



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 6

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

25 March 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I move that this House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means and that the Speaker do now leave the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:
The motion is that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means and that I do now leave the Chair.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker,

This day I bring you good news, and, through you, good news to the people of this Province.

Excepting only its first year in office, the Peckford Administration, from late 1980 to early 1984, had to labour against adverse economic events brought on by a world-wide recession, exacerbated by national policies in Ottawa out of tune with regional realities. The year 1984 saw the beginning of the end of that dark night and today, on behalf of a battle-scarred but victorious Government, I rejoice in proclaiming, Mr. Speaker, the certainty of a new era in the fortunes of the long-suffering people of this Province.

The worst recession since before the War, struck this Province a year before it was visited upon the rest of the Country. By reason of the export nature of the major sectors of our resource economy, the recession here persisted a year longer than elsewhere in Canada. Those four recessionary years saw the average annual rate of increase in Government's Current Account revenues decelerate to 10.6 per cent (less than 1 per cent a year net inflation) whilst persistent demands for public services permitted the restraining of public expenditures to no less an average annual growth rate than 12.8 per cent. The widened gap between our means and our expenses stemmed, of course, from a sharp contraction in our Provincial economy of 6.9 per cent in real terms, and it was only in the latter part of 1985, in fact, that our Gross Domestic Product approached the level attained in 1979.

Only history will fully document the multitude of measures which this Government constructed to stem the hemorrhage in public finances during that benighted period. Fortunately, we were successful to a degree hardly matched elsewhere in the nation. Fortunately, we were successful to a degree hardly matched elsewhere in the nation. Nevertheless, the toll was heavy, and debt has accumulated on Current Account of over \$230,000,000. The strain was shared also by our people, by our public servants required to forego salary increases despite continuing inflation, by our pensioners, and to a limited extent by all those relying on health, education, and other social services, as well as certain business undertakings

accustomed to promotional and other public assistance.

Even during the worst of times, however, Government reacted to an almost complete disappearance of private sector investment by a deliberate loosening of its purse strings for public capital expenditures on schools, hospitals and other building projects, supplemented by loan guarantees and cash investments in the fishery, the paper manufacturing industry, mining and other industrial undertakings. Again, I believe that history will applaud this Government's drive and daring for stepping with such firm determination into the breach to shield the Newfoundland workforce from the worst effects of the 1980's recession. It was a necessary and noteworthy rescue mission, which exacted its own financial toll, as our Capital Account accumulated new debt totalling \$618,200,000 during the recessionary period.

Mr. Speaker, With economic recovery in the United States, which saw its Gross National Product advance fully 10.5 per cent over the two-year period, 1983 - 1984, with the vital ingredient of a determined new management team in Ottawa as of September, 1984, and with the welcomed return of sanity in interest and exchange rate policies, the Newfoundland economy advanced 5.6 per cent over the past two-year period, ending December 1985.

We stand today, therefore, at the outset of fiscal 1986, with the expectation of 2.7 per cent growth in the Newfoundland economy, a low 3.5 per cent inflation rate, probably a 10 per

cent real growth in our seminal fishing industry, a modernizing paper making industry in Central and Western Newfoundland, a secured offshore oil industry, and a strengthened service sector anticipating 2.5 per cent real growth.

In a word, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the unwelcome vicissitudes of recent international events, the solid base for the Newfoundland economy which this Government has laboured so hard to emplace is beginning to produce results which bid fair to accelerate at a pace unlikely matched throughout the long and varied history of our Island home and Labrador.

FINANCIAL REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

Mr. Speaker, let us at this stage review the financial progress of the Government itself during recent years, and that in prospect for the fiscal year ahead. This can probably best be capsulized by focusing our attention on the deficit status of our Current Account; the plotting of shortfalls in revenues against expenditures provides a useful graph for assessing our financial progress during these early post-recession years.

The deficit for 1984 - 85 totalled \$87,000,000 in round numbers, despite the vigorous application of a restraint program to all Government activities. During the year now ending, that is, fiscal 1985 - 86, I am happy to report to this Honourable House that the deficit will be down to \$51,700,000 - over \$21,000,000 lower than projected in the Budget estimates last May. Mr. Speaker, Adjustments to revenue estimated by Federal authorities account for

much of that welcome improvement, due in no small part to persistent efforts by ourselves and our counterparts in Ottawa.

The printed version of my Address, Mr. Speaker, will contain a table setting out our financial performance for the year just ending.

I am equally delighted to report that we are projecting an even lower \$49,300,000 deficit for 1986 - 87, down more than \$23,000,000 from the deficit I felt necessary to project in the Budget I presented last May, and some \$2,000,000 below the revised 1985 - 86 deficit I have just announced. Again, in the printed version, there is a table setting out those facts.

Mr. Speaker, that is part of the good news promised at the beginning of my Address. Although unexpected additional expenditures were encountered during 1985-86, particularly for teachers' salaries and various social assistance programs, our taxation, transfer and other revenues increased even more, giving the improved year-end results relative to the Budget estimate. Similarly, even though net expenditures during 1986-87 are projected to grow by 6.8 per cent, Current Account revenues will grow by 7.1 per cent, giving the lower deficit. In other words, we are beating the deficit problem that has plagued us since 1982, we have stepped of the "slippery slope" which was our fate for four trying years from 1981 onward, we have turned our Budget around through assiduous effort during the three most recent years we are considering.

Mr. Speaker, Let no one think

that this happy trend of declining deficits has been achieved with ease or with luck. With most careful and painstaking financial management; with pressing emphasis on economy and productivity in all our operations, whilst preserving those investments and promotions critical to economic and social development; with continued deferral to more affluent times of certain planned initiatives (such as construction of a new House of Assembly, car allowances for senior staff, particular new constructions, etc.); and with relentless consultations and representations to the Federal Government pertaining to regional assistance which have met with considerable success, this Government, over the past three years, has employed the limited means at the disposal of the public purse to put in place a remedial budgetary process hardly matched anywhere else in Canada, by either the Federal or any provincial government. With continuing care, we will maintain and accelerate a hastening pace towards a fully balanced Current Account budget within the near future.

GREEN PAPER ON HEALTH CARE

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members are aware that, as part of our drive for rational funding of public services, Government published a Green Paper on health care expenditures late in the year and received over 60 submissions of recommendations and suggestions from the public in time for consideration during the Budget preparation. Of the four main options spelled out in the Paper for handling the health care system funding problem, none found favour with our respondents. Accordingly, I am pleased to

announce that Government has readily accepted that verdict of the public - there will be no deficit financing of the health care system itself in this Province, we will not privatize major elements of the system, there will not be reductions in needed health services beyond Royal Commission recommendations, and no new forms of taxation or premiums will be levied to finance health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Rather, Government has embraced the majority opinion of respondents that Government should continue vigorous pursuit of its campaign to enhance cost-effectiveness, as laid out by the Royal Commission on Hospital and Nursing Home Costs, and should persist in active, innovative co-operation with hospital management and other authorities in the field to deliver ever greater services more effectively and at lowest unit cost. We are pleased that our policies in this area have been roundly commended by the public through their responses to the Green Paper.

Mr. Speaker, particularly on behalf of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Health, Government formally extends to all respondents for their thoughtful efforts towards their fellow citizens, and each will receive an individual reply now that government's decision is made known.

FISCAL MEASURES

Mr. Speaker, the second item of particularly good news I bring to this House and to the people is

that Government has attained its notable budgetary success for 1986-87 with only small recourse to fiscal and revenue measures, the implementation of which will provide an additional \$20,200,000 in 1986-87,

* Government has decided it is no longer necessary to maintain the special stimulative reduction in Retail Sales Tax on building materials, temporarily instituted in 1982, with the result that the tax rate will return to the 12 per cent level as in effect for most consumer items, effective immediately.

* The Insurances Premiums Tax will be replaced at the same level, by a Retail Sales Tax on insurance, to take effect April 1st, 1986. This will be administratively easier to deal with and will affect only certain public corporations, but not individuals or private businesses.

* The relatively low taxation level on loose tobacco will be increased somewhat, yielding an additional 50 cents on a 200 gram tin, effective immediately.

* An increased markup by the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation on spirits will yield an additional \$1,000,000 in profits, but there will be no increase in the Corporation's markup on beer sales.

* And, certain fees will be increased modestly,

including Motor Vehicle Registration, Drivers' Licences, the Registry of Deeds, and tuition fees in vocational schools and colleges, the last mentioned by 5 per cent, not much more than the rate of inflation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

EXPENDITURE PROGRAMME

Mr. Speaker, I have been pacing myself somewhat impatiently in getting to this next section of my good news Address. The Estimates for the coming fiscal year provide increased funding amounts for a wide range of needed ongoing public services and programs, and reflect our assessment of the most cost-effective use of our financial resources. It is my pleasure now to announce the more significant items of public interest, on which my hon. colleagues, the ministers of the departments concerned, will elaborate later.

Pensions

An annual increase of 4 per cent, with a floor of \$240, is approved for all individuals receiving Government pensions, effective April 1st, 1986.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Education

I am pleased to announce that a 6 per cent increase in per pupil operating grants is provided to all school boards and the special

grant to compensate for lost revenues related to declining pupil enrolments is continued. With the continued decline in interest rates, the special temporary interest subsidy introduced when rates were extremely high a few years ago will be eliminated, but I am pleased also to announce that an additional \$1,000,000 will be distributed, on the basis of greatest need, to boards primarily serving rural areas of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

The \$20,000,000 per year school construction program is extended beyond the three-year period initially announced to include a fourth year in 1988-89.

Post-secondary Education

As indicated recently, projects totalling \$34,000,000 have been approved from the Federal/Provincial Offshore Development Fund, specifically: \$25,000,000 for a Centre for Earth Resources Research at Memorial University; \$1,000,000 for a computer-aided design facility at Memorial's Engineering School; \$5,000,000 for an Offshore Survival Training Centre for the Marine Institute; and \$3,000,000 for equipment for Occupational Trades Skills Training at the College of Trades and Technology and at various vocational schools. Cash flows on these projects in 1986-87 will be \$10,500,000.

Let me announce three further significant expenditures for post-secondary education:

- * First, Memorial University's operating and furnishings/equipment grants, on which the Honourable Minister concerned will later comment more fully. These grants are increased overall by 9.6 per cent, one of the largest increases in the Budget, to a total of \$78,900,000;
- * 2,000,000 out of a total \$5,100,000 for the School of Fine Arts at the Sir Wilfred Grenfell College in Corner Brook - further evidence of this Government's strong commitment to the Arts;
- * Initial funding of \$1,000,000 for a \$3,000,000 extension to the Faculty of Business building at Memorial University.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Job Creation

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege now to announce the main components of our short-term creation program for the year ahead:

- * \$2,000,000 for a Student Summer Employment Program in conjunction with the Federal "Challenge '86" Program;
- * A total of 770 seasonal jobs in silviculture activities through the Department of Forest Resources and Lands and in co-operation with

the pulp and paper companies;

- * \$3,500,000 as our share towards the \$35,000,000 Canadian Job Strategy Program;
- * \$27,000,000 for the Community Development Program in the Department of Social Services which will create up to 12,000 short-term jobs in 1986 as happened in 1985.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Municipal Assistance

I am pleased to announce a recent decision which Government has taken with respect to municipal assistance to the City of Corner Brook. It has been decided that Government will reimburse approximately 15 per cent of the annual fire protection costs of the City of Corner Brook in order to compensate for the costs of fire protection for non-taxable Provincial Government properties within the city's boundaries.

Additionally, Government is increasing its municipal firefighting equipment allocation to \$750,000, representing a \$230,000 increase over 1985-86, to assist municipalities to acquire essential new equipment under this 75/25 cost-shared program.

Health

In the area of health care, Government is announcing significant expenditures to improve services in all areas of

the Province:

- * \$6,000,000 for the Burin Peninsula Hospital;
- * \$4,500,000 to commence construction of the \$16,000,000 redevelopment of the Grand Falls Hospital;
- * \$1,800,000 to construct an extension for outpatients and ambulatory care at the Baie Verte Hospital;
- * Funding to enable the Clarendville Hospital to become operational this year;
- * Construction funds totalling \$3,700,000 to commence the new 75-bed chronic care/clinic facility at Botwood;
- * Funds have been provided through the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation for a total of 105 new chronic care beds to be added to the Agnes Pratt Senior Citizens Home in St. John's and the Golden Heights Manor Home in Bonavista;
- * Funding for the operation of the following new chronic care facilities: the 75-bed Lion's Manor Senior Citizens Home, Placentia; the 40-bed Harbour Lodge extension, Carbonear; and, the 50-bed extension to Bay St. George Senior Citizens Home;
- * Funding to provide for 40 new staff positions in existing nursing homes around the Province to upgrade nursing care, a 4

per cent increase in the rates to licenced boarding home operators and \$200,000 for additional boarding home beds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Social Services

It is a pleasant duty to announce significant expenditures for improvements in the social services area:

- * A 4 per cent increase is provided for all components of the Social Assistance Program to take effect April 1st, 1986;
- * Five additional group homes are funded for various categories of children in need;
- * \$150,000 is allocated for assistance in purchasing a new "Good Will Centre" building in St. John's;
- * \$145,000 is allotted for a physically disabled group home to be operated at the Orange Home;
- * Three new group homes and a specialized open custody group home for young offenders are funded;
- * \$450,000 is assigned to begin development of a new closed custody facility for young offenders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Fishery

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to outline major initiatives for our fishery:

- * A new type of middle distance fishing vessel will be designed at Marystown Shipyard Limited, which will construct one new such vessel, and will participate with other local shipyards in the construction of a second new middle distance fishing vessel. These two vessels will operate in conjunction with the two existing middle distance vessels owned by the Department of Fisheries, purchased for pilot program purposes;
- * Over \$400,000 is provided for an expanded aquaculture development program, and as well a Retail Sales Tax exemption is granted on certain equipment and materials used in commercial aquaculture operations;
- * \$350,000 has been supplied for expanded departmental quality and productivity enhancement programs;
- * \$6,500,000 will be supplied through the Fisheries Loan Board for loans and other assistance to the inshore fishery;
- * \$3,000,000 is provided for completion of the Marine Service Centre in Green Bay and for a new straddle crane and related wharf facilities at Harbour Grace;
- * An additional \$1,300,000

over that expended in 1985 will be spent on other fisheries infrastructure;

- * \$2,400,000 is provided as the Province's portion of an \$8,000,000 contribution from the Burin Peninsula Development Fund towards the expansion of the secondary processing facility and the construction of the trawler refit centre at Burin by Fishery Products International.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Small Business

It is especially exciting to announce new thrusts for small business promotion:

- * The limit on Rural Development Authority loans has been doubled to \$50,000, and the limit for the Farm Development Loan Board has been increased from \$30,000 to \$75,000. In both cases, preferential interest rates are maintained at three points below bank prime;
- * The Agriculture Development Fund has been boosted to \$1,300,000 for 1986-87 so that our farmers can improve buildings, breeding stock, and land development;
- * An allocation of over \$1,000,000 has been provided to the tourism advertising budget, aimed particularly at Eastern

Canadian and Northeastern United States markets. This more aggressive promotional campaign is expected to result in an additional \$10,000,000 in tourism expenditures in the Province. In addition, the Tourism Development Subsidiary Agreement is expected to inject \$5,000,000 into the industry this year, leveraging a further \$12,000,000 from the private sector, for improved tourist facilities and attractions in the Province;

- * We are prepared to support financially a new private business engaged in car wreck and metal recycling in the Province this year, which will have highly desirable environmental spin-off benefits;
- * The incubator mall at Pasadena will be brought to completion and planning is in its final stage to allow commencement of the Port-aux-Basques incubator mall. This will be complemented by the newly opened Federally sponsored Innovation and Entrepreneurial Management Corporation (TIEM) Enterprise Centre in St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Forestry

The Budget includes several initiatives aimed at strengthening

the contribution made to our economy by the forestry sector.

Over \$27,500,000 is provided for forest resource management programs including more than \$11,000,000 under a new forestry agreement with the Government of Canada expected to be signed in the near future, and \$3,500,000 for spraying against the hemlock looper insect under cost-sharing arrangements with the paper companies.

Also cost-shared with the paper companies and with the Government of Canada is the \$248,000,000 pulp and paper modernization agreement, and in 1986-87 our Provincial contribution is \$1,500,000.

For forest fire protection, \$8,700,000 is allocated towards the acquisition of the Province's new fleet of waterbombers being built under the Federal/Provincial National Air Tanker Fleet Program.

Mining

Mr. Speaker, this Government has regularly displayed a lively concern for the welfare of the mining industry in the Province, and for those gainfully employed in mining, as witnessed by our prompt response to family hardships in Labrador West when recession-dictated layoffs occurred there, and as witnessed by our successful efforts in recent years to stimulate exploration in all areas of the Province.

That policy is being maintained with high priority, as the following announcements demonstrate:

- * \$2,700,000 will be spent to

promote and support mineral exploration and development under the Canada/Newfoundland Mineral Development Subsidiary Agreement;

- * The Budget contains an equity investment of \$6,000,000 for Baie Verte Mines Limited, the first instalment of a total \$12,000,000 investment to maintain efficient operations with resulting jobs over the long-term;
- * The Budget also includes \$1,300,000 from the Burin Peninsula Development Fund for the reactivation of the St. Lawrence Fluorspar Mine and construction of an on site processing mill, making it a more advanced enterprise than the previous mining operation.

Offshore Development

I am pleased to announce today the formation of a partnership between Marystown Shipyard Limited and Moss Rosenberg of Norway. This new partnership, to be known as Vinland Industries, will pursue major contracts relative to the construction of the gravity based structure and associated work stemming from the Hibernia development. Moss Rosenberg is one of the most capable and technically advanced offshore contracting firms in the world and we are confident that this "marriage", coupled with our earlier technology transfer agreement, will enable Marystown to become a significant player in this exciting new development.

In addition to the cash flow for the Offshore Development Fund

projects referred to earlier, a further \$29,500,000 is provided under the Fund for other initiatives and projects to be announced in conjunction with the Government of Canada during the year.

Construction Industry

Mr. Speaker, the construction industry is of vital importance in our Provincial economy, not least because of its capacity for rapid response in enhancing rates of employment, given appropriate financial and market conditions. Many sectors, such as housing, transportation and others, influence the level of construction activity. Accordingly, with employment opportunities largely in mind, government is particularly gratified to be able to make the following announcements:

- * Gross capital expenditures by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation (NLHC) will exceed \$78,000,000 in 1986-1987, and amongst the projects funded will be industrial land developments at the Octagon Pond, Donovans, O'Leary Avenue, and Springdale industrial parks and several other areas for a total of \$3,600,000, and \$4,500,000 to upgrade corporation-owned market rental units in St. John's, Stephenville and Goose Bay;
- * The Provincial road and bridge construction program comprises the following three initiatives:

The highway and bridge rehabilitation program will

be continued and
\$13,700,000 has been
provided for the coming
year;

Over \$22,000,000 is provided for
highway improvement and
construction projects;

\$4,300,000 will be spent on bridge
and causeway projects;

* Spending under the
Canada/Newfoundland Highway
Funding Agreement will
increase in the new fiscal
year to \$33,600,000,
primarily for the
Trans-Canada Highway and
the Trans-Labrador Highway,
but also including some
secondary road construction;

* \$8,000,000 will be spent
under the Coastal Labrador
Air Strip Program;

* \$3,800,000 will be spent to
continue construction of a
new Department of
Transportation depot at
Deer Lake, the final cost
of which will be \$5,700,000
when completed in 1987;

* \$300,000 is allocated for
planning and site work for
a new \$1,100,000 depot at
Baie Verte;

* During the coming fiscal
year, \$25,000,000 will be
made available through new
guaranteed loans to enable
municipalities to provide
water and sewer services
and to construct and pave
roads;

* \$2,000,000 will be expended
out of the recently signed

\$7,500,000
Canada/Newfoundland
National Conservation and
Alternative Energy
Initiative Agreement with
emphasis on
labour-intensive
demonstration projects and
wood-chip fuel priorities;

* A total of \$1,800,000 will
also be spent on energy
conservation projects for
public buildings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that
Honourable Members without
exception will agree that what I
have just read constitutes indeed
a "Good News" message, especially
for those employed and unemployed
who are striving to participate in
work activities for the
improvement of their standards of
living. As the year ahead
unfolds, Government will continue
to search out every possible
opportunity to create and
stimulate gainful employment in
all areas of our Province.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the best news of
all, in Government's view, may be
distilled from my concluding
remarks.

Let me first state that, in the
minds of some people, it may
appear unusual to present this
type of "Good News" Budget at such
an early stage in the renewed
mandate of any Administration.
The tone of the Budget may be more
reminiscent of the closing days of
a Government's mandate.

If such perceptions exist, they can be readily dispelled. The tone and good news in today's Budget bears no relationship to this Government's time in office, but, rather flows directly from past performances of the Administration and from economic circumstances, current and in early prospect.

Mr. Speaker, I submit it is a fair assessment to say that if one single trait is characteristic of the Peckford Administration, that trait is a propensity for, and a belief in, forward planning. We have initiated studies, established Royal and other commissions, published White, Green and other papers, appointed councils and task forces, and partaken of conferences and consultations on the widest possible range of activities appropriate to Government's attention. Indeed, we have sometimes been criticized for words and not deeds. However, we believe it axiomatic that rational, definitive planning is a prerequisite of success, contributing in no small measure to our good news Budget today.

Of course, we also recognize that other events contributed importantly to our present circumstances. There is alive and well throughout Canada today a self-image of confidence and optimism, standing in stark contrast to the confusion and doubt so prevalent in the era of "stagflation" which epitomized the 1970's and early 1980's. In those days, Canada was beset with regional antagonisms, management improvisations, and confused objectives of awful proportions. Incoherent government interventions, particularly at the National level, in all manner of

activities were rife, frequently for less than noble purposes. A radical sweeping aside of time-encrusted methods of governmental activities and interactions with other societal players was urgently needed, and the prescient insight of the Canadian electorate achieved that handsome result in the latter part of 1984. I believe the most biased observer will now agree that West talks to East, all sectors have resumed the pursuit of invention and productivity, and the multiple challenges of our time are being faced by all segments of society with vigour rather than dread.

Our Province is sharing visibly in this new Canadian awakening, and, indeed we have our own social rejuvenation dating a decade beforehand. Newfoundlanders now occupy a respected and enlarging place in the Canadian society; we have not as yet seen that develop into equivalent economic prosperity or comparable public services. However, the point we insist upon, as a Government, is that the stage is now set for the attainment of a new plateau. On all sides, our sectoral economy and our social arrangements are solidly poised for "take-off".

Who can doubt that our fishery has found its feet, realizing the success of the restructured offshore division, and the aquacultural and other innovative stirrings of the inshore? Despite temporary dips in petroleum prices, can there be any doubt that our proven offshore treasures will see early development? Can the further unlocking of Labrador hydro potential be long delayed considering the new realities in Quebec and the mounting appetite for electrical energy in Eastern

Canada and the Northeastern United States? Will not the present hectic pace of mineral exploration throughout our Province bring new bounties to rival past developments? Can the rapidly escalating skills and educational status of our population fail to find early outlets of attainment and standard of living? Are Newfoundlanders now not immeasurably better ordered in their community organization, artistic attainment and social stability? The answer to all these questions is more confidently affirmative than at any other stage in our history.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is on a forward move, and the good news is that Newfoundland and Labrador is about to match the marching pace.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the debate be adjourned until tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is that debate be adjourned until tomorrow. You have heard the motion. Those in favour 'Aye', those against 'Nay', carried.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the

House that I received a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER:

This message is addressed to the hon. the Minister of Finance. "I, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates required for the public service of the Province for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1987, in the aggregate of \$2,126,904,800, and in accordance with the provisions of The Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly."

(Sgd) -----

W. Anthony Paddon
Lieutenant-Governor

We will just take a few moments now to distribute documents to all hon. members.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the message, together with the estimates, be referred to a Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is moved and seconded -

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we understand this is a debatable motion. We refer Your Honour to -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We understand that this is a

debatable motion. If there is any question we refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 311 of the Fifth Edition. It is my intention to proceed to debate this motion. Does Your Honour wish a moment to check that?

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like that reference.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on it, if I may.

MR. BARRY:

Well, it is not a point of order. I am rising to debate the motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. One does not ask the Speaker a hypothetical question. In accordance with the rules of the House, one gets up on a point of order, and the points of order and/or points of privilege are then debated. Otherwise the Speaker is drawn into the debate.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I did not rise on either a point of privilege or a point of order, I rose to commence debate on this matter. I raise the question with Your Honour, if you had any questions about our entitlement to so debate it, and referred Your Honour to page 311 of Beauchesne. But I will procedure now with debate on the motion made by the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Just one second.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, normally on a ceremonial occasion we would not do this.

MR. SPEAKER:

Just one moment, please.

MR. BARRY:

Is there a problem, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes. I would rule that the motion of the Minister of Finance that the message of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, and the estimates be referred to a Committee of Supply, is a form of a dilatory motion. Having considered the procedure of the House of Commons, such motions have been put without debate since 1955, and are quite clearly not substantive motions capable of expressing a decision of this House. This type of motion could be further clarified in accordance with Beauchesne as a subsidiary motion. I refer hon. members to pages 151 and 152, paragraph 417 of Beauchesne.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

It is an interesting method of proceeding that Your Honour has adopted in this matter. Normally one would hear argument, with respect, if there was a question, as to whether or not a debate was in order or a motion was in order. Your Honour, there will be a number of other motions that will be made this afternoon. We would ask Your Honour to give us an opportunity to establish whether or not we are entitled to debate. We would ask Your Honour to listen to argument with respect to whether or not a debate is permissible before Your Honour stands up and makes a ruling, with

all due respect.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have already ruled on that matter.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather regrettable that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would get up after Your Honour has made a ruling and, in effect, question the ruling of Your Honour. It is perfectly plain there on page 151 of Beauchesne that a dilatory motion, as Your Honour indicated, is not debatable. One such dilatory motion is that the debate be now adjourned or it proceed to Committee.

I would also like, just for the sake of the House, Your Honour, to refer you to Standing Order 1. That is the first Standing Order that we have. "In all cases not provided for by sessional or other orders, the usages and customs of the House of Commons of Canada as in force at the time shall be followed so far as they may be applicable to this House." But, of course, it is the primary usages and customs, Mr. Speaker, are the usages and customs of this House as they have existed after Confederation and as they existed prior to Confederation. If Your Honour or anybody in this hon. House does any research into the proceedings that have been adopted over the years, they will find that this type of motion is not debatable. They will also, I submit, Your Honour, find a well engrained procedure that the hon. the Minister of Finance is leading this House into now on Budget Day. I think it is appropriate that we follow that and there not be attempts to adjourn it or

sabotage proceedings that have been handed down to us by our forefathers for generations in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
I assume Your Honour, having heard argument after the fact from the Government House Leader, might consider some argument after the fact from this side of the House as well.

MR. SPEAKER:
I have already ruled on that particular matter.

MR. BARRY:
Your Honour, there are two sides to this House and there are two sides to most arguments. Now, Your Honour, the Government House Leader -

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:
I will rise on another point of order. I will rise on a point of order as to what is happening here today -

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

MR. BARRY:
- as to what procedure we are involved in here today. There are Standing Orders for this House which provide, Your Honour, an opportunity for the Opposition to make certain points at various times in the proceedings of the House. The Government House Leader has said that it has not been the practice, the procedure, to do this on Budget Day. Your Honour, that may be correct, but

rarely have we had a situation on Budget day as we have in this Province today. Rarely have we seen, Your Honour, an illegal strike with certain -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I do not know what the point of order is the hon. member is trying to make.

MR. BARRY:

What I am saying, Your Honour, is that the fact that debate has not been urged as a matter of practice since 1949 does not answer the question. A precedent is only established if there is an attempt to debate and a challenge made, and I am submitting to Your Honour that the reason that has not occurred before on Budget Day is because it is normally taken as a ceremonial occasion. But ceremony, Your Honour, must be put aside when you have workers in this Province out on an illegal strike, when you have some of them being arrested and some not, when you have judges of the Supreme Court being forced to enforce injunctions because of lack of action by the Attorney General of this Province (Ms Verge).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
We have an unusual situation occurring in this Province today.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

On motion that the message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the estimates be referred to a

Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I have to debate this motion because I have not seen on this side of the House a lot of progress made, despite all attempts by Your Honour to make such progress.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman, has come up.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, the matter which is now before the Chairman's attention, a point of order being submitted, is that the motion now before you is not debatable. If the authorities, the officers of the House and yourself will examine the uninterrupted practice of the House of Assembly, going back from Responsible Government up until the withdrawal of parliamentary government in 1933, beginning with Confederation in 1949 up until now, it will be seen that on no occasion with respect to the day on which the Budget is delivered have any of these motions been debated.

Now, I think first what we have to establish is what Standing Order

one says, and that is clear. That says that what governs in the House are our Standing Orders and the practice of the House, and if they are not clear or are not definitive, then the practice in the House of Commons. So the practice in the House of Commons, I would suggest, is not the matter here. Obviously we have had a parliament in Newfoundland and budgets in Newfoundland and we do not need on this occasion to go to Ottawa, we are competent within our own jurisdiction and our own practice. So it is our own Standing Orders and our own practices.

Now our own Standing Orders are silent, so it is our own practice. Our own practice has shown, since parliamentary government in 1832 was initiated in Newfoundland, up until its temporary interruption in 1933, and from its re-establishment again in 1949 up until now, this matter has never been challenged. Now I am somewhat anticipating, but obviously since the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) referred to it a few moments ago I can address myself briefly to that argument which I am sure will be his, and that is that because nobody has challenged that procedure, that does not mean that the procedure has become law merely because it has never been challenged. What I submit with respect to that is that compliance, uninterrupted, unchallenged for the period of time that we have in mind, 1832 until 1933, and 1949 until 1986, that there is a point where uninterrupted usage crystallizes into practice, and I think that that has happened. The hon. gentleman's arrogance is so apparent that when anybody does not agree with him, what is his

answer? Do not be so silly. All he can do is show his arrogance and try to undermine the Chair as we have seen a number of times. However, I did not intend to get into that but I was provoked by the interruptions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition which are not facts but are merely allegations of 'Silly, silly.' Let the hon. gentleman practice his own form of debate and I will practice mine. The submission is that the practices which have gone from 1832 up until now, with the interruption when there was no opportunity to practice them because there was no parliament, have now crystallized into practice which is law governing the procedures of the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, I refer all hon. members to Standing Order No. 45, "A motion that the Chairman leave the Chair is always in order, shall take precedence of any other motion, and shall not be debatable. Such motion, if rejected, cannot be renewed unless some intermediate proceeding has taken place."

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

That is a very interesting approach taken by Your Honour. One side is heard with respect to a point of order and the other side is not - a very interesting approach. I would refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 311 which lists debatable motions.

Paragraph 32 says, "The following motions are debatable." Go down to (j) "for the consideration of a ways and means order (Budget)" and (k) "for the consideration of any motion under the order for the consideration of the business of supply." Any motion, Your Honour, is what is set out there. Now, Your Honour, this is not a minor point, for the administration to say that they are now going to redo the Standing Orders of this House by calling on ceremonial occasions dating back to 1832, or 1492. Your Honour, there is a right in the opposition of this Province that has been established over a long period of time, that the Opposition is entitled to debate Supply, and it is not the right of government to force the closure of this House when there are matters that should be debated. We have a very serious situation in this Province today that should be debated, and it is the reason that we are not prepared to accept that this is a merely ceremonial closing that takes place here. I ask Your Honour to look at those sections in Beauchesne. These deal with "the consideration of any motion under the order for the consideration of the business of supply." That motion affects the business of supply, it is directly dealt with by Beauchesne and we submit we are entitled to have that motion debated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
If I may just respond to that.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I will just respond briefly. In

this particular instance Beauchesne has no relevance. What has relevance always is our Standing Orders, our usages and our customs. Our Standing Orders first, and our usages and our customs. Your Honour has correctly read Standing Order 45 which says a motion to leave "the Chair is always in order, shall take precedence over any other motion, and shall not be debatable."

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Once again I wish to remind all hon. members that this House is governed by its own Standing Orders of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland, and I refer you again to Standing Order number 45. I will now leave the Chair and report progress.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole reports that it has considered the matters to it referred, has directed me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to

the imposition of a tax on tobacco. And I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the imposition of a tax on retail sales.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, April 7, and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there should be no doubt about this motion as being debatable.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am rising to debate this motion and I have precedents established by this House, by Your Honour and by others, if there is any question about my right to do that.

Now, Your Honour, this is a debatable motion and we on this side of the House intend to see that it is debated. We have a situation in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that has -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

There are two points of order. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is too eager. I do not think, Your Honour, has put the motion yet to the Chamber, so that is the first thing. Second, Mr. Speaker, and I want to urge this on, Your Honour, normally, of course, adjournment motions are debatable with respect to the ordinary business of the House. Mr. Speaker, this is not, I would submit to Your Honour, the ordinary business of the House. This is an instance which occurs just once a year, the budget debate. As we have already pointed out in our arguments, there is an accepted procedure on Budget Day, it is really a ceremonial occasion. Your Honour, I draw to your attention that Your Honour will note that we do not on Budget Day, for instance, go through the ordinary routine of the day, so the ordinary rules do not apply. We do not go through Oral Questions and we do not go into Petitions and the other elements, neither do we enter, as is customary, Your Honour, into debate. That being the case, I think we have to look just to what the usage is and the customs are which, certainly, we have in this House. I would suggest to Your Honour that the usages and the customs quite clearly in this House, since 1832 up to the present day, have had budgets delivered by Ministers of Finance, have gone through the proceedings right up the present proceeding. my adjournment motion, and that adjournment motion has been decided without debate. So I would recommend to Your Honour that Your Honour take into

consideration the normal usages and customs, and the normal usages and customs are different than the ordinary routine of the day, ordinary business. An ordinary motion to adjourn the House, were we in ordinary business, certainly is debatable, I would concede that. But this is another situation. We have a specific type of procedure that is set down, and I would submit to Your Honour that that procedure entails an adjournment motion being entertained without there being any debate, for obvious reasons.

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:

We are on very dangerous ground here, and Your Honour is being asked by the Government House Leader to do something -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour is being asked to do something here which could result in a severe infringement of the rights of the Opposition, and a severe restriction, Mr. Speaker, on democracy in this Province and on democratic principles. If the Government House Leader's point were correct, why did Your Honour come and ask for my consent and the consent of the member for Menihek for the televising of these proceedings? If, Mr. Speaker, you were entitled to throw out the Standing Orders

because this is a so-called ceremonial occasion, why do you come?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I am quite prepared to hear what the hon. member has to say, and I will consider the matter then.

MR. BARRY:

Well, thank you, Your Honour. I had every expectation that that would happen. The point I am making is that that fact in itself, the fact that Your Honour would come and ask for consent, is in itself a clear refutation, rebuttal of the point made by the Government House Leader. The ordinary rules are not thrown out. This is the House of Assembly. This is a day in the life of the House of Assembly. Normally, Mr. Speaker, it would be just a ceremonial occasion because the Opposition would not feel the need to stand and attempt to continue debate and to have this House remain open to deal with a very serious situation that exist in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

I would ask Your Honour, if you do not mind, if you would control the members opposite, because this is a tactic that is all too often used, to try and shout down members on this side when valid points are being made. I ask for the protection of Your Honour, the protection of the Chair.

Now motions to adjourn the House, Beauchesne, page 91, Paragraph 283, 'A motion to adjourn the House may not have conditions attached, otherwise it becomes a substantive motion which may be

moved only after notice.' Mr. Speaker, this has come up before. It came up as late as last Fall's sitting of the House, Your Honour may recall, and there was a ruling. The fact that the Government House Leader has set a specific date - it is not just adjourned over until tomorrow, it is adjourned over until April 7 - that is the attachment of a condition which makes the motion substantive and therefore makes it debatable. And I refer Your Honour to the Hansard of December 6, 1985, at page L4123, Volume 40, No. 75, where the member for Fortune - Hermitage rose and referred Your Honour to an early precedent, a precedent of the Minister of Finance when he was sitting in the Chair, where the Minister of Finance said, "The motion which we are considering here and which was ruled in order was that the House adjourn to a certain date. This is not a dilatory motion. This is a substantive motion." Your Honour went on to say, "To that point of order, I did have an opportunity of looking at Hansard of February 15," which was the Minister of Finance's earlier point, "while I was waiting to get my advice and help from Ottawa and also before that. In connection with the first ruling that I made, that exact question did come up on this particular date in the House and it was ruled at that time that the motion was in order and that it was debatable."

Your Honour, that is the exact same motion that is now before us today and we submit that if Your Honour is to accept the point of the Government House Leader it is to make a total mockery of this House, of its Standing Orders, of democratic principles and of the rights of the Opposition in this

House. We ask Your Honour - it is a very serious matter - to recognize the precedents of this House and rule the same way that Your Honour did on December 6, 1985.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, briefly to this point of order. First of all, the references cited by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, with respect to a previous ruling of Your Honour and a previous ruling of another member who was in the Chair at that time with respect to the debatability of a motion because it was substantive and not dilatory and had a condition and all of that, I suggest are totally irrelevant because these did not take place on any of the two extraordinary - they can be called 'ceremonial,' I prefer to call them 'extraordinary,' outside of the ordinary - days which are in the session of a House. They are the opening of the House with the Speech from the Throne and the Budget day. So I submit that that is irrelevant.

We come back to Standing Order 1, which shows that the practice in the House of Commons and Beauchesne, which governs that, is only operable if our Standing Orders or our own practice are silent. It is clear here that our own practice is not silent when it comes to Budget days. So I think what is important to consider here is whether it is an ordinary or

extraordinary day.

Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says, to show you it is an ordinary day, you, Mr. Speaker, asked the consent of the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. the member for Menihek about whether the television could come in or not. One of them said, no they could not or under certain conditions they could not, or whatever. I suggest that that shows that it is extraordinary because I do not think Your Honour goes around every day asking members do they give unanimous consent. That shows that it is extraordinary.

Secondly, if words mean anything, Standing Order 14 says, "The ordinary daily routine of business in the House shall be as follows," and it goes on and lists the six things; the Statements by Ministers, the Oral Questions, the Answers to Questions, Petitions, etc. There are only two days on which that does not happen, when the Speech from the Throne is delivered and on Budget day. Again, without wishing to repeat it, our whole Parliamentary history since 1832 establishes that practice and the government submits it has now crystalized into usage and it is part of the law of this Parliament.

With respect to opportunity to debate, the hon. gentlemen opposite will have ample opportunity to debate. They have had during the past number of days and they will from April 7 on. It is not a question of whether they have the opportunity to debate or not, it is a question of whether the practices over a century old of this House are to be subverted or respected.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, Standing Order 1 says in part, and I quote, "In all cases not provided for hereinafter or by sessional or other orders, etc." Mr. Speaker, the first point I want to make is that contrary to what the gentlemen on the opposite side have submitted, there is no provision in our rules that we be governed by our practice, only by our Standing Orders. Where our Standing Orders do not provide, then we follow the customs and usages of the House of Commons.

The second point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the effect of the motion put down by the gentleman from St. John's East a few moments ago would be dual.

First of all, it would have the effect of concluding today's sitting, and it would have the second effect of shutting down the House for about two weeks, until April.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the first respect, even if you buy the argument of the gentlemwn from Waterford-Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) and from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) that this is a ceremonial occasion and we have done certain things on ceremonial occasions that we do not normally do, etc., etc., even if you buy that particular argument in terms of their desire I presume to conclude today's sitting, because that was the brunt of their argument, to conclude today's

sitting, you still have to address the other half of the problem; that in voting for this motion the House shuts down itself for the next two weeks. Mr. Speaker, when it provides that such a motion with conditions attached, in this case the condition of time of reopening, that is the point that is addressed by Beauchesne, that as soon as the House resolves, or somebody in the House moves that the House ought to shut itself down for an extended period, two weeks or whatever, then the membership of that House ought to have say in that, ought to be able to debate that particular issue. So while we have no difficulty with the argument that this is an extra-ordinary or ceremonial occasion - we have no difficulty with that - we have great difficulty with the proposal that the House be closed for the next thirteen days and that is what we want to debate. I would suggest to the gentleman from St. John's East, the Government House Leader, there is a way out of this dilemma here. He can do what has been done on other ceremonial occasions; instead of putting a time definite in his motion, he can seek the concurrence of the House to change the date - drop the April 7 altogether - and that would have the effect of concluding today's sitting, ceremonial as it is, until tomorrow, and we come back tomorrow and then we deal with the substantive matter of whether the House ought to go on sitting or indeed conclude, as he would like it to do until April 7.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, he has created the dilemma today in that we would not normally want to debate this on a ceremonial occasion, but he has given us a very difficult choice; he asked us

to conclude the sitting, which in terms of ceremony we do not mind doing, but he asked us also in the process to be party to shutting the House for two weeks, which we have no intention of being party to. I would appeal to him, if he is as concerned about ceremony as he purported this afternoon, to resolve the issue very quickly by seeking the concurrence of the House to remove the date from his motion, that would have the effect of, one, concluding the session in the next few minutes, and, secondly, getting us back here tomorrow where we belong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard enough on this particular matter. I am going to recess the House for a few minutes.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

I have had an opportunity of looking into this matter. Certainly this is one of our two ceremonial occasions, the opening of the House and Budget Day. However, I have also read through the ruling that I made in December last and I am satisfied that this is a debatable motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour, we intend to debate this just as long as we can. We intend to debate it this evening. We intend to debate it as long as the rules of practice and the rules of this House permit us to debate this motion. I mention this just for the benefit of the guests in the Gallery. We would understand completely if some of them found that they might have to leave before six o'clock tomorrow morning for one reason or another.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen in recent weeks in this Province a situation develop that has caught the attention of all of Canada. Why has it caught the attention of all of Canada, Mr. Speaker? Because it is something that rarely occurs in the history of a Province. I guess we have to go back to the IWA strike to see anything close to the current situation in labour relations in the public sector in this Province. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, a government react in an arrogant, intolerant, heavy-handed fashion to employees who took the position that they had been pushed to the wall, that they had been sitting at the bargaining table for over a year, that government had not been making any reasonable proposals to correct what government admits, what the Premier admits, is an unjust situation that now exists within the public sector of this Province, namely, that you have employees doing exactly the same job in different units and one of them is earning \$12,000 and another is earning \$14,000 or \$15,000 for the same job.

I had a gentleman call me up a week ago, and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, he is a gentleman who has called me up fairly frequently and

he was a member of another party until this happened. He would call me up when any issue of importance or significance arose in the House of Assembly and he would attempt to persuade me of the error of my ways in taking the line that we were taking in Opposition. That gentleman called me up last week, Mr. Speaker, on one occasion and said, "Boy, I do not know. I do not think there is much I can say to criticize the approach you are taking this time. I have got two sisters. One of them is covered by the unit of collective bargaining responsible for health employees and the other sister is in the General Service." He said, "My sister in the health care service of this Province is earning \$3,000 more than my sister who is in the General Service and they are doing exactly the same work. That is not fair and you have to do something about it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the issue of parity. That is the issue that the strikers have had emblazoned on their buttons. That is the issue, Mr. Speaker, on which they have said, "We are pushed to the wall and we have to go out on strike."

