will not be heard in this Chamber, I give him that notice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

That is right.

I will repeat it for the record. You will not be heard, unless we can be heard.

Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

My point of privilege is that -

MR. J. CARTER:

What happened during your ten days?

MR. PATTERSON:

Ten days that did not shake Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) income tax.

MR. SIMMONS:

You can smear and slur all you want, you poor excuses for human beings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

My point of privilege is that, Sir, we have said we do not want a review because it will be Mulroney's licence to wipe out the programme. We do not want him to gut the programme. He is misrepresenting our position. As long as he misrepresents it, we will interrupt him and keep putting the position. Our position is, we do not want the programme gutted, we do not want to give that shyster Mulroney a chance to gut the programme under the excuse of review. I call for the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I will rule on that point of privilege tomorrow or the day after.

It is now 6:00 o'clock and I am going to put the question.

All those in favour of the amendment please say, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

"Aye".

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Nay'.

MR. TULK:

Division.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Are you ready for the question?

All those in favour of the amendment, please rise.

Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Flight, Mr. Tulk, the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lush, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr. Decker, Mr. Fenwick.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against, please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), Mr. Patterson, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt), Mr. Peach, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Warren, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Woodford.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The amendment is defeated.

We will now vote on the main motion.



All those in favour, please say  
'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Those against, 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Carried.

It being now 6:00 o'clock, the  
House stands adjourned until  
tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.