There are other issues, of course. One of them has to do with the arrogance of the approach, the heavy-handed approach. We have an entire historical process that has gone on here, a process that started as long ago, Mr. Speaker, as when the Premier sent a letter off to the paperworkers in Grand Falls and said, "Now, don't you dare ask for too much money," before they ever had an offer on the table. It goes back to the teachers' strike of last year. Before that, it goes back to the wage freeze that was brought in without any

consultation with labour leaders in this Province. Now if there had been that consultation maybe we would not have these inequities, this lack of parity, Mr. Speaker. If the Premier had not been as heavy-handed and as arrogant, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he would have been aware of the fact that he was locking in various units, one unit locked in at a higher level because their bargaining took place in a period of inflation, another unit locked in at a lower level because they concluded their agreement during the period of disinflation or recession. That is what the freeze has done, Mr. Speaker. It has perpetuated this disparity between the salaries of public employees in this Province.

So it is in that context, the context of arrogance, and intolerance and heavy-handedness, that we have to understand the frustrations that have built up amongst the public sector employees. We do not condone their breaking the law - anybody who breaks the law in this Province must suffer the consequences; the courts will deal with that - but everybody is suppose to be treated equally before the law. If the law is applied for one group, it should be applied for everybody. And we have a very unique situation which has developed in this Province where the Attorney General (Ms Verge), despite the fact that her lawyer had drafted the injunction, gets up in this House and says, "Well, I do not know whether the injunction applies to the General Service," when the clear wording of the injunction says that it is to apply to all the members of the NAPE, and the General Service employees are members of NAPE. It is a funny situation in this

Province when we have to have a Justice of the Supreme Court get out of his car and take on the enforcement of the injunction himself, Mr. Speaker. What does that bring respect for the law and respect for the courts to in this Province? That is what members opposite are bringing about in the course of their bungling of this labour dispute. Now why do I say, 'bungling'? Well, if ever you saw their heavy-handed approach boxing themselves in, Mr. Speaker, we saw it in this labour dispute. I think it was within two days after the strike started there was an applications for an injunction and then, a day or so after that, we have the statement by the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) that any employee who returns to work is going to be suspended for thirty days. Now he has not explained how it is that if these employees are essential why he is going to suspend them. If they are so essential, why are they going to be suspended? How can they be suspended?

We saw the President of Treasury Board react, Mr. Speaker, in an insensitive fashion, and that has led to an impasse, and it has led to an escalation of this labour dispute. All of a sudden we saw a very interesting thing happen in this Province. Normally the general public is not very sympathetic to government employees asking for more of the taxpayers' dollars. Normally the general public says, 'I am paying enough taxes now, and those guys are earning enough, and they should get back to work.' That was the attitude again in this strike I think, Mr. Speaker. In the first day or so the strike was on, I travelled around this Province and I would hear people say, 'Well that Fraser March, he

is a bit of a radical, you know. That Fraser March he is out to crave out a career for himself now, he is out to make himself a martyr.' Mr. Speaker, when the time arrived, however, that we had Newfoundlanders being hauled off in paddy wagons, when the ordinary Newfoundland saw the heavy hand of the law being brought in to throw these workers into jail for exercising what is a normal democratic right in any other part of the country, it is then that the tide of public opinion started to turn.

Now, what did government do? Did they then take a conciliatory approach, Mr. Speaker? Did they then say, 'Well, we obviously made a mistake, we cannot go on because we are going to have to arrest another 3,500 workers, and then it is going to escalate and there are going to be others walking out and we are going to have to arrest some more and the whole court system is going to bog down and the jails will be full.' They said, 'Well, we obviously cannot continue on this course.' But did they remove the suspension? Did they admit that that was a flagrant provocation and did they say, 'We will correct that by removing the suspension'? Did they offer a bone or a sign of good faith? No, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what they did?

They said, 'We are going to apply the law selectively. We are going to have political influence brought to bear on the police function of this government.' Normally, the Director of Public Prosecutions in Department of Justice decides whether or not there are going to be investigations and criminal charges laid. It is not for the Premier or any politician to

decide who is to be charged or not charged. But that is what we heard the Premier say, standing up in this House, that he had decided that they would not clarify - using his words - clarify the injunction to decide whether or not it applied to the General Service.

There was no clarification needed, Mr. Speaker. What do you need to clarify? The injunction says it applies to all the members of NAPE, nothing needed to be clarified. What the Premier was saying was that he is going to decide who will be charged and who will not be charged, he, the Premier of the Province - not the Director of Public Prosecutions, not the police, not the Department of Justice - the Premier, as a politician.

MR. J. CARTER:

Keep your voice down please.

MR. BARRY:

Sorry, 'John', am I keeping you awake?

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes you are. I want to save up some sleep in preparation for tonight.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have this situation now where the rest of the country is looking down to Newfoundland and saying, 'What is going on here? Is it anarchy? What is happening?' We have laws being applied unfairly, unequally.

I have had, Mr. Speaker, a businessman call me up and say that he was about to do an important deal, a joint venture with somebody from outside the Province that would see many jobs

provided in this Province, and the other person said, 'Hey, hold on now. I am not sure I want to come down and do business here. The whole thing seems to be falling abroad. Is it safe for me to invest my money in a Province where you have a government unable to control things and willing to take a course of action that leads to this type of disrespect for law and order and, in fact, where government is encouraging a lack of respect for law and order?'

Mr. Speaker, another reason why this matter has occurred, why we had the initial walkout, was the provocation caused by an administration that was saying, 'We must have restraint, we cannot increase your salary,' while, at the same time, we had the renovations to the Premier's Office proceeding full tilt, we had car allowances for deputy ministers and assistant deputy ministers, we had massive expenditures on government propaganda in newspapers and on the radio, we had the political hacks and the backbenchers getting their car allowances, Mr. Speaker, and the government employees are saying, 'What does the Premier mean when he says there must be restraint?' It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, the restraint is only for others, not for them.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:
I am wondering if the Leader of the Opposition has a car assigned to his offices? Could he answer

that?

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I have answered that question, I think, about three times for the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:
You said no but you have a car.

MR. BARRY:
The fifteen members of the Liberal Opposition caucus have a car assigned because, Mr. Speaker, the government would not supply us with the messenger service which we asked for and which we said we needed. We did not need a car. We told them we did not need a car. We wanted a messenger service.

MR. PATTERSON:
You took the car. You took the Queen's silver.

MR. MARSHALL:
All you are are a bunch of messengers yourselves.

MR. PATTERSON:
A bunch of messengers is all you are.

MR. BARRY:
They refused to reintroduce the messenger service, Mr. Speaker, and there is a -

MR. PATTERSON:
You took the Queen's shilling.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has been trying now for ten years to get himself into Cabinet. He will not get into Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, by continuing with that sort of

incompetent comment.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I just say to the hon. gentleman, on that point, I do not see why the Opposition need messengers because all they are really capable of doing is delivering messages themselves.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, again we see the level of debate from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). I want the protection of the Chair. I want the member for Placentia and any other who tries to interrupt kept quiet or thrown out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is debating please?

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour, we have a situation where there is no restraint shown by members opposite. They are

lining their own pockets. The Public Service is able to see this.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:

You lined your pockets on the Ocean Ranger.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to have debate but it is another thing to have personal abuse. I think the Leader of the Opposition should take back that statement, that members over here are lining their own pockets. It is an unacceptable statement in this House of Assembly and I urge Your Honour to take action.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I think it is very relevant when Parliamentary Secretaries, some of which have ridings where there are unemployment rates of 80 per cent, are given an extra \$5,000 above and beyond the \$12,500 for their duties as Parliamentary Secretaries, while the ordinary citizens of this Province are out there manning picket lines in high winds and foul weather trying to just get one simple piece of justice called parity. That is called lining your own pockets, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Of course there is no point of order, Your Honour. There is no point of order when a truthful comment is made in this House.

I repeat, the public servants of this Province are able to see first hand, they experience every day, Mr. Speaker, the lack of restraint shown by members opposite when it comes to expenditures for their own purposes. They have been able to look, Mr. Speaker, and see the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) get a car allowance when there are no roads in his district to drive a car on; when they see, Mr. Speaker, car allowances being given to executive assistants who not only do not have any cars, Mr. Speaker, they do not even have driver's licenses which proves, Mr. Speaker, that the car allowance was nothing more than a hidden salary increase, Mr. Speaker, for certain members opposite through the backdoor. Backdoor salary increases when they are asking government employees to show restraint - an intolerable provocation, Mr. Speaker. Rubbing their nose in -

MR. WARREN:

Who pays for your gas?

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour, I would ask that the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) and any other member be just kept quiet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Once again I would ask all hon. members to please be silent while the Leader of the Opposition is debating.

MR. BARRY:

I do not intend to go on every minute either, Your Honour. I would ask Your Honour to intervene and keep them quiet when they open up. Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to have quiet when I address this House and I ask for the protection of the Chair.

Your Honour, we have that flagrant provocation, that rubbing of their noses, Mr. Speaker, into the lack of restraint shown by the administration. The public servants of this Province had their noses rubbed in this every day, Mr. Speaker, every day the elevator stopped on the eighth floor and they saw the sumptuous renovations to the Premier's Office. Every day, Mr. Speaker, there was a new announcement with respect to a new hidden salary increase. The same day that picketing workers were being hauled away in paddy wagons, the Order in Council was being signed for these car allowances, the same day exactly. Your Honour, if that is not provocation, what is? You have, Mr. Speaker, brilliant investments being made.

MR. TOBIN:

What about your car?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

Could we have silence. Once again I will ask all hon. members to please be silent while the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is debating.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour, we have the situation where -

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:

I quite agree with Your Honour's sentiments that this side of the House should keep quiet and allow other members to speak in silence. But when we are faced with someone who is bawling at the top of his lungs, it is only natural that we should object. If this side is going to be kept quiet and respect Your Honour's wishes, we would respectfully ask that you keep the level of decibels of the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) speech down to a tolerable level.

MR. SPEAKER:

I ask all members of this hon. House to please be silent.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

That, coming from the member, Mr. Speaker, who, yesterday, referred to a majority of the voters in a district of Newfoundland as scum, is a little laughable, I think. In fact, if it were not so serious it would be laughable. Yesterday, the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) suggested that my colleague from Port de Grave (Mr. Eford) was elected by the scum of that district, which makes up for more than half of the entire population in the district.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the only provocation that occurs. The provocation of watching the brilliant investment decision of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) when, in order to save \$2 to \$3 million in rentals, where government employees were out in rental space, they were going to build an extension to the Confederation Building to save all that money. Now they have not explained yet why it is they are saving money or how they are saving money when that extension cost \$40 million. If the money is borrowed at only 10 per cent, that is \$4 million a year. What a brilliant investment decision! They are going to save \$2 or \$3 million a year by paying \$4 million. The public employees of this Province look at that and they say, 'Now this is a good example of restraint.' The public employees in this Province look at the hiring, Mr. Speaker, of the defeated Tory candidates in the last election -

MR. PATTERSON:

What about the Red Trench over there?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Could we have silence, please.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, send him home and let him have a rest.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has drawn my attention to another brilliant investment decision by this government.

Paying for a piece of art to decorate some basement where nobody can ever see it. It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of an old question. If a tree falls in the desert and nobody can hear it, does it make a noise? Does a painting that is hidden in the basement of some building, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, have beauty or does it have ugliness? Is it the same as one hand clapping, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PATTERSON:

No two hands.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

That is another brilliant investment decision. What was it \$12,000?

MR. PATTERSON:

You posed for it, you should know.

MR. BARRY:

Twelve thousand dollars was lashed out for that particular work of art and it was hauled off to the basement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other thing that the public employees of this Province really appreciate as an example of restraint is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) losing \$5 million on his way home from his last borrowing. They were delighted, Mr. Speaker, they were absolutely ecstatic when they

saw the restraint that was being shown by the administration with that particular brilliant investment decision.

MR. TOBIN:

What about your car and government credit card?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, how many times must I intervene to ask Your Honour for protection? I want to be able to speak in silence, Mr. Speaker. I ask Your Honour to give me the protection of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Once more I am going to ask all hon. members to please be silent while the Leader of the Opposition is debating. Please be silent.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the other great example of restraint, as I just mentioned a while ago, are these expenditures on advertisements. Remember that advertisement a week or so ago, Mr. Speaker? Right across the top it was written: 8,056 Jobs. Remember that? A bald-faced lie, Mr. Speaker. Now you ask me can I prove that that is a bald-faced lie? Well, Mr. Speaker, I have referred you to Statistics Canada figures which show that between 1981 and 1986 this Province lost 5,000 jobs but, if Your Honour is not prepared to accept that, how about a statement right out of the mouth of government itself, out of this document just tabled, *The Economy 1986*, page nine, Mr. Speaker. Look at the last sentence there on page nine. "Economic output in the Province has finally surpassed pre-recession levels," and, Your Honour, note this, "and employment

losses since 1981 have nearly been recovered."

MR. TULK:

What does that mean?

MR. BARRY:

"Employment losses since 1981 have nearly been recovered." Does that sound like, Mr. Speaker, 8,056 jobs being created in this Province? Liar, liar, liar, Mr. Speaker, is what has to be attached to the draftsmen of that advertisement. Propagandist, propagandist, propagandist, and the sad thing about it, Mr. Speaker, is that it is being paid for by the taxpayers' dollar. If they are going to have propaganda, Mr. Speaker, let the Tory Party pay for the propaganda.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

The public employees of this Province look at that and they say, "Is this restraint?" And of what benefit is it? Even if it were true, of what value would it be to the unemployed of this Province, to anybody in this Province, to have government pat itself on the back and say, "Whoopee! Look at all the jobs we have created." Well, Mr. Speaker, let that nefarious lie be put to rest once and for all because we have the government now admitting in this document, and I am sure it was done inadvertently because they would not admit it in this House earlier, employment losses since 1981 have not yet been recovered is what they are saying here, have nearly been recovered. We do not have as many jobs yet as we had in 1981 is what is being said here.

Mr. Speaker, for a number of days

we have been attempting to question government with respect to its position on the strike and I think it is very clear what their tactic has been. They sent the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) back to the bargaining table so that they could avoid questions in this House by pretending that negotiations were underway. Look, we have the union negotiators telling us very clearly that negotiations are not underway, that all they are doing is trying to keep us quiet here in the House of Assembly and trying to get the House closed as quickly as possible. Mr. Speaker, we saw it here again this afternoon. They fought hammer and tong to try and close this House so that we would not have a continuing debate on the matter of that serious strike that is now ongoing.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has made a proposal that would see the settlement of this strike. We have proposed government kill Bill 59, which has not worked, which is not working now and which will never work because it has been tainted. It has been tainted by bad faith on the part of government. If you wanted to see an example of bad faith all you had to do was look at that recent statement by the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) where he lists the number of essential employees in the Department. It is now four hundred and something and in 1984 the document that was supplied to NAPE set out over 600 employees as being essential, almost 50 per cent more than they are now claiming as essential. That is again, out of their own mouths, proof of their bad faith in the implementation of Bill 59.

Bill 59, Mr. Speaker, was an experiment and I think if good faith had been shown, it is very, very doubtful if Bill 59 could have ever worked in hindsight because of the fact, and the most significant fact is that you would have a situation, even if you accepted that the 400 were essential - you are talking about 20 per cent, I guess - a situation where 20 per cent of a bargaining unit would be in earning a full salary and 80 per cent would be out on the picket line. That is not something, Mr. Speaker, that would go over well with members of the union because people are then not being treated the same. One sector of the bargaining unit would be getting full benefits and salary, would not be hurt by the process of striking, while the other members would have to sacrifice their salaries and go out and go through the turmoil of the picket line. Mr. Speaker, we have suggested Bill 59 must die, kill Bill 59.

The second thing we have suggested that should be done and probably the first thing in order of priority is for the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) to stand up and admit that a mistake was made when these suspensions were imposed and to withdraw the threat of suspension.

The third thing that should be done, Mr. Speaker, is to set up an industrial enquiry, have government commit itself to set up an industrial enquiry to look at the whole state of collective bargaining in the public sector.

The fourth thing is, and I think the Premier made some conciliatory statements along these lines, he indicated he would look at having a proposal on the table that would

go towards parity or move towards parity.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing that has to be done now as a consequence of the bungling of government and that other thing is that there has to be a commitment by the Attorney General (Ms Verge) and the Premier of this Province to go down to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and ask that charges be dismissed against those that have been arrested so that we do not have a situation in this Province where some people are treated one way under the laws of the Province and other people are treated in another way. The Attorney General, the Premier and the administration is going to have to explain why he would get up and advocate in this House contempt for a court order, contempt for an injunction; why he would direct the public employees of this Province turn a blind eye to whether the injunction applied to General Service members. The Premier is going to have to explain that and the Attorney General (Ms Verge) is going to have to explain that to the Chief Justice of Newfoundland before this is all over.

Mr. Speaker, we think that if the proposals that I have made -

MR. PATTERSON:

The media wants to talk to you. They want you to go on the television news.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I am going to break now for a few minutes and I will have another opportunity to speak later. Since this is an amendable motion, there will be lots of time for all of us to speak.

Mr. Speaker, we have made a

proposal that we think would very likely lead to a breakthrough in talks, and we made it after very serious consideration and after consultation, Mr. Speaker, with NAPE. We made a proposal that we thought would help expedite a settlement of this dispute. We will continue to push for government adoption, recognition and acceptance of that proposal. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we have seen government recognize so late in the game that it was making a mistake, but it did, I think, when it stopped the process of arrests. It did recognize that it had turned public opinion against it. It recognized that it had made a very serious mistake when it started the process of arrests and, Mr. Speaker, we think that once that admission was made, then government should go further. It is not a matter of saving face any more. They have lost face. They have no face any more, Mr. Speaker. Their face has disappeared. They have admitted when they had to stop the process of arresting Newfoundlanders that they had made a serious mistake and they had misjudged the basic decency and fairness of the people of this Province, a fairness and a decency which said, 'By heavens, there is something not right about this situation. There is something not right about having these men and women, who were trying to get a basic living wage, being thrown in jail. That is not what happens in a democracy.' It is not what happens, Mr. Speaker, under a fair and reasonable government. It is unfortunately what happens when you have a government which is arrogant, which is intolerant, and which engages in labour relations with a very heavy hand.

It is the same bullying type attitude that they have in this House of Assembly. It is the same bullying type attitude that sees them trying to shout us down, Mr. Speaker, when we get up here to debate a legitimate point affecting the public interest in this Province. Bully, shout, scream, trying to interfere with the train of thought, that is the tactic, Mr. Speaker. Those were the tactics of the Brown Shirts, those were the tactics of fascists throughout history, Mr. Speaker. It is a commonly accepted tactic when you do not have a strong argument, when your arguments are weak, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

Who barred the doors of the Confederation Building?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please! Could we have silence, please?

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

That is an example of what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. That is an example of the bully boy tactics, the fascist, Brown Shirt tactics engaged in by members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this all too often in this House and it is easy for us who experienced it every day in the House to understand what is going on at the bargaining table, to understand how intolerant and how arrogant the government is, Mr. Speaker, when they deal with these striking employees. It is, Mr. Speaker, this intolerant and arrogant approach that has led to the problem that now exists in this Province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have said that we will do what we can to keep the pressure on government. We will keep this House of Assembly open as long as we can. We know there are religious holidays. We know, Mr. Speaker, there are days that normally we should not be involved here in the House.

Do you know something? Whether it is a Christian religion, a Jewish religion, a Buddhist religion, a Moslem religion, any religion in the world, they are all based upon caring for their neighbor. They are all based upon concern and passion for the individual. That comes first or should come first.

MR. DECKER:

It is not wrong to do good on a Sabbath.

MR. BARRY:

As our member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) has had some direct experience in this aspect of community life, he mentioned that it is not wrong to do good on the Sabbath or Good Friday or Easter Saturday or Holy Thursday.

MR. SIMMONS:

There have been elections called during Holy Week.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, there have been a few elections called during Easter Week. Mr. Speaker, I think we can do good work over this Easter holiday right here in this House of Assembly. We can do good work that will help a lot of our fellow Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We need not be shy, Mr. Speaker, about saying that we are going to continue to debate this motion and we are going to see that this issue of the arrogance and the intolerance and the high-handedness and extravagance of members opposite is aired and aired fully and completely.

MR. PATTERSON:

You are a jealous Tory. You asked the Premier for your place back in the cabinet and he said no.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

I would like to remind all hon. members that if they wish to speak, they may stand up on a point of order. Apart from that, please be silent.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, every time it happens it just confirms my basic thesis which is one of arrogance, which is one of intolerance, which is one of lack of respect for the basic institutions of democracy and for the rules of democracy. It just underlines and stresses the point that I am making, Mr. Speaker.

We have had a very responsible and a very reasonable approach. A lot of people are out on these picket lines. But, Mr. Speaker, behind the scenes I can tell you I know things are starting to get very, very dicey. The executive of NAPE is having one very difficult time in keeping other employees at work. Other units, Mr. Speaker, who are totally committed to those members now on the picket lines, have offered their full support and are prepared to carry that

support as far as they have to in order for it to be effective.

Unless we see government doing more than they have done so far, we are going to see a serious deterioration of services for the people of this Province. Members opposite are trying to blame us for holding up cheques, Mr. Speaker. Whose decision is it to close the House today? Who is trying to close the House today without finishing debate on Interim Supply, Mr. Speaker? Now that the House is open and now that the House will continue to be open this evening and subsequently, we will be happy, Mr. Speaker, to agree to have the Government House Leader reintroduce Interim Supply. We are going to be here anyhow. Interim Supply will give us an opportunity to debate these points.

Mr. Speaker, if Interim Supply is not passed, -

MR. SIMMS:

You listen to 'Open Line' by the sound of it.

MR. BARRY:

- it will be because of the actions of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) in trying to close off debate in this House. 'Open Line' the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) says. You know something, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are prepared to communicate our beliefs, our positions, and we are prepared to change attitudes if necessary, when necessary. We are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to make polls. We are prepared to go out and fight for what is right, and have trust and confidence in the basic decency of Newfoundlanders to accept that. When we take a position as we are doing now, we

will not have a very hard time in persuading the people of this Province that what we are doing is right because there is a lot of sympathy out there for those workers on the picket lines.

Mr. Speaker, what is the administration proposing? They are proposing to leave these men and women on the picket lines for another couple of weeks while they take off for their holidays, get away from the sight of these workers out there in the sleet and the slush and the rain: 'Let us head off to some sunny sandy beaches and get this picture of these nasty picket lines out of our sight.' Out of sight out of mind, that is the approach taken by members opposite. One or two of them actually might have a heart, Mr. Speaker. It would be hard and it would be cold, I am sure, if you found one over there, but there might be one or two with a heart. Mr. Speaker, even a cold, hard heart would have to be touched by the hardship that these men and women on the picket lines are experiencing.

MR. TOBIN:

Turn in your car and credit cards, if you feel that way.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you for the protection of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Once again the Chair is asking for silence while the hon. member is speaking.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) received a public rebuke yesterday in this House from the Premier;

the Premier had to turn around and tell him to shut up. Now maybe we will have to get the Premier up to keep him in line again this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. It was a very obvious and public rebuke. When a mouth like a torn pocket gets going in this House, Mr. Speaker, obviously even the Premier recognizes it is not going over very well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Tell us about your car. Tell us about the car.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Could we have order, please?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have a new Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) in this Province who came into office with a great promise of reform. He was going to look at Bill 59, conveniently concealing the fact, of course, that he had been one of the architects of Bill 59. He was going, Mr. Speaker, to consult with the working men and women of this Province; he was going to be the great mediator, the great conciliator, and what happened? At the first sign of a labour dispute, he went into hiding. You could not find him, Mr. Speaker, you could not hear him, you could not see him. He saw his own shadow the day of the strike and he went underground. Well, we will bring the Minister of Labour out of hiding, we will bring the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) out of hiding, and we will bring the Premier out of hiding before debate on this issue is finished. The Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) I do not know if we will ever get out of hiding, because I am not sure she knows where she is most of the time. I think when this strike is

finally settled there will be a couple of things that will stand out: The arrogance and the heavy-handedness and the intolerance will be one of them, and the other one will be what it has done to the concept of justice and to the administration of justice.

Now, how are we going to see injunctions enforced in the future? In the private sector, how are we going to expect workers in this Province to show respect for court injunctions when government itself is not showing respect for them, when government itself is refusing to enforce them, and when they are forcing a judge of the Supreme Court to become involved directly in the enforcement of the injunction? I have never heard of it occurring anywhere else in the British Parliamentary system, that a judge of the Supreme Court had to hit the picket lines and go out and threaten arrests himself.

MR. DECKER:

They should arm the Chief Justice, I guess, if they are going to do that.

MR. BARRY:

No, this fellow does not need to be armed. Mr. Speaker, I tell you it is a very, very strange situation that members opposite are permitting to develop in this Province. And what is going to be the end result? The strike at some point, God knows, we hope will be settled, but what is the residue that is left in this Province? What are the messages that will be left for the people of this Province after the strike is settled? A government that is prepared to ignore the law; a government that has no more respect for the laws of this House

than it does for its own restraint measures; a government that is communicating to the people of this Province it is all right, Mr. Speaker, for a few people to be arrested, but when a lot of people do the same thing, we are not going to arrest them.

Now, I am not too concerned about what people outside the Province think of us, whether it be in other parts of Canada or whether it be internationally, but I am concerned about what it may be doing to the economy of the Province. We have a large number of people who are unemployed in this Province, and we have to try and find jobs for them. We do not have enough capital in this Province to create those jobs, we have to attract capital from outside the Province. How are we going to attract investors? How are we going to encourage people to invest for job creation in this Province with the state of anarchy that is being communicated on the media throughout Canada and throughout the world? We are making headlines internationally. The International Labour Organization has identified this Province as having repressive legislation. We heard the Premier get up and say, and pay for again not just full page ads but double page ads to say the ILO supports Bill 59. Here is what the ILO says: "The ILO calls on the Premier to give back full bargaining rights." A story hot off the presses today: "The workers group of the International Labour Organization called on the Newfoundland Government on Monday to drop charges against Provincial Public Sector workers who are striking illegally and to resume bargaining. 'We strongly urge that full bargaining rights be restored to the employees of

the Province of Newfoundland' the ILO group said in a statement which it released via the Canadian Labour Congress and sent by telex to Premier Brian Peckford."

"The National Labour Federation said the Province should drop charges against members of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees and resume bargaining with a view to speedy negotiation and a new contract to replace the one which expired two years ago."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that again puts the lie to these advertisements that the Provincial Government has been paying for, this propaganda that the Provincial Government has been paying for out of taxpayers' dollars.

MR. DECKER:

They should have a Department of Propaganda.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, well, they do have a Department of Propaganda, it is called the Premier's Office.

MR. DECKER:

Oh, I see!

MR. BARRY:

It is just hidden, the name is hidden. They do have a Department of Propaganda. The Premier's office churns out all these little pamphlets which you can get in the liquor stores, it churns out all these advertisements you see in the newspapers. One of these advertisements in all the major newspapers of the Province costs \$10,000 for one day only, when they get into these double page ads it is probably \$20,000 dollars, and when they get into radio advertising, as well - now just picture this, Mr. Speaker: Let us assume that it is only one

ad a day - how many working days are there? - let us say there are at least 200 working days, probably 260 -

MR. TULK:
There are 210.

MR. BARRY:
Two hundred and ten working days? Is that all?

MR. TULK:
Yes.

MR. BARRY:
There must be more than that. Okay, 210 working days. That is over \$2 million in advertisements if there is only one ad, but, Mr. Speaker, every day you look in the newspapers you see five, six, seven ads, with smiling faces of ministers.

MR. TULK:
I am sorry, there are 310 working days if you count Saturdays, and Saturday is a working day.

MR. BARRY:
Saturday is a newspaper day, sure. So it is over \$3 million, Mr. Speaker. Just think of the hospital beds that could be provided every year. Think of the chronic care beds that could be provided, Mr. Speaker, with that \$3 million. Think of the repairs to schools. Think of the new programmes that could be implemented in our schools. Think of the job creation programmes for young people that could be implemented.

What we have is a government that has its priorities distorted; it is more interested in trying to keep itself from sliding down that slippery slope that the Minister of Finance thought he was off. If you ever saw anyone whistling in

the dark as he passed the graveyard, Mr. Speaker! But it is a long walk through that political graveyard, and the minister is not out of it yet. As a matter of fact, I think it is probably -

MR. TULK:
He is whistling past the graveyard.

MR. BARRY:
I do not want to be too unkind to the minister, because I think this might be his last budget.

MR. DECKER:
It will be, definitely.

MR. TULK:
Think so?

MR. BARRY:
Well, you know, we have yet another year where his projection of the deficit has been way off. Now, it was way off on the high side this time, and he thinks that is a good thing.

MR. TULK:
But that is trying to blindfold the devil in the dark, right?

MR. BARRY:
Yes. He decided he would go high enough in the last time so that he would not be humiliated.

MR. TULK:
He could have really made a name for himself by saying the deficit was going to be \$150 million.

MR. BARRY:
Last year he should have projected a deficit of \$500 million, and he could then have come in this year and said that he had saved \$450 million. His only mistake was that he was too modest last year in his exaggerated figures that he threw out.

Mr. Speaker, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, I think, put his finger right on it. What we see happening today in Newfoundland has happened in other provinces, in other countries, in different times and places. It is the throes of agony of a corrupt administration in its dying days, that is all. There is nothing complicated about it.

MR. TULK:

The minister is like Stomping Tom Connors, spending money he does not have.

MR. BARRY:

Yes. Mr. Speaker, when you have the dying days of a corrupt administration what takes place is that they just cannot do anything right. Nothing can be done right.

Now there are a lot of factors that explain why this strange phenomenon occurs, and it has occurred in places other than Newfoundland. In the late sixties we saw it in Newfoundland. We saw Mr. Miller in Ontario, we saw Mr. Levesque in Ouebec, we are seeing Mr. Hatfield in New Brunswick, Mr. Lee in Prince Edward Island, Mr. Buchanan in Nova Scotia, but the most obvious one is right here in this Province.

MR. PATTERSON:

Tell us about your buddy, forger Fox.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, since the last election we have seen one thing after another go wrong. The reaction of the Premier, of course, is to blame it on bad press; 'Nobody understands me anymore' he says. Now he is

starting to say, 'Nobody believes me anymore.' The poor fellow, nobody believes him. Why is it that nobody believes the Premier anymore? I wonder if it would have anything to do with the fact that you see these advertisements, '8,056 jobs all around the Province' and then we see the statement in the Budget papers 'Employment losses since 1981 have nearly been recovered'? Let us explain that one, Mr. Speaker. Why is it that nobody believes the Premier anymore? Is it that difficult to understand? Is that why the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is more and more taking over the prerogatives of government and the prerogatives of the Premiership?

MR. TULK:

He is the real Premier.

MR. BARRY:

Is the Government House Leader now the real Premier? Is he the one who is calling the shots?

You know, Mr. Speaker, members opposite should realize that the Government House Leader has had it, he is not running anymore. He has recognized his string has run out. He has declared that he is now a lame duck going into retirement. We will never have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, the pleasure of having another run at the Government House Leader because he is going to be plucked next time around, if he runs, and he knows that. And that is why it is very dangerous for members opposite to permit the Government House Leader to take over the responsibilities of Premiership, because he has nothing to lose. Now the Premier himself has given up because nobody believes him anymore.

MR. TULK:

That is not the way he said it. He said, "How come nobody believes me anymore?"

MR. BARRY:

Why is it nobody believes me anymore?

Mr. Speaker, he has just about washed his hands of the whole kit and caboodle and he has left it up to the Government House Leader to exercise the office of Premier. You know, there are a few movements underfoot there in the benches. The President of Treasury Board had a very strong campaign going for the leadership; he had his eye on the Premiership; I think he might have blotted his copybook a little bit. Mr. Speaker, we have to wonder to what extent do we have a strike being continued out there because of the internal political wheelings and dealings of that party opposite. To what extent does the Premier want to try and damage the leadership aspirations of the President of Treasury Board? To what extent will the President of Treasury Board be hung out to dry by that brilliant thirty day suspension decision that he put in?

MR. HEARN:

(Inaudible) all for one and one for all.

MR. BARRY:

Have I missed something? The President of Treasury Board does not have leadership aspirations. Has that changed recently? Did that take place after the Premier warned him to stop collecting money, during the last campaign, for his leadership race? as it only after the Premier called him in and said now listen, cut it out, cut out these statements that I am not running any more and that

you are going to be the next Premier, and cut out these collections for your leadership campaign? Was that why the Government House Leader (Mr. Barry) put the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) in that sensitive position? Is that why the President of Treasury Board ended up in that graveyard of potential premiers?

MR. TULK:

Do you think that the President of Treasury Board might be enjoying this strike?

MR. BARRY:

Now that is other side of this coin. Is the President of Treasury Board enjoying the strike? Does the President of Treasury Board chuckle when he goes home at night, realizing the difficulties that are being created for the current Premier? These are all, Mr. Speaker, the types of questions that arise. In the dying days of a corrupt regime, we see all these different factors coming to the fore. So we have, Mr. Speaker, to keep this House open so that we can look over and eyeball members opposite, so that we can eyeball the Government House Leader and eyeball the President of Treasury Board and eyeball the Premier and make sure that we know when the President of Treasury Board is about to make his move for the leadership, and make sure that it is not the workers of this Province who will be sacrificed for those leadership aspirations.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

Just when I was having fun, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave?

MR. BARRY:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be long, but I will move the previous question. I move that the question be now put which, of course, is the previous question which we have had before. All members are aware of the procedure there, I can see them scuffling around in the alleys of their minds.

MR. MARSHALL:

In the back alleys of their minds.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, the front alleys.

MR. MARSHALL:

Question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is moved and seconded that the question be now put.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I refer Your Honour to Standing Order 42: 'A motion for the previous question may be superseded by a motion to adjourn

or for reading the Orders of the Day.'

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It has not been superseded, it is just put.

MR. TULK:

That motion, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you is out of order, that the motion to adjourn is a motion of a higher order than the previous question. I would ask that Your Honour rule on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council to the point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, we had this over and over again, I remember. Now Your Honour relies on Your Honour's own wise and sagacious precedents, and Your Honour came in today and relied on Your Honour's wise ruling which is just as wise today as it was when you made it in December, mind you, Your Honour. During that hearing or that session, the previous question was moved and exactly the self same point was brought up by the hon. gentleman and exactly the self same point was ruled out of order. This is under Standing Order 40: "The previous question, until it is decided, shall preclude all amendments of the main question, and shall be in the following words, 'That the question be now put.'" That question is that we adjourn, and now the hon. gentleman wants to supersede it with another motion that we adjourn. No wonder the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) referred to the back alleys and recesses of the hon. gentlemen's minds.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I said the front alleys, you said back alleys.

MR. MARSHALL:

The wonder is that the hon. gentleman could discern any mind let alone any alley. "If the previous question be resolved in the affirmative," it says - Mr. Speaker, I know Your Honour knows, but the hon. gentleman may not know, that means if it is carried - "if it is resolved in the affirmative, the original question is to be put forthwith without any amendment or debate."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen are playing a little game here, and this is the type of game they have been playing all the time with this House of Assembly. They have, within the rules, proposed that the motion be debatable and they are debating it. We have, within the rules, proposed the previous question. The previous question is debatable, but when it is resolved, then the question is put, under Standing Order 40. We do not need hours of adjournments, Mr. Speaker, it has already been decided.

MR. SPEAKER:

I rule that the motion of the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, during the hour that

the Leader of the Opposition took to make the points he was making, he was interrupted almost continuously.

MR. SIMMS:

He was not by us, there was nobody in here.

MR. CALLAN:

No, a lot of people were out having a few, and that is fine. It is Budget Day, there is a reception and so on, and if you had coffee or tea, that is fine. But, Mr. Speaker, the Leader was continuously interrupted, and most of it was nonsense. You see, Mr. Speaker, the Premier likes to chastise us on this side of the House for comparing apples and oranges rather than comparing apples and apples or oranges and oranges, but what he fails to do, Mr. Speaker, is look at some of the comments that he himself makes from time to time, and also the comments made by some of his Cabinet colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is here and I am glad he is, because I want him to contemplate a statement that he made several days ago in answer to a question regarding the \$3,600 up to \$5,000 car allowances paid to parliamentary secretaries and senior civil servants. The Minister of Finance in defending that new allocation, which comes into effect on April 1, as I understand it, said, well, it is on a par -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Read the budget, boy. It is on page 4.

MR. CALLAN:

I am talking about the answer the minister gave several days ago. Why did not the minister say there

are no car allowances, several days ago?.

MR. SIMMS:
He said it today.

MR. CALLAN:
Here is the answer the Minister of Finance gave: 'These are the same as allowances paid in the private sector, they are on par.' In other words, they have parity with allowances paid in the private sector from time to time.

Forget what is in the Budget, Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about is the minister's answer of several days ago.

Mr. Speaker, the people who are on strike today around this Province are not asking for parity with the private sector, as the Minister of Finance suggests is a good thing for parliamentary secretaries and deputy ministers and so on, the people who are on strike today are looking for parity with their colleagues who work for government. As an example, I have a brother-in-law who is a mechanic with the Department of Transportation, at least he was before this started. Whether he will be afterward, in a dictatorship, is a fair question, and we are coming closer to that every day.

Mr. Speaker, this gentleman who is a mechanic did his mechanics course as a one year course, or whatever it was, several years ago.

MR. BAIRD:
What is his name?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
His name is Baird.

MR. TOBIN:
Could I ask you a question?

MR. CALLAN:
No.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, the same gentleman who was interrupting the Leader of the Opposition is persisting in doing the same thing with me. Now, when I finish, he will have lots of time.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, for the record, the member opposite refers to car allowances for the political staff. I think it is clearly outlined in the Budget Speech, 'with continued deferral to more affluent times and certain planned initiatives (such as the construction of the -')

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if his leader is prepared to throw away his car allowance, as well?

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

MR. CALLAN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I noted the member for

Burin - Placentia's comments about the Leader of the Opposition's car allowance. I am coming to that, and it has to do with comparing apples and apples or apples and oranges again. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have, as I have said, a brother-in-law who works with the Department of Transportation as a mechanic, and he is earning just over \$9.00 an hour. Now, he is not looking to be on par with his brother who works with ERCO Industries at Long Harbour and earns over \$13.00 an hour. That is not the kind of parity he is looking for.

MR. SIMMS:

The guy at ERCO, is a mechanic?

MR. CALLAN:

That is right. Both of them are mechanics.

MR. SIMMS:

Is he your brother-in-law, too?

MR. CALLAN:

That is right, two mechanics who decided that there was a good future in mechanics' work. I am told by my colleague down the way here that \$13.00 an hour is comparable with what is paid to mechanics in other companies in the private sector, as well as ERCO Industries. By the way, ERCO Industries is a good topic for another time, Mr. Speaker. It looks like ERCO Industries might be another one of these industries which is on its last legs and the government will have to have this knee-jerk reaction to, as they had with Corner Brook, as they had with Baie Verte mines on several occasions, and several other industries around this Province.

Mr. Speaker, he is not looking for parity with mechanics in the private sector, all he is looking

for is parity with mechanics working with another department of government in this Province. So when the Minister of Finance gave that answer in response to a question the other day, as I said, he was comparing apples and oranges, and he should not do that, because the Premier is on record as telling us on many, many occasions not to be comparing apples and oranges.

Now, let me get on to the member for Burin - Placentia West. Let me talk about his argument, Mr. Speaker. Again the gentleman is talking about apples and oranges. You see, in his comments the Leader of the Opposition was talking about parliamentary secretaries who are being paid \$12,500 a year, and the member for Torngat Mountains is one of the secretaries he was talking about. He is an MHA, he has district work to look after and his constituents, but he happens to be a parliamentary secretary to a minister. Secretaries who work in our offices and in many government offices around this city and around the Province, secretaries who are on strike now, many of them earn about \$12,500 or \$13,000 a year, a lot of these underpaid secretaries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls, who nearly went down the tube in the last election and who probably may go all the way down next time, he should be listening to what I am saying because I am going to make some good points, points that members of this administration can probably put to good use if they want to survive.

MR. SIMMS:

Are you still talking about your

buddy?

MR. CALLAN:

No, I am talking about a new topic.

MR. SIMMS:

I am sorry.

MR. CALLAN:

I can see why the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) was fired or quit as a salesman for a car company, and why he ran a campaign in which a gentleman lost, and why he, himself, nearly lost last Spring. I can understand that, because he is a bit dense, apparently.

In response to the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin): When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was talking about secretaries and their car allowances, they shot back and talked about the Leader of the Opposition's perks. Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison. Let us assume that the Leader of the Opposition does have a government car, as other Cabinet ministers have, and let us assume that he does have a credit card to buy gas and so on for that government car, we will assume all that is true, in no way can the Leader of the Opposition as a member of this Legislature, or in his position in this Province as Leader of the Opposition, be compared with the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). It has been traditional for the Leader of the Opposition to be paid on the same salary scale as a Cabinet minister and to be treated in almost the same way a Cabinet minister is treated, when you talk about a parliamentary secretary getting a car allowance of \$3,600, whether it is the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice, who does not even have a driver's

licence, or whether it is the member for Torngat Mountains, who has no roads, or whoever it is, there is no way to compare it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I wanted to say on that. The member for Torngat Mountains was heckling me yesterday, even when I was not speaking, but he is not in his seat today so I will not be heckled by him. He probably knows that I know too much.

MR. MITCHELL:

He is running against you.

MR. CALLAN:

Talking about running, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) threw out a challenge to the Leader of the Opposition just now, 'Come out and run against me.' He has done it several times. The member for Placentia does not realize that it is not the person who is going to be running as a Liberal candidate in Placentia in the next election that he has to worry about, it is the people on his own side, the backbenchers on his own side who have told me on dozens of occasions, 'I would like to run in Placentia, against the sitting member.' And I would not be surprised, as I said, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman who is the present member for Placentia is not opposed and opposed strenuously for the nomination whenever the Premier gets the courage to call the next election. It will not be two and a half or three years, which is what we had in 1982 and 1985, it will be close to five years. I think we can all depend on that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We might be dead in five years.

MR. CALLAN:

Politically, yes.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, the reason we are trying to keep this House of Assembly open is obvious to everybody, even to the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). It is obvious that this government is in the throes of terrible trouble, terrible difficulty around this Province, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can stand up and talk about the good news that he has in his budget today, and some of it is good news, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about that, a lot of it is good news. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new there. The good news is not new news. He talks about getting the Clarenville Hospital open. That was talked about when I first ran. In 1975, the former Premier, Frank Moores, was in Clarenville during that September election and he talked about the Clarenville Hospital. The Minister of Finance talks about it today, and he talks about the Burin - Marystown Hospital. It is good news that money is going to be spent to get these facilities built and operational. And Baie Verte mines was talked about. But how many times has Baie Verte mines been talked about and recovered, Mr. Speaker, right from the brink of shut down and total disaster?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is your brother-in-law (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:
Your brother is a Liberal, I believe. He must be, he certainly must have more sense.

MR. SIMMS:
Your brother-in-law must be a Tory.

MR. CALLAN:
Not very likely. If he was before, it is very unlikely now.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
The fellow who works with ERCO is working today thanks to Joey Smallwood. That is who put the ERCO plant there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Now, Mr. Speaker, again let me get back to the comments of the Minister of Finance today and the way he contradicts himself. And I hope the media picks it up, because it is very obvious to anybody who listens. You see, what happened today the minister in his glowing remarks about how this Province is coming out of a depression talked about the fact that during the early 1980s, and this Province we are told was a year late going into the depression and consequently we were a year late coming out of the depression -

DR. COLLINS:
No, we went into the depression a year early and we came out a year late.

MR. CALLAN:
I will accept that from the Minister of Finance. If he says that Newfoundland went into the depression a year early and came out a year late, that is fine. I will accept that. But, you see, Mr. Speaker, in the Minister of Finance's remarks he talked about, 'This is the reason that my Budget estimates were so far off, this is

why the Province has been suffering so terribly over the last four or five years. At the same time, the Minister of Finance and the Premier talked about bad old Ottawa for the last four or five years, how they could not get any satisfaction from them, and how they were cutting back on this and that.

The Minister of Finance seems to forget that it was not just Newfoundland. He just admitted that Newfoundland was later than the rest of Canada. And, of course implicit in that statement, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that Canada was going through a depression in 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1984. Now, since the Minister of Finance thinks that we are coming into good times, he says, why did it happen? Oh, it is all because of the change of government in Ottawa. It has nothing to do with the change of climate economically, it has nothing to do with the rest of Canada coming out of the depression a year or so ago, it just happens to coincide with the PC Party taking over the reins of power in Ottawa. So the Minister of Finance conveniently leaves out that very important point.

That is why the Liberal Government in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, brought in these make work programmes four, five or six years ago. They were brought in as LIP programmes.

MR. BAIRD:
LIP?

MR. CALLAN:
Yes, Local: L for Local, as you are, I for Initiative, and P for programmes, Local Initiative Programmes. They were called LIP grants. That is how these make work programmes, the ones, by the

way, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands heard the Premier roundly condemn when the Liberals were in Ottawa. I have seen the Premier stand in his place during Throne Speeches and Budget debates and roundly condemned these make work programmes that were coming out of Ottawa for the last six or seven years. They were brought in, Mr. Speaker, as a response to the depression and the state that the economy of the whole country not just Newfoundland but the whole country, was in. Now, what do we see in today's budget? What have we seen over the last year? What have we seen in the double-page ads over the last month or so? I picked up one of the ads and it was a rose by any other name, as the Minister for Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) likes to say.

The exact projects are going on in Arnold's Cove, Come By Chance, Chance Cove and Norman's Cove today that went on five years ago. They are make work programmes. They are doing the same sorts of things. They are putting, what the Premier refers to as, fences around graveyards and they are building extensions to community centers. They are doing all of the same sorts of things that were done when the Liberals were in Ottawa. How transparent the Premier is becoming, Mr. Speaker, to everyone in this Province! Thanks be to goodness!

Just now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talked about the Premier blaming everything on the press last Fall, the bad old CBC and the entire Press Gallery were down on the Premier last Fall. Now he has taken a different tactic. Now, nobody believes the

Premier. No wonder! His credibility is gone, Mr. Speaker. That is why. The Premier's credibility is gone.

MR. WARREN:

Talk about credibility, what about (inaudible)?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) wants me to get into a debate with him but I do not want to do it because we both have to attend a fiftieth wedding anniversary together in his home town in Chance Cove, which is in the district of Bellevue. I do not want to go there on unfriendly terms with the gentleman. After April 19, after that event is over and we both appear there to congratulate friends of his and friends of mine, Liberals to the backbone, of course -

MR. WARREN:

They were.

MR. CALLAN:

- and they still are. Nothing will change them. I dare say that the member for Torngat's parents will be there as well. I understand that they returned from their annual trip to Goose Bay today. It is great to see old people, Mr. Speaker, people who are celebrating fiftieth wedding anniversaries, as the member for Torngat's parents did last Spring. I attended their celebration and it was right in the middle of the election campaign when he was unable to do so because of bad weather conditions. I am not going to attack the member for Torngat today. Any time after April 19 I will do it.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible)?

MR. CALLAN:

Well, I do not know. I am not invited to any birthdays in Chance Cove but myself and the member for Torngat, whose home town is Chance Cove, born and raised there about forty-seven years ago -

MR. WARREN:

Your ten years out but you are close.

MR. CALLAN:

I know exactly how old the gentleman is, Mr. Speaker. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be sidetracked by the member for Torngat. Let me just simply say, Mr. Speaker, that if the member for Torngat leaves his district - he wanted to do it the last time - he wanted to leave Torngat and run in Bellevue the last time but the Premier very sensibly said to him, "Look, you just crossed the House a month ago and what were the grounds that you crossed the House on? That you can do better for my district. Then a month later you go and leave the district that you were hoping to help by crossing the House. No, you cannot leave your district. You have to run in Torngat." The Premier had a good point and the Premier was pretty credible up until a year ago, but his credibility went down the drain. It has gone down ever since he said, "Give me a mandate to create jobs and jobs you will have." Ten months later we see the Premier feebly trying to take credit for creating 8,056 jobs which were created by Ottawa, number one; and number two, they were the same jobs that the Premier was roundly criticizing and condemning when the Liberals had that as their answer to unemployment in the Province.

And, to add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, not only is the Premier taking a page out of the Liberal's book by now saying to Mr. Mulhooon in Ottawa -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who?

MR. CALLAN:

He was praised in the States, Mr. Mulhooon.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Muldoon.

MR. CALLAN:

Muldoon was it? Whatever it was. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is adding insult to injury not only in this budget, but he did it last Spring when \$20 million was poured into make work programmes for people on social assistance. This year it has gone up by \$7 million. This year \$27 million will be spent to create part-time jobs, jobs of five and six and seven and eight, perhaps ten weeks, perhaps fifteen weeks, to get people off of social assistance and let them now be kept by the unemployment that comes from Ottawa and so the Province will be a little bit better off. That, Mr. Speaker, partly explains the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) better financial picture. That is what explained it because these make work programmes, administered by the Department of Social Services, only started two years ago, Mr. Speaker. It only started two years ago. Of course, the people on welfare, who would ordinarily be getting welfare twelve months of the year now work for ten weeks, or five or whatever they need, some of them have stamps already but anyway whatever it is, even if it is twenty, even if they have to get twenty stamps to

qualify for UIC, then, of course, they are being fed then out of Ottawa rather than out of the coffers of this Province. So that probably explains why the Minister of Finance's financial picture is looking better.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), in his interruptions to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), was talking about something else. He mentioned it over and over. He was talking about, "What about the Ocean Ranger and what about the \$1 million and all that?" Well I have a question for the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) perhaps and I have asked this question before and I hope that Newfoundlanders all over are asking it because, at a time, when the Premier was believable, everybody believed everything and that is how it is. If a person has a lot of credibility, everybody believes all of the good things. The Premier, of course, traditionally, for the last half a dozen years, has done a good job of being front and centre when the good things were on the go but when the bad things were on the go, he was in the back rooms and he had someone else up front announcing the bad news. That was a good tactic. But, Mr. Speaker, I will say it now, I have said it before, if the member for Placentia wants to talk about the Ocean Ranger I am prepared to talk about it and I am convinced in my mind and nobody will deter me from thinking it or saying it, that the Ocean Ranger would never have sunk, nobody would have been in a position to earn any money as a result of that unfortunate tragedy, if the government of the day and the minister responsible for the offshore had been doing his job

properly. I wonder is that part of the reason why the Ocean Ranger sank? Number one, because the government failed to listen to the then Leader of the Opposition, Steve Neary, and failed to listen to the captain who quit and talked about the dangerous circumstances that existed. It was all pooh-poohed by the minister who is now called the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall).

MR. FUREY:

The minister responsible for Tory icebergs.

MR. CALLAN:

That is another one. When the Liberals were in Ottawa, 'Oh, we cannot allow drilling on the Grand Banks,' but now that the Tories are up there, we have not heard of it since.

Anyway, getting back to the Ocean Ranger, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am convinced that the Ocean Ranger would never have sunk if the proper steps had been taken at the time. Perhaps it was because we only had a part-time minister. We know of other reasons now. With a minister who turns back half his salary, we were forced into hiring, at tremendous costs, the former Premier of Alberta. That is one thing that the taxpayers in this Province had to do. They had to hire Peter Loughheed because our minister is only a part-time minister, by his own admission. Of course, we have another consultant at \$150 an hour whose apparent duties include carrying around cakes to Pat Carney. Is that another reason why we had to hire him, because we do not have a full-time minister? Is that why the dangers mentioned about the Ocean Ranger were not heeded? Is it because the

minister did not have time to heed what was happening around him?

These are good questions, Mr. Speaker, and they are fair questions. Perhaps the minister will want to respond to them. When did the minister start turning back his salary? When did he become half a minister? When did that start?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Talk about something sensible.

MR. CALLAN:

The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) does not know what is sensible and what is not, Mr. Speaker.

It is unfortunate fact in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that this government always closes the door after the horse has gone. We saw it happen with the Corner Brook mill, we saw it happen with the Ocean Ranger and we saw it happen with the Whitbourne clinic. They made it a nine to five clinic and then, when Adelaide Pettatis's son got tragically killed on the highway, overnight, it became a twenty-four hour clinic.

I pleaded with the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) the other day when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) presented that petition. In Come By Chance, they will accept the fact their hospital will close. We accept it. There is a modern hospital in Clarendville. They tried to get chronic care but they said no.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

The Minister of Health said no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Leave, leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. CARTER:
Now we will hear real dirt.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the motion before us right now, the motion that the previous question be put because, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the previous question, as it is worded right now, is completely unacceptable in its present wording.

However, there is a way out of the dilemma. It is in the hands of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), as are most things within this House and this government. It is in the hands of the Government House Leader to seek the concurrence of the House, which he will have insofar as this party is concerned, to change the wording of the previous question to, in effect, provide that we will be here tomorrow. We have no more desire to sit into the night than he does, but if the choice is between doing this and not coming back here until April 7th, then we shall persist in our present position.

MR. J. CARTER:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
Do we understand on this side that the hon. gentleman is trying to blackmail us? Would he clarify, is it blackmail that he is proposing when he says, "Do what we tell you or else we will sit all night?" It is quite irregular. I think he should be named and flung out.

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

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
There is a way out of the dilemma. I am always proud to talk about my cousin, especially at the invitation of such distinguished gentlemen as those from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) respectively. It is the kind of thing that I want to do more eloquently, so I will prepare some notes on the subject and, at the right time, I will give an undertaking to the House, I will give a full address on my cousin.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, just in the interest of being relevant, I would like to say that there is a way out of the dilemma. I would appeal to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) over the supper hour to do some sober second thinking and instead of sitting throughout the night, we can come back tomorrow and address the business of the House and the Province, including this labour dispute that is affecting the lives, not only of the employees directly, but of many other thousands of Newfoundlanders, and

I refer in particular again, Mr. Speaker, to the students and the children whose education is being interrupted because of the non operation of buses on schedule, again, because of road conditions. There is a way out of this dilemma, and it is for the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) to undertake to reword that adjournment motion.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Oh, the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is every inch a gentleman, there is no question, as is the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) every inch a gentleman, and the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Doyle), and I can go on. This House is graced with a number of gentlemen, in particular the gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), the man for whom I have the deepest respect. The Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) is an honourable lady, the gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) should know that.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What about your cousin?

MR. SIMMONS:
Oh my cousin is an honourable man.

MR. DECKER:
Brutus was an hon. man too.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, there is a way out of the dilemma. I am deliberately saving the main thrust of my remarks for eight o'clock, should those remarks be necessary at that time. But I would hope by then that saner heads would have prevailed and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) would give

notice that he wants to change the motion so we can come back here tomorrow and fall into an important routine to address the problems affecting this House and this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! It is now six o'clock and I will leave the Chair until eight o'clock.

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) has spoken for five minutes.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, certain commodities and certain practices in this life are addictive. I am told alcohol is addictive to some people. I am told that drug consumption is addictive to some people. I read from the newspapers that the former president of the Philippines, Mr. Marcos, found that the use of dictatorial power becomes addictive and the use of the police becomes addictive. He found, of course, in that particular example, that while you can stuff ballot boxes, intimidate people and use slight of hand, all the while exercising a smiling reasonableness, that eventually your actions catch up with you. He found that eventually, despite all your protestation, the people's democratic right will eventually win out.

Mr. Speaker, I commence this evening on that particular note because I believe the situation we face in the Province today is much more analogous to the situation that I have referred to than one would want to admit, no matter on what side of the argument one finds oneself.

Let us remind ourselves why we are here tonight. We are not here because we differ about whether to observe Easter. We are not here because we differ about whether or not persons depending on the

Interim Supply Bill ought to receive their stipend on time. We are not here for those reasons. These are related to why we are here but it all comes down to the question of the NAPE dispute, that is why we are here in effect. It could also be said that we are here because of a lack of good will in this Chamber. We are here because the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has not well managed the affairs of this House. We are here because the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), either wittingly or otherwise, have not done their job properly in relation to the NAPE dispute. We are here for all of those reasons. But the principle reason we are here - I am glad the Premier is here because now perhaps he can keep the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) quiet as he did so ably yesterday.

MR. BAIRD:

I would not talk about principle if I were you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, they can abuse all they want. I intend to say what I have to say. What I cannot say inside this Chamber, I will say outside this Chamber.

MR. PEACH:

Turn your collar around.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

No. I say to the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) I will just say what I feel and then he can do

likewise. He has got all night to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say some things about this labour dispute. I would like to be able to exercise my right to do so. I do not think it is a very light matter. The NAPE dispute, Mr. Speaker, need never have gotten to the strike stage if this government had exercised some good faith. It comes as no surprise to anybody on this side of the House that they have not exercised good faith because we have seen in a fair number of examples of bad faith in this particular House. We saw one this afternoon.

The customary thing, Mr. Speaker, if observed here, would not have put Your Honour in the awkward position Your Honour was put this afternoon. The customary convention in any other House under the British Parliamentary system is that the matter of adjournment, especially if it is going to be brought in on a Budget Day or on a ceremonial occasion, that matter is checked out with the official Opposition and other parties in the House. We happen to be the only other party of the House, together with the independent member from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). The customary thing would have been to check that date before hand. The date came as a complete surprise to me and I suspect to my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) today when he heard it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A letter was written to you on March 10.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we keep talking about that letter of March 10. The one time -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
You can mutter all you want, your poor, pathetic, little, imbecilic mind.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) you will never be elected again.

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

I have asked hon. members on my left to please be silent.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, this dispute should never have reached the present, quite unconscionable impasse that it has reached. These people are just fighting for their basic rights.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Ten-day wonder.

MR. SIMMONS:
Some of the people heckling now, Mr. Speaker, are getting as much in their supplement as a parliamentary secretary as that poor man who was on T.V. the other night is getting altogether for working down in the mail room. They can afford to sit there and heckle and take this thing likely, Mr. Speaker. They are getting as much on their supplement in respect to being a parliamentary secretary, you are getting just as much under that heading as that poor man down in the mail room is getting altogether, \$12,000 or \$13,000 a year.

MR. DECKER:
Shameful.

MR. BARRY:
The member or Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr Tobin).

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren), and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). They can afford to heckle, Mr. Speaker. It must be nice to sit there. It is a very different situation for that poor man who is on the picket line who is getting \$13,000 altogether at the hand of this government. It must be nice if you are a friend of this government not to be in any bargaining unit, just have your supplicants right at the table, Mr. Speaker, so they can look after you directly. It must be very nice. But I say at the very least give to that poor man on the \$13,000 income the courtesy of having those who speak out for them, even if you will not speak out for them, give him the courtesy of having those who speak out for him the right to be heard. You might not agree with those who speak out for him. You obviously do not because you are a party to keeping that man down. You are party to keeping him at a \$13,000 salary. You think that is the kind of person we should bring the full brunt of the law on, not only should bring the full brunt of the law on, but do it in a discriminatory fashion. Do it selectively, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:
How much (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Name that idiot.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You just did.

MR. SIMMONS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, this dispute should not be at the stage it is today. It should not be there. If government had been less conniving about this, it would not be there. This was meant to be a repeat, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. PEACH:
You know all about (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
I understand the gentleman for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) may have dined well tonight, but if he can just keep quiet for a few minutes, I will say what is on my mind, then I will sit down.

Mr. Speaker, this was meant to be a repeat of the teacher thing of a couple of years ago, remember the script for that one, get the teachers out and save some money, or a repeat of parts of the script for the brewery strike, keep them out and make some money. This, Mr. Speaker, is the whole scenario again, keep them out.

I will give you an example: Mr. Speaker, twenty people in one particular department of government under the General Service Unit, decided at noon Friday past that they were going to walk out, noon Friday. They stayed out Friday afternoon. They thought about it over the weekend and all twenty of them went back to work Monday morning after having been out a half day only. They went back to work Monday morning. All twenty of them were

suspended for thirty days. Mr. Speaker, whatever the merits of that in terms of their going out or going back is not the point I want to get into right now. I just want to use that as an example of another point I would like to make. In any other labour dispute that I am at all familiar with, one of the tactics of the employer, I am not saying I condone this tactic, but one of the accepted, or accepted through use certainly, tactics of an employer is that he finds enticements to break down the solidarity of the group that is out, finds enticements to get them back to work, to break up the solidarity, to split them off, the divide and conquer approach.

Here was a case, Mr. Speaker, this past Monday morning where twenty people walked back in, were immediately slapped with the thirty day suspension. Remember where we are now, Mr. Speaker, this is Tuesday, I am talking yesterday morning. I am talking about after the millennium had arrived. I am talking after the Premier had had his Damascus road trip. I am talking after the Premier had discovered this thing called delicacy. Remember that speech on Friday? After he had somehow come across the notion that this business of the strike is a delicate matter and we cannot say anything for fear that we might upset some applecarts. Remember that famous speech here on Friday? Come Monday morning there was no need for delicacy. There was a need then to apply the suspension to those twenty people.

Mr. Speaker, I put it to you, had that suspension not been applied to those twenty people, what might have happened? Potentially, the word would have gone out that

those twenty went back to work without any disciplinary action applied and maybe others would have gone back. I am not advocating that as an approach, I am holding it up as an example to make this point: Government does not want those people to come back to work. The longer they are out, the more money this administration saves.

In normal terms, Mr. Speaker, that would be a ridiculous statement and I would not even make it, but I make it on the basis of a knowledge of what they did to the teachers. I make it on the basis of what they did to the brewery workers. I know, Mr. Speaker, that this crowd will save a cent wherever they can, which is to their credit if they were saving it for the people of Newfoundland, but when they are saving it, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Go out and plow a few roads.

MR. PATTERSON:

Plow you.

MR. BARRY:

Come on.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I thought the gentleman for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) was going to tell us something and I was giving him a minute. This, Mr. Speaker, is not only a dispute which has been orchestrated from the beginning to antagonize people, to get them to walk out but the use of the police has been orchestrated and deliberate. The

enforcement of the law here has been selected to suit the political ends of the government. The very threat of the thirty day suspension was used to intimidate. It has been applied in a manner to intimidate and to keep people away from a conciliatory approach to the problem.

MR. BAIRD:

What a devious little mind you have.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

The truth hurts.

MR. BARRY:

Did someone have a liquid lunch tonight?

MR. SIMMONS:

The whole matter, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BAIRD:

I have more sense in my head than you have in your body.

MR. PATTERSON:

He has his red trench coat on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

How long do we have to endure the hon. member's silence. If he is not going to speak, let him sit down and have someone else speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. BARRY:

He has said more in silence than I have heard from you since you have been in the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the whole set of events that we have seen at the hands of the government during the past few days have been quite deliberate, deliberately intended to antagonize, to save some money on the back of those people who are getting \$13,000, \$15,000, and \$18,000 a year. It, Mr. Speaker, is an absolutely disgraceful set of events.

What is even more appalling to me, as just one ordinary Newfoundlander, is the brazenness with which it is being done, the absolute baldfaced, barefaced brazenness with which it is being done. Now they want to shut down the House altogether in the hope the problem will go away but the problem is not going to go away. They underestimate the resolve - ah, now the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) responds to the thesis I laid out earlier, he admits they do not want the problem to go away.

MR. MITCHELL:

I said you do not want the problem to go away.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we have some other things to talk about. We can talk about the minister's astounding admission today that the recession arrived here a year earlier than everywhere else.

Do you remember the argument before that it was triggered by a big bad federal government? Do you remember the argument before that it was not our fault because it happened out there in the big

bad world? Now he tells us for the first time that is not so, it happened here first. Well, if it was not triggered by some recession outside, across Canada or across the world, you have to ask yourself how was it triggered? It was triggered by this hon. crowd, Mr. Speaker. They, by their own admission today in the Budget Speech, tell us that they triggered the recession. We have known it for awhile but at least they have come to admit it now. There are other things we can talk about. We can talk about the desperate job situation and we can talk about the bungling efforts in the fishery on the Southwest Coast down in LaPoile. We can talk about many other things I tell the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) but right now the number one issue, Mr. Speaker, on our agenda here and on the public agenda out there is this NAPE dispute. That is why we are talking about it and that is why we appeal to some common sense on the other side to let us do it in an orderly fashion, instead of trying to beat us into the ground with numbers, as they eventually will if they continue their silence as they have done throughout this debate this afternoon and evening, instead of doing that, why do they not recognize the reality that the people out there, Mr. Speaker? The ordinary person across this Province with children in school, the people who are on the NAPE picket lines, the people who identify with them, who know them, who see them as neighbours and law abiding citizens, these people generally, a great mass of people of there, Mr. Speaker, would like to have this matter addressed, not laughed off, not shrugged off, they would like to have it addressed. We want it addressed

and we believe, if the right will were applied, this matter could be resolved. We are not talking about the impossible, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier, by his own admission, says he is in favour of parity but it is too expensive, he says. There we have this great gulf as to what it will cost. The union says it will cost \$19 million and the Premier, in his ads, tells us it will cost \$140 million. My basic knowledge of arithmetic tells me if the two sides sat down and sharpened their pencils they would come to some way to resolve that contradiction, between \$19 million and \$140 million. They both cannot be right and basic math will show which is right. There has to be the will, Mr. Speaker, there has to be the basic will. I submit to you not only is there a will to resolve this dispute absent on the part of government, but even more diabolical, Mr. Speaker, is an agenda here on the part of government which flies in the face of any will to resolve it. They do not want it resolved.

MR. J. CARTER:

That is a lie.

MR. SIMMONS:

They do not want it resolved.

MR. J. CARTER:

That is a deliberate lie.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

You did not hear that. He just said that is a deliberate lie.

MR. SIMMONS:

I say to my good friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) do not get your blood

up about the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). If any ordinary member were saying that, we would get very exercised. Since the extra ordinary member from St. John's North is saying it, we have learned to tolerate him. We all have our crosses in this life and he is one of ours, as is the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) I may say.

Mr. Speaker, what is absent here is not only the will to resolve this issue but also there is a diabolical, nefarious plot here to save some money at the expense of those people, to rub their noses in it -

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:

We have said in this House very clearly that if a member gets up and obviously gives misleading information to the House, he must be challenged. I say to the member opposite that he is giving misleading information to this House and he should stop.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the intimidation will not work. The intimidation of those people has been tried with very limited success. I think the government will agree. What the government

under estimates here very badly is the resolve of those people. If you go down there on the picket lines, as I have done over the last few days, and talk to those people, you will find that they see here, as I do, some very important principles at stake. They have been frightened as citizens in a supposedly free democracy by the selected use of force to intimidate them. They have been frightened by that. Like me, they thought that living in a supposedly free Province as we do that that could not happened. They know now not only did it happen, it happened to them or it happened to the person who works next to them in this building.

MR. TOBIN:

After what you did to the people of Burin.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will talk about Burin at another time with great pride but right now I will not be dissuaded from making the point that this dispute has gone on long enough and these people have been intimidated enough. The time has come now, if the government wants to talk about a mandate, what it has is a mandate to be decent to the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

We are not asking for miracles. We are asking for some basic, ordinary, old-fashioned good will that sits them down at the table and recognizes the principle of parity now and addresses it and comes up with a schedule that will address it properly; that calls off the police dog approach with

the thirty day suspensions, calls off that police dog Mafia approach which says, "If you do not do it my way, I will shoot you in the head," gets away from the threats and the intimidation and gets down to the table. The gentleman for Mount Scio, the Leader of the Opposition, has given the formula and we will give it again.

Call off the suspensions, Mr. Speaker, for starters. Agree to the principle of parity now, not only as a motherhood expression but put your money where your mouth is. Do something about it and have a full scale industrial enquiry into the collective bargaining procedures and practices in this Province and what a can of worms that will uncover, Mr. Speaker, especially if we are talking about collective bargaining in the public sector. What a can of worms that will uncover! And, of course, withdraw the threat of the thirty day suspensions.

Mr. Speaker, that is our proposal. We stand by it and we will use every available opportunity in this House to put that proposal until that hon. crowd gets some sanity knocked into their heads either by us or by the public at large out there. Sooner or later they will get the message. For their own good, they ought to get it sooner, Mr. Speaker. I hope they will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do not adjourn at eleven o'clock today.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I know that this motion has been put before, that the House not adjourn at eleven o'clock but I would suggest to Your Honour that there are a number of things that are peculiar to today that were not peculiar to the times when it was ruled that this motion was in order. Let me point out to Your Honour, at the present time we have a question under debate, which is the previous question. That previous question, of course, means immediately after the debate upon this question is finished, we must then vote upon a motion to adjourn. Mr. Speaker, this motion that the hon. gentleman is putting at the present time says is that this House do not adjourn at eleven o'clock.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, an adjournment motion has to do with the time and sitting of this House. Today, we are now debating, by means of the previous question and so on, a motion to adjourn that was put this afternoon by the hon. gentleman. I would suggest to Your Honour that you cannot have two motions that deal with the time and sitting of this House on the floor at the same time. One of them must be resolved first. So on that basis, I would suggest to Your Honour that the hon. gentleman's motion's timing is

bad. It should have been given this afternoon, before the motion to adjourn was put in place. It should have been given before the previous question was moved. I would suggest to Your Honour that his motion is out of order.

I would also like to suggest to Your Honour again that Standing Order 8 is quite clear on this whole procedure. I have to bring this to Your Honour's attention again. It states quite simply, and I will read it for the sake of the record, "At 11 of the clock p.m., unless the closure rule" - I know it went through under different circumstances - "(SO 50) be then in operation, the proceedings of any business under consideration shall be interrupted and Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put, provided that all business not disposed of at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day when it will be taken up at the same stage where its progress was interrupted."

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman in the last debate in this House went back to the Standing Orders of this House that were adopted on May 8, 1951. Mr. Speaker, he quoted from a procedure. He did not even quote from a Standing Order at that time. Mr. Speaker, those Standing Orders have since been amended and we now have, instead of the little green book, as the hon. gentleman calls it, Standing Orders adopted May 8, 1951, with amendments to and including July 23, 1979. Anything that is taken out of that green book can be considered an amendment. And those are the Standing Orders we abide by in this House today. We do not abide by something that was passed fifty

years ago, a hundred years ago, two hundred years ago, or even in the time of Aristotle, we go by the Standing Orders of this House. And, of course, if our Standing Orders are silent, we then move to precedent. Now, Mr. Speaker, our Standing Orders are not silent, our Standing Orders are quite clear that unless the closure rule is in effect, this House stands adjourned at 11:00 o'clock. So I would suggest to Your Honour that we abide by the Standing Orders of this House, otherwise, we are going to end up in a situation where the Government House Leader will take this place on his back, will do what he chooses to do with it. The fact of the matter is, I say to Your Honor again, we cannot go back to precedent, even if it was yesterday. We should not go back to precedent if our Standing Orders are clear, and they are clear, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to point out one other thing, and that is that at this point in time we are having put before us two debatable motions despite the fact the President of the Council said the 11:00 o'clock notice is not debatable in this House. Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to consider page 311 in Beauchesne where it lists debatable motions for us, and I refer, of course, to Standing Orders of the House of Commons. Debatable motion 32 (o) "Any motion that has to do with the suspension of any Standing Order unless otherwise provided is a debatable motion." I would suggest to Your Honour that what we are doing if we accept this motion not to adjourn at 11:00 o'clock is suspending the Standing Orders of this House, Standing Order No. 8, and therefore that is a debatable motion. I fail to see

how we can have two debatable motions on the same subject put to us at the same time, namely, the time of sitting of this House.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order..

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the selfsame motion that was put before Your Honour in exactly similar circumstances in December of last year. At that time, Your Honour ruled quite properly that it was in order, that it was not debatable, and that it was to be ruled on. The hon. gentleman really does not know the rules. He gets confused by colour. See, there is a blue book and there is a green book. Now, on the front of the blue book it says, 'Adopted May 18, 1951', which are these right here. Standing Order 8 which he refers to, which he read from the blue book, is exactly word for word as what was there then.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It is a commentary.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will read it again. I will read from the green book. 'If at 11 of the clock P.M., unless the closure rule then be in operation'. Why is that there? Because the closure rule says it is 2:00 o'clock. When closure is in effect, you automatically go to 2:00 o'clock. When closure is not in effect you normally go to 11:00 o'clock. The procedure rules that are here attached to this Standing Order 8, on page 10 of the green book, say, 'If the House intends

to sit later than 11:00 p.m.'. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there have to be rules to permit the House to deal with business, to go beyond its sitting time. A motion may be made during the sitting - and that is what we are into, 'during the sitting' - and without notice having been previously given, "that the House do not adjourn at 11:00 o'clock today." Exactly the same as what I put before Your Honour. Now, Your Honour, this, as I say, should be very fresh in Your Honour's mind. I have answered completely what the hon. gentleman has brought up. What he quotes from Beauchesne is not relevant precisely because this is not a debatable motion. This motion that we put up has been ruled to be not debatable, so there is one debatable motion at the time. And it is not suspending the Standing Orders.

MR. TULK:

It is. It is.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It is applying them.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is applying the Standing Orders. It is part of the precedents of this House and, Mr. Speaker, it is what Your Honour accepted after a great deal of consultation on adjourning the House. In December of last year Your Honour decided quite properly, in accordance with the rules, that it was in order in these circumstances, it was not debatable and the question was to be put right away.

So, Your Honour, I would ask the question be put right away and then the hon. gentlemen can go on and talk as long as they want to and we will eventually come to the time for the vote, which is the

appropriate way to go.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, to the point of order.

MR. BARRY:

If I could just refer Your Honour to the previous ruling that came up on December 6, last year. Your Honour took certain decisions at that point in time with which we disagreed but Your Honour's ruling stood and that is there. But if Your Honour looks at it, the Government House Leader made his motions at that point in time in the reverse order. The first motion that was made was that the House not adjourn at eleven o'clock. This is contained on Page L4108.

MR. MARSHALL:

Look at page L4117.

MR. BARRY:

I know the Premier is just interested in ramming it through but maybe the Speaker is interested in establishing what the precedent is.

Mr. Speaker, subsequently, at Page L4117, you see the Government House Leader moving, in the upper left hand corner, "When this House adjourns today it will stand adjourned until Thursday, February 6, 1986 at 3:00 p.m. Now, why did he do it in that order, Your Honour? First of all, why did he not do it in that order today, which is the proper order? Because he had taken the stand, Your Honour, that he would let the other motions proceed and that he was going to be able to close off debate. He made his choice. He

lost on Your Honour's ruling on that issue, so he could not have that other motion first today. He is now trying to distort the Standing Orders. Because if you look at Standing Order 33, Your Honour, our Standing Orders, I think this is the key to what is happening and why the Government House Leader quite properly put the other motion first the last time: "When a question is under debate" - as we now have, the previous question - "no question is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the Orders of the Day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; or for the adjournment of the House." But not, Your Honour, that the House not adjourn at eleven o'clock. That is not there.

I would say this Assembly will go down in the annals of parliamentary practice in this Province, Mr. Speaker, for the number of times the government House Leader has attempted to erode away the rights of the Opposition during this Assembly. Now, Your Honour, the last occasion, the first motion was that the House not adjourn at eleven o'clock and then there was the previous question; where the Government House Leader has now put the previous question, that is under debate and it is not proper. Under Standing Order 33, it is not proper, Your Honour, for there now to be a subsequent motion when that other motion is under debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

This can be done very briefly. All the arguments brought up by the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) were ones made on December 6 and ruled on then, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) took further development from there and said that because the order was reversed, whereas previously it was a non-adjournment motion at eleven and then a previous question, now, today, there has been the previous question and the motion now, non-adjournment at eleven, because of the order, and he endeavours to substantiate it and even said something to the effect the nub of the whole thing, the heart of the thing, whatever his word was, was Standing Order 33. Now Standing Order 33 is exactly supportive of the position of the government. "When a question is under debate" - the question under debate now is the previous question - "no question is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question" - obviously that is already there - "for reading the Orders of the Day, for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; or for the adjournment of the House." And that is exactly what this motion is, one dealing with the adjournment of the House saying we not adjourn at eleven.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is what it is about. The motion is that the House not adjourn at eleven. It deals with the adjournment of the House. It is clearly there and I thank the hon. the Leader of the Opposition for drawing to our attention, not that we were not well aware of it beforehand, for emphasizing for

the Chair's benefit that Standing Order 33 in its last part there, "or for the adjournment of the House", completely substantiates why this motion is in order.

Your Honour heard hours of argument and then adjourned for about another hour and the whole thing was decided on December 6.

MR. BARRY:

Just a very brief point, Your Honour, two points actually.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The same day, page R4108, the same minister stood up in his place and said, "Mr. Speaker, the precedents will clearly show that the motion that this House not adjourn at 11:00 p.m. is not a debatable motion. The precedents will show that a motion to adjourn is debatable, but this is a motion not to adjourn." Now he is getting up and telling Your Honour that it is a motion for the adjournment of the House; out of his own mouth he is rebutted.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the minister would not engage in debate on silliness but he is happy to engage in debate on foolishness.

Standing Order 42, Mr. Speaker, I should have drawn your attention to that as well, deals with the motion for the previous question and perhaps we should go to Standing Order 41 first because that shows us why the Government House Leader (Mr. Barry) did not go into Interim Supply. "A motion for the previous question is not admitted in a Committee of the Whole or any Select Committee of

the House." That is why we are not in Interim Supply. I am sorry, that is not quite relevant to this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear Hear!

MR. BARRY:

It is relevant as to why we are not in Interim Supply, though.

Standing Order 42, Your Honour, "The motion for the previous question may be superseded by (a) a motion to adjourn" - which the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) admitted last time this was not. So it is not a motion to adjourn - "or for reading the Orders of the Day."

Mr. Speaker, that is all that can supersede. That confirms the point that I made earlier, going back to Standing Order 33. It confirms that unless the Government House Leader had the other motion down first he cannot put it down now because that would be to supersede the motion for the previous question which cannot be done. Standing Order 42 governs it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I must admit, it is getting a bit confusing. I have been trying to follow it and referring to what I did rule on in December. I would like to take a few moments just to refresh my memory.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I refer hon. members to our Standing Order 8. Looking at the Standing Order in the May 1951 book and also our book of 1979 the Standing Order is exactly the same, but there is a procedure in the earlier one which reads, "If the House intends to sit later than 11:00 p.m. a motion may be made during the sitting and without notice having been previously given, 'that the House do not adjourn at 11:00 today.'" I rule this motion is in order, because on December 6, 1985 I ruled that Standing Order 33 refers generally to the question of the adjournment of the House and therefore falls within the motion admissible when the question is made in debate.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, with respect we must appeal your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

All those in favour of upholding the ruling of the Chair, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Speaker's ruling is upheld.

The motion is that the House does not adjourn at eleven p.m. tonight.

Those in favour 'aye'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is carried.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Now that we know when we are not going to adjourn, we should all be reasonably happy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

The reason why we on this side were objecting to the motion put by the House Leader that the House not adjourn at 11 o'clock was because we were trying to use all of the democratic leverage that is ours to ensure that this House was open tomorrow and the next day. It was the only leverage we had. If the hon. House Leader did not make that motion, then we would have returned to our places tomorrow at the normal time, 3:00 o'clock, and we could have carried on with the business. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it crystal clear that we were opposing the motion by the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) not because we did not want to carry on debating but just to the contrary. Had the member not made this motion for the benefit of people in the galleries and the press, the House would have adjourned at 11 o'clock and we

would have come back tomorrow and carried on the same as usual, and it would have given us the opportunity to carry on our debate, and talk about this on Friday, Saturday or whatever. But that motion effectively ruined that and now we on this side do not have too many democratic options left and we must carry on until we run out of speakers, out of numbers.

Mr. Speaker, good news, new era, jobs, employment, good labour relations, normally these are self-explanatory words, normally they are very easy to understand, normally people do not confuse what they mean. Good news, certainly that should not be a difficult term. Just about any primary student is able to tell you what is good news. Today we heard that good news was jacking up the building supplies tax to 12 per cent, and we heard that good news was a loss of jobs, 1 per cent between 1981 and 1985. That is the good news we heard about today. A new era: Mr. Speaker, the definition of that today was the government kowtowing to a federal government that is responsible for raising income tax and the retail sales tax, a government that was responsible for cutbacks in equalization payments, cutbacks in transfer payments and cutbacks of established programmes, financing grants, all of that. And the cutbacks with respect to the EFP Programme, one that hon. members kicked up such a stink about a couple of years ago, cutbacks in that programme which result in cutbacks in education and in health, Mr. Speaker. That is the new era that we are talking about. That is the new era that hon. members were talking about, obviously. That is another part

of the good news that they were so proud to talk about today which, a couple of years ago, would have been talked about in terms of such bitterness and such acrimony, Mr. Speaker. But today we were marching along in an atmosphere of optimism with all these cutbacks and these increases in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, what do jobs mean to this hon. crowd? Jobs mean 8,056 make work programmes. This is what their job initiative now has come to. These members who harp so much on developing permanent jobs, this is what they have come down to now. Advertising, putting on a massive propaganda campaign to convince the people that they have created 8,056 jobs, that is what they have come to now. This is what jobs and employment mean.

What does good labour relations mean, Mr. Speaker, to this government? Pushing our people to civil disobedience in order to fight for their rights, that is what it means. Mr. Speaker, that is the good news, that is the new era, those are the jobs, and those are the good labour relations that this government has been promoting over the past few months.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we on this side realize that we are in a critical situation. We do not think that we should have arrived at this situation. The government had ample time to avoid this labour dispute that we are in today, all kinds of time. Back last Spring we questioned the Minister of Labour time and time again about Bill 59. When the International Labour Organization condemned Bill 59, we then took new initiatives to question the Minister of Labour about Bill 59 and as to what he was going - thinking about that, Mr. Speaker, I wonder where the

Minister of Labour is tonight and where the President of Treasury Board is. Are they negotiating tonight? It will be good news if they are. I wonder if the President of Treasury Board and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) are out negotiating tonight?

MR. BARRY:

They are on vacation. They have gone down South.

MR. MATTHEWS:

They are going to Puerto Rico with you.

MR. LUSH:

I am told the NAPE negotiating team is here, so if the Minister of Labour and the President of Treasury Board are down in the collective bargaining room, they are there alone. I would doubt they are there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

Did you vote for Bill 59?

MR. LUSH:

I may have. If the hon. member would want to know the episode, would want to know the details of Bill 59, I can describe them to him very quickly. Yes, I voted for that bill. I was here in this House, and at that particular time we said that we were going to keep this House open, until we changed that bill, and what happened? I can tell the hon. member what happened. The Minister of Labour, at that point in time, met with NAPE officials and told them that if they passed it that particular day they would meet with them and change the bill, that the regulations and so on put in with the bill would be made satisfactory to both sides. NAPE and the labour movement of this Province took the Minister of

Labour at his word, that labour would be consulted and that the bill would be straightened out, the bill would be made satisfactory to both sides. This is what we believed and we let the bill go through.

MR. TULK:

NAPE asked you, as our labour spokesman, to let it pass.

MR. LUSH:

That is right.

MR. BARRY:

The question is, did they live up to the deal?

MR. LUSH:

They certainly did not. The labour movement of this Province never heard another word from the government on what they planned to do with Bill 59 until the imposition of the law; they never heard a word until they decided that they were going to use this against the labour movement of this Province, particularly against NAPE. So, Mr. Speaker, that is how come we supported the bill. We were bluffed into supporting the bill.

MR. BARRY:

The labour leaders were all up in the gallery and they nodded that there was a deal.

MR. LUSH:

They called me outside and told me not to object, that they had an understanding with the government.

MR. BARRY:

Who said this?

MR. LUSH:

I just forget the personality, but they asked me to let it go through. They said, 'We have an understanding with the government,

they are going to consult with us and the bill is going to be fine-tuned and refined.'

I do remember one hon. member standing in his place and saying that he believed government would not live up to their word, would not live up to their commitment, and he feared the day when the labour movement would regret having agreed with the government, having been sucked in, and that was the former leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Neary), the former member for LaPoile, who is now at Dalhousie. I remember his remarks and they have come true, and Hansard can be checked, Mr. Speaker. The former member for LaPoile was correct in his predictions that the government would not live up to their word, that they would just trick the labour movement. And that is what they did, they tricked the labour movement that night into not opposing that bill. The labour movement thought the government would live up to their word and they did not live up to their word. Mr. Speaker, talk about trickery! Here we have a bill that is anti-labour, that is against collective bargaining, but not only that, Mr. Speaker, they bluffed the labour movement in this Province. They broke their word, they broke their commitment with the labour movement in this Province, and we wonder why there are not good labour relations in this Province. That breaking of their word with the labour movement at that particular time should take a long time to heal, that government broke faith, broke their word with the labour movement.

MR. TOBIN:

Your leader drafted Bill 59.

MR. LUSH:

I wonder what hand the present Minister of Labour had in it?

Now, if the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is just going to make remarks and then take off out, I can answer his questions. I expect the present Minister of Labour also had a hand in formulating that bill, I would expect a big hand. What a strange event that the deputy minister at that time, who, no doubt, had a big hand in formulating that bill, should today find himself as the Minister of Labour and the person who was to come and save this Province, the person who was supposed to come and really improve labour relations, and, Mr. Speaker, we have not had such labour relations in the history of this Province, never!

Mr. Speaker, we have made recommendations as to how we can solve this, but it seems as though nobody is listening; the government is not willing to listen. We have come out with our four point formula for solving this dispute, and I want to discuss two points, particularly, among these four. I want to talk about parity. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, that is a justifiable cause, for a group of workers to want parity. Not parity with another group of workers working for another company and another union, but parity within the same group of workers, with the same company, parity of workers with the same employer. That is what they want. That certainly, Mr. Speaker, has to be a justifiable cause, and a reasonable one, and a ration one, one that members on the other side certainly should be willing to concede to as being reasonable, and being fair, and being just. That workers should

want parity with fellow workers, workers employed by the same employer, workers represented by the same union is certainly a justifiable cause, certainly one that all members should be able to empathize with and sympathize with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government in its propaganda campaign have been saying they cannot afford the money. Now naturally the answer to that from all workers, from what they have been observing in the past three or four weeks, is that government can find money for any other group of people; they can find money for the senior employees, for the senior bureaucrats, they can find money for them for just about any purpose.

It is certainly a poor example to people who are negotiating, a poor example of trying to convince them that they could not afford to pay parity. And I understand that the average wage that will bring everybody up to parity is somewhere around \$3,600, \$3,700 for approximatley 5,500 employees. If you multiply 5,500 by \$3,700, you will get something less than \$20 million. That is what it would cost to gain parity. To give these workers in the MOS and the GS parity with their fellow workers, that is what it would cost, \$20 million, from the figures given by NAPE. What are government's figures again? \$140 million, Mr. Speaker, seven times the figure quoted by NAPE. Now, will somebody stand in his place and tell us why that discrepancy? I mean, quite obviously what NAPE is saying looks reasonable. 5,500 workers, that is not an imaginative figure, that is a positive, tangible figure, 5,500, and the average increase that must be paid to

reach parity is \$3,600 or \$3,700, I just forget the figure and it does not matter, multiply 5,500 by either one of them and you come to less than \$20 million.

MR. BARRY:

It is just a car allowance apiece.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

I wish to inform all the people in the gallery that they are not to interfere with the proceedings of the House. If so, I will have no choice but to clear the galleries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Put them in jail.

MR. SPEAKER:

Once again, I will repeat to the people in the gallery they are not to interfere with the proceedings of the House.

MR. BARRY:

Why? Why?

MR. BAIRD:

Be quiet when the Speaker is speaking, boy. Be quiet!

MR. GILBERT:

There he is, the ice thrower from Corner Brook.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, this government has not answered why the tremendous disparity and discrepancy in these figures that we have been having thrown at us in the papers in the last three or four days, and again I quote: The figures of NAPE say

it would take \$20 million to achieve parity, and government is saying it is \$140 million, seven times as much.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier then says, "Why does not anybody believe me any more?"

MR. LUSH:

Exactly. Why do they not believe me? Well, it was the same notion, the same propaganda story that they tried to spread with the 8,056 jobs they created. It was not of the same magnitude because, number one, anybody who really cared about unemployment in this Province, anybody who cared about the situation, anybody who was sincere about the situation would be embarrassed to advertise 8,056 jobs, even if they did create them. In terms of the problem we have, 100,000 people unemployed, to have the effrontery and the audacity to say that in view of that serious kind of situation a government created 8,056 jobs would be an embarrassment. Mr. Speaker, it was not the truth and that is what made it so bad, it was not the truth.

Mr. Speaker, if we found the government trying to bluff in that situation we can only assume that they are trying to bluff in this situation. Because nobody has come out and defended the government, no one stood in this Committee to say how it is the government have arrived at that \$140 million. We know how NAPE have arrived at \$20 million, they told us, crystal clear. Any elementary school student can arrive at the figure from the information and the details given by NAPE, but government just quotes a raw, blatant figure of \$140 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope some member on the other side can be embarrassed, if nothing else, into standing up and defending that figure and telling the people of this Province how it is they arrived at that figure, how it is that for 5,500 workers to achieve parity, which would cost in the vicinity of \$3,700 per worker, it is going to come to \$140 million. Somebody on the government side certainly has the responsibility to explain that situation.

Mr. Speaker, somebody certainly should feel a responsibility or an obligation to defend themselves, if nothing else, for being part of that kind of propaganda.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Do not let anyone interrupt you, 'Tom', you are doing alright.

MR. LUSH:

I get worried when the Minister of Finance says I am doing alright. I am going to be worried about that. I have to try all over again.

Mr. Speaker, someone asked me a couple of days ago - I do not know where it was - whether we were taking a rational approach towards this labour dispute. They said, "What would you do if you were Minister of Labour?" Well, I said, first of all, if I were Minister of Labour, that assumes our party would be in power, we would not have a labour dispute. There would not have been a labour dispute, first of all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

We would not have brought in such offensive and oppressive laws, as Bill 59, that would have driven

these people out on the streets. We would not have done that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

But I suppose to not run away from a challenge - that is an easy way out - supposing we had inherited the situation, we had inherited these offensive and oppressive laws, such as Bill 59, what would we do? Well, we got into this strike right away. Our leader came through with a four point formula that can solve that dispute overnight: Lifting of the suspensions and the threat of suspensions - we all know them, very simple. Going back to the bargaining table - with an understanding from the workers that they will return to work - with a proposal leading to parity, point number two. Point number three - I notice the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is listening very attentively - set up an industrial enquiry looking into the status of collective bargaining within the Public Service. Heaven knows we need to do that. With the kinds of relationships that we have been having, the kinds of confrontation that we have been having over the past four or five years, there is something rotten in the State of Denmark and if this government were sincere, if they were honest about doing something, they would set up an enquiry to look into the state of collective bargaining within the Public Service. Our public servants, our people who work in the Public Service, deserve that kind of action from government.

The fourth point, which is a temporary one, really, is to look into the recommendations made by

the International Labour Organization with respect to Bill 59, four simple steps that I believe would lead to the immediate resolution of this labour dispute that we are now in. Why is it government will not take the initiative along these four points and bring this labour dispute to a resolution satisfactory to both sides and let us get this Province moving rather than having this bitterness, this animosity that we have been having here in this Province for the past number of weeks now?

Mr. Speaker, if there is a Province that can do without labour disputes, industrial disputes, I am sure Your Honour will agree that it is this Province. We cannot afford that kind of industrial dispute in this Province. We cannot afford it. We need our people working, we need our government working, and we need good labour relations.

I say to the Premier, even though the hour is getting late now, and we have been into this labour dispute - how long have we been into this now? However long it is it has been too long. But I say to the Premier, to use his favorite poem, "'T'is not too late to make a new beginning/ 'T'is not too late to seek a newer world/ There lies the port" - and I think all of this - "and the vessel puffed her sails." If the Premier wants to be a pioneer, if the Premier wants to do something for the labour movement, he has the opportunity tonight. And I can tell the Premier that whatever records the Premier would like to boast about, whatever accomplishments the Premier would like to gloat over, whatever triumphs and successes the Premier would like to lay claim to, good

labour relations is not one of them. We have seen proof of that in the last number of weeks around this building, on the outside, with people clamouring and fighting and trying to convince the government of the day that they simply want parity, they want to have the same pay as their fellow workers within the same union and doing the same kind of work. That is all they are asking for, Mr. Speaker.

I would hope that members on the other side would take this seriously and before we close tonight will get together in a huddle out in the corridor somewhere and say, 'We are not going to close this House, we are going to go along with the Opposition and we are going to go along with the MOS workers and the general service workers. We are not going to close this House, we are not going to take an Easter break until we see this labour dispute resolved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are here tonight for many serious reasons, the major one being the labour dispute that has dominated this Province over the last couple of weeks and is going to dominate this Province for another number of weeks if this administration does not soon come to its senses and do something about it. Now, I have a great

problem in trying to understand how this has all come about. I have tried to follow the logic of government's attempts to settle this dispute, but I have some major problems with it. They say they want to negotiate, they say they want to go back to the bargaining table, they say they want to discuss the issues, yet the things they have done have pretty well made it impossible for negotiations to go on. They will not say whether or not they are going to get rid of those conditions, they will not say whether or not they are going to try to improve the climate for those negotiations.

We have had an injunction served on some of those people and nobody knows to whom it applies. The 4,000 or 5,000 people on the picket lines, supposedly on an illegal strike, do not know, nobody knows. Everybody is out walking around, but nobody knows if it is an illegal strike. Government went after the injunction, so they are the ones responsible for its being in effect. But nobody wants to take the responsibility. We have asked questions about it in this House but we cannot get a straight answer. So that injunction still remains a major problem. It has not been dealt with and it will not be dealt with if that attitude prevails on the government side. So this dispute will go on unless they change their attitude. You have got the thirty day suspension that is on the go. That is a lovely one. That is a real good one. That is a really good way to negotiate. It is a really good way to get people back to work.

Essential services: We get the cry from the other side, 'You want everybody out. You do not want

anybody to stay in and protect the people of Newfoundland.' Yet, they will give everybody who has waled out a thirty day suspension. That is what I call logic. That is how they are running this Province today. That is what negotiations mean over on that other side.

This has gotten a lot of national press, and rightly so. This shows the ineptness of those over there who are trying to negotiate a collective agreement which should have been negotiated long ago, and would have been negotiated long ago if they had had the proper attitude.

When we try to question the administration all we get is, 'No, we are not going to answer any questions, we do not want to say anything to prejudice the negotiations wherever they may be, whoever they may be with. NAPE is up there sitting down trying to bargain with nobody. But I think they may get further that way, because it would probably make more sense to bargain with nobody, judging from the logic that is coming from the other side.

I am serious when I say I want to give some advice to this administration: They should put together some type of proposal, go back to the bargaining table and get everybody off the streets and back to work. We cannot do it over here. You are the government. You are the employer. It is your responsibility to get them back to work and to get this Province moving. But it seems as if you do not want to take that responsibility. But if you do not want to take that responsibility, you should get up and go and we will gladly move over there and do

it.

MR. DAWE:

The people would not want you.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Do not worry, they are going to want us, Sir, and they are going to want us very shortly as a matter of fact, especially if this keeps up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did you listen to the radio this morning?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Listen to the radio! You can go listen to the radio. I think you have been listening to the radio too much, to tell you the truth. Just put all that aside now. If you will do something to get this thing solved, I will get up and clap for you, gladly. Because there are too many people out there suffering right now on those picket lines, and families and everybody else are being divided. The whole works is going crazy out there, yet the administration does not know what is going on. They do not want to talk about it, they want to close the House down and run away.

I will tell you that that, to me, is not taking responsibility and going with it.

MR. BAKER:

You can run but you cannot hide.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

You can run but you cannot hide, yes. Because the people are not going away, the issues are not going away, the thirty day suspension is not going away, and the injunction is not going away. None of that is going away. You put it there, you now have to do something about it to get this

thing straightened out.

If you would at least change your attitude, maybe have a huddle - somebody suggested a huddle. Maybe that is a good idea. I do not really care how you do it, but we are here tonight to try to press you to do something to settle this dispute. That is our role. We want you to try to do something about this dispute which, as I said, is having a bad economic affect on this Province. It is an indication of what has been going on the last couple of years, and it has come to a head. So do not give us this stuff about we are very concerned, we are this and we are that, because you have had lots of opportunity. You have taken moves that have now jeopardized any settlement at all, and you are not showing a positive attitude. We, in Opposition, do not go for that kind of thing, and that is why we are here tonight to try to get you to do something positive.

One of the issues that should be brought up is equal pay for work of equal value.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Now, to me that seems quite logical. The Liberal Government in Ontario, Mr. David Peterson and his administration, have brought it in as a policy and it is working out quite well. There are a lot of other administrations in this country that are going to do the same thing. But it seems as if the attitude here is well, no, we are going to be last again; we are the last in everything else, we might just as well be last in this.

I think it is time this Province took the bull by the horns and decided to upgrade its labour legislation and become somebody to follow instead of following, because it is time changes were made. Equal pay for work of equal value is not a hard concept, it is a pretty fair one, as a matter of fact. We have a new Charter of Rights, and a number of new initiatives are being taken to give people equal pay for work of equal value. But here the attitude is, We are going to throw you a thirty day suspension, or we are going to throw you an injunction and nobody knows what it is about. This is a good way to get paid for work of equal value. It is a real good, it is really a constructive way to solve a labour dispute.

While we are on this topic and while we are here tonight to discuss this major problem, I have to get on to a couple of others, as well. The present Premier of Newfoundland used the saying, 'have not will be no more'. 'Vote for us, vote for Mr. Mulroney in Ottawa and have not will be no more. We will inflict you with prosperity that you have never seen in your life.'

Well, I am going to read about some of the prosperity that has been inflicted upon us, just a couple of notes.

MR. FUREY:

Not too much.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

No. This is from Atlantic Insight, a good magazine, very educational, and I am going to give it to the other side to read. One of the things they have inflicted on us is the slashing of half a billion dollars from

regional industrial expansion programmes here in Atlantic Canada. I do not want to be inflicted with any more of that kind of prosperity I can tell you, they can have that back. They have inflicted us with transportation deregulation, Structure 90. Structure 90 is not even supposed to exist, yet there is an article in here which talks about the airlines going under because of Structure 90 which has been put in place. Well, I think they can take that back. Do not inflict that one on us. The cancelled the PIP grants which got the offshore going, and now there is talk of layoffs everywhere. The PIP grants are gone, but the oil companies are out there drilling. We have lots of oil out there which is going to be developed. We are going to make sure of that when we take over, there is no doubt about it, and we are going to spread the benefits far and wide in this Province. The cancellation of PIP grants, do not inflict us with that, either. They are relying on the private sector to solve Newfoundland's problems and are just taking away all the supports that have been here in Atlantic Canada. 'Survive on your own', they say. That is the Tory philosophy in Ottawa. They inflict that on us.

Well, the workers of this Province have been inflicted with Tory philosophy and Tory governing for too long and it is starting to show; it is starting to show when we have 5,000 people out on strike who would never go out on a picket line in an illegal strike. They would never think of this. People, after twenty years working, who never broke a law in their lives, are down there on that picket line. It is unreal when you take it all into

perspective. One hundred thousand people are now receiving UIC in Newfoundland, official figures. I do not want to be inflicted with that. I am tired of that infliction, to tell you the truth. For the first time in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador, we have 100,000 people receiving unemployment insurance.

This is really something to be up in arms about, really happy and overwhelmed with, our Cabinet ministers in Ottawa are losing clout, as this article says, which speaks the truth, and we are being done in down here. I have got a major question. Four or five years ago, if you argued with the ladies and gentlemen of this present administration you were an anti-Newfoundland, you were fighting against Newfoundland. If you said, 'I do not go along with Mr. Peckford's policy of this or Mr. Peckford's policy of that,' you were labelled anti-Newfoundland. Do you want to know something? They used to fight for Newfoundland. That was their role, that was the real vine, fight for Newfoundland. Where has all the fight gone?

MR. BAKER:

They are shadow boxing.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Shadow boxing? It is not even shadow boxing. You cannot find the shadow. They are running too far away from Ottawa to fight the shadow. If they had their way up there we would be pushed about another 500 miles over toward England and they would have nothing to do with us. Where is that great fighter now? Where is this great administration fighting for the rights of Newfoundlanders when 5,000 public servants are out on the picket lines on an illegal

strike and nobody knows who should go to jail and who should not?

It is very ironic that in September of 1984 we had a new administration in Ottawa and it was, Now, boys, whatever you say, it goes. Whatever you say, no sweat. Just send it down. Now, NFDC is gone. The federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) just decided that, so that is gone. That is good co-operation and consultation, I tell you. We just heard in a press release that it is gone, it is all out the window. The federal forestry center is not coming here, anyway, that has gone out the window. And we can go on and on and on. Where are the fighters for the rights of Newfoundlanders? I have a great problem with that.

One of the things we have put forward is a constructive compromise that could see the end of this dispute, but it seems that whatever the Opposition has to say, and it has been constructive most of the time, it goes out the window; 'If it is from your side, we want nothing to do with it; it could end this dispute tomorrow but we do not want anything to do with it because it is from you guys.'

Well, I have listened to the other side a number of times when they have presented good policies, or whatever, and I have patted them on the back, but this dispute is getting so ridiculous and wicked that it is time they listened to somebody else. I do not know where they are getting their advice from. I do not have the slightest idea. There is more intelligence in the couple of rocks on the beach at Bell Island than there is in the Department of

Labour because, as far as that department is concerned, all logic has gone out the window. Because it is our job, we have put together more good points to help solve the dispute and the only reaction we have gotten is, 'No, we are not going to answer your questions, these are delicate negotiations.' We have put forward four proposals and an industrial enquiry is one of them. That is exactly what they did in Ontario a while back, they set up an industrial enquiry on essential employees which came out with a mechanism that could solve it. And it has been done in other provinces. But here, because the Liberals suggested it, they will not do it. 'It might see the end of the dispute, but it is Liberal policy. Let us reword it.'

I do not care what you do, but you should solve the problem before it gets too far out of hand. And do not blame it on the Opposition, 'The opposition did not suggest good proposals to help solve it', because we have and we will continue to do so. We are not the government and you should remember that. I think you are forgetting that, because you are blaming every problem in Newfoundland on the Opposition. We gave away hydro, we gave away this and we gave away that. Well, I will tell you, you have been in power seventeen years, it has been so many years I do not want to think about it, and it is time you start accepting some responsibility, it is time to say, yes, we are responsible for the 25 per cent unemployment rate in Newfoundland, we are responsible for the highest unemployment rate in North America, just a little tiny bit.

I do not want to even see the admission to that, to tell you the

truth, I want to see a constructive proposal, first off, to end this dispute so that you can get people back to work, where they should be. You have put the injunction there, you have put the thirty day suspension there, you have created the problem and it is time now to negotiate to get rid of the problem. We are here tonight because of this major issue. I hope that gets through to some of the influential people on the other side.

I think most people would like to see an end to this dispute. We cannot do that, but the administration has the power to do that tonight, they have the power to do it tomorrow. They had the power to have the injunction issued, they had the power to give the thirty day suspensions. I want to make this clear: My colleagues on this side did not put out the thirty day suspension, we did not put anybody in jail. No matter what they say over there, and they may blame that on us also, we did not do any of that and we are against it, I will tell you.

MR. MITCHELL:
(Inaudible).

MR. K. AYLWARD:

If the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) has something to say, he will have his opportunity. And I am looking forward to him giving us some wise comments on the government's position and why they are where they are now. I look forward to his comments in the very near future. As a matter of fact, I will be sitting here later wondering what his comments would have been, because I am sure they will not be made.

I just want to give this message to the administration tonight: The time has come to get away from the delicacy, get away from walking on thin ice and trying to skimper and scamper around. It is time to settle this dispute. The time has come. Pressure is building and people are noting the prevailing attitude and are shaking their heads, people from every walk of life. They are getting tired of hearing, 'well, there are all kinds of conditions to do this and there are all kinds of conditions to do that.'

You have the power to solve the dispute, so solve the dispute. We have given you constructive proposals with which to do it. You do not have to go by them, you can come up with a better way to do it. All we are doing is suggesting that you do this. We feel it would be a good way to solve it and make it come to an end. We all, at least I hope we all, want to see an end to this dispute and the people going back to work who do not want to be breaking the law, if that is what it is called, if that is what it can be interpreted as. They are fighting for their rights. They do not want to be out there, they want to be working, contributing to our economy, which needs a boost in the arm like it has never needed it before. This Province does not need 5,000 people out on strike when we have an unemployment rate which is astronomical and which looks as if it will stay that way if this Tory attitude prevails.

I think it is time for the Minister of Labour and the President of Treasury Board to sit down, look at the whole situation logically in the next couple of hours or so, and come up with some

type of solution, some type of compromise instead of promoting conflict. Because that is what you have, that is what you are going to have unless you change your attitude.

I mean, the workers are not trying to break the government, they are out there trying to get a decent wage, trying to earn a decent living. I know what the process of collective bargaining is, we all do. You have them out there looking like they are all criminals, because they are on an illegal strike, which is the furthest from the truth. They are fighting for the right to earn a decent living and to negotiate a collective agreement in a fair manner. This administration has made that very tough. You have the power to make it easier. My advice is that you make it easier. My advice, which I think is constructive, which I think the Opposition has made, can help bring an end to this dispute. I think if you take our advice, go with it, take that attitude into these negotiations, you will see an end to this wicked dispute that has gone on far too long. This has been building over the past two years, it is time it came to an end.

We are here, as I said earlier, to make sure that you know your responsibility. This is the House of Assembly, this is where the elected representatives come to represent the taxpayers of Newfoundland and Labrador, where public issues are debated. The number one public issue today - and do not let anybody forget it - is this labour dispute, and they are trying to close the House down so we cannot ask any questions, so we cannot ask how the negotiations are going.

You know, we take a chance when we get up and ask them how negotiations are going? They can say to us, great, they can say to us, we have an agreement, they could say to us this, that and everything else, they have it done and it is beautiful, number one! Well, I will risk the embarrassment of getting up and asking the question. I would risk that embarrassment, no problem whatsoever. But I will collapse if they get an agreement, but I think it would be excellent, it would be us doing our job and the government doing its job. But they have not done it and they are not doing it. I do not know when they are going to do it. We cannot get a straight answer. I do not know if anybody can get a straight answer, outside of Cabinet, as to what is going on and when this dispute is going to come to an end. I just do not know.

Today we had a good news Budget. Well, I drove down the road there a while ago and I did not see a lot of people hopping. As a matter of fact, I never saw too many smiles, to tell you the truth. The major problem that is facing everybody today, and that is on everybody's mind, is this dispute and the fact that the rights of people are being infringed upon. There are some good things in the good news budget, by the way. I have to compliment the Minister of Finance. There are some good things in it. We are going to put a lot more in our budgets, when we take over, things which are going to help this Province a lot more. I must say there was good news in that Budget, but the good news was drowned out totally by what is going on right now with this labour problem. You may gloss

over things in your Budget, in this wonderful document, but you still have the problem you had a week ago, two weeks ago, you have people out there not knowing when or where or what is going to go on in the next day, in the next hour, in the next week, in the next month. They still do not know. So as far as I am concerned, debate on the budget can wait, everything can wait until this thing is solved. I want to implore the government to come up with some effective proposal to solve this dispute, the like of which has never been seen in years and years and years in this Province. The fighters for Newfoundland had better put their boxing gloves back on and go boxing again.

On second thought, I am going to take that back. They have been boxing the wrong people; they have switched from boxing with the Federal Liberal Government in Ottawa to boxing with the people of Newfoundland. They are afraid to tackle the present administration in Ottawa.

I have to talk about that, because this labour dispute is a direct result of the lack of money coming down from Ottawa, the lack of programmes to stimulate our economy. That has an effect on labour relations in this Province, and it is going to have an effect on labour relations in this Province for the next five to ten years. Hopefully, we will only have to last another couple of years with this kind of prosperity. But, for the next two or three years, we are going to be faced with this kind co-operation and consultation. Well, I think Webster is adding two new definitions to the dictionary for co-operation and consultation;

Co-operation: I will tell you what to do and you do it. That is what Mr. Mulroney has told Mr. Peckford, and that is what he has told this administration down here. Consultation: Again I will tell you what to do and you will do it. That is the definition of that one. I hope the definitions change over the next couple of years because, if it does not, this prosperity that has been inflicted on Newfoundland, well, I think I would rather be hit with despair, to tell you the truth, because I think it would probably be better than the prosperity that we have been inflicted with in the last year to eighteen months. We are being done in down here like you have never seen before in your life and the great fighters for Newfoundland are sitting back saying, We have to have restraints. Everybody else in Canada is doing it. You would never have heard the like two years ago.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say most of my remarks have been related to this labour dispute, they have been related to getting it resolved. I implore, I ask the government, the administration, to come up with some proposals in the next little while to do something about this crazy, confusing dispute that has been ongoing for far too long, which is a burden to too many people, and which is causing too much pain, in a lot of ways, in this Province. I want to tell the government to look at our proposals, to look at their own, to look at whatever. Ours, I feel, are very good, and I think that if you look them over you might come up with some positive movement in this dispute.

With that I conclude my remarks,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Listening to the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), a young member, very sincere, I noted a tone of despair from the point of view of his saying that when he got elected he thought that the House of Assembly was a place where government would help the people and now, although not even a year has passed, I hear a tone in the member for Stephenville's voice, saying, 'What is the Premier doing to our people? What is he doing to our Province?' For the first time in Newfoundland's history 100,000 people are on unemployment insurance, 80,000 people out of work, and that is not counting how many people are collecting minimum wage, that is not counting our senior citizens, that is not counting our younger people - and we see in this budget today an increase in student tuition fees. So one has to ask what has happened to a government that, after just getting elected less than a year ago, finds themselves in a situation where a group of people, which historically has always been loyal to their employer, the public service, is on strike?

Some argue one of the reasons why they have been loyal to their employer, no matter what government, partly is job security and how they are basically treated. We find ourselves now in

a situation that job security is no longer secure, we find that people are coming into the public service political appointments, and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, one may have to ask, as and I sure some of the people who are out on the picket line are asking, are those people who are staying behind the political appointments? Are they the ones who are the friends of government, and, when we go back, will they be the ones who will be getting the promotions? I found, even before this strike talking to some people in the public service, that there was poor morale. Gradually both sectors of the public service ended up saying, 'Enough is enough. We have to take a stand for ourselves and for our families and show that we might be public servants but we do not have to take this treatment.' I think, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable. Since being elected in 1979, in three elections, I have never yet witnessed the situation that we have in our Province where our own employees are this unhappy. The government is supposed to set the example in a society of treating its people in such a way that the private sector and the business sector take the nod from it. What direction are we giving to the private sector and to the other groups in our society? We are using boots on our employees and we are forcing God-fearing men and women to go out and break the law. Then the question asked by government and asked by people in the Province is, 'Why are they breaking the law? It is wrong to break the law. The law is sacred.'

Well the law is not sacred. John Locke, a philosopher, said back in the time of James I and Charles, when kings were considered gods, that when a king brings down a law

that is unjust the people have the right to rise up and overthrow the king, which has been done, and one of them was even beheaded. We had the American revolution as a result of unfair taxation. We had the Russian revolution because of arrogance. We had the French revolution, again because of arrogance and their telling the people, 'Let them eat cake.' I suppose one could go back to Nero's time and find that Nero played the fiddle while Rome burnt. We have a situation in our own Province with the Premier spending \$1 million on his own office and giving executive assistants, some of whom do not even have cars, car allowances. And the Premier's explanation was, well, sometime they rent a car now and then.

Mr. Speaker, in the parliamentary tradition and the progress that has been made over the years and through the centuries, this is a rather unique occasion. I suppose this is one of the most historic occasions that has taken place since we got the right to have free, elected government, Responsible Government. This is the first time this House of Assembly, down through the ages since 1832, was opened for Budget day and got into politicking. Because normally it is a ceremonial occasion. Normally afterwards there is a reception and, because of invited guests, the heads of state and church and business, you normally do not get into mud slinging and the politicking. But we today have upheld the rule and the right of the people who have gone before us in saying that when laws are unjust, as members a Loyal Opposition, have an obligation to bring government to task. But looking across the House the

question has to be asked is anybody listening? And obviously there is not. Is anybody listening to the 5,000 who are on the picket lines? Again the answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

When the English got the Magna Carta and forced King John to sign it, was that done through the idea of respecting law, or was it gotten through the idea that the law was not fair and people were not being treated fairly? So any changes that have come down have come down as a result of people challenging the system. I find it a rather sad statement on our system of government here in Newfoundland and Labrador that a young Premier, with so many hopes and aspirations placed upon his shoulders, so much trust given to him by the people of this Province in three elections, now finds the prosperity that he was going to bring is a dream, it is a hope, yet the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) comes in today and says, I have a 'good news' budget.

Well, when you look at it basically it is not overall such a bad budget. But when you consider that they collect \$2.5 billion, there has to be some good things in that budget. And if you look at the amount of money that is spent on various capital things, a lot of that money is coming from Ottawa, \$8 million for the upgrading of the airstrips in my district, the Burin Peninsula Development fund, the Trans-Labrador Highway and the Trans-Canada Highway. So the good news budget is that since 1979 this government has put us in debt approximately another \$2.5 billion. That is the reality, \$2.5 billion more in debt. The Premier says we cannot afford to give parity all at once. The

question I have to ask is how could the Premier sit by and see loyal civil servants get into such a situation that they have to hit the streets and are willing to do it? I was amazed, and I still am absolutely amazed to see men and women being interviewed on T.V. asked, 'What if you are going to go to jail?' And the answer is, 'Well, jail it is.' I find that great courage, and I commend and compliment our people for having the courage to stand up. I only regret that it has not been done before, because each splinter group in our Province that goes on strike fights it alone. I remember driving past the Trades School and seeing them out for almost nine months. It was the same with the lab technicians and the teachers. In listening to people and talking to them, and deliberately asking people the question, "What is your attitude on this strike?", one of the main things that is coming clearly across is that our people feel, not just the ones on strike but the ones who are working and the ones who are unemployed, quite prepared that this is a strike against injustice.

MR. HISCOCK:

As a result, the people who are on welfare who were interviewed said, "I do not mind waiting even though I am on welfare, a little longer for my cheque." And it is the same with the senior citizens. But we find ourselves in a situation, since 1979, of getting in debt by over another \$2.5 billion. When you look around, what have we really got to show for it? We have the extension to the Confederation Building, \$40 million, and find with regard to that we have to pay \$4 million interest a year, when we have businesses downtown, for example

the Fishermen's Union Building, still trying to rent that office space. But, of course, no private business or government would even rent anything belong to a union, would they?

So, Mr. Speaker, we find out, after seventeen years of P.C. administration, that there are no new ideas coming, that they are operating from one day to the other, from one crisis to another. We found only a few weeks ago the Premier off to China trying to find new jobs for exports in Hong Kong and Japan, after seven years, Mr. Speaker. I am not one who really questions the idea that the Premier go to China and Japan to look for jobs for our people and for industry, but I ask the question why, after seven years is he only now trying to do it? Because for five or six years it was pinned on the hope of oil, oil, oil. We allowed our fishing industry to collapse. We allowed our mining industry to collapse and we also ended up allowing our forestry industry to collapse. We paid no attention to tourism and paid no attention to agriculture, just put all our eggs in one basket with regard to the oil and this was going to be everything.

Well, we find ourselves in the situation that we are not the center of the universe, as the Premier may think, that we do have to interrelate in the world. Now we find ourselves in the situation, after five years of arguing with the former Liberal government in Ottawa, that oil on the international market is at such a price that Hibernia - I do not hope is in jeopardy because I would love to see prosperity for our people - will probably will be delayed.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we find that Bill 59 was brought in under false pretenses, brought in with the idea that it was going to be reviewed and that the labour unions would be consulted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, could I have silence, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. POWER:

So pious!

MR. HISCOCK:

Do not talk about being pious. Do not talk about being a hypocrite either. Just reflect back to what you said to the students down at the University a couple of days ago when they asked if there was going to be any increase and the Minister of Finance basically said, "No." Now, Mr. Speaker, we find another 5 per cent increase in student fees.

MR. POWER:

You did not read the budget very well. That 5 per cent applies to vocational schools, and there are no vocational students at Memorial.

MR. HISCOCK:

With regard to the other thing, I want to say the Premier himself also said in the last election when the teachers were striking, and he was telling them to go back and the public servants to go back, that after the two year freeze was over a \$25 million kitty would be set up and people would be advanced.

Well, the question I have to ask there is why was that brought out

in an election and why was it not done before? If the two year freeze had to be applied equally why was it not applied also to the private sector in our society? Why is it both levels of government, Ottawa and our own Province here, took it upon themselves to say that the public sector had to bear the responsibility because they have job security? Well, there is a freeze on hiring, there is no job security, and there is no promotion on a professional basis anymore, particularly in Ottawa. We find now the reason for promotion is having ties with a political party. I would say the same thing applies here, and the unions have it brought up, that a lot of people who are brought in as part-time people, and other civil servants who are brought in, are political appointments. So the morale again is something that has to be addressed.

Bill 59 itself was brought in under false pretenses because it was going to allow the unions and the government to sit down and fine tune it. Then, after he got such a shock with the teachers, he got the Deputy Minister of Labour to bring in a new era. Then after we got new hopes put on him, particularly by labour, when he became Minister of Labour, the end result was everybody thought that Bill 59 was going to be fine tuned. But a year has passed almost and we find out that the unions after two years of negotiating are finding out that their members are falling behind in such a way that you have one group in one department getting more than another group. And you talk about fairness and you talk about morale! Even with that, Mr. Speaker, as it was addressed again by the member for Stephenville,

parity may get straightened out, and let us hope it does, but when they do go back, Mr. Speaker, there is still going to be an unjust system of a lot of people who are working in the civil service doing the same jobs as other people but because of their different sex find out that they are not getting paid equal. So it is the idea of the question of equal value for equal work and equal pay that has to be addressed.

When we look at the industries in this Province over the past years that have closed down, whether it be the refinery in Holyrood, or whether it be Come By Chance and all those promises, or whether it be Bowaters, or whether it be the Buchans mine, or whether it be the St. Lawrence mine or whether it be now the Daniel's Harbour mine and possibly ERCO, all these industries, Mr. Speaker, were brought in before the Tory administration took over and we have seen the gradual decline of our industries. So when the Premier goes to China and Japan, I automatically think maybe it is okay, maybe the Premier is going to take a page out of the book of the Liberal era, and maybe invent the shovel and going around and start opening up new industries. But, no, Mr. Speaker. They go over to China at a most inopportune time, because cynicism creeps in and says where are they going in the middle of Winter? Not in Spring, not in the Summer recess, or not in early Fall, so cynicism creeps in and our people say, well, they are only gone over for a holiday, and yet we have to see what are the results of these. It is only the second one and, as I said, after seven years why has this not been done before and why have we not been going down to the States? Any time that the Premier

has left this Province, other than that trip to China, it was always on confrontation, making speeches across Canada or down in the States, putting Newfoundland's position forward on the fish, on the oil, and never going away with an industrial, a business delegation, and meeting with the top business people and trying to convince them, Mr. Speaker, that we have industries here, hard working people and resources. We find ourselves now after seventeen years, the first time in our history, 100,000 people drawing UIC. In the Newfoundland Quarterly, the Spring edition, 1986, Highlights from November 1, 1985 to January 31, 1985, the National Council of Welfare in reporting its 1984 poverty profile states that 23 per cent of Newfoundlands were living below the poverty line compared with 15 per cent of the nation. That is just 23 per cent of our people. That is not talking about our senior citizens, that is not talking as pointed out by the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), about the cutbacks that the Nielsen Task Force wants to do to this Province, it is not talking about closing down the industries. Then the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) states it is a positive budget because he know that deep down in the heart and soul of every man, woman and child in this Province, if there is anything we want to hear it is that word 'positive', that things will get better, that things will improve. Mr. Speaker, the Premier even said to the former Leader of the Opposition, who is not studying law, when he was visiting during Christmas, and asked 'Brian, what are you going to be doing with the oil?' 'Oh, there will be an oil agreement in place by May, and if the industry is not

going to start construction in May, then they will hear from me.' Then he said as an aside, 'Our people are used to depression. We have been here 500 years and we are used to depression.' We have a Premier with that mentality, that our people are used to depression meaning, of course, that they will put up with anything, so he always hangs out that little bit of hope. This is what has happened to our people. Under the Peckford administration over the past three elections, there was always hope. It was not a vote for the PC Party as such, it was a vote for hope, it was a vote for change, it was a vote that things would improve and that we would not have to be in a situation of saying to the rest of the country, yes, there are 23 per cent of us Canadians in this part of Canada living below the poverty line, and maybe Mr. Peckford can do something about it.

So what do we see, Mr. Speaker? Now we find out that it all was basically political propaganda to entice our people so as to hold onto power. They have been holding onto power, Mr. Speaker, now for seventeen years, and we find out that the laws are becoming more unjust, we are finding out the arrogance is setting in. While they talk about a freeze for two years, here is the Premier getting a tax free allowance, his own chauffeur, his own dining room, spends a million on his own office because it has not been renovated since the Smallwood years. Well, Mr. Moores was a millionaire, he came into politics a millionaire, and I would go so far as to say he left better than a millionaire with some of the companies he set up before he left, but one thing was that office was good enough for

him. There was a bit of age and tradition in it. But now, no, out with anything that reminds him of the past Liberals. I suppose the Premier has questions at times about being a former Liberal and changing, so basically, he wants to get rid of anything that reminds him of the years of prosperity.

MR. PATTERSON:

What about your leader?

MR. HISCOCK:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was President of the Young Liberals in Dalhousie University, so at least he changed his ways and came back to it. We see, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of arrogance of the government, an arrogance that I would say, Mr. Speaker, is going to cause and continuing to cause a lot of suffering and continued suffering. Here we brought down the budget today and they wanted to close the House right away so the members and the ministers could go down South to their Condos, or go over to Houston, Texas. We found out, Mr. Speaker, they wanted to close it down and be away, and sort of say, 'They are not going to hold out that long. They have been out almost a month now, the MOS workers, the other ones will get a bit tired, and public opinion will eventually change.'

Mr. Speaker, the end result will be, since MOS has been out a month now, if we go away on a holiday for a couple of weeks maybe public opinion will turn, because we got power on our side, we got the public purse, so we can pump out propaganda over the radio and over the T.V. saying that only 12 per cent are essential employees, when they know that is wrong. But yet again, as was said before, if you

state a lie and you keep repeating an untruth, the end result will be that people will listen to it in the long run. So, Mr. Speaker, my question -

MR. POWER:

Why listen to him? He is never here -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

I say when I am here there is a little bit better quality than when you are here all of the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to our people on strike, the government itself was willing to go on holiday for two weeks and leave people out in the rain, out in the snowstorms, allow them to continue there while they bask in the sun, hoping by pumping out all this propaganda the general public of the Province would turn on the public servants and the pressure would be on them and they would come back. But I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that this strike may be a long strike. It may escalate, it may involve other groups, and we will find out that this administration has probably bitten off a little bit more than it can chew and that it is time now for a little bit of humility. Mr. Speaker, those 5,000 people who are out there are out there for a good reason. They are out there because of injustice and they want to see some offering, as the Minister of Finance said, of hope and positiveness. They want to see something coming from this government to allow them to go back to work and to be able to pay

for heat and light and for their cars, those who can afford them, and for their children to have the basic necessities that the Minister of Finance does not have to worry about because of his salary, or the Premier does not have to worry about.

So, Mr. Speaker, in concluding: Of the seven years that I have been here, and after listening to the member for Stephenville, it is regrettable that ever since we have had Parliament in this country of ours, now a Province, this is the first day that the budget was presented and the House stayed open because our people are hitting the streets. I will tell you this, if it was not for strike pay and it was not for solidarity among the workers, this would be worst than the riots in the 1930's. Whereas Squires hopped over a fence and down an alley and into a house and went, there would be not one house that the Premier of this Province could hide in.

So in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Premier show compassion, show justice. He has put this Province in debt since he has been Premier, since 1979, by \$2.5 billion, yet he allowed his own workers to slip back in parity, while he spent all the money on himself and all his other Parliamentary assistants and executive assistants. I hope he will look at it carefully and say to the Minister of Finance, to the President of Treasury Board, that we will find ways to come up with this parity money, and look at the question of equal pay for equal work of equal quality and do what he promised. Because it is now becoming a question of honour, Mr. Speaker. This administration promised to revise Bill 59 and then went back on their word. Not

very many administrations can survive the fact that they give their word and then fall back on it.

So, in concluding, I would ask the Premier, the Minister of Finance and the President of Treasury Board to treat our people in this Province with the respect that they deserve and give them the salary that they deserve for the work that they do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think I want to take a slightly different tact from the previous speakers and talk a bit about - I am not even entirely sure it would be sensible - what it means to belong to a union, my experience with unions and why I think we have a major problem here and some sort of suggestions that the government may wish to listen to in terms of how we can get ourselves out of it.

The interesting thing about belonging to a union is that I have belonged to the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees and I have been a member of it since 1972 when, in the Stephenville Adult Center in Stephenville, Fraser March and I were looking around for a union. We actually tried to start our own union. I am beginning to wonder what kind of a union it would be given the evolution of our two paths since then. Fortunately, I believe, at that time we managed to sign up both ourselves and the other instructors at the Adult

Centre as members of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, and in that time period, I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to negotiate a series of collective agreements as a vocational instructor, and Fraser, for a time, was an employee of the union. Later on he became a member of the executive and eventually became the president of the union. It was an interesting experience back then in the early 1970s.

Another person who is quite interesting from that time period is Nancy Riche, who was also working at the Stephenville Crossing Vocational School, and was in the same Local with us for a period of time. She, of course, is now a candidate to become Vice-President of the Canadian Labour Congress, and, as I understand it, in about a month's time will become the first Newfoundlander to become a full-fledged Vice-President of the Labour Congress. That is an indication that, whatever else you may say about the Stephenville Adult Centre and the Stephenville Crossing Vocational School, you can imagine that the principals of those schools had their hands full with the number of activists we had on hand.

The reason I ended up in the Stephenville Adult Centre was quite a curious route because I had been a teacher at the Cape St. George High School for two years previous to that, as a matter of fact, from the time I first became a resident of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Unfortunately, after the first two years, the local parish priest and I had somewhat of a disagreement about a number of things that had seemed rather inconsequential to

me, but important to him. The net result was that my contract was terminated. In other words, I was fired from my job as a teacher.

I say that because I want you to understand how you get to become a union activist and later on an NDP politician, where you come from and what sort of a situation. I can tell you to that point being fired was the most dramatic thing that ever happened to me. Looking back on it, it probably still is the most dramatic thing. It was a couple of months before I really got to the point where I could sleep properly again, and it especially burned me because I really felt that it was a totally unjust firing in that situation.

In a sense you must believe in predestination because if I had not been fired, I would probably still be teaching at the Cape St. George's High School to this very day, and not a thorn in the side of almost all of the other parties in the House at this time, and probably not here taking up your time trying to talk as a union member rather than as a member of the House of Assembly. But I did and I appreciated the fact that the NTA, unfortunately at that time, was unable to preserve my job. Unfortunately, I had done one of the major crimes that you cannot possibly be resurrected from as a teacher and that was the end of my employment in a day school system. But I enjoyed my time at the Adult Centre in Stephenville, which in 1975 or 1976 became the Bay St. George Community College, and an institution that I am immensely proud of and had a very productive period of time teaching at.

One of the things that I wish to address in this short speech that

I want to make is the whole concept of whether you can be both things, whether you can be a good employee to your employer, and you can be a good union member at the same time. I have heard suggestions that that is an impossible situation. I would like to address it because there are some people who continue to hold that attitude and I think it is important that it be dispelled.

The Community College in Stephenville, in my opinion, is the most innovative and creative post-secondary educational institution in this Province, well ahead of Memorial University and the other vocational schools in the Province, perhaps on a par with the Fisheries College, but in a different area and with a different expertise. All the time I worked there, I found that it was challenging to work there. Many challenges were thrown to me by the administration in terms of introducing new programmes, working in new programmes, and I enjoyed myself tremendously. During that entire time period, I was a shop steward of the union and was President of the Local for a period of time. I was almost perpetually, from about 1972 to about 1981, a member of the negotiating team that negotiated with Treasury Board. Yet, I felt no difficulty in wearing those two hats, if indeed those are two hats. As I look over there I see the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wearing one of those white hats with the NAPE crest on it and it does seem a bit incongruous but it does remind me that you can wear those two hats.

I want to return to it afterwards, but the first strike that I ever got up against was the strike in Stephenville at the town council

that occurred in January of 1975. The Stephenville town council strike was an important one. At that time I was the Vice-President of the union and there were twelve employees in the bargaining unit. Inside workers was the phrase that was used to describe them. There were another twenty-five or thirty outside workers operating on graders, tractors and so on and labourers and these were in a different union. I think it was the operating engineers or something. Of those twelve, nine of them were women, three of them were men. I think two were the town cops and one was the tax collector. The others were women who worked in the office as secretaries, as receptionists, working on the computer, although back in 1975 I am not sure they had one at that time.

They went out on strike in January. As Vice-President it was my job to co-ordinate the strike. I found it quite difficult because we only had twelve people in the bargaining unit and we co-ordinated about five or six locations. We had one or two people standing at the town dump and one or two at the stadium and one or two at the city hall. But the strike was going and we were doing very well because they managed to keep the Public Works Depot from getting their heavy equipment out. As long as that happened, the snow was building up and pressure was increasing to settle the strike.

I remember about a week after the strike started, we were on the picket line and the police came. The reason I mention this, of course, is because we have also seen the same thing happen here. They came and they said, "We have an injunction from the town and

you must move away. If you do not step aside, you will be arrested and all the rest of the court proceedings will occur." At that time, I was not sure about what to do and I stepped aside, the equipment came out and they started to clear the roads. The crisis peaked and then was gone.

We had a meeting the next day. I sat down with the twelve people in the bargaining unit. This was a week after the strike had started. I said, "I do not know if we can continue on. We have lost our big leverage. I do not think we can do anything with the strike." At that point the women mostly, although the men went along with it, said to me, "We always knew we had to win the strike on our own merits, not on Public Works. We are going to fight it ourselves and we are going to stay here if it takes a month or two months or three months or six months because we know we are right. We are going to stand out there until we win." I do not want to elongate the story but the strike took six weeks to settle. We went to arbitration. There was a final settlement on it and they got virtually all that they were demanding at the bargaining table at the time.

The point I wanted to make with that is that when you put people on strike you change them. I think the government is going to have to recognize that the 5,000 employees that are out on their picket lines now are very quickly changing their basic attitude and their basic concept of what is fair and just. I want to return to that a bit more but that is a basic lesson, I think, that we have got to make to this government so that they will

understand what is going on.

The other problem they get is the longer the strike gets, the more bull-headed you get. That is the great danger in this particular dispute. If it is not settled, in my opinion, in the next couple of days, it may drag on for a couple of weeks, a month, two months, maybe six months. That is something that I think all of us who hold the best interest of the Province at heart do not particularly want to see.

The other problem we have is there are 5,000 people on strike. That elevates it from a labour dispute to almost a social movement. At this point, I am not sure if we had a strike that lasted three or four months whether we would ever put the pieces back together so they even resemble what we had before. In some instances, maybe we do not want to put them back the same way but we will see.

There has been a request from the government that the individuals on strike go back to work and then, after the illegal strike is over, they will be able to negotiate. The question is, do unions send their membership back to work before they have a collective agreement if they have been out on strike? The fact of the matter is they do not. The fact of the matter is they cannot.

If Fraser March or a thousand Fraser Marches were to go out to every picket line in this Province and tell the people on that picket line, "Go back, we are beaten, you have to go to work," I doubt if any more than a handful would go back. That is the situation that we are in today and it is the situation that the government must realize. When you talk of Fraser

March and he tells you, "I am sorry boys, we have to have some sort of settlement before we go back," he is not lying. His members would totally disown him. They would throw him in the harbour, as the expression goes, if he were to come and suggest something like that. I say to you that it is important that you realize that they cannot go back. That is just as solid a decision as when you say that you cannot negotiate because it is an illegal strike. They cannot go back until they have a collective agreement and that is our problem, that is the problem that, I think, we all have to address.

There is a way to get them back to work without a collective agreement but that means you will have to beat them. And I mean you will really have to beat them. It will not be done in a couple of weeks or a month. Maybe in two months time when the strike funds start to run out and so on you might have a chance, or three, four or five months. You might actually be able to send them back to work without a collective agreement but when you do that you will have destroyed the union utterly.

I know that it was only a joke that he was making, but Fraser on Saturday morning in the meeting with the Federation of Labour stood up and said, "we are getting quotes on the price of bricks because the NAPE office is made out of bricks and we will start selling those at the end if we have to continue to put money in our strike fund." Although it is somewhat hyperbole, he is not in error in saying that that is the degree of commitment this union is into. It is absolutely critical that the government realizes that

is what is going on. If that happens, I would argue to you that very little of the government would remain at that point either.

At the meeting that we had with the Federation of Labour on Saturday morning, there was the start of a crusade there, not only a crusade to raise money in order to finance the strike over a number of years but also a crusade in terms of spending speakers throughout the Province. It is an election campaign in which there is only one kind of a party and that is the Federation of Labour, the Coalition for Equality and other groups that are willing to support it. They will go and they will hammer in every single hall in this Province and I would suggest to a pretty enthusiastic crowd of not only NAPE strikers but of people like that social welfare recipient we saw on TV who said, "well, I had to wait a couple of hours for my welfare cheque but I did not mind because I support my welfare officers while they are out on strike." That campaign will do a lot to discredit this government. It is something that the government must consider at this point.

The point I am trying to make here is that the government will have to negotiate before the illegal strike is over. There is no other way around it. We can create fictions, we can create excuses, we can call it discussions, we can call it negotiations of a sort, which is the word that we used out there, we can call it whatever else you want, I do not care what you call it, but you have to find some way to negotiate a settlement before those groups will go back.

I would suggest to you that we

need a settlement now. We have to have it soon because in a strike of this size and this magnitude what is going to happen is we are going to start tearing apart the very delicate fabric that makes up our society. We are going to end up with brothers against brothers, sisters against sisters and friends against friends. You have seen on the picket lines some of the best behaved picket lines I have ever seen in my life but that may not continue next week or the week after because the degree of frustration may get worse and worse. We may see incidents on the picket line that none of us want to see, that that frustration might bring to the fore. I say to you that it is important that we find a solution soon.

Getting back to what I said before, I considered myself a good employee of the community college and I considered myself an extremely strong union member. I still consider myself a strong union member and committed, through the experiences that I have had, to a concept that when there are other people who are working for the same kinds of equality and working to prevent the same kinds of injustices, they must be supported. They must be supported no matter what the implications of supporting them will be. When your government employees come back to work, they will come back and be just as dedicated government employees as they have ever been but they will also be much stronger union members than they ever been and they will also have a much stronger commitment to social justice throughout the entire society than they have ever had before. You must do it now, you must do it quickly and we must cooperate in trying to get an end

to this strike so that there is some degree of equality and justice in our Province again.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, we have been here today since 3:00 p.m. We have heard the good news budget, which I intend to say a few words about, but it is too bad that the people of Newfoundland cannot see what is going on in this House tonight. We are here to discuss possibly one of the most serious and critical situations that has occurred in Newfoundland in its history. We have a public service union that has been forced into a strike by government. Yet, as we stood here and debated this, we in the Opposition, the members opposite have sat there with blank looks and have not uttered one word in defense of the policy that they have been espousing since this strike began.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, would you tell the clown from Carbonear (Mr. Peach) to be quiet or leave the House?

I say that it is a sin that this is not televised. I would like for the people of Newfoundland to be able to see what is going on here tonight and to see the total disdain that the Government of Newfoundland has for its workers and the way that they have sat there and not said one word in

defence of the policies. They have heard members of the Opposition get up and discuss the problems of Newfoundland and the problem of the workers. I wonder where they are, why have they not spoken up?

Why does the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) not stand up in his place and defend the policies of the government instead of sucking his thumb in the corner? Where is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard)? We have not seen the Minister of Labour in this House today. We do not know where he is negotiating. He is certainly not with the negotiating team because nobody showed up there today. I do not know if he is down South or not but the thing is I think he should be in his place in this House when debate of such a magnitude is going on about the labour force in Newfoundland. Why is not the Minister of Labour here? Where is the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) tonight? Why are they not defending their position? We sat here this afternoon and we listened to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) bring in his good news budget. We have people out on the picket line who are not too concerned with the budget and they are not too concerned with Interim Supply. They wanted to get a settlement to the strike. In the last four days since this House has been opened we have sat here and continually asked the Premier, the President of Treasury Board, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) what they plan to do about this strike. All we got from the Premier was notice that the negotiations were in such a delicate form that he was not going to answer any questions. Well, we found out how delicate

they were, Mr. Speaker. They were not even started. That is how delicate they were. NAPE have tried all week to get negotiations started. They sat down last night and then negotiations broke off this morning with the idea they were going to start again later in the day. NAPE showed up. Where was the government? They were not there, Mr. Speaker. This is the sort of thing that we are faced with.

We have 5,000 Newfoundlanders who were forced into a strike situation because of the arrogance and the contempt and disdain that members opposite have held for the labour force. They sit there with blank looks on their faces and total disdain for the labour force. We have heard members tonight, as they spoke in this debate, talk about parity. They realize the disgrace it is that people in different departments of government with the same employer do the same job but have a \$3,000 difference in salary. Why did this occur? Well, we all know that down through the years we have heard this government preach restraint and wage freezes, all the sort of things that the Tories are good at saying. The Public Service had a wage freeze imposed on them. When they were to come out of it, everything was supposed to be settled and levelled off so that everyone got a fair deal.

Every time that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brings in a budget, he talked about restraint, but this one was the good news budget. I am going to get into that a little later, what the good news was. I do not know how he got the good news name. It seems to me to be the same old restraint. When we hear restraint from members opposite,

it is for the employees, it is certainly not for the Premier or his ministers who like to go globe-trotting to China. The President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) had a march to Korea. That was overshadowed, of course, by the Premier going to China with his entourage and St. John's Tory hacks and that that he took along on his ride at the taxpayers' expense no doubt, his bagmen that he took along for a ride. This is the sort of thing that we see.

There was very little restraint when I asked the Premier on Friday would he table the minute for Treasury Board, Minute 616, showing \$785,600 that was spent on redecorating his office.

MR. TULK:

Did he do it?

MR. GILBERT:

No, it has not been done. So this is the restraint and the things that we hear about. We have a very serious problem in Newfoundland and yet we hear restraint practiced on one hand and then we hear of the Premier spending \$800,000 to redecorate his office. We do not even know if that is the true figure because there is possibly another \$150,000 to decorate his inner throne room that we have not even got an answer to. We asked the question and we do not know if there is another \$150,000 spent there.

MR. TULK:

We know one thing though, he is the most expensive Premier in Canadian history.

MR. GILBERT:

That is right. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) when the people of NAPE were forced into a strike situation,

the first thing he did was get an injunction. Immediately after he got the injunction, he came out and made an announcement that if they were not back to work the next day, he was going to impose a thirty day suspension.

So he then had to enforce his injunction and they arrested, in a haphazard manner, 126 people and then he realized that there was more support there than they thought there was. He realized the people of Newfoundland were behind this and he had to haul in his horns. So now we find that he does not know what to do about that.

People who are out on that line were told "if you come back, you are going to be suspended for thirty days." We sometimes wonder why.

These people were out and then they were issued an ultimatum: "Be back by 12:00 o'clock noon the next day or you are going to be suspended."

I have talked to the members of the General Service as I have gone back and forth this last week. Those people are not out there because they want to be out there. They are out there because they were forced out there. They want to go back to work and then they were told that they were going to be suspended for thirty days when they went out there. It does not seem to be the action of an employer that is trying to bargain in good faith when you have a situation where immediately after people go on strike, instead of wanting to sit down and negotiate, they immediately say "if you do not come back, you are going to be suspended for thirty days."

Obviously, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) in his other career as a Deputy Minister of Labour had much experience in the settling of strikes. I am sure that in his heart and maybe in his mind, if we knew where he was, if he was here, he would like to tell us about this. Maybe he would like to speak and defend what he has done in the last week. I think it would be only fair for the minister if he was here to defend his policy. When he was the Deputy Minister of Labour he had a good name. He was considered to be fair to labour. What has happened to him all of a sudden? We find that he did not even have the energy to be in the House today when this very crucial debate is going on concerning the General Service and MOS strike. We have not seen the minister. That seems strange.

We have suggested that there are many ways that this strike could be settled, and we wonder, with the reluctance of the Premier to answer the questions that we put to him in question period, why it was that the Premier did not want to answer the questions about the strike and why he did not want to say that he would take some of the suggestions that were offered to him from members of the Opposition? We asked him time and time again would he consider dropping the charges against the workers that were arrested? We asked him would he consider dropping the thirty day suspension that was imposed rather arbitrarily on the workers? Then we asked him if he would sit down with those people after that was done? Would he sit down and negotiate a settlement? That is the whole crux of this problem.

There has not been any effort by

the employer to negotiate a settlement, and this seems to me to be the type of negotiation that our Premier is now become famous for: might is right. We heard the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) yesterday say, "if you do not do it our way, boys, we are going to force it on you."

I think they take the same attitude towards the Opposition as they take towards their employees. We have asked him, "do you really consider that the people who are out on strike deserve a thirty day suspension? Do you think this is fair?" We wondered when we heard this good news Budget today if the thirty day suspensions were imposed on those workers out there so that the good news that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was talking about would be to reduce the deficit on the backs of the people who were on that picket line out there? These are the things that cross our minds when we see this attitude from those people. Why would they do such a thing?

We wonder if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), with the 5,000 workers that are out there at an average of \$1,200 a month, really just wants \$6 million towards reducing his deficit. I am sure that has crossed his mind because otherwise they would have done something and we would have some movement on the part of the employer to do something about settling this strike.

We have heard the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) say that he was not saying anything because the negotiations were in such a delicate stage. We have asked questions about Bill 59 and we have heard all sorts of reasons

for it. We have suggested that one of the easiest ways to get the people back to work again is to do away with Bill 59. At one time we thought that the now Minister of Labour, when he was the deputy minister and helped draft this bill, was doing it at the word of his masters but now, with the attitude that he has taken since this House has been opened, we wonder if it was his idea all the time that this bill was put into force. Was it some sort of a scheme that he had in his mind to make sure that this was going to be there to take away the bargaining rights of the people in the public service?

It is strange to me, Mr. Speaker, because we heard today that these negotiations were going on and progress was expected and all of that but, immediately when the word came down this evening that the House was going to be closed, we heard that the employers did not show up at the negotiating table. The members of NAPE were there but the government was not there. I wonder was it because they knew the House was closing and the heat was off. Everybody knows it was not the Interim Supply Bill that is causing this House to close right now. This House is closing because members opposite want it closed.

We see now the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) and the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power). The people of Newfoundland should be here to see the interest that they have in the labour movement in Newfoundland. Everybody knows why they wanted the House to be closed so fast, so that the heat would be off for a little while. There would not be the press every day and we would not be able to raise the issues in

the House. They could go away on their holidays or go wherever they were going.

Interim Supply was a sham that they used to once more try to hoodwink the people of Newfoundland. As soon as they knew that this could not be discussed in the House of Assembly, in this Chamber, there was no more negotiation and no more attempts to negotiate. Their idea was to shut down the House today even though, as we pointed out to them in debate yesterday, there is no need of shutting the House today, you can bring in your budget today if you want to today, we have tomorrow, we have Thursday, we have Monday and everybody here is prepared to stay and debate this issue until at least there is a settlement or at least people are sitting down and talking to each other again. That is what I think we should do.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is the people of Newfoundland know why members opposite are in such a hurry to close this House today. Mr. Speaker, they wanted to get out of there and run. Hoist your sails and run was the deal they wanted to do today to get out of here so they would not have to face the people and would not have to sit down and negotiate a deal.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland will remember the attitude that was put forward by members opposite. I am sure that the time will come when they will pay for the crass way in which they handled this labour situation right now and the way they sit there now. It is alright for the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) to smile. At least he is showing some emotion and that is better than the rest of them over there.

Mr. Speaker, it is nice to know that the member opposite is upset today because he never got to see his favourite programme, Sesame Street. That is his intellectual movement for the day. Now I happen to have a seven-year-old grandson and he outgrew that three years ago, Mr. Speaker. So I am sorry but tomorrow you will be able to go and watch it and get your intellectual stimulation then.

We saw another example in this House today, Mr. Speaker, of total arrogance when we heard the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) come in and present a budget that he called the good news budget. I do not know who was going to reap the good news from it, Mr. Speaker. It surely was not the people who have got to buy building supplies this year. It is not the people who have to buy insurance this year. We heard a thumping of desks when it was announced there would be no tax go on beer but we never heard anything when there was a taxation announced on loose tobacco because, I would submit, that maybe a lot of the people who drink beer also use loose tobacco. So if you did not get them going, you got them coming.

There was an increase in motor vehicle registration fees and all the rest of the fees. It is not good news for people. So, in other words, I do not think this budget is good news for anyone in Newfoundland,. I fail to see how it is good news for anyone in Newfoundland. Here we are seeing a budget that has increased fees and nickled and dimed Newfoundlanders to death again. Maybe this is the other way that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) wants to decrease his deficit, on the backs of the poor

hard-working Newfoundlanders, not his rich buddies. There is nothing in that budget that is going to hurt the people who go on the trips with the Premier and his friends. There are no taxes in there that are going to hurt them. But it is going to hurt the poor ordinary Newfoundland and the same people who are involved in the strike situation.

It is not good news for the people of the South Coast when you talk about health care. There is not a senior citizens home from Grand Bank to Port aux Basques. There are twenty-six of them in Newfoundland, nineteen of them East of Gander and not one on the South Coast. So the health care on the South Coast is not good news when you talk about health care on the South Coast in your district. Maybe the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) would like to speak on that a little later on.

It is not good news for the transportation in the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, around Burgeo in particular. Mr. Speaker, there has not been any money spent on the Burgeo highway since the last federal - provincial agreement was signed on secondary roads five years ago with the previous Liberal government. That was the last time there was any money spent on the Burgeo highway. We have heard of the situation in Burgeo. There have been briefs presented to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), and the MP for the district (Mr. Price).

I had an interesting experience on the weekend on my way to Burgeo. I hired a taxi to get me down to Burgeo and the taxi driver was a good friend of the Premier's, he told me, he supports him and gives

donations at the time of elections, as a matter of fact, he gives free drives.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who is he?

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Brennan from Service Taxi in Stephenville. He told me to be sure and tell the Premier, because going down to Burgeo over that road he busted the base pan in his car and he had to be towed into Burgeo. He said be sure and tell Brian about that because I am a good supporter of his. I give him a contribution during every election when I drive people around, and maybe he will do something about it. I sympathize with Mr. Brennan, but more seriously, I sympathize with the people who live in Burgeo.

The member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) talks about the money that went into the Burgeo fish plant. What would he like to do? Take the money from the Burgeo fish plant and close the plant and let another town starve? Is that your idea? Is that what you would like to do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

That is what you would like to see, is it?

If the Provincial Government has to put money in the Burgeo fish plant, maybe one of the reasons why they have to put it in is that it cost the Burgeo fish plant another \$150,000 a year to transport their fish over that road, because the road is not fit to transport fish. The truckers who go down have put an added surcharge on the transportation of

fish out of that area.

The other thing that they talk about as a matter of concern to the people who live in Burgeo is the fact that that road is not safe to drive over. Then the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) can sit there and laugh. Maybe he should talk about the CN Marine Service and the transportation budget that is on that coast. Maybe the people in Grand Bruit or LaPoile and those places would like to hear a few words on the CN transportation that has been cut down over the last seven years. They were getting better service seven years ago than they are now. Maybe the member for LaPoile would like to stand in his place and say what he is going to do. Is he going to ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to make some overtures to his friends in Ottawa to improve the CN Marine Service on the South Coast?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible.)

MR. GILBERT:

The only reason why they have service on the coast this Winter, the bit they got, and it is a sin - if I were the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), I would not want that published. He said that he was responsible for the service on the South Coast. That is enough to ensure that you will never be elected again, I can assure you right now, if you are going to take any credit for the CN Marine Service on the South Coast, stand up in your place and take it - one trip a week!

Two or three years ago the service was 100 per cent better than it is right now. At least they were getting two trips a week in the Wintertime. Right now, you stand

there and say you are taking credit for it. Good! I will circulate that on your behalf. You know that is one of the best things I have heard you say in a long time. To say that you are responsible for the CN Marine Service on the South Coast, that should be admission enough that we should not even have to run anyone down there in the next election, just send out a fellow's picture and he will be elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

As a matter of fact, in LaPoile tonight they are electing a Liberal Association. If I were you, I would start shivering after making a statement like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

My was the only Liberal district the Liberals lost in the last election.

MR. GILBERT:

We have no worries about what we will do with it the next time.

MR. TULK:

You are living in the past, my son, look to the future.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I can vouch that the Tories lost a few. We have no worries about that. Quit while you behind, because you are only going further behind.

Mr. Speaker, if we really have to get down to the South Coast of Newfoundland, I would ask the hon. member to take a trip along the coast and ask the people how happy they are with the CN Marine

Service.

MR. BARRY:

And with the Tory Administration in Ottawa.

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, the Tory Administration in Ottawa and the bungling that has taken place. Ask the people of Francois and McCallum how happy they are with the CN Marine Service.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we have talked about this very serious situation of a strike in the Public Service. Members opposite, the three of them who are there now, have not been able to make an intelligent comment all night. They have not said one word in defence of the policy that the Premier was supposed to be espousing all week. He did not have one so maybe that is why they did not say a word, they did not have a policy. Not one word has any member over there uttered in this debate.

MR. TULK:

Notice how important the strike is to them, there are only three of them in the House.

MR. MITCHELL:

We want the strike over with.

MR. GILBERT:

You want it over with but what are you doing about it? Why do you not get out and do something about it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

Listen, my friend, I have no problem with that. That person is the one Tory left alive in Newfoundland that wrote that or

some misguided person who should be in an insane asylum, perhaps sponsored by the member or the hon. minister there. You may have wrote that. You have the intelligence for that. As a matter of fact, I think you have, with that bovine look, the intelligence for that letter. As a matter of fact, I bet you graduated from Sesame Street and that makes you qualified to write that letter. You are the only fellow over there who could do it as the Sesame Street graduate.

MR. BARRY:

Was it written in block letters?

MR. GILBERT:

It would have to be for him to be able to write it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask members opposite to go and see if they can find their Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), find the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) and ask them to please go and try to sit down and negotiate a deal so that we can get those people back to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few words on this very important debate because today, I think, we are again being treated to the spectacle of a government that is only too anxious to back away from its responsibilities, appearing to be more interested in running off, keeping their date with their travel bureau to get down South,

without any regard whatever for the misery and the suffering that is being inflicted on 5,000 fellow Newfoundlanders who are now forced to stand out in the rain, snow and sleet and suffer the indignities of being arrested, carted off to jail, and treated like criminals, all because Mr. Speaker, they want the chance to make a decent living.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Parity!

MR. W. CARTER:

That is the only crime they have committed, that is their crime. The great crime against this Province is that you have people who want parity.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rather sad spectacle that tonight we saw the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) standing in his place trying to manipulate the House into an all night sitting. I can tell you now, Mr. Speaker, and there are people here I am sure, and I know that my friend and former colleague in the Cabinet will attest to this, the same gentleman who tonight stood in his place and tried to get this House to remain open all night by finagling this and that was the very person who opposed night sittings when the Peckford administration assumed power in 1979. That man was absolutely opposed to night sittings. Maybe he had business in his law office, I do not know, but he absolutely opposed the idea of night sittings. Now he is quite willing to have the House sit all night rather than come back tomorrow morning, like reasonable people, have the House open and let us get on with this debate. If we have to we can debate the question of supply and hopefully we can find

some resolution to that problem and to the problem now facing at least 5,000 fellow Newfoundlanders who are now on strike.

The actions of this government in my view is appalling, despicable and I mean that very sincerely.

Tonight, for example, this debate has now been going on since about four o'clock this afternoon with a break for dinner. There has not been one member from the other side utter one word on his feet. Mind you they will sit back like the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and he will make his little snide remarks and then run out behind the curtains. Then we will see the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) do likewise and a few others but, they have not stood on their feet to say one word, not one syllable, either for or against what we are debating tonight. Obviously, they are too anxious to get the House closed and to get in their Panama shirts and their blue jeans and to meet their deadline with their travel agents in order to avail of the seat sales that, I am sure, most of them took advantage of -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Globe travel.

MR. W. CARTER:
Globe travel, yes, that most of them, I am sure, took advantage of twenty-one days ago.

MR. TOBIN:
You would never have been elected in St. John's West if it was not for myself, Charlie Power and Loyola Hearn.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I have made one resolve. I have been in this House now for a while and I have

seen people come and go. I have seen great men and I have seen small men elected and some stayed and some have passed on into oblivion. There is one resolve I have made and I hope tonight to be able to stick with it, that I am not going to dignify the young gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) by trying to react to some of the nonsense that he gets on with. I am sorry to say that because, as the young gentleman knows, I pretty well taught him what he knows certainly about the decent side of politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
I take no credit, by the way, in fact I am a little embarrassed, and I am being quite frank, by the hon. member's behavior in this House. It is not becoming. Let me tell him now, I think he is a young man with a lot of future, a good future, comes from a good family in Trepassey. His father and his mother were good friends of mine and still are, I hope. But he is not going to get very far conducting himself the way he is going because at times he appears to be absolutely irresponsible, making statements that are false and untrue, that in some cases and in many cases are very, very damaging. He says things that are better left unsaid in an area where a gentleman's rules are still supposed to prevail.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
So my advice to my child protege, the young man that I elevated from a runner to an agent to a poll captain, you know, the promotions

were fast and furious at that time because I did recognize some potential there, is to cool it. He is still young enough to be able to sit and wait and eventually some of the other members will fade off the scene. The government will change no doubt before he gets the chance to serve in the Cabinet. That is obvious and inevitable. But eventually they will come back, they always do. I do not think that our leader would want to be Premier for any longer than, say, fifteen years. The young gentleman will still only be probably under fifty by that time. So, you know, he will have his chance.

MR. TOBIN:
I remember your (Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
That is a tongue-twister.

MR. TULK:
Sit back now and be a man. Be a gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I apologize -

MR. TOBIN:
I remember when Roger Simmons defeated you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for taking up five minutes

of the House's time on such a trivial matter but I suppose it had to be said.

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:
There are things that have to be said.

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

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

MR. BARRY:
Not only is the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) grossly abusing the rules of the House but he is also speaking from another member's seat which is, of course, clearly against the rules. I would ask that Your Honour control the young gentleman.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of detail to what the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) had to say and I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of what the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) had to say was probably true. I guess I was involved in his campaign. I did contribute a lot to the success that the hon. gentleman had in politics as well as my colleagues from Ferryland (Mr. Power) and St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn). Mr. Speaker, I was involved in his campaign when he

was defeated. I was involved in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) campaign when he was defeated.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
You are embarrassed and you are making a fool of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The point of order is well taken. I ask the hon. member to be quiet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, one thing you must learn in politics and you must learn it early in the game is that you must be able to take it as well as give it. I am afraid that the young gentleman tonight is telling the House, he is telling all and sundry that he can sit in his seat and he can throw slurs and innuendos and slime across here but he cannot take it. He cannot take the truth. Mr. Speaker, I think there are more important matters tonight to be discussed than the behaviour of the young gentleman.

MR. TOBIN:
Tell us what you called Roger Simmons.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I ask you again to keep him quiet.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have already called the hon.

member to order and I ask him to restrain himself now.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, tonight we are debating a very important point and I get back to what I said a moment ago. It is rather unfortunate I think that we only have five members of the government sitting in the House not even taking part in this debate, just sitting. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that speaks for itself and I do not think I need to elaborate or spend any more time talking about that aspect of it. Obviously, they have no interest in what is happening. They are here because we forced them to be here. They are here because Your Honour saw the justice in what we were trying to do and allowed the House tonight to remain open to discuss this very important point.

It is obvious that the government side is more interested, especially the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), in playing little games, little tricks, getting up on points of order and at the same time riding roughshod over thousands of underpaid, underprivileged and in some cases poor Newfoundlanders.

We saw the other night the spectacle on television of a gentleman who is a worker for the government, I think he said he works in the mail department or mail room, a fellow with a family. He admitted publicly, and it must have been some embarrassment - nobody likes to go on television in front of maybe 25,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 Newfoundlanders and bear your soul

and plead poverty and admit that you have not got an income sufficiently large to be able to properly maintain your family. That is not an easy thing to do and for that reason I admire that chap and if I were his employer, if I were his superior, I would seriously consider promoting that chap because he must have a lot of courage and certainly the kind of courage that should be recognized, to get on television in front of all and sundry admit that he is not able to properly care for his family and that he has had to swallow his pride and go and live with his parents because the government was not paying him enough to be able to rent even a very inexpensive apartment. That I believe, Mr. Speaker, is a very serious indictment against this government and one that they should not be allowed to just walk away from and ignore.

I saw tonight in the gallery, in fact I saw him on television last night, one of the union leaders. I forget his name. The name is not important.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tom Hanlon.

MR. W. CARTER:
Tom Hanlon was sitting in the gallery tonight. I must say I felt for the man, a chap who came on television last night and gave an account of his ten days behind bars. He said publicly that it was the first time he had ever been arrested, the first time ever he served time in jail, a man, I suppose, in his last thirties, mid forties, probably a family man who has got to go through life now, and his family must also bear the burden and the certain amount of shame that goes with it, I suppose, of being in jail. For

what? Because he dared represent the people who he is supposed to represent on the picket lines.

I can tell you now, Mr. Speaker, I have never been arrested in my life. I have done nothing more serious than maybe go through a stop sign. I can tell you now that if I were that gentleman I would do the very same thing and I have as much respect for the law as any person in this House tonight. That was my upbringing, to respect the law and respect your elders and others in authority. But I will tell you now, I would have no compunction whatever about doing what that gentleman did. I would not appreciate it and maybe I would not have the courage to stay ten days locked up.

Sometimes laws have to be broken. If laws are bad and if government is insensitive to the inequities of those laws, then, Mr. Speaker, it might well be that the only alternative is to defy the law. It is a hard thing to say and maybe I should not say it but I am being truthful. I do not blame these people one iota, one bit.

In fact, my twenty-two year old daughter is on the picket lines and she has been on the picket lines since the strike started. That young lady has never even gotten a parking ticket in her life.

MR. MARSHALL:
She is lucky to have a job.

MR. DECKER:
Listen to the attitude!

MR. W. CARTER:
Lucky to have a job!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I will not even dignify that comment by even referring to it. I am saying that young women like my daughter are now on the picket lines being threatened with arrest. For what? Because they dare stand up for what they believe in, the very simple question of getting parity.

I wonder how would the ministers opposite, for example, enjoy it if there were different pay scales in Cabinet? Just say the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) was earning, say, \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year and maybe the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) earned what he is worth, say, about \$10,000 or \$5,000 a year, how would that go down do you think, Mr. Speaker, if that kind of parity existed in the Cabinet or in the House of Assembly itself? I certainly do not think it would be accepted and I think, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be tolerated and that these members would be the very first to speak out against it.

MR. BUTT:

Walter we are going to do a poll on you tomorrow and see (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite can laugh all they like. They can joke and they can jeer and they can make fun. But I will tell you now, any person in public life in this Province who can come through that picket line on days like

today and yesterday and other days and see people there, decent, God-fearing, honest people with families standing up with rubber clothes on, oil skins, being pelted with rain and with sleet and with snow, standing on the picket line for eight hours, carrying a placard, any member who can sit and laugh and jeer and make fun and take that lightly, in my view, does not deserve to be in this House. In fact, he is not worthy of the trust that is being imposed on him by the people who put him here.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some suggestion that there is a tug-of-war going on between the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) and the Premier. I am inclined to believe that story is true. I think the Treasury Board President is getting a sort of inner satisfaction out of what is going on and, conversely, I would suggest to you that it might well be that the Premier is getting some little inner satisfaction out of probably what he perceives to be happening to his Treasury Board President. There is a tug-of-war. If the Treasury Board President and the Premier want to eat themselves let them do it, but not at the expense of the working people in this Province, especially the members of NAPE who are now fighting for their very survival.

The government of this Province, Mr. Speaker, must realize once and for all that people are not going to be pushed around. This is not the 1930s and it is not the 1920s, it is an age when people are going to fight, in fact demand their rights, and that is what we are seeing today in this Province. The injunction has been, in my view, very unfairly executed, we

saw the spectacle on television, and this went right across Canada, of people being herded.

I must say I have nothing but respect for the law enforcement officers in our city. I think we have a fine, decent bunch of men. I have always had a great deal of admiration for the Newfoundland Constabulary. They are a bunch of, by and large, young Newfoundlanders, dedicated, committed to their work and to their Province. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I got very little pride, I got very little satisfaction out of seeing the way that they were being manipulated, by the Attorney General (Ms. Verge), maybe, and others, into marching on these strikers as if they were in Hungary and Poland. It reminded me of the riot scenes that we have seen on television coming out of Hungary and other Communist Warsaw Pact Countries, policemen just rushing up - and I do not blame the policemen, obviously they were told to do it - taking people by the arm as if they were going to resist arrest.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. the gentleman for Twillingate can tell me if he finally shook hands with Roger Simmons?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, there is no need for that kind of thing. That is nonsense. That is below the dignity of this House I think. I think if the hon. member persists in that kind of behavior, Your Honour would be doing the House, and the whole process a favour by suspending him for a while. He has got to be taught a lesson and I think the sooner the better.

MR. TOBIN:
I know the truth. I know the story.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would ask hon. members on both sides to restrain themselves.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I have these few words of wisdom to impart to the young gentleman opposite. I would suggest to him that he be very, very cautious, because people who live in glass houses should not throw stones and I am afraid that he is starting to live dangerously in that regard. So my advice is do not push your luck.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen in this House the kind of arrogance and selfishness of uncaring, dictatorial attitude on the part of gentlemen opposite. We have seen the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) sitting back smirking and doing his best to get the House closed and to get on with

his business or whatever happens. We saw the Minister of Justice last week, I think on Wednesday, getting up in reply to a question, wringing her hands and could not explain, for example, what the contents of the injunction were and what sector or what segment of the work force it covered. What are we witnessing? The chief law officer of the Crown in the Province was not able to properly explain an injunction that was issued by her office and, I presume, should have been vetted by her before it was ever allowed to be served. Yet the young lady, the hon. member, could not properly explain what it was all about.

Tonight, for example, Mr. Speaker, where is the Minister of Labour? We saw the Treasury Board President just make an appearance in the door. He did not come in and take his seat but I presume he is in the House somewhere. Where is the Minister of Labour tonight? Surely he should be here having some input into this very important debate, telling us what the status of negotiations are. It is not enough to hide behind the so-called secrecy of the negotiating room. Surely this House is entitled to know what is going on. Are they now meeting with the NAPE executive? What is the status of negotiations? What are the chances of a settlement in the near future? These are answers I think, we are entitled to have. This government has developed, obviously, a bunker mentality, a last days type mentality. You can see it. In fact, the day that the injunction was being served, they announced at the same time, and issued a Cabinet directive to the effect that there would be a car allowance paid to senior

officials. Of course, the public got up against it and I think they were wise enough to sense that it was the wrong kind of thing to do. The Throne Speech today announced that they were withdrawing that car allowance to senior staff. But, Mr. Speaker, be that as it may, the fact that they have now withdrawn does not excuse them for what they did, because it was clearly their intention to find some way to get an extra \$4,000 or \$5,000 into the pockets of certain people, including certain members of this House and certain key officials in the Premier's Office. Is it any wonder that the people of this Province are getting turned off, that the working class of this Province are just about fed up with the shenanigans going on with the present government? And I think the time is coming in the not too distant future when they are going to live to regret it, and I think that is becoming very, very obvious now, despite the Premier's mostly prefabricated comments about certain polls that are being done and certain glowing reports of support for his party. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the opposite is true and that if a poll were conducted today, a properly conducted poll, this government would be in very, very serious trouble. I think they know it, we know it and the people of Newfoundland know it. The sad part about all of this is that there is no election in the offing. That is the sad part about it all.

Mr. Speaker, I had occasion last week to talk to a highly placed official of the PC Party, a man I had known for years. I met him in the Evening Telegram office, as a matter of fact - he does not work there, but he was there

conducting some kind of business - and he said, "Look, if Peckford went to the people now, I do not think he would get six seats - ten seats at the most." That was coming from a gentleman who has been a long-time supporter of this government and of this Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly suggest to this government that they get off their high horse, come down to earth and face up to some very, very serious problems that are now facing this Province. In fact, problems, Mr. Speaker, that might very well escalate into a major confrontation that could, as my friend and colleague here, the Leader of the NDP Party said, very well threaten the whole social fabric of this Province. Because I do not think the union people, labour, is fooling, I think they are dead serious. I have heard my young daughter who is one of the strikers, repeat what I am sure she is hearing others say, that we are never going to give up, we are going to hang in there, we are going to fight and we are going to batten her down supposing it takes a month. I know these are probably not her thoughts, but she is repeating what she is hearing on the picket lines. And, believe me, if that happens, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we could be in for some very, very rough times over the next few months. In fact, like I said, it could very well threaten the whole social and economic well-being of this Province, so I think the government would be well advised to stop fooling around. The time has long passed when the Premier can come in here and in his cavalier attitude refuse to answer questions and hide by saying that to comment now might threaten negotiations.

Nonsense!

Nonsense! The Premier must get off his high horse and come down to reality and do something about it. The future of our Province could very well depend on his actions and the actions of his colleagues in government over the next few days or few hours.

I think that the suspension that is being so unfairly imposed on these workers should be lifted. It is an interesting point, by the way, that the government under Bill 59 is anxious to designate certain essential workers, I think roughly 40 per cent of the people working in that sector have been so designated, but despite their importance, despite the fact that they cannot be done, without not even to go on strike, the Treasury Board President threatens to suspend these very same people for thirty days after they offer to go back to work. Now there is an inconsistency there that I think somebody should explain.

I believe that the threat of suspensions must be lifted, and I believe that the government must remove other conditions that they are inclined to attach to negotiations. I believe that they must undertake immediately to ensure that an attempt, and a very serious attempt will be made to ensure parity amongst public servants, and I believe that they must undertake to abolish Bill 59. That Bill might have been brought in with all good intentions but, Mr. Speaker, but it is clearly obvious now that it is a bad piece of legislation, it is bad law, and no law is probably better than bad law, but that one should be abolished. I am not suggesting that some effort should not be made by the union and government to designate certain essential workers, but if you do that you

must offer to be fair to them, to be extremely fair to them. I think that there are people who should be so classed, but again I repeat that if you are going to deny a person the right to strike then you must ensure that person the fairness and the equity that goes with it. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that the government should immediately undertake to instruct the Supreme Court that the charges that have been laid against a hundred or more people will be dropped, because it is unfair. The Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) even refused to enlighten the House as to just how wide-ranging that injunction was.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. W. CARTER:
Do I have leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY:
What? No leave?

MR. TOBIN:
No leave, no nothing.

MR. W. CARTER:
I have no leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:
No leave.

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

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

MR. TULK:
We have just heard one of the best

speeches that this Legislature ever heard. We have just heard the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) give the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) one of the best pieces of advice that has ever been given to anybody in this Legislature, and yet that hon. gentleman was the very person who refused the member for Twillingate leave. I would ask the member for Burin-Placentia West to reconsider.

MR. TOBIN:
Not a second.

MR. TULK:
Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. FUREY::
A point of order?

MR. TOBIN:
No, Mr. Speaker, this is no point of order, but I would like to enter into debate for a few short seconds, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
In the past few minutes, Mr. Speaker, and during the evening session we have listened to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in particular making accusations across this House that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is not going to seek re-election. Mr. Speaker, that is wishful thinking and I

understand that it is some sort of system that has been set up, organized by the Leader of the Opposition Mr. Speaker, a man who has lost some major customers, a man who last year got in this House and said, 'I am not associated with a law firm, I have nothing to do with a law firm.' A few days ago he came in and he said, 'My secretary called me regarding my law firm.' That is what we have heard from the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). The fact of the matter is that the Leader of the Opposition is, Mr. Speaker, soliciting from other law firms in this Province, I would suggest, some very firm business. Unfortunately for him, Mr. Speaker, some of the people who are coming to this Province know the reputation of the member who is now Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I can understand that the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has been indulging in a little entertainment and relaxation out in the common room, but I will ask the member for Burin-Placentia West to keep something in mind. I would ask the member to step outside the House and repeat any statement that he makes in this House the House so that it can be dealt with in the appropriate fashion, Mr. Speaker. Now the appropriate fashion for the member for Burin-Placentia West would normally be to squash it underfoot, that would normally be the appropriate approach to take, but I ask the member for Burin-Placentia West and I ask the

Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to recognize that this can be carried too far. Let the member proceed on that basis.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will respond to that point of order. I do not know if the hon. gentleman was conveying a threat across the House, but I hope he was not. The hon. gentleman has gotten up and made a few statements and he is entitled to make statements with respect to his impression with respect to events. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman's skin is a little bit too thin or what the hon. gentleman's problem is, but the fact of the matter is that the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West was making a speech and he is entitled to continue it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I am ruling on the point of order now.

I have heard enough on that point of order. There is no point of order, just a difference of opinion between two hon gentlemen.

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo on a

point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader has just made a statement in this House that my hon. friend for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was perhaps throwing threats across the House. I want to advise him that that is not what the member for Mount Scio was doing at all. The Leader of the Opposition was not doing that. He was just giving the member for Burin-Placentia (Mr. Tobin) another piece of good advice, that you cannot impugn motives to a member of this House and that is what the hon. gentleman for Burin-Placentia West was doing. We saw the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) give him advice and that is exactly what the member for Mount Scio was doing as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It appears to the Chair that the hon. member is getting up on exactly the point of order that I have already ruled on. It did not appear to me to be another point of order.

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is clear, Mr. Speaker. The Hansard will record that the Leader of the Opposition stood in this House last year and said, 'I am not associated with a law firm' and yet, Mr. Speaker, the other day he got up in this House and said, his secretary called him regarding telephone calls to his law firm. Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the

Opposition wants me to apologize or to withdraw what I said regarding that, if that is what it takes, Mr. Speaker, I will do it.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this has to be clarified. I will challenge the hon. member to put his seat on the line on this basis. I referred to my law firm because my name is on that firm. I did not refer to my secretary. I do not have a secretary at that law firm. I referred to a secretary at the law firm, Mr. Speaker. Now let the member stand in his place and if he is going to make a statement with respect to something that is contained in Hansard, it is easily established what was said in Hansard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is we have listened with utmost boredom to the speeches of all of the hon. members there opposite. We have a process now where there is going to be adjournment of the House as sure as day follows night, when we have exhausted the boredom of the hon. gentlemen there opposite. The hon. member

gets up and makes a few remarks, just a few remarks, and there are statements made that I can only interpret, and I hope it is not so, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition being rather threatening. I do not know whether he means he wants him to come outside the House so that he can engage him in a legal battle or whether the hon. gentleman wants him to come outside the House and engage him in fisticuffs. I do not know which it is but either is equally sublimely ridiculous. The hon. gentleman has a very, very thin skin. The government of this Province can sit down and listen to the insults of the heirs apparent and the people who have long since gone over to the Liberal Opposition purely and simply because they could not get the leadership over here, but because the member for Burin - Placentia West made a certain comment with respect to one of the hon. members who could not stand another hon. member, because he makes certain innuendos with respect to the Leader of of the Opposition with respect to statements that he made before, he is threatened.

Now I would like to establish, Mr. Speaker, is the Leader of the Opposition threatening the member for Burin - Placentia West with fisticuffs or is he threatening him to a legal battle? I would think, Mr. Speaker, in either case that the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West would win and win handily.

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, the Leader of the Opposition was very clear in his statement. He put it forward very logically, very clearly. I would ask that the hon. the House Leader control that latent streak of grease which is emerging from him.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

I call on the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, eyeball to eyeball with the Leader of the Opposition, that if I said anything tonight that is not included in Hansard, then I have no difficulty, Mr. Speaker, whatsoever in with drawing. Mr. Speaker, I still submit that the Leader of the Opposition did refer to 'my law firm' and 'my secretary.' But in case that he did not, Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in withdrawing that if it is not the facts, no difficulty whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Leader of the Opposition has been all day today suggesting that the member for St. John's East will not be running again. Mr. Speaker, that is a pile of propaganda that is originating from the Leader of the Opposition's office, wishful thinking, Mr. Speaker, the hopes of the Leader of the Opposition and other Liberal people in St. John's. But I say to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that the member for St. John's East will have his seat in this House of Assembly long after the

Leader of the Opposition and many members opposite have excited this hon. House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) tonight, and I must say some of what the hon. member for Twillingate said was true in that he did involve me in politics a number of years ago. Mr. Speaker, I was the poll captain for the member for Twillingate when he ran in St. John's West. As a matter of fact, I believe, Mr. Speaker, in the last federal election that I lived in Trepassey - I probably left Trepassey while he was still a member - but the last I probably organized Trepassey for him.

Mr. Speaker, myself and the hon. the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) and the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), while we did not have a whole lot to work with, Mr. Speaker, and while we did not have a whole lot of substance to promote to the people of the district of St. John's West, we were successful, Mr. Speaker, in having the hon. gentleman elected. While the substance was not there, while there was not a whole lot to work with and not a whole lot to sell to the people, not a great record, Mr. Speaker, to go out to the people and promote, we were successful as a team. It was a team effort. I think that is what the hon. member for Twillingate was trying to address tonight, that it was through a team effort that we were successful in St. John's West.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please! A point of order,

the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman is -

MR. POWER:

You have raised four points of order and we did not raise one point of order of which you guys talked.

MR. BARRY:

You have not debated either. You have not opened your mouth.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would be quiet I would tell him why there were no reasons to raise points of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is debating the previous question, and the previous question is for whether this House should or should not adjourn. And it is obvious as to why it should not adjourn, because of the dismal labour relations of the government of which he is a part - no, he is not a part of the government, he is a backbencher, he is a gofer for the Premier, g-o-f-e-r, not g-o-p-h-e-r, not the animal, just a person who runs around. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that Your Honour enforce the rule of relevancy. I fail to see what any comments the member for Twillingate might have made about an election that the member for Twillingate ran in has to do with the motion that is before us. So I will ask Your Honour to enforce the rule of relevancy. Perhaps the only way to do it is to ask the hon. gentleman to leave the

Chamber so that the debate might get back to being as relevant as it was when he was out about half an hour ago. I would ask him to have some consideration, as the member for Twillingate said, for the place that he is in. This is not a place for a brawl, this is not a place to throw personal innuendo, it is a parliament, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to remember that.

MR. MARSHALL:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Are you in a hurry to get up?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, Mr. Speaker, what a lecture from the hon. gentleman there opposite. There have been no speeches on this side of the House. We have listened, as I said, with boredom. The hon. gentlemen there opposite have not wanted to see the House adjourned because they want a resolution of the labour dispute, which everyone wants, but the hon. gentleman's only solution is to urge us to put more charges against people in the labour movement, which we absolutely reject. The fact of the matter is their parliamentary maneuver has not made any difference at all. Whether we adjourn at 4:00 a.m. or whether we had adjourned at 6:00 p.m. or 8:00 p.m. makes no difference at all; we are still going to adjourn because we happen to be the government. The hon. gentleman is making a great contribution to this debate. The fact of the matter is that the hon. gentleman is making and stating certain truths that do not happen to be

appreciated by the hon. gentlemen there opposite. He is talking about an instance, I understand, where the hon. member Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) would not speak to the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). He is talking about situations where the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), in his mad dash for power, wanted to be the Premier of this Province and all the rest of it. It might be unpleasant to the hon. gentleman, but they have to listen to it because we have had to listen to a diatribe of about four or six hours from the hon. gentlemen.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, it is very rare in this House that you will find myself and the member for St. John's East, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), in agreement. I would agree with him that we have heard no speeches from that side of the House because they are ashamed, of course, of their actions in this strike, for one thing. I agree with him that we have heard no speeches, because what we are hearing now from the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is not a speech that is related to the subject. It is a matter of trying to tear apart men who are far better than he will ever be himself, namely the member for Twillingate and the Leader of the Opposition. So, there is no speech, I agree with him.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

What we have got here tonight, Mr. Speaker, is the Opposition asking someone to get involved in a debate. Mr. Speaker, how can we get involved on this side of the House in a meaningful debate when we are being totally harassed by the members of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, Larry, Curly and Moe, The Three Stooges.

MR. TULK:

You dummies! You wimp.

MR. TOBIN:

Moe has just spoken, Larry and Curly just left.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Twillingate got up here tonight and I asked him a very simple question: Has he yet spoken or shaken hands with the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). I remember back, Mr. Speaker, not that long ago when the member for Fortune - Hermitage defeated him, whitewashed him in the polls at Burin - St. George's. I remember distinctly the words of the hon. member now from Twillingate as he referred that night to the member who is now the member for Fortune - Hermitage. I remember distinctly his reference to the member for Fortune - Hermitage. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I ask them have they shaken hands? Is that a crime, Mr. Speaker? Is it a crime, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Leader of the Opposition if he has ever shaken hands with the former member for Burin - Placentia West, the man who is retired, Mr. Speaker, a man who I have a great deal of respect

for, Mr. Paddy Canning, who came back in 1975 and almost cost the member who is now the Leader of the Opposition his nomination fee. Is it a crime, Mr. Speaker, to ask that question of the Leader of the Opposition? The facts are clear. The member for Twillingate was whitewashed, a total loss in the district of Burin - St. George's against the now member for Fortune - Hermitage. Mr. Speaker, when we had a man of character to put against the member for Fortune - Hermitage in Burin-St. George's, yes, Mr. Speaker, we were successful. But who could win with the member for Twillingate in Burin-St. George's?

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, I am just sitting here wondering what this has to do with the present labour dispute in the Province and what relevance this has to getting those people back to work.

MR. N. WINDSOR:

(Inaudible) the labour dispute either.

MR. FUREY:

Oh! Dracula is in the wings.

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is I just wonder about the relevance of this tirade, this running off at the mouth, attacking the person of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), who is an hon. member, and who spoke honourable words about that hon. member. I would like for him to get up and deal with the real issues here, the people out on the streets,

their families who worry about where the bread is going to come from to put on their tables in the future. Those are the real issues and you should address those instead of getting on like a miniature Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) that the hon. the member for Twillingate is certainly, unquestionably, more honourable than the hon. member for St. Barbe. With that I ask a question: What would the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) do with the member for St. Barbe if he ever decided to run against him in Burin-St. George's when we compare what happened to the member for Twillingate?

The facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker, are that we are being harassed -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAIRD:

Spurious points of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Oh, the Corner Brook Royals fan is alive.

Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is saying surely has nothing to do with this debate, and I would ask Your Honour to

enforce the rule of relevance. I know it is very wide ranging, but if the hon. gentleman is going to speak in this debate, surely it is not relevant whether the member for Fortune-Hermitage ran against the member for Twillingate or whether he is going to run against the member for St. Barbe. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the kind of debate that we are going to have in this House, that kind of personal attack, that kind of slithering and slimey movement, then surely the Chair has to intervene and call upon that hon. gentleman to be relevant, something which he has never been in his entire career in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we have seen I think it is three attempts now by the Opposition House Leader to try to stifle debate on this side of the House. They have, Mr. Speaker, tried to stifle debate. There have been about seven types of order already in about five minutes, Mr. Speaker, trying to stifle debate. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Twillingate wants to give it he should be prepared to take 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:

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a point of order to tell the hon. member that I have no desire at all to stifle debate in this House.

MR. BAKER:

If it is debate.

MR. TULK:

If it is debate,. But what the hon. gentleman is engaging in is personal innuendo and insult and I would stifle that, and I would stifle the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

In that statement, Mr. Speaker, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has contributed as much to this House as he has contributed to the district of Fogo in the past seven or eight years.

MR. TULK:

I am from Fogo. Do not call me Twillingate.

MR. TOBIN:

You are from Fogo? Mr. Speaker, if he is the member for Fogo I apologize, because working in the Premier's Office and looking at the calls coming there from Fogo I did not think they had a member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I hope he does better for the people from Fogo when they call his office than the people from his own district that I refer to him. I hope they get better action out of him than the people in his own district whom I have

the courtesy to refer to him when they call me. I hope he does better for the people from Fogo than he does for his own district.

MR. TOBIN:

Who? Who?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Howard Barrett, if you want me to name him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member is referring to but I have a very sneaky suspicion, Mr. Speaker, that he is referring to a constituent of mine. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Fogo is conferring to a constituent of mine who - guess what, Mr. Speaker? - hired the Leader of the Opposition as his lawyer and got no action. That is what he is referring to. I have a sneaky suspicion, Mr. Speaker, that that is what he is referring to. I can table letters, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Table them.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West is speaking?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Could we have silence while another member is debating?

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for trying to restrain the member for Fogo. The facts of the matter are clear; the people from Fogo are pleading for help to the Premier's office and every other office in government. I assume, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, that the people did not realize they had a member. Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with suggesting that? It is only a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Terra Nova had to bring in a resolution, had to bring a petition before this House on behalf of the constituents of Fogo. On behalf of the member for Fogo the member for Terra Nova had to bring in a resolution.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. BUTT:
'Glen', he should not be allowed to keep interrupting.

MR. TULK:
'Glen'! His name is Mr. Speaker, not 'Glen'. I have to correct the hon. gentleman again. This is getting to be fun, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. member for Terra Nova would know, Mr. Speaker, that petition was not presented on behalf of the people of Fogo. It

was presented on behalf of a last Tory candidate whom I have now defeated twice and if he chooses to run again I will defeat him again, for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER:
There was no point of order.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, and let the record show it, that when we tried to enter into this debate tonight we were stifled by the Opposition on points of order. They have tried everything, Mr. Speaker. They do not want to hear the realities of what is happening in this Province. The member for Twillingate, Mr. Speaker, the man, like his leader, who aspired to be leader of this Province and subsequently Premier, the member for Twillingate and the member for Mount Scio, who wanted to be leader and Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, scuttled across the floor and tonight they are here trying to demonstrate the incompetence -

MR. TULK:
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 would ask the hon. gentleman to be relevant in debate.

I have never in my life seen a better dressing down by an hon. gentleman in this Legislature than the member for Twillingate (Mr. W.

Carter) gave the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). It was good advice, though. Now I know that he is smarting and hurting but I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, to be very relevant and to speak to the debate. Never mind the member for Twillingate or the member for Fogo, or indeed the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening).

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the member for Fogo is abusing this House and if they want to set the ground rules for the continuation of this debate tonight let it be known that there are a lot of us around. The fact of the matter is that the member for Twillingate was the former member for St. John's West. I look around here and see the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and others, Mr. Speaker, and if it had not been for that group of people who collectively promoted and sold a very stale product, Mr. Speaker, the member for Twillingate would not have a presence in this Province. We can look at the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and I do not want anybody to tell me about trying to sell a stale product.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have to start off by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am an admirer of my office mate the member for Twillingate. Since we were elected and came here and were sworn into the House of Assembly, I have had the honour and the privilege of sharing an office with that very experienced politician, a fine gentleman and certainly a true Newfoundlander in every sense of the word. Tonight, in a much finer and a more eloquent manner than I could have ever managed, he delivered, without a doubt, the best dressing down of a junior member of this hon House that I have ever heard. I have heard some attempts at dressing down from members opposite, particularly the Government House Leader and the hon. the Premier when he is in his mimicking, sarcastic mood, I have seen that attempted, but never in the year that I have been in the House of Assembly have I seen a member so properly dressed down as the young fellow from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). In the year I have been here, as I said, Mr. Speaker, that is the best I have ever heard.

MR. WARREN:

You have only been here a year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence, please?

MR. KELLAND:

The only thing I can say, Mr. Speaker, is Joe Goudie did not make it eleven years here.

MR. WARREN:

This is ten more than you.

MR. KELLAND:

Do we have to put up with that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have silence while the hon. member for Naskaupi is debating?

MR. PATTERSON:

They raised eight points of order while our member was speaking. I did not rise once on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I make that point. I did not rise on any point of order, nor did I heckle the debator on the other side, and there was only one, if you classify that as debate. But in actual fact it goes back to what I said initially, in that getting his dressing down, the best I have heard since I have been in this House, which is one year, he, like a typical spoiled little boy, rose at the instigation of the Government House Leader, and I saw the little verbal exchange, and attempted or pretended to debate the very serious question we have here. But he was smarting, and he was trying to hit back at a man so much his better that when they were involved politically on the same side he certainly was only in the shadow of a much greater man, our colleague on this side from Twillingate. So, you know, that childishness is probably not worthy of the comments that both my colleague and I have devoted to it so far, but I wanted to make the point that my colleague from Twillingate did an excellent job, an outstanding job. I hope some day, as I gain years of experience in the House, that I could deliver that sort of a dressing down because, no doubt, many, many times in the future the childish

attitude of the members opposite will warrant that sort of a repeat. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, we will let it go.

The interesting part about all this, Mr. Speaker, is that it is referred to as debate. Now I guess I am not an absolute expert in the English language by any means, but I have a reasonable command, I guess, of the English language, a reasonable understanding of most of the words. My understanding of the word 'debate' is that there would be so sort of a meaningful exchange between at least two parties and the only person we have seen up in the House was one member, the previous speaker, and I have already described his reasons for standing, and they certainly were not relevant to anything that we were addressing here this evening.

The other interesting part about debate, the definition that I have always understood is that when both sides or two sides participate in a discussion, argument, debate or whatever, that the Government House Leader, in putting the motion that we would not adjourn at eleven o'clock, would indicate that he wished to participate in a debate. Is that not obviously so, Mr. Speaker and members opposite? Is that not obviously so, that if he wished to go beyond eleven o'clock this evening, he wished to participate in a debate and he wished his colleagues on the other side of the House to participate in a debate? But we have not seen that. We have seen a spoiled child get on his feet and react to a chastisement that he justly deserved. That is all we have seen. And to talk about points of order, that is certainly within

the rules of the House and the Chair rules on the effectiveness or the validity of any point of order, which you have done very effectively, Mr. Speaker, as it applies to both sides. I find no argument with that.

The question of debate is one that I have just raised. It is something that I fail to understand in the government's approach to the whole question. If they wish to remain beyond 11:00 p.m., I would have to assume that alternatively, as is the custom of the House, that when one of our members sits down a member from the government side will get up and debate this very important issue. But they have failed to do so and I question that.

Then I started to think about some of the things that my colleagues have said over the past while and today as well. I remember, I believe my colleague from Fortune - Hermitage, if not my good friend from the Strait of Belle Isle, one of these two and I would have to check back in Hansard to find out exactly which one, said words to the effect that we were actually being a part of something in history in this Province, that we were looking at the first writhings of the final days of a decaying and dying government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
The Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. KELLAND:
I believe, as my colleague from Gander suggested, it was my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle. As he so eloquently puts these things, we were looking at the death throes of a dying Tory

administration which has a phoney head - a false head, I suppose, might be a better word - and I liken it to something of the situation that is in Ottawa at the moment, and I will explain that a little further. The honeymoon with the Prime Minister of Canada is obviously over. The man with the mellow voice and the ski slope chin is no longer in favour with the people of Canada. He is no longer in favour with a lot of Tories, certainly not in this Province, and certainly not in Atlantic Canada.

MR. POWER:
That is what you think.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker, could we have some protection from the other kid over there?

MR. FUREY:
The one with the Liberal tie on.

MR. SPEAKER:
Could we have silence, please.

Order, please!

MR. POWER:
Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:
Do you mind, Mr. Speaker? You know, I do not interrupt these gentlemen, and I ask for the same courtesy when I am speaking. We have a situation where Yukon Eric is the real Government of Canada. We have all seen that.

MR. BARRY:
Like the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

MR. KELLAND:
We see Mr. Mulroney, with that mellifluous voice, down South of the border kissing Ronald and all

that sort of thing, while Yukon Eric is pulling the strings and telling him when to jump. Now, I have to tell you something, and I have looked at this for a long, long time. I could never understand what I believed or what I perceived our Premier to be, and what I have actually seen since I have been a member of the House of Assembly. I have watched him a number of times, I have watched him for a number of years -

MR. WARREN:

You wanted the nomination last time and could not get it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Could we have silence?

MR. WARREN:

He was looking for the nomination and could not get it.

MR. KELLAND:

Do you mind, Mr. Speaker? Either control them or kick them out.

MR. WARREN:

Tell us about the nomination, 'Jim'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have silence, please.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Down here what do we see? I have seen the pose of the Fighting Newfoundlander many, many times. The Fighting Newfoundlander, he will fight anybody, anybody, providing it is a Liberal in Ottawa.

MR. WARREN:

Peddle your papers!

MR. KELLAND:

But, as soon as Mellow Voice makes it on the Ottawa scene the Fighting Newfoundlander becomes what? He is really a wimp. What is he other than a wimp? In Naskaupi district, the Fighting Newfoundlander did not have the guts to get out of the car during the election campaign and talk to 200 or 300 people who were there in support of teachers. Here they were, they carried placards and they wanted to talk to the Premier.

MR. WARREN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe, if you check Hansard, you will find the hon. member used the word 'guts', which is unparliamentary.

MR. GREENING:

I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that particular word, please!

MR. KELLAND:

I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw it, whether it is unparliamentary or not. The Premier did not have the intestinal fortitude, which means guts, which I am not allowed to say, Mr. Speaker, so I will not say it. The Premier did not have the intestinal fortitude to get out of a vehicle and face a couple of hundred people who were disturbed at the way he was treating teachers.

MR. WARREN:

You called his office five times on nomination day.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

He wanted to challenge him to run against him.

MR. KELLAND:

What was that? I would like to hear that comment. Stand on your feet and say it, Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Let us have it in Hansard. I challenge you to say that for Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

I asked the hon. member how many times he visited the headquarters in Goose Bay on nomination day?

MR. KELLAND:

I did not quite hear that. Could someone translate?

MR. FUREY:

How many times, what?

MR. PEACH:

Is the member finished?

MR. WARREN:

Yes.

MR. KELLAND:

No, I am not finished.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I would like him to repeat that standing in his place so I could hear what he said.

MR. FUREY:

So another one has no intestinal fortitude.

MR. POWER:

Could we have the question, Mr.

Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, I am still speaking.

MR. WARREN:

Oh, I see.

MR. KELLAND:

Obviously, the Premier is not the only one on that side with no intestinal fortitude.

MR. WARREN:

How many times did you phone -

MR. KELLAND:

It is fine to sit in your place, Mr. Speaker, and howl and yell and beat your gums, but when you have to stand in your place and speak like a man we find them somewhat lacking on the other side.

MR. WARREN:

Tell us about your calls to Dennis White.

MR. KELLAND:

Would you like to stand? I would be happy to sit down for a few minutes if you would stand.

MR. WARREN:

Sit down.

MR. KELLAND:

Either control him, Mr. Speaker, or flick him out. Let us observe the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence, please, while the hon. member is speaking?

MR. WARREN:

I think that is enough.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

If the hon. member wishes to speak, would he please stand?

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, if I stand I guess I can speak in the -

MR. KELLAND:
Is he on a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:
No, he is not on a point of order, but he was asked to stand.

MR. KELLAND:
I am not finished my portion of debate, Mr. Speaker. May I resume when he is finished?

MR. SPEAKER:
Yes.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you.

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

ooo

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

MR. KELLAND:
Obviously, the length of time in the House has nothing to do with your knowledge of procedure. Not referring to you, Mr. Speaker, of course.

MR. WARREN:
Tell us about your calls to Dennis White.

MR. KELLAND:
Anyway, let us get back to what we were talking about, Mr. Speaker. I would ask you to control what the member for Torngat Mountain is attempting to do. Let us get back to what we were saying here. Yukon Eric runs Ottawa, not Slopey Chin, not Mellow Voice. I do not know if that is unparliamentary or not. I am talking about the Prime Minister of Canada, of course. That is obvious, I believe. Around this Province people are saying -

MR. TULK:
I thought you said Smokey Chin.

MR. KELLAND:
No. Not Smokey Chin. Around this Province people are saying the same thing exists in Newfoundland and Labrador, that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is the real Premier, the hidden Premier. He does not sit on the Premier's right hand. If he sits on the Premier's right hand in actual fact he must be sitting on his own hand because people around this Province, and I have travelled a bit, I have been in contact with many people around the Province in all kinds of districts and they say that the member for St. John's East really runs the government, he calls the shots.

Now, first of all, my antecedents are from the outports of Newfoundland, I, myself, was born in St. John's. I have lived twenty years in Labrador and I have a fairly reasonable knowledge of our Province. Now over the years I have seen St. John's in many forms, merchant classes and so on from years ago, try to absolutely control everything that happens in this Province. I hate to use the term, but the term is often used in a derogatory format

by people from out of town who call people who belong to St. John's townies, derogatorily, and people from St. John's who call those fine Newfoundlanders and Labradorians from the outports baymen, in a derogatory sense.

MR. WARREN:

Bay wops.

MR. KELLAND:

Well, it depends on where you are from, whatever the term. Let the record show that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) corrected me by saying they were not baymen, they were bay wops. We have that in Hansard.

So that is a derogatory term. Now this has been applied for years and it is an unfortunate thing, because it created years ago, before people became more knowledgeable, a feeling of inferiority in the people from outside St. John's and they expected to be taken when they came to St. John's - the sort of city slicker type arrangement. So if you start to think about that, and think about what people are saying around this Province, that the person really running the Province is the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), then you realize, gee whiz! is this what is happening here? This Premier from a smaller outport who has come to St. John's full of vim and vigor, with all kinds of integrity when he arrived and so on like that, who had a dream and was probably quite an honourable man at the time he arrived - I am making no comments about his present status - has he been taken? You know, the fellow from the outport being taken by the fellow from the city. So the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) sits and smugly grins

across at us all and tell us we are boring and that we are wasting the time of the House. And the Premier goes into his fighting pose, not with Ottawa anymore, however, he is scared of Ottawa, he cannot touch Ottawa, they tell him exactly what to do, they say, 'Froggie', if the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) will pardon the expression, and the Premier just asks how high he has to jump. That is the way it is in this Province.

MR. WARREN:

Tell us about the Winter Games.

MR. TULK:

Do not get upset, boy. Do not get upset.

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have silence, please?

MR. WARREN:

Sit down, boy.

MR. TULK:

Shut up 'Garf'.

MR. KELLAND:

Do you mind, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member wishes to speak, would he please stand?

MR. KELLAND:

If, indeed, the Premier has been taken as being a man from a smaller outport being controlled by the St. John's man, the evil genius of government some people around town have called him, if he is being controlled by the gentleman from St. John's East, what about all the other poor people in the Province who live outside the Overpass, are they not being sold down the drain in the same manner? Are they not being used? Is not their birthright in

jeopardy?

When you talk about the offshore, up in Labrador the offshore is a remote, Avalon Peninsula based problem.

MR. WARREN:

Not true. Not true.

MR. KELLAND:

That is what it is. The people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, in Naskaupi district, they say it is just a bunch of Newfoundlanders talking about the offshore.

They would like to know what it will mean to them. And I can remember it in that context, listening to various people, politicians and people in the oil industry, talking about the sinking price of a barrel of oil and what would happen when it went well below twenty dollars and down around fifteen dollars. I can remember, I believe, the Premier saying that it was still a viable operation, that money can still be made at fifteen dollars a barrel. Well, this morning the news was that oil was down to twelve dollars a barrel. But the point to be made here is that at the time the Premier was saying that it was still viable at fifteen dollars a barrel, an oil expert in the oil industry was on the air saying, 'Oh, yes, it is still viable, but only the companies will make money. At fifteen dollars a barrel there would not be enough left over for Ottawa or for our Province.'

MR. TULK:

That is a very important point.

MR. KELLAND:

It is a very important point. That is the kind of thing that bothers me in the whole context of

everything, that we are being misled. Perhaps the Premier is not aware that he is being misled by the St. John's power structure. Perhaps he does not know. I think that would be a sad thing if it were true. But the Government House Leader, in the view and in the eyes of many, many people in this Province, is really the hidden Premier. Now that statement, I suppose, may be something that both the Government House Leader and the Premier would object to, but I am just trying to report the reaction, the feeling, what people are saying around our Province. If the Premier, the apparent Premier can be misled so easily, if such is the case, and the real Premier is able to mislead him, how badly is the rest of the Province, certainly outside the overpass, being misled? It is a terrible thing.

I have heard all kinds of facetious remarks attached to the government in recent times. I arrived back from my district fairly late this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I was able to be here for the latter couple of hours of the House, and I did not hear the Finance Minister read the budget. Nevertheless, I have had a chance to look at the summary, the highlights and so on, and almost everything I can see in there is designed to mislead. So is that the approach of this present government, to mislead by failing to give proper information, or detailed information? For example, the retail sales tax applicable to building materials, if I can just mention that briefly. It says the tax was raised by 4 per cent. Now, that is a very misleading statement. The tax was raised by 50 per cent. The tax rate went up 4 per cent, from 8 per cent to 12 per

cent, but the rate of increase was 50 per cent. So, in effect, when you say it has only gone up 4 per cent, that is 4 per cent of the purchase price of the building material, but it is actually a 50 per cent increase in the actual tax you are going to pay.

MR. MARSHALL:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. KELLAND:

I wonder, would the hon. the Government House Leader do the same thing? I would say no. Give me my thirty minutes.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will be fast Your Honour.

MR. KELLAND:

No.

MR. BARRY:

You get up afterwards and speak in the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

Tell us about the P.C. nomination you wanted.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why do they keep running?

Let me look at another little thing here: 'The Newfoundland Liquor Corporation will increase its profit margin on spirits only to yield \$1 million in additional revenue.' Even that is misleading. They say the profit

margin. We are not talking tax, you know.

MR. WARREN:

No.

MR. KELLAND:

I did not think so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

hear,hear!

MR. KELLAND:

So we are talking about the selling price of the product sold by the Corporation. I assume that is correct. We have to assume that is correct, based on the document here.

Now, even if you consider that they are going to increase the price by enough to garner an extra \$1 million, they are actually sticking over \$100,000 on there in taxes. Am I not correct?

MR. FUREY:

That is exactly right.

MR. KELLAND:

At the very minimum. So that is misleading. Get us another \$1 million in revenue on profit, but get us another 12 per cent or whatever -

MR. FUREY:

More than that.

MR. KELLAND:

A lot more than that, perhaps - in taxes. So that is misleading. There is an increase in the total tax paid and the whole thing is geared to mislead people and that seems to be the total procedure of it all. I do not care what we say we are debating in here, what we are debating in here is the terrible situation in this Province with respect to labour unrest in the public sector. I

have been in my district, and been in a number of other districts and talked to many, many people involved with the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees and people who sympathize with them, and I can say this: This time, unlike what happened to the teachers, to a degree, where a great deal of government propaganda started to turn some public opinion against the teachers, I think it is quite obvious that public opinion is on the side of the workers.

MR. TULK:

Would you say it is working in reverse, that the more the government push the more people are against them?

MR. KELLAND:

So it appears. Because when they went to the point of the injunction and the arrests and jailing, a lot of people feel they were jumping the gun. They should have given it a little more time, a little more effort, maybe, to try to work it out in a more amicable manner. But they did not do that. So public opinion, and I have witnessed this in my own district, I have witnessed this in St. John's, and I have witnessed this in one other district, is in favour of the strikers, no question about 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 behavior of the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West, down in his seat laughing, is despicable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to bring him to order or flick him out of the House. It is terrible! My friend is making a good speech and he is acting in a most ignorant fashion, interrupting him. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to bring him to order or flick him out of this House.

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I was having a very quiet discussion with my colleague and good friend, the very capable Minister of Health, when at such time, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health happened to describe for me the member for Fogo. Looking at the member for Fogo and hearing the description, one could not help but laugh.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the point of order is well taken. Again the hon. member, number one, was not in his place and I distinctly heard him interrupting the debate. I would ask him to restrain himself.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must say, making an aside comment, I appreciate that protection, Mr. Speaker. But of the fifty-two members in this House, the member for Burin - Placentia West is the guy that I have heard corrected and cautioned and warned more often than anybody else, perhaps more than all the others

combined. I cannot understand why he has not gotten the ultimate penalty, out the door, but I leave that to the discretion of Your Honour. I am sure you will use your best judgement in that.

We are in a situation where we have 5,500 of our fellow Newfoundlanders and Labradorians out on strike, and we have the vast majority of our population in this Province in apparent support of them. That would mean that if they are in apparent support of the strikers they are in utter disagreement with the actions of government. Because you cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker, and that must be quite obvious. If the general public in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are on the side of the 5,500 NAPE employees who are out on strike, they cannot possibly be on the same side as government. They are disgruntled, dissatisfied and displeased with the action that government has taken so far because, it would seem to me, and this was mentioned in the House by our Leader and by our House Leader, the law is being applied unfairly, or government has interfered with the due process of law. Because there were arrests in St. John's, as we well know, and, for some reason, in some of the comments the Premier was making he was trying to imply that the thirty day suspension was somehow or other tied in with that injunction. Now, that injunction had nothing to do with the thirty day suspension. The injunction was an entirely, separate, legal procedure and the thirty day suspension was a decision of the employer, of government, to put their fellow Newfoundlanders out of work as soon as they came back to work. They said, 'You are essential and you cannot strike

but, if you come back to work, you are not that essential that we can put you out of work for thirty days, every bloody one of you, 5,500. It is utterly ridiculous! What a contradiction! It was described here by one of my colleagues about people who had gone out on strike and then gone back to work only to find they got a thirty day suspension, and on that thirty day suspension they did not receive salary nor would they receive strike pay. So why not go back on the line? That has happened in my district as well, Mr. Speaker, and it is distressing to see that kind of conflict being created within the union ranks by the arrogant attitude of the government and the intimidation tactics they have been employing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:

May I have a few seconds just to wrap up?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has been granted.

MR. KELLAND:

When my colleague for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was talking about the fact that his daughter was on the picket line, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), in his usual foot-in-mouth attitude, said, 'She is lucky to have a job.' Good God Almighty! is he a member of the government that is running this Province, to make a

statement like that? I cannot believe it, Mr. Speaker, but somehow or other it seems to epitomize what this government is all about.

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. TULK:

Where is the member for Torngat? You wanted to say something when the member for Naskaupi was speaking, go ahead now.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I will gladly yield to the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren).

MR. WARREN:

I am waiting for 'Beaton Tulk'. I am anxiously waiting for 'Beaton Tulk'.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, it is now five minutes to one in the a.m. and the logical question for reasonable men and women, for reasonable people in this Province to ask is what are we doing here at five minutes to one in the morning?

It is a logical, reasonable question to ask, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to be a member of the Opposition at this time in the history of our Province, Mr. Speaker. I would not want to be associated in any way whatsoever with the administration which forms the majority in this hon. House.

The Opposition, Mr. Speaker, said

that we will use every means at our disposal to keep this House open until the government showed some effort, showed some concrete proof that they want to solve the dispute which has now brought this Province to a standstill, which has now brought this Province, Mr. Speaker, right to the brink of anarchy. This was mentioned tonight in a national news bulletin; it went right across the nation, the accusation that Newfoundland is on the brink of anarchy.

MR. TULK:

Was that the National news?

MR. DECKER:

It was on the Journal tonight, Mr. Speaker, that we are on the brink of anarchy. The Opposition said, "We will use every means at our disposal to force government back to the bargaining table." We attempted to use the Interim Supply Bill. Mr. Speaker, what happened to the Interim Supply Bill? I remember it was barely yesterday that the hon. House Leader got up and pontificated, chastised the Opposition because welfare recipients might not be able to receive their cheques on time, because employees of the government would not be able to get their cheques on time, because the people who just got the 6 per cent pay increase would not be able to get the bulk sum that they have coming to them, which goes back to January 1. We were chastised for that. What happened to the Interim Supply Bill?

Mr. Speaker, what happened to the silliness that the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was getting on with, taking up the time of this House trying to accuse us of delaying the passage of this Bill?

Today, Mr. Speaker, we saw this government try to use a ceremonial occasion to bring this House to a standstill so that they could slither back to their holes in the ground, away from public sight, away from the view of the public, back to their bunker, back to their uncaring holes where they could not care less that this Province is on the brink of anarchy, that there is an injustice which has permeated the whole basis of our culture in this Province today.

Let me tell the hon. gentlemen something about ceremony and the relevance of ceremony when you have to deal with the real world. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of its validity, but there is a story that in the early days of the First World War, before the Russian Revolution, that on one night in the City of Moscow there were two meetings taking place. At one meeting a group of priests of the Greek Orthodox Church were debating whether or not to lengthen their gowns by two inches. It was a ceremonial matter, the length of their gowns. The other meeting, across the street, Mr. Speaker, was attended by women, among others, and they were discussing whether or not they would adopt a communist manifesto and revolutionize the whole of the Eastern world. This is no time, Mr. Speaker, to stand on ceremony, this is no time to argue about whether or not we are going to lengthen a gown by two inches, because there is much in the ceremony that takes place on budget day which is just as irrelevant to the reality of today as the lengthening of the gown by two inches was in the early days of the Second World War, just previous to the Russian revolution.

MR. BARRY:

Or to increase the car allowances.

MR. DECKER:

Or to increase the car allowances.

Mr. Speaker, government wants to stand on ceremony when we have 5,500 people on strike in this Province today. Why are they on strike, Mr. Speaker? They are on strike because they were provoked into going on strike. They are not on strike through any choice of their own. But you can only trample on people so many times, you can only whip people so many times. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) used the term 'just as sure as the sun is going to rise tomorrow morning.' Well, just as sure as the sun is going to set tomorrow night if you continue to spit in peoples faces, if you continue to kick people in the derrieres, if you continue to grab people by the throat, eventually the time will come, Mr. Speaker, when they are going to stand up and fight back, and this is exactly what we are seeing happen.

We saw Bill 59, a bill which completely took away their right to strike. The Premier gets up in this Chamber and he boasts by saying that the Tories gave the civil service the right to strike. What he failed to say, Mr. Speaker, and I am now saying it for him, is the Tories, with Bill 59, took away that right to strike and in doing so provoked the MOS which had never before, I do not believe, gone on strike. One of the most civil unions this Province has, a group of the most law-abiding people in this Province were provoked into going on strike by a piece of garbage legislation that was tricked through this House. We heard the

hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) explain how it was done today, tricked through this House, Mr. Speaker. We see 5,500 people on strike because of the injustice which is permeating our society. It has become part of the Charter of Rights that people are guaranteed equal pay for work of equal value. This has become an accepted thing in the nation, right across from sea to shining sea, Mr. Speaker, and we have a little group of nincompoops who somehow have set themselves above the law and have somehow forced a group of people into the ground so that they have no other choice but to stand up for themselves and go on strike. This is why people are on strike today.

Before this strike was on, Mr. Speaker, this government imposed a freeze on the wages of the civil service and, while that freeze was on, the grader operators in Raleigh did not get an increase in pay, the tractor operators in St. Anthony did not get an increase in pay, the mechanics out in Placentia did not get an increase in pay, but what was happening, Mr. Speaker, through devious manipulation, job after job in the higher echelons were being reclassified so that pay increases were granted. This was salt into the wounds of the already beaten members of the MOS. This was adding insult to their injury, Mr. Speaker, so they were forced, they were provoked into going on strike and bringing our Province to the brink of anarchy. While, Mr. Speaker, members of the MOS did not have parity, while the basic injustice was being perpetrated upon them, our Premier takes a bunch of his hacks and slithers off to China at a cost of \$300,000 or \$400,000 to the tractor operator in St. Anthony, to the

mechanic in Placentia, to the grader operator in Deer Lake. You ask, Mr. Speaker, why is this province on the brink of anarchy? It is on the brink of anarchy, Mr. Speaker, because the government manipulated -

MR. MITCHELL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! On a point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the hon. gentleman who is now speaking to the House has any objections to members of his own party going over to Norway next week? Could he answer that?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman is taking, Mr. Speaker, a very cheap shot.

MR. MITCHELL:

Not as cheap as the shot you made.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Something is happening in this Province that is far more relevant than the trip to China.

MR. POWER:

Not as cheap as your shot, that the members of the group were all political.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, would you ask the red tied gentleman, wherever he is from, to be quiet while I am speaking?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is taking a very cheap shot, a trip to China and a trip to Norway are so different. I understand that the trip to Norway is to look at something connected with the oil industry, which all in this House hope will be of great benefit to Newfoundland.

MR. POWER:

All you care about is oil. You do not care about the rest of the things.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I would suggest to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), and everything else that is left over on the other side, that he restrain himself and listen to what seems to be a very reasonable argument. We would hope, and we would pray, and we believe that if the Premier had not played political games with the offshore that perhaps development would have occurred in this Province far quicker than it has, and we still hope that there is some development in this Province in offshore oil. I want to say to the hon. member that we think it is very worthwhile to send people, members of the House of Assembly, who are going to have to debate -

MR. MITCHELL:

Let us not get hypocritical about

it, now.

MR. TULK:

Who is being hypocritical? You are.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

It is going to be very beneficial to people to become aware of what is happening in the oil industry, especially if we are going to become the government, which we on this side obviously intend to be in a couple of years. So, Mr. Speaker, the two are not at all related. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) is being very hypocritical in trying to blackmail the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) into being quiet, which he could not do in a month of Sundays.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, there is no point of order.

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

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, government members want to close this House. They do not want to debate the fact that 5,500 members of NAPE are on strike. I wonder what they do want to do. It is common knowledge what they want to do. They want to go South. They want to go to the sandy beaches and sunny skies. Well, Mr. Speaker, the concept of going South has taken on a completely new twist. There was a time when you went South to look for the heat, now, Mr. Speaker, they are going South to get away from the heat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

There is more heat here, Mr. Speaker, and they want to leave it. They want to bask in the anonymity of a strange land, where nobody knows them, because if this Province goes on forever and a day, everybody will remember the members opposite and how they brought this Province to its knees. They have practically wiped out this Province and every school child from here to eternity will read how the Premier brought this Province to its knees. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid to mention it, but there is a glove factory still operating in this Province. I refuse to say where it is because they would close it down tomorrow morning. Every single business that Premier Smallwood tried to put into operation, members opposite went around and meticulously, religiously closed them up, barred the doors and nailed them shut. They have brought this Province to its knees economically and now, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to bring the Province to its knees socially. They are trying to disrupt and tear up the very basis of our democracy. Every school child will read in years to come of the tragedy, the travesty of justice that was poured upon the 500,000 upon this rock in the Atlantic. No wonder they want to close the House and slither away.

But while they want to do that, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering about their consciences. I am going to look directly at the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, a man I believe to be a half decent sort of human being, and I am going to ask that hon. gentleman how he can look at

himself in the morning and shave, how he gets to sleep at night. These few minutes before sleep overtakes you, does it not bother your conscience to see that you are part of a government which is perpetrating such injustices on your fellow human beings?

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands is not here. I wish he were, because I do believe he is an honourable type of gentleman. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, how he can look at himself and shave in the morning. How can he? Surely he has a conscience, he sees what is happening.

How can hon. members live with themselves? Those members who are decent, how can they live with themselves and be counted with a government which is bringing this Province to the brink of anarchy? How can they be part of this budget which we just saw, this budget which addressed health, among other things?

Speaking of health, Mr. Speaker, I have had the responsibility, not the opportunity, which was clearly a heavy responsibility, to look into some of the problems in health in this Province today. I wish I had not been called upon to serve on that committee, because there, Mr. Speaker, is a festering wound, there is the utmost disgrace.

I have a letter here which found its way to our health committee from a Mrs. Mary Stockley, a good Newfoundlander, a good voter. This letter is truly the Macedonian cry if ever I heard it. It starts off with a bit of anticipated eschatology on her part, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:
What does he mean by that?

MR. DECKER:
It is the coming. The Macedonian cry. When St. Paul was preaching the gospel, there was a group in Macedonia and they sent the cry to St. Paul. They said, "Paul, come and bring the gospel to us, we need it." The Macedonian cry came to the Liberals saying, "We need the Liberals," Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. MITCHELL:
The gentleman the hon. member is referring to was Saul, he was on the road to Damascus and he had his eyes opened. I can say to the hon. member that he may be on the road to Damascus but he does not got his eyes open yet.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

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

MR. DECKER:
At the beginning of this letter there is a little bit of anticipated eschatology. It is the knowledge on the part of a people that we are about to receive something great. Here is the anticipated eschatology: On the top of this letter is the name, Leo Barry. The salutation says, "Dear Sir, Premier." Here is the anticipated eschatology. Here is the prophet, Mr. Speaker. Here is someone who inadvertently is prophesying something which is

about to happen. This is anticipated eschatology, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUTT:
I must be asleep, because I know I am having a nightmare.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, this lady says to the future Premier, "I am writing to give my opinion on the hospital. I am sick. I was back and forth to Grand Falls" - I am reading it as it is written, Mr. Speaker, I am not making fun. I will table it, Mr. Speaker, if that is the wish of this House - "I am sick. I was back and forth to Grand Falls. It costs so much money." She may not be alive now, Mr. Speaker. This is what this health system has done to this lady. It matters less whether it is tabled or not, because I doubt that the lady - by the time I finish this letter, you will see - is alive today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUTT:
Amen, brother!

MR. DECKER:
Oh, yes, you can 'amen' all you like, you can try to laugh it off all you like, but the fact of the matter is you are a member of a government who has brought a festering wound to our health system. How can you look at yourself, the hon. the Minister of the Environment? How about your conscience?

MR. TULK:
It is an easy matter to say, 'Amen.'

MR. DECKER:
Say amen.

MR. BUTT:
Amen, brother.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, she was back and forth to Grand Falls many times. She could not afford the expense of going back and forth to Grand Falls, so do you know what she did? In desperation and disgust she gave it up; "I gave up in disgust." And do you know the condition she is in today? She went to the family doctor, "who bucked me about one month and now, she says, "I am suffering shocking." She spends most of her time in bed, and do you know what she blames it on, Mr. Speaker? - and I totally agree with her - "This is what our PC Government has done for us," she says. Do you want to say amen now? Are you proud of it? I certainly am not. Are you proud that this woman could not afford to go back and forth to see her doctor? "This is what our PC Government has done for us." She fair spits it out. The words are almost rising from the tip of the letter, Mr. Speaker. She spits it out!

She says, "My husband got six weeks work and if he had not had four stamps last year, he would not even been able to get his unemployment insurance." And do you know what this lady is asking? She is asking that the future Premier, the one who will come when the eschatology becomes a real thing instead of just anticipated, she is asking that hon. gentleman to stand up in this House on her behalf and say something. Because it is utterly disgraceful.

MR. TOBIN:
Who is the hon. gentleman she is asking for help?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:
She ends off her letter, Mr. Speaker, when you go back in the House see if you can get up and get something done for us, for God's sake.

MR. TOBIN:
Who is she talking about.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:
I am reading this letter. "I do not know," she says, "when I will get surgery done." And then, Mr. Speaker, in the depths of her agony, in the depths of her uncertainty, not knowing whether she is ever going to get surgery or not, do you know what she says to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition? "Keep up the good work."

MR. TOBIN:
To whom?

MR. DECKER:
She says that to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I can table this, Mr. Speaker, if you so wish. This is what has happened,

MR. MATTHEWS:
If he is doing his job, why does he not get her in for surgery?

DECKER:
You hit the nail right on the head. There are about 10,000 of them out there, Mr. Speaker, 10,000 who could write exactly the same letter, perhaps worded a little differently, because health care in this Province is in the worst state that it has ever been in the history of this Province.

MR. REID:

Lies!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

There could be 10,000 such letters, Mr. Speaker. That is why I said when I began my debate that I regretted being asked to serve on this health committee, because of the anguish that is out there.

Mr. Speaker, I have a short time left, and in closing I want to end on a positive note.

MR. TOBIN:

Your leader hung up the phone -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask hon. members on my left to just keep quiet.

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

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a message for Mrs. Stockley, I have a message for the 5,500 NAPE workers who are out freezing themselves to death on a picket line which they were provoked into going on, I have a message for them, the end is fast approaching. The signs of time: The knives are out, the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) is flexing his muscles, he wants to become Premier. The member for Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) wants to become Premier.

MR. POWER:

Boy, your are sick. Go home and soak your head.

MR. DECKER:

The hon. the House Leader is losing his control. The half-time Cabinet minister is now attending the House full time. Something is amiss. The signs are evident, and tonight I have a message for the 5,500 NAPE workers as I have a message for the Mrs. Stockleys of Newfoundland: Hang in there a few more days, because as soon as the election is called, Mr. Speaker, we are going to see a change in government. And do you know what our problem is going to be?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, there are going to be more of us.

MR. DECKER:

Our problem is going to be having an Opposition.

MR. REID:

Your problem is going to be trying to beat the NDP.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

It is going to be a problem having an Opposition. We are going to be accused of governing without an Opposition. We are on the brink of that, Mr. Speaker. The signs are there. The fights are beginning within, and the corruption, and it is only what you would expect. After seventeen years of Tory rule, how can you help but have corruption? It has to come. The signs are there and the knives are out. But the best sign of all, Mr. Speaker - you are not allowed to sing, are you? If you were allowed to sing, Mr. Speaker, I would say the greatest sign of all is this, Good-bye, Mr. Peckford, Mr. Peckford, good-bye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I cannot sing.

MR. WARREN:
You cannot talk, either.

MR. FUREY:
I just want to say this before the jackals get started. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you sang during your maiden speech in this House.

MR. BUTT:
Chuck, sit down, you just made a fool of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, there are words lifted from pages to help us understand the common thread, and it becomes the common thread, which gives each of us human beings a sense of dignity, Mr. Speaker. One such word is the word 'conscience'. Mr. Speaker, conscience, 'the sense or consciousness of the moral goodness or the blameworthiness of one's own conduct, intentions, or character together with a feeling of obligation to do what is right and to do what is good.'

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) could repeat that again for the benefit of his leader?

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

The hon. the member for St, Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, conscience, to reiterate for the benefit of the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), in a nutshell, is an obligation, a principle to do what is right and to do what is good. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the word conscience I have to look across the way at, for example, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell,) and I apply that definition to his attitude, his very arrogant attitude towards young people in this Province - we witnessed it, we heard it - 'They are not working because they are lazy.' You have to question whether there is a conscience between the ears of the member for LaPoile.

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

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

MR. MITCHELL:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe is very peeved and he just cannot seem to forget. The reason why he keeps bringing this up is the fact that he referred to all the young people unemployed in his district and I made the notation in this House that if they had a better member representing them, there would not be so many young people unemployed. That has gotten

around his district and he now is trying to live it down. I cannot blame him for that. Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I would ask the member for LaPoile, when he is talking about the unemployed in his district, to rise in this House on debate, when the member finishes, and explain what he is going to do with those unemployed CN workers, unemployment brought about by his friends in Ottawa. What is he going to do about that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about conscience and I know that hurts sometimes, when the word is lifted from the pages and brought into flesh and a face is put on it and you talk about the obligation to do what is right and what is just and look at that kind of arrogant attitude about young people coming from the lips of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), and his crazy logic that because unemployment is bad in St. Barbe the member is bad. Because unemployment in Port au Port is at

80 per cent, is the member for Port au Port bad? Because unemployment is savage in Labrador and the only member representing Labrador on the government side is the member for Torngat Mountains, does that mean he is bad? Start recognizing that logic means one plus one equals two.

Secondly, the member for LaPoile attacked my fishermen, Mr. Speaker, some of the hardest working fishermen anywhere in this country, on any coast. He attacked them and said in this House one day that if they would get back in their boats, unemployment would be all right. This gentleman said that. And what else did he say? As the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was talking tonight about his daughter on the picket line, what does he utter forth? 'She is lucky to have a job.'

So if you apply those kinds of statements against this definition of conscience, I think it starts to unfold very clearly that there is no conscience between his ears.

And the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) walks into the House of Assembly with notice - twenty-four hours before - that 165 miners in Daniel's Harbour were going to be knocked out of work on April 14, and what happened, Mr. Speaker? As a young rookie who did not know what else to do, I had to come in, after a flurry of phone calls from my people, some of them crying, and interrupt the proceedings of this House to get the attention of the Minister responsible for Mines, who was sitting on that information. Conscience, Mr. Speaker: 'The obligation to do what is right and what is just.' I wonder if there is a conscience

between those ears, Mr. Speaker?

The hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt), does he know about the problems - I am sure he does - they are having in Stephenville with the storage of PCBs, and with people removing some of the fuel because they have no money for fuel? Conscience, Mr. Speaker. Is there a conscience between those ears?

The Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), Mr. Speaker, was down at the university the other day talking to students, and somebody tells me he told them everything was going to be fine, honky dory. A 5 per cent, I think it was, and the minister can correct me, increase to the colleges, to the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, to the trade schools on tuition. Young people, stick it to them in their guts. Conscience, Mr. Speaker: 'A moral obligation to do what is right and just.' The young people of this Province are bleeding and crying out for help and what does he do? He sticks it to them. Conscience, Mr. Speaker, conscience.

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) or, as my paper's editor on the Northern Peninsula called him, the hon. minister of smocks and jocks. Mr. Speaker, conscience. Could he have in all good conscience attended the arts meeting in Gander? He has to answer that. He has a moral obligation, Mr. Speaker, according to this definition as it rises from the pages and comes to life, 'to do what is right and what is just.'

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the collective conscience of this

government. We have looked at some samples, we have heard them jump up on spurious points of order to try to defend that which is not between their ears, conscience. Let us look at how they are treating labour in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the Throne Speech given in this House some days after the election when they were given a fresh mandate by the people of this Province, albeit only by 48 per cent. On Thursday, April 25 when they brought down their first Throne Speech in this new Fortieth General Assembly, here is what they said about labour. This is the government's collective words from the collective conscience, which seems to be invisible:

"Moreover, it is essential that there prevail a labour relations climate conducive to industrial peace. My government plans a series of tri-partite meetings to help establish such an industrial relations environment. It is imperative that the workers of this Province be in a position to benefit significantly from the employment opportunities soon to be available." April 25, 1985, out the window! 'Conscience,' Mr. Speaker, "That which makes you have a moral obligation to do what is just and to do what is right."

Mr. Speaker, somebody over there mentioned that I was down South. Yes, I was. When the House closed I walked into a travel agency and said, "I need to get down South." I had no reason to be browned off. I was not brown, but I wanted to go down South and have a break for six days. Unfortunately, all they could offer me, Mr. Speaker, was Cuba. I took it. I went to Cuba and I

noticed that as we landed the pilot came out and he said, 'Ladies and Gentlemen, you are now entering the province of Holguin in the country of Cuba. No pictures are allowed and permission must be granted to leave your resort of Guardalavaca.' Some of the similarities were also interesting, Mr. Speaker, to watch their leader. I did see him there smoking his cigars, riding along in a parade, very expensive cigars, and as I walked through the airport, guess whose portrait was there? Does it remind you of another Island, Mr. Speaker? Expensive cigars and portraits in airports.

MR. DECKER:

How much were those cigars?

MR. FUREY:

They were \$50 a crack.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I became very close to a number of teachers down there from Cuba, both from the province of Holguin.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

They were very fine people, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Did you lose your hearing as well?

MR. FUREY:

Did the Minister of smocks and jocks want to say something on the record?

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there a point of order?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes.

MR. FUREY:

I am sorry Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

I think the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) is showing contempt for the House of Assembly in the way he is getting on in this debate. Mr. Speaker, as he refers to the member for smocks and jocks, both smock and jock are on the other side of the House of Assembly, one happens to be the Leader and the other happens to be the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) for rising on that very significant point of order but I think that any member who would rise in a debate on a labour dispute that sees 5,000 of his fellow Newfoundlanders on the picket lines during Winter and when that member manages to make a speech in this House on that issue without ever mentioning in the course of his remarks the fact that there is in fact a strike on. I think that is what shows contempt for this House and contempt for the people of this Province.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Let the record show, Mr. Speaker, that there is a labour dispute in this Province and that the people who are involved in the labour dispute, Mr. Speaker, have the right to protest in front of this building, have the right during the session of the House of Assembly to sit in this gallery. When the fishermen, Mr. Speaker, protested here in the early 1970s, prior to 1975, it was the Leader of the Opposition who was then the member for Burin-Placentia West who went to the Minister of Public Works and asked to have the door barred so that the people could not have the right to protest to the government of this House.

MR. KELLAND:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, further to that point, I am absolutely certain I heard the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) correctly but has not the government - my point of order - said that the current strike is illegal? Is that not so? Did not the member for Burin - Placentia West just say that these people have the right to gather outside here? Is that not a contradiction in terms?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, further to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The member has made that same falsehood a number of times in this House, Mr. Speaker. It would be interesting to see where the member got his information since, as I understand it, he was out shafting social assistance recipients at that point in time. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that I was invited to address the strikers by the strikers. They asked me to come out and address them and, Mr. Speaker, they were invited to come into the Confederation Building and meet with the then Premier, who the Government House Leader did not like but who, I must say, a lot of Newfoundlanders are developing a greater and greater affection for in hindsight, Mr. Speaker. The former Premier of this Province invited the fishermen not only to come in the lobby and demonstrate but invited them to come up to the Premier's office, Mr. Speaker, and meet with them, which is more than the current Premier has done, which is more than any member opposite has done.

What we saw in the House of Assembly is an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to block strikers from getting into this House. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) issued a restrictive number of invitations. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance sent over eight invitations to the Opposition because he was afraid that we would do as we did during the

Throne Speech and pass on our invitations to those strikers who would like to be present in the galleries. Mr. Speaker, that is the reality.

A previous Tory administration had the guts to invite the strikers to go up to the Premier's office and address the Premier. We now have a Premier who runs and hides, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, we understand that he is doing that for a reason. We understand that he is trying to keep himself as the peace-maker so he can cut the legs out from underneath the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) at the appropriate time.

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. What the Leader of the Opposition just said cannot go unchallenged. The facts of the matter are clear, Mr. Speaker, and the record will show that when the Leader of the Opposition was the member for Burin - Placentia West, when the fishermen came in here, the doors were barred. The member for Grand Bank could tell you the same thing, Mr. Speaker. The record is clear.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that when I was a social worker for ten years that I never shafted people on social assistance. Mr. Speaker, I worked for people on social assistance, despite the contempt that was

shown to the people of that area by the Leader of the Opposition. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Leader of the Opposition that I never shafted the widows of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that while I was in Cuba for seven days, I did meet some of the local people and, in fact, some of them were teachers of English. In fact, some of the teachers asked me to send in some English textbooks, phonics, etc. because they were very interested. We did talk, Mr. Speaker, and they were extremely proud of the day that Ché Guevara and Fidel Castro left Mexico to throw Batista out. They strived, they tell me, and this is coming from them, for the day when they can have a free country again but on their terms because it was not on their terms before, Mr. Speaker. Five per cent of the nation owned 95 per cent of the wealth and that is wrong. When I told him I was from Canada, they lit up because they talked about this great, sweeping, vast land.

MR. SIMMS:

Did they light up cigars?

MR. FUREY:

No, they lit up in the faces and in the eyes.

MR. TULK:

What a question!

MR. FUREY:

They did not light up cigars.

MR. SIMMS:

Were they really interested?

MR. FUREY:

Yes, they were and you should be proud that they were interested because that is our country, yours and mine, that you are being sarcastic about.

Mr. Speaker, when I talked about Canada with them they were very, very interested and they knew a lot about Canada. Do you know what they knew about Canada? They knew about Newfoundland. Do you know why they knew about Newfoundland? Because our trade missions from Ottawa had gone there to sell different species of fish, etc. and they talked glowingly of Canada, of a free land and they talked extremely glowingly of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, calling him a great statesman.

Why do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, they said that? I will tell you something that they knew. They knew about the just society that he strove for and that this particular administration, this puny administration is trying to dismantle. We talked about conscience. Conscience and justice go hand in hand.

We talked about not much being between the ears of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) but certainly not a conscience after those words he uttered. We talked about what was between the ears of the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) and his attitude towards Daniel's Harbour and the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) and how he stuck it to the young people on those increases in tuition. We talked about the Minister of smocks and jocks - and by the way that was not my phrase, that was the editor's phrase of The

Northern Pen, cute, clever, I believe, proper - but these people do not live in a free land. When we left, everybody on that plane clapped their hands in unison because, although we liked it there, and although the people were simple, and although they were poor, the cards were on the table. Sure, they are living under communism but they know they are living under communism. When they get up at 8:00 a.m. in the morning to go into the sugar fields to cut cane, they know that they are going in there and they know they are going to leave at 5:00 p.m. They know how much money they are going to get. They know how much the budgets are there. They know that they are working on an equalization standard and all of that is laid on the table. But, Mr. Speaker, when I arrived back in Toronto, it was so great to be back in Canada. But I flicked on the television in my hotel room because I had to wait for a night to catch the early morning flight back to Newfoundland and what did I see.

I saw Newfoundlanders and Labradorians being hustled into paddy wagons, being dragged out by the law, with policemen everywhere around them. I saw mass rallies downstairs in front and, quite frankly, I was in shock. I did not have the full story because I had been away for awhile and things had unfolded but it is interesting because cab drivers certainly have their finger on the pulse of things. The particular cab driver who drove me from downtown Toronto to Malden Airport said to me, "Is it not criminal what Peckford is doing?" Is that not an interesting choice of words, Mr. Speaker.

When I arrived in St. John's, it was interesting to see the Premier's portrait hanging in the airport. It kind of made one drift back to Cuba. I saw the Premier for the first time as I entered the House, scuttling along behind, sucking on a \$50 Havana cigar. That is an interesting kind of comparsion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the problem with this Premier is that he epitomizes the Greek story of Narcissus. Narcissus was that mythological character who looked into the clear pool, fell in love with himself and could not move forever. That is the problem with this government and its leader, Narcissusism, looking after themselves and lining their own pockets. What does he do with the Public Treasury? Does he take the money on his office and put it where it should be, for parity for people, so that people will be treated fairly and justly? No, he does not do that. He spends \$800,000, so we are told - it may be more - fixing up his office for himself, the ultimate act of Narcissusism. Does he go around and say, "let us give some of our public employees a break on their cars?" No, he does not do that. He turns to his deputy ministers, his assistant deputy ministers, the gofer, the parliamentary assistants, the political staff and he gives all of them, because he is the king, he is Narcissus, he bestows upon them his little trinkets and goodies.

MR. TOBIN:

What about your leader?

MR. FUREY:

Narcissusism, Mr. Speaker. He has floated so high that he has become so out of touch with the ordinary person who butters his own bread

that that is what is going to be their ultimate downfall, Mr. Speaker. That is what it is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, what does he do to try to cure this very serious problem with labour? What does he do? He sends the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), who was after threatening all of labour with suspensions, to go and heal the problem. Mr. Speaker, labour relations in this Province needs a massive blood transfusion and who did they send? Dracula.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trudeau strove for the just society and I can understand why Tories everywhere hated Mr. Trudeau. They hated what was emblematic of justice. We have proven that because justice is premised on conscience and we know there is hardly any conscience over there. There are some with consciences but not many.

Mr. Speaker, what is their stance to date? Where are they now? Where do they stand in this whole labour affair? I submit that because they are unable to make justice strong, Mr. Speaker, this tribe has made strength just. That is a sadness from that coalition of malcontents, this collection of antis, contras is the best word, because they are against everything that does not go into their own pockets.

Mr. Speaker, where else are they wasting money now? Somebody mentioned earlier tonight the advertising campaign. It makes Gobbles pale. The propaganda machine over there with Billy and the boys is just incredible. How do you get it out so fast? How do you get this garbage out so fast? Hundreds of thousands of dollars promoting 8,000 make work jobs,

those God darn make work jobs that the Liberals in Ottawa have created, those dirty Liberals and their make work jobs. They condemn them under Sterling, they condemned them under Neary, they condemned them under Barry, they condemned them under Trudeau, but they are all right now because they do not have any answers. Now they are okay, just like the Chretien Liberal icebergs.

When the icebergs were going out there and the minister was concerned for the health and safety of fellow Newfoundlanders, those icebergs were Liberal. Well, hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall), are they Tory today? What is happening out there today? Why are you not speaking up for safety out there? What about the Royal Commission's recommendations from the Ocean Ranger report? Why are you not every bloody day in this House screaming at Ottawa to implement those? Safety for you, Sir, was a political consideration and it stopped there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

What about the Budget, Mr. Speaker, the good news Budget from the Care Bear? Good news Budget, my rear end. It was punish and pork, that is what that Budget was. Punish the 52 per cent that did not say yes to this sick and tired administration and pork the other 48 per cent. The budget will go down, Mr. Speaker, as a budget of punish and pork. Have a look at the script. You tell me a hospital in a Liberal district getting anywhere in this Province that has a cent today. Tell me one! By leave, tell me one! The member for Trinity-Bay de Verde

(Mr. Reid) has to ask the question. He does not even know.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is running out but let me get back to the issue of the 5,500 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are out there struggling, Mr. Speaker, for what they believe to be a sense of fairness and a sense of justice. Guaranteed to them, Mr. Speaker, under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is the freedom to be. Is that not great to be able to be in this country, to be free? What are they doing? They are seeking justice, they are seeking equity, they are seeking parity, and Mr. Speaker, we put forward our suggestions again.

I know that over there amongst that thirty-five there has to be one or two with a conscience. I know one for sure. There is no doubt in my mind that the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) has a strong conscience. I have no doubt about that. I find it hard weaving through the others to find consciences and I exemplified that tonight by just randomly picking five. I do not know what else is between the ears but there is no conscience.

Mr. Speaker, let this administration act in a courageous way. Hemingway had the best definition of courage. "Courage," he called, "grace under pressure." What pressure they are under. How graceful they can be, Mr. Speaker, by removing those suspensions, number one. What a graceful move!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Number two, by setting up an industrial enquiry to look into

the whole problem of collective bargaining in this Province. That would be courage or grace under pressure. Number three, Mr. Speaker, take a second look at the ILO's recommendations with respect to Bill 59 - grace under pressure. That would be courageous gentlemen. And number four, to review Bill 59 in this House of Assembly and to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that it chokes freedom, it takes the average worker and takes away his right to be and in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, as we stand on the edge of the twenty-first century, that is very, very unacceptable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, what an opportunity for that collection that I mentioned tonight to regain some of that conscience that I am sure they had. Mr. Speaker, what an opportunity to put aside the pride and to stand here and accept the will of the majority of the people. That is what the Premier's own words were with regard to that sculpture, Mr. Speaker. He said, "When we are so insensitive as a government to suddenly not respond to what clearly the majority opinion of this Province says, then we do not deserve to be here." His words!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, what an opportunity to stand in their place and to display, pride aside, egos under the desk, pure courage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
First of all, I would like to commend the previous speakers on this side for the very excellent speeches given in this House. I am sure that members opposite should consider themselves very lucky to be in this hon. House listening to such high quality speeches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:
Hear one and you hear them all.

MR. W. BAKER:
We have heard one speech from the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think it is worth even commenting on.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give you my impression of why we are here. We are here debating what is, in effect, a motion to adjourn. One would assume that in debating a motion to adjourn there would be speakers who would put forth the view that we do not want to adjourn. Mr. Speaker, that is what you have heard from this side, various arguments, good, reasoned, sound arguments, as to why this House should remain open.

One would also expect, Mr. Speaker, to hear from the other side as to why the House should close. There is no doubt in anybody's mind that they want the House to close. They have made this quite clear but have never yet stated a reason. I wonder why they want the House to close. Is it that if the House is closed they can perhaps do a more effective job? Is that what is behind all this? Is it that when the House is closed they can perhaps serve the people of Newfoundland better? Is this the object of closing the hon. the House of Assembly? If that is so, Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest that it is a rather strange attitude, simply because if you carry that attitude to its logical conclusion, then we never need open the House. I wonder if members opposite really would take that approach. There must be reasons, Mr. Speaker, why they insist on closing the House.

Mr. Speaker, we have pointed out a number of reasons why the House should remain open. The first and foremost reason, obviously, as speaker after speaker have reiterated, is that we have a very serious situation in the Province with regard to the strike; a strike that spread since it first began, that obviously government efforts to control and to end were not being successful; a strike where government instigated the union, inflamed the union and its members, intentionally inflamed, and caused a situation that I have not seen in this Province. Mr. Speaker, that in itself is reason enough to keep this hon. House open, to discuss the situation, to listen to suggestions as to how this situation can be brought to a successful conclusion that is satisfactory to everybody

concerned. It would seem to me that that is a good enough reason to keep this hon. House open. It is a public forum and the people of the Province can be assured that the members that they elected are doing whatever they can to bring an end to this strike. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is a good enough reason.

However, let us look at the other side. In relation to the strike, what would be the advantage of closing the House? We know what the advantages would be to keep the House open. What would be the advantages to closing the House with regards to the strike? I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, being a very reasonable man, that the only reason I can think of that members opposite want to close the House in relation to the strike is that they do not want to be on public view, they do not want the people to know what they are doing to end this strike and what their attitudes are concerning the strike, and maybe they simply want to run and hide. Mr. Speaker, I will get back to this point about running and hiding in a few minutes.

There is another reason to keep this House open. I would like to go on to a couple of other reasons and I will come back to the strike situation. There is another reason and that reason is Interim Supply. Obviously, the government has stated that they need money to pay various bills after April 1. They have no authority to pay bills beyond April 1. They need supply to be passed in the House, a bit of pocket money to tide them over, until the main budget is passed.

That is another reason, Mr. Speaker, to keep this House open.

As a matter of fact, I could go back a few weeks. I am getting around now to the government's reason for closing the House in relation to this Interim Supply. If, in fact, government wanted this Interim Supply, then they could have brought Interim Supply on February 21, easily, instead of adjourning the House. There could have been a proper debate on Interim Supply. We could have received answers that we wanted and the government would then not have to disrupt the people of this Province. However, they did not do that.

A comment a few moments ago by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) indicates the attitude across there. He said, "You could have voted for it." Certainly we could have. You can bring everything into this House and we can automatically vote for it, let you do what you want, no examination, no questioning, no debate and we are not seeing debate here tonight. We are not even seeing a debate or discussion. We are seeing a monologue by thirteen or fourteen people. A debate involves give and take. A debate involves opinions on both sides.

However, Mr. Speaker, they could have gotten their Interim Supply by simply not adjourning the House and going through that four weeks. It would not have taken four weeks. We are reasonable people. We wanted a few questions answered. Even if we were to be unreasonable, which we have not been yet in the year that I have been here, the time would have run out anyway because we only have thirty-two or thirty-three hours left to debate Interim Supply.

Interim Supply could have easily

been obtained if members opposite had been interested in obtaining Interim Supply but, no. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they had no intention of getting Interim Supply, that they would come to the Opposition and say, "Here is the Interim Supply. We have to have it now," and use some threats and some blackmail about going to the people of the Province and saying what nasty people the Liberals were, they were holding up the cheques and so on. My goodness! Do those people not realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is in fact an admission that they have lost control of everything, lost control of the affairs of this House and the affairs of the Province? They have lost control, Mr. Speaker, of this House and of the affairs of this Province, obviously. By their own admission, they cannot get Interim Supply. Even though the rules of the House are rigged so that there is a very limited debate on Interim Supply, in spite of that, they cannot get an Interim Supply bill through this House.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, and this is why I brought this up, that the reason they do not want this Interim Supply to get through is to try to take some of the heat off in the strike situation, that is all, to try to stir up some people out there to say, "Boy, these Liberals, they are nasty people. They do not want us to get paid." That is the only reason.

Mr. Speaker, there is another reason for keeping this hon. House open. I will just review the two that I have given so far because with the interruptions from the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, you may not have been able to follow

clearly. The first reason is the strike. That should be settled and there have been solutions proposed to the present situation. Number two, Interim Supply, we could get that over with with proper management of the House.

The third reason, Mr. Speaker, is that quite recently there have been some rather significant documents tabled in Ottawa and these documents have a very direct relationship to the Minister of Finance's budget. Mr. Speaker, I would even go so far as to suggest that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in his budget may be off a little bit because of the significance of this rather massive document. He may be off a little bit because of it and I would also suggest that the Minister of Finance has no concept of what the effect on the finances of this Province are going to be if the recommendations of this document are accepted by the Cabinet.

I refer, of course, Mr. Speaker, to the Nielsen Task Force on Programme Review. We have heard some of the items from this task force over the past few months. Some of them have already been implemented and others are ready to be implemented. I would like to give you just a small smattering of items that I am talking about so that at least you, Mr. Speaker, can appreciate the effect that this might have on the Province.

DR. COLLINS:

Would you like to write us a letter about it?

MR. BAKER:

In response to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I suppose I

could write him a letter but sometimes I tend to use words that are a little bit complicated. I would rather explain it to him in person so he can question any of the words he may not quite understand.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out some of lesser known things that are in this report. Let me set the stage by saying that this is a report that was ordered by, and was presented to this Nielsen Task Force on Programme Review. I would like to point out who is on that task force because three of them at least are very powerful people. There is the hon. Eric Nielsen, Deputy Prime Minister, the hatchet man, the hon. Robert de Cotret who is President of Treasury Board and the hon. Michael Wilson, who is the Finance Minister. These people, Mr. Speaker, are heavyweights. They have influence in that Tory Cabinet and they have put forward their right wing Tory views. The fourth member of that Nielsen Task Force on programme review, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. John Crosbie, Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what our Newfoundland minister commissioned to be done or was part of commissioning. I would like to also say that these four gentlemen did not write the massive volumes at all. What they did was get over 200 people, experts in various fields, in industry, many people in the private sector, some people from the public service, consulting people and so on. They got 256, I believe, of these people and they put them on various committees to come up with recommendations. The recommendations were printed and they were submitted to this task

force of these three and a half powerful men.

Mr. Speaker, from there these men look at the reports individually - this is a huge report - and then submit them to the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet for Cabinet approval. Of course, guess who is on the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet? Guess who is on that Planning and Priorities Committee?

I would like to point out to gentlemen opposite and to you, Mr. Speaker, some of the items that are in this Nielsen Task Force Report. I do not know if these things have gone to Cabinet. I know that a lot of them have already gone to Cabinet.

First of all, let us deal with Search and Rescue. The thing was brought up a moment earlier about Tory and Liberal ice bergs and so on. Do you know what one of the recommendations of Search and Rescue are, Mr. Speaker? The Finance Minister probably knows, 'effect a 10 per cent reduction in marine search and rescue costs.' How do you think they are going to do that 10 per cent reduction, Mr. Speaker? I wonder? Another suggestion is to 'provide experimentally suitable vessels to approved volunteer groups.' Volunteer groups are now going to take on search and rescue responsibilities, Mr. Speaker. These are really brilliant suggestions.

Another suggestion, 'develop a licence fee to apply to all marine vessels, fishing craft and pleasure craft to recover part as of SAR costs,' a tax on all the boats that go offshore here because some time they might become lost and they might need

search and rescue, therefore all fishing vessels be taxed so that they can recover SAR costs.

A big one, Mr. Speaker, is the Newfoundland Railway of course, we all know about that one. The recommendation concerns the end of 1985. Now, that has already gone past. They have been working on this a while and recommendations have gone to Cabinet. This is probably retroactive or radioactive or something, but by the end of 1985 - this is the prosperity they are going to inflict - 'by the end of 1985, reach an agreement in principle,' not try to reach, but 'reach an agreement in principle with the Government of Newfoundland to phase out the Newfoundland Railway.' Do you know the reason they give for doing this, the statement they make in a preamble for doing this? They say 'there is no real economic or public interest need for continued rail service due to the availability of alternate truck and water services.'

Mr. Speaker, I do not know too much about the water services around the Coast I must admit, I do not know too much about that, but I drive that road they are talking about twice a week, that road that is now going to take all this traffic. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when I drove in this last time there is at least fifty miles of that road that I could not get above forty kilometers an hour on, otherwise I would beat my car up. They even call it a highway, the Trans Canada Highway. It is not even a road. It is a goat path. A goat path, that is what it is in part. Mr. Speaker, that is the Newfoundland Railway.

Let me go over some of the recommendations on water transportation for instance. We are dependent on it. A lot of Newfoundland and Labrador is dependent on water transportation. 'Negotiate a termination of subsidies for passenger vessel services along the Labrador Coast.'

MR. DECKER:
What!

MR. FUREY:
Shame! Kirby called that the most underdeveloped part of Canada.

MR. BAKER:
The most underdeveloped part of the country and 'negotiate a termination of subsidies for passenger vessel service along the Labrador Coast.'

MR. DECKER:
Holy mackerel!

MR. BAKER:
'Require CN operated freight service between Mainland Canada and Newfoundland to charge commercially viable rates.' What effect that is going to have on the Province and the cost of things in this Province! The infliction of prosperity we are seeing is raining down on us. Every day there is more and more of this prosperity. We should stack it up somewhere and throw it back at them.

Here is an interesting recommendation. 'Seek judicial clarification on federal constitutional obligations concerning subsidies of constitutional services to Newfoundland and provisions of Newfoundland and Labrador Coastal services.' In other words, they are starting to tinker with the

Terms of Union.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had a couple of hours to into detail on a lot of these things. Let me outline a few more. Labrador Airstrips, let us deal with that one, just one simple little recommendation. These airstrips are being built all along the coast of Labrador. 'Make no commitment to provide direct operating subsidies for coastal Labrador air service' ahead of time, before anybody even suggests it.

Let us go to some of the programmes.

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

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

MR. TULK:
There is some awful disturbances coming from the other side. I find it difficult to hear my friend from Gander speaking. I think it is the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) again. I wonder if you could ask him to be quiet. We have to have some quiet around this place.

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

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Let us go to some other things, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I just listened to the member from Gander (Mr. Baker) and he was speaking about the airstrip programme in Labrador, I never heard his comments so if he would like to repeat it, I would like to hear it.

MR. TULK:

If you can keep your side quiet you might hear it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

For the hon. gentleman's edification, I will simply repeat that the recommendation on Labrador airstrips is that 'the government make no commitment to provide direct operating subsidies for coastal Labrador air service.'

I would like to move onto some other items, Mr. Speaker. The LEAD programme I am particularly interested in. There are tens of millions of dollars every year coming into Newfoundland under the LEAD programme. This is money destined for small business, private enterprise, to create jobs and it creates hundred and hundreds of jobs every year. Do you know what the recommendation for that is, Mr. Speaker? Can anybody guess? It says eliminate the programme. Tens of millions of dollars for small business eliminated.

Small craft harbours. Let us just mention that as well, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure we are going to get into a lot of detail on these things later on. By the way, we have 405 small craft harbours in

this Province.

MR. WARREN:

How many are in your district?
How many are in Gander?

MR. BAKER:

I am not so narrow as to think only of my district. This is one of the problems of members opposite that all they think of is either their own district or Tories and they do not think of the Province. I am thinking of all the Province, even the people in your district.

There are 405 small craft harbours in the Province. Do you know what the recommendation is? 'Impose uniform user fees for all users of Small Craft harbours.' Mr. Speaker, this is a current recommendation that may get through the process of going through Cabinet. It has not been dealt with yet.

Fisheries Vessels Insurance Plan, 'terminate programme within three years,' and put it on a cost effective basis in about two weeks from now. The Fishing Vessels Assistance Programme, 'terminate.' Terminate is the only word that they seem to know when it comes to things that effect Newfoundland. Fisheries Improvement Loans Programme, 'terminate.' That is the recommendation.

Of course, I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not point out that one of the recommendations in that task force is to move another fifty jobs from Gander and put them in St. John's, to move the Gander Weather Office to St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, these are recommendations that are currently

before the Federal Cabinet. I would like to try to relate all this to my particular philosophy of what government should be. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the only possible reason for the existence of any governing body or any government is to provide the best possible life for the greatest number of citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

That is a pretty basic statement on how I believe government should operate. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that government should be a business that is run in the most cost effective manner. I did not say that. I said that my philosophy of government is that the only reason for the existence of government is to provide the best possible life that can be provided for all of the people.

Under this definition would be included an awful lot of things that are not very cost effective. Under my definition of what government should be doing would not come the elimination of services to Labrador. Under my definition of what government should do would not come the elimination of the Newfoundland railroad and would not come increasing freight rates across the Gulf. Under my definition these things would not exist. These things are cost effective things. These things are things that a big business would try to do, not big government. Under my definition, we would try to provide the best services for people in this country, no matter where they live. I would not, as this seems to be doing, try a forced resettlement programme, an

indirect resettlement programme. I would not do that. I would say, regardless of the cost effectiveness of a programme, it has to be done in a way that best serves the people, not in a way that best serves the particular financial system. Mr. Speaker, that is why I have a lot of differences with members opposite. They seem to support what the federal government is doing. I have not heard any outcry, have not heard any screaming, have not heard of any representations made to stop these things from happening. I, Mr. Speaker, have just perused a couple of volumes. I have another sixteen or seventeen volumes to go. I see all of these things recommended.

MR. BARRY:

We have two years of debate now from two volumes.

MR. BAKER:

Yes. We have at least two years of debate.

From what I have seen here there should be almost grounds for revolt, certainly a few voices raised in outrage from members opposite, from the Premier and the Cabinet. Certainly, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should be looking at these things and finding out which of these recommendations have actually already gone through the federal Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that a lot of these recommendations have actually gone through the federal Cabinet. We should know which of these have been accepted. We should have been consulted beforehand on all of these and, for goodness sakes, do not somebody over there tell me that

they have input into these recommendations and this is what was come up with. If that is the case, then their input has been extremely or totally ineffective. So I do not think they were consulted. I do not think this age of consultation really amounts to anything. I do not think the promises of prosperity really amount to anything, Mr. Speaker, because with what is going on here, what kind of prosperity will this mean for our Province? What kind of extra services do these things give? The promise of inflicting prosperity has turned into a horrible nightmare. I would expect that members opposite would join with me and with us, in trying to track down these recommendations and trying to get them changed. I would certainly expect, Mr. Speaker, that that would be done.

In Opposition we received these reports quite recently. I know that they have been available to government for quite some time yet I have not heard a single word. One of those days, somebody is going to have to account. It is as simple as that.

So, Mr. Speaker, they want to close the House down. They want to close her down and run away and hide. They do not want to deal with these problems, the strike, the Interim Supply, paying their bills and this horrible report that does so much damage to this Province. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are no greater reasons for keeping this House open. I have not yet heard a single reason from members opposite why we should close.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing at least I admire about the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) and that is his red tie that he wears. I admire that. There is a Liberal streak in him. He is not completely Tory. There is hope for that vile sinner over there yet. I would ask -

MR. FENWICK:

It looks more orange that red to me actually.

MR. TULK:

Well, you see orange wherever you look 'Peter'.

MR. POWER:

It is just a case of seeing what you want to see, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. POWER:

Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want first of all in this debate to congratulate you, Sir. You were in the Chair at the time. I want to congratulate you first on your courage that allowed us that at least this evening to have this kind of debate that we are having. The government would have wished, when they put the motion to adjourn in the Budget Speech this afternoon, to close down the House. I would suggest that Your

Honour, as an elected member, shows a great deal of courage to uphold the non-partisan nature of this House and to rule according to the rules of this House. I want to congratulate Your Honour on that. We, of course, may not agree with you at all times, as you -

MR. WARREN:

You are only trying to bluff His Honour, sit down.

MR. TULK:

You cannot bluff His Honour. His Honour is a good solid Irishman, and you cannot bluff a good, solid Irishman, he will come out fighting every time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you, I want to congratulate you on having the courage to vote against what in another office -

MR. WARREN:

Double talk!

MR. BAIRD:

What a bluff.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if they can keep going, I can stay here until Your Honour tells me my time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Oh, the minister of farms just spoke from the doorway. Mr. Speaker, as I said I want to congratulate you on your courage to see that at least here is a little bit of democracy retained in this Province. The government of the day, the member for Torngat

Mountains (Mr. Warren), the parliamentary secret to the farm minister, would not want to see that happen. The member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) would not want to see that happen but I want to congratulate Your Honour on at least having the courage to stand against what is basically - we accept that system - his own colleagues. I want to congratulate you on that Your Honour. While we may not agree with you -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bluff!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Flick him out, Mr. Speaker, flick him out. We may not agree with Your Honour on the eleven o'clock ruling for example we do want to congratulate you on that one point.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate -

MR. TOBIN:

Who challenged the ruling?

MR. TULK:

That is our right. His Honour understands that, that is our right. He is not like the people on the other side. He is not like yourself who wants to rule this Province with an iron hand, in a dictatorial manner and in an arrogant fashion. Your Honour is not like that. He understands the process that is there.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, if Your Honour would protect me from the people he has had to chastise on that side all evening, I want to congratulate the members on this side too for the excellent speeches that we have heard this

evening.

MR. POWER:

You are running for leadership are you?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

'Charlie', I am not in the position you are in. My leader is soundly in charge of the party and yours is not.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I want to congratulate the members on this side, and even the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). I can assure him it is not often that we will do that in this House because I am not as far to the left as he is but at least the people on this side have the courage to be here at 3:00 o'clock in the morning showing an arrogant government, a government that seems not to believe in the people that they represent any more, showing them that at least we will stay as long as it is permitted for us to stay to fight against what is obviously an injustice in this Province.

MR. WARREN:

You are making a fool of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, when the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) tells you that you are making a fool of yourself, you can be sure of one thing, you are talking above his head and you do not have to be on to much of an intellectual level to be above his head.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address one other question before I get into exactly why we are here tonight, a question that has been posed by the other side. There are sixteen people, including the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), in the opposition, fifteen Liberals and one NDP. Do you know what we have been told in the past four or five days? We are not allowing the affairs of this Province to be run. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are in control, the fifteen Liberal members and the one independent are in control of this Province. How many are over on that side? There are thirty-six over there. I am sorry Your Honour, thirty-five. You have to sit as an independent person. Sixteen of us are in control over thirty-five. The President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) threatened us with extinction, they are going to wipe us out if we do not give them Interim Supply. We are responsible for the people of this Province not getting paid. Well, well, what an admission of failure and what an admission of mismanagement in this Province, what an admission on the part of the government.

I want to review something that I did the other day on Private Member's Day. We came into this House on February 6 to debate the Atlantic Accord, to debate the offshore, the central theme about which the Premier and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) have built their administration. We were going to debate that and we were going to pass it. The Care Bear over there wanted a few bills passed from 1984, the Loan and Guarantee Act, money that he has paid out that he really does not have the consent of this legislature to pay out yet

or guarantee at least, he wanted that. He called me up one day and said, can he have it and I said when we get our questions answered.

We went until February 21. I think it was on February 17 or 18 when the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) walked in and he said, "we are closing her down on February 21." Why? He was closing her down because the publicity was not what he thought it was going to be, the bloom had gone off the offshore rose. He closed her down on February 21 and he said we are going to open on the 18th. If he wanted Interim Supply, if he wanted to run this Province as the Government House Leader and the Premier are responsible for doing, why did he not keep the House open on February 21? Why did he not bring in his budget and then ask for Interim Supply? I said the other day, I think to Barbara Yaffe from The Globe and Mail, that we have seventy-five hours we could use to debate Interim Supply. Do you know I was wrong? I was wrong. I never thought about it until after I hung up. The truth of the matter is that we have thirty hours at our disposal for Interim Supply as an Opposition because for every department that is referred to the Estimates Committee we have to give up three hours of our time and there are fifteen departments, as the Clerk of the House knows, that are referred to the Estimates Committee. Three times fifteen is forty-five. Forty-five from a total of seventy-five is thirty hours. Thirty hours of debate. That is the maximum that the Opposition could command.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Twenty-five.

MR. TULK:

Forty-five from seventy-five is twenty-five? It is thirty, I tell the hon. gentleman. My math is perfect, it always was. That is the maximum that we could command in Interim Supply.

If the government of this Province had stayed and taken the heat, if the government of this Province had been willing to manage this Province, we would have been here from February 21 until March 18 and until March 31. Where would our thirty hours of debate have gone? It would have gone all over gentleman on the seventeenth day of March. It would have been over. You would have had your Interim Supply but, that is not the way this government operates. That is why we are here tonight. We have to ask ourselves a question, I have to ask myself the question as an individual, as a member of this House, what the hell am I doing here at 2:35? Why am I here?

MR. BUTT:

Making a fool of yourself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I will ignore that comment from a non-minister, from a backbench minister.

Why am I here? Do I want to be here at 2:35 a.m.? For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, no! Mr. Speaker, we are here in this House because we are dealing with a government that is the most arrogant that this Province has ever seen. It has more contempt for the people of this Province

than they have ever witness.

The hon. gentleman from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) was in Cuba. I have sat down and I have watched people in the Province in the last week and a half or two weeks break the law.

MR. WARREN:

And you agree with it.

MR. TULK:

I do not like breaking the law. I do not agree with breaking the law but I have to ask myself the question and I would ask the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to ask himself the question, does there ever come a point when you break the law. That is the key question. The law is something that is made by individuals and the law in this Province is made by the House of Commons and by this Legislature. We are governed by the laws of Canada and the laws of Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN:

They must be obeyed.

MR. TULK:

They must be obeyed at all costs, says the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). So, as an individual, I have to ask a question and I am certain that the people today who are living under Bill 59 and who are living in disparity with their other workers, in a non-equal situation with their fellow workers, they surely had to ask themselves the question, they surely must be asking themselves the question, is there a point at which we should break the law? Is there a point? Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is self-evident.

Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. the

member from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) that he is too much a gentleman to sit with the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). He is a man with a great deal of respect and is seen as a man with a great deal of integrity in this Province, unlike the guy that he is sitting next to right now. I would remind him not to get down to the same level that that hon. gentleman is down. A person that the Speaker this evening has had to chastise at least four times. Mr. Speaker, let me continue.

Are there unjust laws? The answer is yes. Of course, when you follow it up to its logical conclusion, the answer is yes. The Premier of this Province, the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and the other thirty-two members on that side would have us believe in this Province that Fraser March wants to break the law or has a desire to break the law. They would make us believe that the 5,000 who are on strike today would want to break the law. That is what they would have us believe. They want us to believe that those people, standing on an illegal picket line outside this building every day, want to break the law. That is what you would have us believe.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that. I do not believe hon. members can. I will tell you the one thing that has become very evident as I watched my colleagues on this side stand in debate, that when you appeal to the consciousness of some of the people on that side as individuals, you know, Mr. Speaker, they get a little bit uneasy and a little bit fidgety. You can see that the iron whip of the Government House Leader, the

steel arm that he has put around them, is weakening a little bit. I will tell you, the best person who I have heard put what is happening in this House is the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) when he says that we are living in the dying days of a corrupt administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha, ha.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the gentleman - I use that term loosely - be brought under control or asked to leave the House. This place is not a place where you come for a concert, Mr. Speaker. This place is a place where you come to debate very serious matters. If the hon. gentleman does not want to do that, he should leave this place.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is going to speak in this House and make such accusations like he just made, he better know what he is talking about. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that I was not the one who laughed. I am sure there are a lot of hon. members on this side of the House who have to cringe in their seats to help from laughing at the hon. member when he is speaking. But the fact of the matter is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, I was not looking at the hon. member that time and by not looking at the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, I

submit, I was not laughing.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo has asked on a number of occasions for silence, so I expect him to get that.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the point of order is not worth replying to.

Mr. Speaker, what my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) has said on a number of occasions in this House is that this administration is in the dying days of a corrupt administration. I do not believe that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle was saying that the members on the other side or the ministers on the other side are lining their pockets necessarily. He is not necessarily saying that. You do not have to line your pockets with cash to be corrupt. You can be corrupt in the way you treat people. That is what is happening in this Province. We have seen incident after incident after incident since this government came to power in 1979, from 1979 onwards. The Premier in his heyday, the more power he got the more corrupt he became. I do not want to accuse the Premier of being a rogue, I am not going to do that. Corrupt in the sense that he had power he did not know how to use.

Do you know something, Mr. Speaker? I came into this House in 1979 and I have to be quite frank with you, Sir, that when I looked at the Premier of this Province, I admired him as a young person who was slightly younger than I am. I believed in my own mind that, even though he sat on

the other side of the House, he was a person who had the well-being of this Province at heart. Mr. Speaker, the Premier quickly changed.

The next year in a by-election in Bellevue, he told the people of Bellevue, 'my way or no way.' Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province elected that Premier. He wrote a letter. He said if you vote for a person by the name of Wilson Callan and do not vote for - I forget the name of the gentleman, I would not use it anyway - if you do not vote for him you do not get anything.

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, who's money was he spending? Who was he administering the power on behalf of? That corruption, that kind of corruption existed in the government. It became very evident in the Minister of Transportation's (Mr. Dawe) statement last year. I do not want to get into that, Mr. Speaker. The last three elections, 1979, 1982 and 1985, the key phrase has been to the people of this Province 'you vote Tory or else.'

Mr. Speaker, I am getting to the strike. The attitude that we saw in this Province for the last five years is coming to a head in this strike. I want to say to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, not the Liberal party, not the NDP party, not the Federation of Labour in this Province but Fraser March is becoming the spearhead of courage. He is leading the way to tell this Premier that you cannot carry on this type of arrogant behaviour. This kind of arrogant behaviour that says, my way or no way.

MR. TOBIN:

Did he contribute to your campaign?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

No. I have to tell the hon. gentleman that he did not contribute to my campaign the last time.

MR. BARRY:

When are we going to see a minister for Labrador?

MR. BAIRD:

You will never see a Liberal minister for Labrador.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, that is what this strike is all about. I have to tell hon. gentlemen that is what this strike is all about. People who are on those picket lines are looking for some sort of equality or parity. Parity means equality. They are saying to the Premier that employs them, they are saying to the master, to the bosses that the Premier pays the car allowances to, they are saying to them, "give me equality, give me equal pay for equal work." That is what they are saying. Can you get that through your heads that is what they are saying. That is all they are saying. They are only asking to be treated equally in a province they belong to with other people. It is very obvious that they are not. From a Premier that I had to listen to as a member of the Opposition for year after year barrage me with the fact that Newfoundland was not equal in Canada. Well, how in the name of God do you expect to be equal in this country, if you cannot grant equality to the very people that you employ.

AN HON. MEMBER:

True. How true.

MR. TULK:

How can you expect that? How can you even ask the question? Where do you find the moral courage to even ask the question that you would be equal in a country when you cannot even give equality to your own people? How can you do it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

That, as my friend for Fortune - Hermitage says, is the acid test.

The Premier is using every technique. Mr. Speaker, does anybody believe that we came into this House today thinking we could keep this House open indefinitely? Not at all. We knew that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier could use the rules of this House and their majority to eventually flick us out of here. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, the difference between this side and that side? At 3:30 or 4:00, whenever the debate ends in this House, this side can go home with a clear conscience.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Because we stood in this House -

MR. TOBIN:

There is not a conscience over there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

We stood in this House and we used the rules of this House and we

used every technique that we could find to defend the people that this House is suppose to govern, but the government has lost sight of that. That is the corruption and it is as bad, Mr. Speaker, as financial corruption, but that is the corruption that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) has been referring to.

I want to say to the hon. gentlemen opposite that there was a Liberal Government in this Province for twenty-three years -

MR. BAIRD:

We are still paying for it.

MR. TULK:

- and it was a very good government. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, when its downfall started? I warn hon. gentleman, for their own sakes. Do you know when its downfall, in my humble opinion, started in this Province? It was a strike which will go down in the history of Newfoundland labour relations as not being a very good strike for this Province. It was a strike, Mr. Speaker, that was called the IWA strike. Mr. Speaker, this strike and the labour relations problems that exist in this Province today have any of the characteristics of that.

MR. WARREN:

Time is up.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, my time is going to be up in a couple of minutes. If I could do one thing - and there is only one person on this side who can speak after I am finished and that is the Leader and then we are going to have a vote and then this place is going to close. The government is going to use its majority to see that that

happens. If I could leave one message, Mr. Speaker, in my next couple of minutes, I want to say to the people on that picket line and the people who are fighting the unjust laws that this Premier and the corrupt attitude that this government has towards its employees, do not let what happened in the IWA strike happen in this Province. Keep her cool, keep fighting, and the corruption that exists will eventually pass from the labour relations situation that we have today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in five minutes we will have been in this House for twelve hours and twelve hours later we still have to hear one member opposite get up and say anything about the fact that there are 5,000 Newfoundlanders on the picket lines in this Province, twelve hours later!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), Mr. Speaker, who is trying to suck his way into Cabinet will not get it by trying to shout me down in this debate. I ask for the protection of the Chair. He will not get into Cabinet by

trying to shout me down. Your Honour, I ask for the protection of the Chair.

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is going to get in this House and try to show leadership and get up and refer to another member as trying to suck his way this way or suck his way the other way, maybe the Leader of the Opposition has a lot of experience in sucking his way through, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Carbonear knows very little about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

If I could, Your Honour, just deal with that point of order, there is obviously a very heavy competition for sucking underway in the backbenches over there.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask hon. members on the left to please maintain silence while the Leader of the Opposition is speaking. He has requested that.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, there is obviously a very heavy competition for sucking and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) does not want to be out sucked by the member for Carbonear (Mr.

Peach). I wonder who is the sucker and I wonder who is the suckee, Mr. Speaker. We have seen this tactic before, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A Point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to keep this up, I can tell him, looking at his lips, who the sucker is.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the quality of those aspiring to enter into Cabinet tonight. We have seen the class act, as pointed out by the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), performance by the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and the record of this debate, Mr. Speaker, will be carried by him around to entitle himself to move into the Cabinet. He will lay this out for the people of the Province to justify his going into Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, when he stood up in this House for thirty minutes and not once dealt with the fact that his fellow citizens in this Province were on the picket line and had a serious grievance, with the administration which he supports.

MR. PEACH:

Barry says (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

The member for Carbonear, Mr. Speaker, did not -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member for Carbonear not to keep interrupting.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the people for Carbonear know what to do with the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) in the next election. I tell you they are very disappointed in that member who, at one point in time, had a certain respect as a municipal politician.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

If Your Honour wishes to cast an admonition towards the hon. member for Carbonear, I would suggest to Your Honour that it could be equally cast to the Leader of the Opposition for trying to entice, after Your Honour has made that ruling, interjections from the member for Carbonear.

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, I hope the Government House Leader is not trying to threaten Your Honour. I hope that the Government House Leader did not intend to prevent Your Honour from doing what he is doing, I think, reasonably well, which is

trying to ensure that we have the opportunity to speak in silence in this House and to speak without interruption.

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Clean.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, when members in the backbenches of this House do not have the courage to stand up and address the public issues of the day, when they do not have the courage to say whether or not they agree with the suspensions that have been imposed upon the people in this Province who are being arrested, and state clearly whether they agree with the injunctions and the arrests that have taken place, Mr. Speaker, we must speak up. We have not heard members opposite stand up and say whether they support that policy or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, here is an example, this is democracy at its best.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is a point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has asked to be heard while he is speaking. I ask that that be honoured.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
We have seen what is supposed to have been a debate in this House. We had one member that I am aware of - was there any more than one that got up and spoke in the debate - one member, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), arose in a fit of pique, in a fit of spite, after having

received what will go down in the annals of this House as the classic, Mr. Speaker, put down. It is on par with one of Stephen Leacock's short stories. The balance, the temperate and moderate tone, Mr. Speaker, that left the member for Burin - Placentia West white faced, not in his own seat, in the seat of the Attorney General (Ms Verge) while his own colleagues laughed at his discomfort, while his own colleagues laughed -

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Your Honour, you made a ruling tonight about members of the Opposition enticing people into debate. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and let the record show that both the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) and the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) were the two members that were put down by the people of Burin - Placentia West and not the present member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly to that point of order.

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

MR. BARRY:
The people of Burin - Placentia West are reserving that pleasure

for you in the next election.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Do you want to put a bet on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) is another dandy. We have heard him stand up here tonight and defend the democratic rights of workers in this Province. That is the same member, Mr. Speaker, who sent his deputy minister to the Arts Conference to explain that the minister had to be at a ministerial conference in Montreal.

MR. TULK:

Where was he?

MR. BARRY:

It just so happened that within minutes after that statement, there was an article from The Evening Telegram passed around by members of the Arts Council pointing out that the minister was on his way to Grand Bank for a sports banquet. It was a stop off on the way to Montreal.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot in this House this evening but the

Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), who is also the member for Grand Bank, may not be in a position to stand up on this, but I can. Mr. Speaker, I take great exception to the people of Grand Bank, who were involved in the sports fraternity, being insulted by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) because the Minister of Recreation was there to speak to them.

MR. BAIRD:

Sit down. Sit down.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Crown here has done an excellent job in all aspects of that Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth and the people of Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, should not be subjected to that type of abuse from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we all take exception to what is happening in this House. We take exception, as the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) did tonight, when the hon. gentleman was making such a fool of himself. The gentleman from Twillingate tonight gave him a lesson on how he should behave.

MR. BARRY:

His own members were laughing. His own members were enjoying it.

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Career Development and Career Development (Mr. Power) was splitting his sides because he

knew that the hon. gentleman was getting such a - well, it was not even a dressing down. You could not call it that. It was an honest appraisal of the hon. gentleman in this House, and I take exception to the fact that the kind words of the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) fell on deaf ears. He should learn to follow some of the things that was laid down for him by the gentleman for Twillingate in such an easy fashion and such a kind fashion and not be making such a fool of himself in this House. That is what we take exception to.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the young gentleman from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), and the young sucker from Carbonear (Mr. Peach), can go on all they want and try and shout me down. They can have an hour of trying to shout me down. The record will speak for itself.

It is members on this side of the House who have gotten up, and I include the member for Menihek in this, and have addressed the issue as to why we are here tonight. It is to point out the injustice that exists when you have men and women who are trying to get a decent living wage, being driven to the picket lines and a government that wants to close down the House of Assembly to get rid of the heat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

They want to cut and run, Mr.

Speaker, and all we have to do is ask where is the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), where is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), where is the Premier in terms of participating in this debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I think that this debate, if it could be called a debate, because normally as the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) has pointed out, a debate involves a give and take, it involves a flow on both sides, Mr. Speaker, and all that we have seen is one member stand up from the other side and attempt to deal with the richly deserved rebuke which was delivered in classic fashion. It will go down in the annals of this House, I would submit, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I would recommend to Your Honour, at the next Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, take that extract from this Hansard be taken, Your Honour should carry it in his briefcase to that conference and challenge the Speaker of any other House of the Commonwealth to come up with such a classic rebuke.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

The young gentleman for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) sat in his seat silently, Mr. Speaker, and that in itself said something

as to what was happening. He did not have a word in his mouth. No, he did not blush. He went whiter and whiter with every word that was delivered because it was going right to the heart, Mr. Speaker, and he knew it. Then we get that member stand up, Mr. Speaker, and his contribution to the debate was to try, Mr. Speaker, and attack the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), as if that would undo the truth and the honesty of the words that were spoken. The member forgot about those people on the picket line as every member opposite has forgotten those people on the picket line.

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is speaking in debate and he is talking about what should be said and what should not be said and what the issues in this debate are.

MR. J. CARTER:

He is just scum, that is all. He is just scum.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point perfectly clear, since the hon. Leader got up to speak tonight it has been nothing except the personal vindictive attack on me as the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. J. CARTER:

He is scum. He was elected by scum. Pure scum.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to Your Honour that that should not be permitted to continue. The reason why, Mr. Speaker, that is taking place is because I happen to win Burin - Placentia West on two occasions, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition did not. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Leader of the Opposition now explains to me, Mr. Speaker, I thought he was in another one of his tantrums because what happened a few minutes ago outside the walls of this House and the threatening from the Leader of the Opposition would not happen in a bar in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member is not making a point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. TULK:

That is number six, 'Glen'.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour is absolutely right. There is no point of order. It was very interesting, however, Mr. Speaker, while the member was speaking to look around and from Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, to look, look, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) is still grinning over there, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) could not help it, Mr. Speaker. When you get members of his own party, Mr. Speaker, laughing at the member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- you know the depth to which he

has fallen, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Ask the Government House Leader to send him out.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it would not be so bad that this is the man who was suppose to be representing the Premier. That was the Premier's speech in this debate that we had. That was the speech of the Premier on this labour issue.

MR. TULK:

That is the man who gives him advice.

MR. BARRY:

He advises?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Do you make any wonder they are in the mess they are in?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I bet he would give advice as good as Rex.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder in how many parliaments in the British Commonwealth have we had debates proceed, this is the second or third time, I am not sure, I think it is the third time that we have seen this approach, Mr. Speaker, where members opposite do not stand up and debate the issues. We have had excellent speeches from every member on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

They were thoughtful, Mr. Speaker, they were researched, they were well articulated, they were hard hitting and they were right to the issue that we are dealing with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there are certain people who will work for a living and make a good living through hard work, and then there are others, Mr. Speaker, who have very few options to fall back on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! There are three or four members on the left who are continuously interrupting and I call on them now not to do so.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there are people who will go out, work well, get good results and make a good dollar through hard work and, I think, it is called a free enterprise system and then there are others who have never seen success. There are others who have never been able to earn a dollar. There are those who have to try and cling to the House of Assembly because, if they are ever thrown out on their arses, they will starve, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I think maybe the hon. member would like to withdraw that.

MR. BARRY:

That is a good parliamentary phrase, by the way, Mr. Speaker, it is a good Anglo Saxon phrase. I will give Your Honour an opportunity to check that out. If it is unparliamentary, I will be happy to withdraw it.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to refer to being thrown out on his own head, which was done in 1975, let him refer to his own head.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I must say how much I have admired the Chair tonight in its efforts to constrain a fairly wild bunch but I want to appeal to the Chair in one respect, in relation to this point of order. I think I have heard about three gallons of order tonight altogether, about a pint at a time, from the gentleman for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). Mr. Speaker, I do not think you can deal with it fully tonight but it seems to me that in line with your undertaking at the beginning of this session, to enforce the rules even more vigorously than

you did before, if that were possible, that people like the gentleman for Burin-Placentia West must be taken to task. It is clear what he is doing. It is clear that he is deliberately obstructing. Nobody on this side of the House tonight set out to deliberately obstruct. We have interjected points of order which we felt were points of order and I believe the gentleman for Burin-Placentia West has to be dealt with. This has gone on long enough and if he is going to come in the House at all, he should just sit there on his brain and stop interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. I think the point is well taken. The hon. member has risen on what I would consider spurious points of order on quite a number of occasions, so I will just have to keep a stricter check on him.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have seen twelve hours and sixteen minutes of debate and we have yet to have one member opposite address the fact that we have a serious labour dispute in this Province. Newfoundlanders have been arrested. We have Newfoundlanders who feel they have been done an injustice.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You wanted more arrested.

MR. BARRY:

We have the courts being -

MR. PEACH:

You know all about injunctions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have the courts in this Province being held up to disrepute by the Premier, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), and the Attorney General (Ms. Verge), who refuse to enforce their undertaking which they gave to the court in order to obtain an injunction, when they had to assure the Chief Justice of Newfoundland that if there was a breach of an injunction, they would see that those breaching the injunction were brought before the Chief Justice. We see the state of affairs in this Province where a judge, himself, has to stop his car and get out and attempt to enforce an injunction because the Attorney General, the Premier and members opposite are refusing, Mr. Speaker, to live up to their undertaking and have decided for political reasons the laws of this Province will be applied unfairly. They will be applied to one group of individuals and not to another. They sit quietly, rather than deal with that type of fundamental issue, which has been raised by member after member on this side, rather than deal with whether or not it is fair to have disparity and to have men and women doing the same work getting paid much less than others in another bargaining unit.

Mr. Speaker, we have not heard members stand up and justify the imposition of the wage freeze without consultation, which is what has led to this disparity. We have not heard members opposite stand up and defend Bill 59 which is an irritant, Mr. Speaker, as far as the labour movement is concerned. We have not heard members opposite get up and say whether they agree that a thirty day suspension is the way to encourage workers to come back to

work. We have not heard members stand up and talk about over what period of time should we seek parity. We have not heard members get up and attempt to justify whether it is \$140 million or is it only \$19 million that is needed to provide parity. The Premier says, "People do not believe me any more in this Province." Is there any wonder, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier authorizes double page ads to be carried saying \$140 million is the cost, when the union is saying that works out to \$25,000 per member.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Twenty-three thousand, five hundred.

MR. BARRY:

Twenty-three thousand, five hundred. Okay. We have not heard, Mr. Speaker, anything about whether that \$140 million is accurate, whether it was drawn out of the figment of someone's imagination in a nightmare. I can understand members opposite being in a nightmare because never in the history of labour relations, not in this Province or in Canada, has a government so bungled a labour dispute; never has a government so quickly boxed themselves into a corner; never have we seen a government take a line which they suddenly discover is going to result in their having to lock up everybody in the Province, except those sitting on the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, one thing they attempt to do periodically, and they must have done in this case, was do a little poll. They did a little poll. Now, it was not the poll that the Premier pretended was carried out. The poll that was carried out concerned what does the ordinary Newfoundlander

think about us having Newfoundlanders arrested? Do you know what that poll showed? It showed that close to 90 per cent of those polled were ready to puke over the actions of members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

It showed that Peter Fenwick is more popular than you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

That must mean I have 51 per cent and Peter has got 49 per cent, surely you have not gone that far already Peter? There is not much left for members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

There are a couple of members on my left that I am finding very difficult to control. I think they are disregarding my request and they have done that for the last hour. I would be very reluctant to name them but I will certainly do that if it continues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I see the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) has just arrived. Perhaps the President of Treasury Board would be interested in hearing that we have had now twelve hours and twenty-two minutes of debate apart from supper -

MR. WINDSOR:

And you have not settled anything.

MR. BARRY:

Now see the open mind of Treasury Board again. We see the open mind of the President, the same sort of open-mindedness he exhibits, obviously, around the bargaining table. We have not said a thing. He was not here to hear what we were saying. But it is the same approach that has been taken with the union membership, they have come in and he says, "You do not have a thing to offer" before he even hears what he has to say.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the opportunity to have some discussions with members of the NAPE negotiating team and they will be making certain statements tomorrow which will be carried in the press, statements such as that the only discussions that have been carried out so far are discussions similar to those held at the conclusion of the Korean War where several months were spent in debating what the height of the negotiating table should be.

Similar debate took place at the conclusion of the Vietnam War when, you will recall, Vietnamese negotiators for a time were over with American negotiators in Paris and they spent a month or so debating whether it should be a square table or a round table.

Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of proposal that has been made by government, that is the extent of negotiations so far with the union. We have had the President of Treasury Board say that he is prepared to put the question of suspension to arbitration. Mr. Speaker, that has been held out to the union leaders. He has also

said that he is prepared to put a proposal that would lead toward parity - now listen to this - do you think it is in one year, two years, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine? Between ten and twelve years, Mr. Speaker, between ten and twelve years is what the minister's proposal would mean that members of that union would have to wait for, ten to twelve years, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Do you know something, the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) was not here, so he is probably not aware of the fact that not a single member opposite has stood up to defend the President of Treasury Board's position, not a member, Mr. Speaker. I see the hand of the Premier in that, because I see the President of Treasury Board being hung out to dry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Swinging in the wind, I think that is the phrase. The Minister of Treasury Board and his leadership aspirations are being hung out to dry and are left dangling in the wind.

MR. BAIRD:

Tell us about your leadership aspirations in 1979?

MR. BARRY:

The ice man cometh from the far corner. What was that interjection.

MR. BAIRD:

Tell us about your leadership aspirations in 1979?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) has said to the union leadership is that there will be no offer and no negotiations until the worker returns to work. There is a precondition for any bargaining which is directly contrary and contradictory to the falsehood issued by the Premier when he said that discussions were underway. When he stood up in this House in an attempt to avoid the heat, in an attempt to avoid answering the legitimate questions that were being put by members on this side of the House we, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Are you breaching your word with NAPE now?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

We heard not a soul over there stand up to defend the position taken by the President of Treasury; not a person stood up to say that a thirty day suspension was the way to induce workers to get back to work; not a single person stood up to commend the minister for getting the courts involved so quickly; not a single person stood up to commend the minister of the efficient way in which he flicked people into jail; not a single person, Mr. Speaker, stood up to talk about the way in which he had managed to get the Department of Justice to turn a blind eye to his subsequent

decision to only arrest 120 and not to arrest the other 4,000 and something who were in a similar position; not a single person stood up on the other side, Mr. Speaker, to explain why, in all decency and fairness and justice, the Attorney General (Ms Verge) should not be going down to court right now and asking the Chief Justice to dismiss the charges that have been laid against those who have been arrested; not a single person has stood up, Mr. Speaker, to explain why it was necessary to clarify the wording of an injunction which said that all members of NAPE shall bugger off; not a single person got up to clarify that, Mr. Speaker, when we heard the Premier and the Attorney General stand up and say that they need clarification as to whether the general service, who are members of NAPE, are covered by that injunction; not a single person stood up to explain what the difficulties in that clear english, what the difficulties in comprehension were as far as members opposite were concerned; not a single member stood up, Mr. Speaker, to answer those calls that we have all been getting where men and women, who are making less than poverty wages say, is it fair that there be car allowances when a car allowance, Mr. Speaker, is less than is necessary in order to give us parity; not a single person stood up to explain why there was that spontaneous round of applause - and Your Honour was not in the Chair, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) was in the Chair - but not a single person stood up to explain why that, not orchestrated, Mr. Speaker, not artificial but that spontaneous applause that took place in this gallery by people who did not know that they were not allowed to do

what they would normally do in church, in their everyday life, whenever they hear something that they know makes sense and they want to applaud.

When we said, Mr. Speaker, that all these people are looking for is the equivalent of a car allowance, not a member opposite has stood to explain what it is that this car allowance has done to those picket on the picket lines. Not a single person has stood up.

MR. WARREN:
What car allowance?

MR. BARRY:
The car allowance that the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) gets with no roads to drive on, that car allowance.

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

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

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know what car allowance the hon. leader is talking about unless it is his own car allowance for the car he is using and the government credit card.

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

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Nor is the member in order.

Mr. Speaker, not a member opposite has stood up to deal with the legitimate concerns raised by the International Labour Organization;

not a single member has stood up to deal with why Interim Supply was not put forth by the Government House Leader today, as he promised yesterday he would do; not a member opposite has stood up to explain why it is that government has not put forward Interim Supply today; not a member has stood up to talk about whether or not it is going to be legal for the Government House Leader to go for a Special Warrant when it is his option and members opposite, their option, as to whether or not the House stays open.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are very serious problems occurring. I understand, for example, that around the Cabinet table we have the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) making the following statement. He said, 'I have been involved in settling every labour dispute of any magnitude in the last fifteen years in this Province and I am not being consulted on this one when I am now a member of Cabinet.'

MR. PEACH:

That is not correct.

MR. BARRY:

I should point out to the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) that he is not yet in Cabinet so I do not think he is the one to rebut that particular statement. How do it know, Mr. Speaker, how do it know?

Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that the Minister of Labour has not shown up here tonight gives some indication of the problems that exist. We have the Minister responsible for Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) being held out to dry by the Premier. We have the Premier's press secretary letting slip to the media this afternoon that the reason why the Premier

has been low key in this labour dispute is because the Premier wants to be the mediator and the peacemaker to settle this dispute after the President of Treasury Board is wiped out and has had sufficient rope with which to string himself up.

MR. TULK:

That is Brian.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for Treasury Board, I fear, is going to finally discover what it is like to have a knot around his neck.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

By the time the Premier is finished with the Minister responsible for Treasury Board, there will be a knot around that minister's neck.

MR. TULK:

It will be a slip knot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

It will be a Peckford knot.

MR. BARRY:

This has been confirmed by the minister's press secretary that the Premier is awaiting the appropriate moment to step in as peacemaker. That is the same Premier who agreed to the thirty days suspension, that is the same Premier who instructed the Attorney General to go down and obtain an injunction, that is the same Premier who stood by and

consented to 120 of his
Newfoundlanders being thrown in
jail, Mr. Speaker, that is the
peacemaker.

It is very interesting you know as
you go around the Province, and I
have been to the West Coast, I
have been to Labrador, I have been
to Central Newfoundland, the South
Coast, I have been to the
Northeast Coast, I have been to
the Avalon Peninsula, wherever you
go you see a similar theme, you
see, for example, the reference to
Marcos.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Goose Bay.

MR. BARRY:
I was in Goose Bay. It was one of
the places. The theme has gone
right through the Province. You
see the reference to Baby Doc
Duvalier.

MR. TULK:
And Baby Duck.

MR. BARRY:
And Baby Duck.

MR. TULK:
Baby Duck is the President of
Treasury Board, a sitting duck.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
No, I did not see any references
to Fidel I must say because I
think Fidel has too clean an
image. Fidel still has the image
of somebody who is concerned about
the ordinary Cuban, I think. I
think Fidel is still believed in.
I think the people of Cuba still
believe in Fidel.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the
President of Treasury Board.

MR. MARSHALL:
I realize the Liberals have a lot
of experience with people like the
Fidels of this world but, Mr.
Speaker, it is hardly relevant to
this motion. I am not interested
in Fidel Castro and what have
you. The motion before the
Chamber is that the House adjourn
until April 7. I do not think
that Mr. Castro has anymore to do
with it than Mr. Barry will have
ultimately in the vote.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
I realize the Leader of the
Opposition was hitting close to
the bone when he was leading up to
an essential and very pertinent
point, that the reason we do not
want this House to close is
because we would like to keep it
open, to convince our Baby
Doc-like Premier that he ought to
allow some common sense to
prevail. I do not think anything
that has been said here tonight in
this debate is anymore germane
than the discussion of the
dictatorial attitude of the
Premier. That is what my friend
was on, that dictatorial
attitude. As long as that
prevails, we have to have an
opportunity to debate the issue in
this House. It must not close
down. That is the issue.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

To that point of order, I think

the whole debate this afternoon has been fairly broad and, in that sense certainly, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I sat up in the gallery for a while earlier today and, Mr. Speaker, the one comment that I got from a number of the people who were sitting and looking down is why is it that the government members are not defending themselves? Why is it that they are not getting up? Why is it that they are sitting there - Mr. Speaker, I think one gentleman said - with not a word in their mouths? The people in the gallery were saying "what are they doing here in the House of Assembly if they are not here to defend government policy." That is something that the people of this Province, I think, are going to look back at tonight. They are going to look back tonight and the people on the picket line - and not only the people on the picket line - all the people who have been watching television and saying, as the people were dragged off to jail, "you know, that is not right." That should not be happening in Newfoundland.

They are not all that sympathetic necessarily to unions or the union, Mr. Speaker, but they are upset. They are, Mr. Speaker, greatly upset by what they see as the injustice of having their fellow Newfoundlanders dragged off to jail.

Mr. Speaker, how is it, they are going to ask, that we can have thirteen hours of debate on the issue of the strike and not have a single member opposite get up to

defend the policies of government. That is the question, Mr. Speaker, that will go forth from this day hence. This is the question that will go out to the people of the Province between now and the next election. Do they care? The answer will be obvious. They do not care enough to stand up and answer some of the questions that I have put here this evening that members on this side have put throughout the day. They do not care enough, Mr. Speaker, to get up and give their explanation of what they think is fair in terms of a decent living wage. They do not, Mr. Speaker, care enough to get up and talk about what is good or not good about Bill 59. They do not care enough to get up and try and justify the thirty day suspensions. They do not care enough to get up and talk about why judges of the Supreme Court are out trying to enforce their own injunctions. They do not care.

Do you know something, Mr. Speaker? The people of this Province no longer care for them. It is, Mr. Speaker, one of the better examples of feedback. A government does not care and a people do not care for the government. Mr. Speaker, that is not going to change overnight. Members opposite have made a very serious mistake here. When they decided that they were going to try and deal with these strikers by brute force, when they decided they were going to try and intimidate the strikers, they made a serious mistake. They know it is a serious mistake. They know they made a serious mistake and they were not men enough and woman enough to stand up and admit they made a mistake and correct it by removing those suspensions that

the minister responsible for Treasury Board, in his arrogance, had the audacity to slap on these workers. They did not have the courage to stand up and admit that a mistake had been made. So what they have done has caused this labour dispute to intensify, to worsen, the crisis gets worse every day, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PEACH:

Tell us about the last poll.

MR. BARRY:

I will tell the member about the last poll. The last poll identified the most important issue in this Province, Mr. Speaker - I can give them all the details if they want - it was carried out by members opposite and it showed the most important issue in this Province is job creation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, leadership.

MR. BARRY:

The most important weakness -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- on the part of members opposite is a loss of credibility, followed closely by poor labour relations. Mr. Speaker, the most important issue that people say that they want dealt with is job creation.

MR. PEACH:

What about leadership?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member for Carbonear -

MR. SIMMONS:

Name him.

MR. SPEAKER:

- insists on interrupting. I will have to name him if he continues.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the poll shows that the number one issue in this Province is job creation. Let us ask what this strike is doing and the government manner of dealing with this strike is that doing for job creation. Here is what is happening. I have had, Mr. Speaker, calls from business people in this Province who are saying to me, we have the opportunity for joint ventures to bring capital in from outside this Province to create jobs and we are losing those joint ventures because people from outside are looking in and saying, "what in God's name is going on?"

MR. YOUNG:

Did Johnston say that in his book about Trudeau?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

"What is going on?" they are saying. "Has the government totally lost control? Are we going into a state of anarchy in this Province? How can we invest money to create jobs in a province where government cannot deal with the labour dispute without throwing people in jail, without forcing Supreme Court judges to enforce their own injunctions, without applying the laws of the Province unfairly, applying them to 120 people and not to another 3,000 or 4,000 who are doing exactly the same thing?"

MR. BAIRD:

Bring back Neary, for God's sake,
bring back Neary.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
These people say "we cannot risk our money in such an unsettled atmosphere," and that is the sad part about what is happening here today, Mr. Speaker. It is not just the irreparable harm to labour relations.

MR. YOUNG:
A leadership review.

MR. DECKER:
This is the same problem they have in developing nations.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, that is the sad situation. It is not just the damage that is being done to labour relations between government and its employees, it is a poor image for encouraging investment in this Province. When you have a government that not only is not able to control but is in fact the cause of the disorder which has resulted, people outside this Province look in and see a government which has provoked, by intolerable action, its employees to rise up and say, enough, no more, we have had it. We must do something we cannot stand by and see the type of waste in expenditure, we cannot stand by and see these travel allowances being doled out to suckers in the backbenches, we cannot stand by and see all those political appointments of defeated party hacks, we cannot stand by, Mr. Speaker, and see the millions of dollars being spent on capital

works.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. MITCHELL:
Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Leader of the Opposition talking about the wonderful intellectual speeches that have been coming from members on the other side. We have heard some words tonight in this debate that I feel are very derogative to have been used in this House of Assembly. We have heard the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) use the word -

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, this is a speech.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile, we understand and we sympathize, finds himself out in a district now that has been eviscerated by Tory policies in Ottawa.

MR. TOBIN:
That is shocking! That is despicable!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I ask that the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) withdraw that comment about

Your Honour. For the member for Burin-Placentia West to say that Your Honour's ruling is 'despicable' must be taken back now, immediately.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon gentleman for Burin-Placentia West, who speaks the truth at all times, said 'despicable' and I think he was referring to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, which is a very apt description of the hon. Leader.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

If the member for Burin-Placentia West is a man of his word he will confirm for the House exactly what was intended, not as twisted by the hon gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). We all know it was an aspersion on the Chair and he knows it was an aspersion on the Chair.

MR. BAIRD:

You are a great one to talk about aspersions on the Chair.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker there he goes while I am trying to make a point of order. We are here on some serious business. My constituents did not send me here to try and match wits with a bunch of overpaid halfwits and drunken slobs. Mr. Speaker, let us hear the Leader of the Opposition. If they want to shut her down let them shut her down, but at least let us have the decency to be governed by some basic rules here. Who takes any pride in what

has gone on here tonight?

MR. YOUNG:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

I say to the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) that I am no drunken slob, neither am I a tax evader. I wish the member to withdraw those remarks. If he thinks I was out this afternoon drinking he got something else coming to him. I was in my district this afternoon looking after my constituents. I am no drunken slob, I can tell the hon. member that.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, seeing I was the one he referred to.

MR. BARRY:

Would the real drunken slob stand up perhaps is what we should say.

MR. YOUNG:

I was over in my district all afternoon. He is a tax evader, a thing that was kicked out of cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

'Haig' is gone! 'Haig' is gone!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

'Haig' is gone! Yes, put him out 'Bill'. He is out of control. He is gone.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! As I understood it, the point of order was in connection with a remark that the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West made. I will check in Hansard, and I will rule the next day on that matter.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

There is no point of order, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have ruled on the point of order.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to make it perfectly clear to you, Your Honour, and to the House that when I said the word 'despicable' I was referring to the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that at no time have I and at no time will I cast aspersions on the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I accept the word of the hon. member, naturally.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will also accept the fact that he is an expert in despicability. There is no question about that, Mr. Speaker. He has carved out an area of expertise, and that is the category, Mr. Speaker, that he has slotted for himself and he will go down in the annals of this House.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen an example of the level of debate. We saw the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) stand up and make his valuable contribution to the cause of the workers on the

picket line. We saw the Minister of Public Works deal with the issues. The Minister of Public Works has done that a few times before at this time in the evening, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG:

I will put your teeth in the seat of your pants pretty quick.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we are being threatened.

MR. BARRY:

Would Your Honour please deal with that, Mr. Speaker? That is not going to be allowed to pass. Would Your Honour deal with that?

MR. SPEAKER:

I think the hon. minister made some comments there that in my opinion should be withdrawn.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

If he had any courage he would do that, Mr. Speaker. But I fear that the minister will run and hide, Mr. Speaker, because that is the type of minister he is.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw what I said. Unfortunately, I was provoked by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I withdraw those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I thank the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker, and I hope he will withdraw his comments with respect to the strikers that he was giving from outside as well. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that he will show some respect for the men and women who have gone out on the picket line.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should get germane to the debate. I mean, the hon. minister has withdrawn any remarks that he made and what the hon. gentleman is doing is trying to provoke other remarks. I think that the hon. gentleman, if he is germane to the debate, should speak to the motion and not speak to individuals. He is a past master, Mr. Speaker, at speaking about individuals rather than issues.

MR. BARRY:

There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I rule there is no point of order. I would like to point out to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition he has about a minute left.

MR. BARRY:

About a minute left, yes. Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is that in a minute I will be able to say more on this issue than all members opposite have said in the

course of fourteen hours of debate.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where our citizens in this Province, where men and women are on the picket lines and are being oppressed. They are having the full force of the law being brought to bear. We have a Premier who has stayed out of this House for fourteen hours of this debate and is now coming in, Mr. Speaker, and presumably they will now do as they did the last time we had a so-called debate on an important issue and one or two or three or, who cares, the whole thirty-six will stand up - thirty-five excluding Your Honour - will stand up now after the points that have been made by this side and attempt, Mr. Speaker, to justify their bungling of this labour dispute, the injustice they are inflicting on workers in this Province, the callousness of their approach for arresting some workers and not arresting others, the lack of respect for the law and for the courts.

MR. TOBIN:

You want them all arrested, do you?

MR. BARRY:

No, there should be nobody arrested. The Attorney General should go down and ask that the charges be dismissed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I said wake up! Wake up before it is too late, wake up while we can still deal with this problem and deal with

these people fairly, wake up and let us have some action instead of the nonsense we have had from you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

As the debate winds up, I shall take a couple of moments of the House's time just to make a few comments. We have been treated here for the past twelve to thirteen or fourteen hours with a debate following an adjournment motion. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, in his remarks, talked about the number of people that he had talked with in the galleries. The fact of the matter is that the Opposition wanted this House to remain open until, as they professed it, there was a resolution of this strike. There were not a great number of people here in the galleries, which indicates the type of support that the hon. Leader of the Opposition can garner with respect to that particular matter. It has all been for naught, these past twelve or fourteen hours. All that the hon. gentlemen there opposite have shown is that it can take twelve or fourteen hours to bring to a resolution and to a vote a simple adjournment motion. He is a party leader and they are a group without a following at all in this Province. They do not excite people, they do not incite people. They have tried to incite them and they will try again to incite them in this particular strike. I think it is rather shallow indeed that the last words

of the Leader of Opposition dealt with respect for the law and bolstering the law and following the law of this Province. I should think over the adjournment period that the hon. gentleman's hypocritical statements could be assessed by the public, and I would hope by himself, with respect to these aspects, because all he has done in this particular House is tried to incite the particular strike itself and that has been the whole purpose of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

The salient issue before the people of this Province, without going into the legitimacy of the substance of what has been said, the kernel issue that is before the people today is whether or not when laws are put down and enforced by the courts by injunctions, what is the consequence of people saying that we are not going to obey them merely because we do not agree with them? If we get that, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we will have the type of anarchy that the Leader of the Opposition and his followers are attempting to engender in this Province and in the House today. Mr. Speaker, when we convened this House was on March 10 we gave the Opposition a letter and we indicated to them the programme by which we had hoped this House would operate; that we would reconvene, as we did on Tuesday last, at which time we had the Throne Speech, then came Private Member's Day and we told them that Thursday, Friday and Monday, three days, would be concerned with Interim Supply, and we brought Interim Supply in in a timely fashion. I say again the

House of Commons considers in six days or seven days or eight days some \$106 billion or \$110 billion, and the hon. gentlemen there opposite could not pass Interim Supply for \$700 million even though they knew when they came back and the House reconvened that they would have an opportunity for debating the very measures entailed in that Interim Supply for three weeks themselves. So the consequence is that Interim Supply has not been passed and the government is faced with the very, very pressing problem of whether they would press on with Interim Supply.

MR. TULK:

Keep the House open.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman says, 'Keep the House open.' For fifteen days or twenty days? There are the rights of the majority, the majority in this Province spoke, spoke loudly and clear approximately a year ago and, Mr. Speaker, there are rights of the Opposition, there are rights of the minority which this government respects, but the rights of the minority do not extend to tyranny of the minority over the majority.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province were entitled to see Interim Supply passed. Well this government happens to be the government and we are not going to bend to the jealousy that we have been subjected to month after month since the members of the official Opposition chose a dissident Tory who lived day after day after day in envy and in enmity against the leader of this government and the government itself. And the people of this Province are not going to suffer,

Mr. Speaker, because of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

So what we are going to do and what we propose to do is use other measures that are beyond the ken and beyond the appreciation and intelligence of the hon. gentleman. But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, and let me say this loudly and clearly, to the people in this Province over the next four weeks, to the people in the health services who have to have their cheques from time to time, to the people actually in health services who need the money to supply the health services -

MR. TULK:

Who is that, 'Bill'.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is using his usual jackass way of doing it, you know, the unusual uncouth way in which he deals with matters in this House and I shall ignore it, - Mr. Speaker.

- to the social assistance recipients in this Province, to the pensioners in this Province, I say that the government of this Province intends to govern and the government of this Province will see that they get their cheques as are due. But, Mr. Speaker, I will say this that there very likely will be delays because of the different procedures that have to be implemented, Mr. Speaker. And when people get their cheques late - they will get them; the government can assure them of that - and when they are inconvenienced, as they may well be although we will try to avoid it, they can give thanks to the Opposition for the way in which,

Mr. Speaker, they have conducted their affairs and have shown their lack of responsibility in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could appeal for order in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

The government of this Province, Mr. Speaker, consists of the Cabinet the government members on this side and consists of the whole Legislature. It requires a co-operative effort. I very much regret, despite the efforts that we have made in setting forth the procedures that are going to occur, giving notice to the Opposition, telling them what is going to come, that they have not seen fit to co-operate in a forthcoming manner in the way in which legislatures of the federal government, the British Parliamentary system and other provinces of Canada seem to operate. And I think it is rather unfortunate that in a province that has a greater history and a prouder history than any other province of Canada, we cannot elicit from the Opposition the same degree of co-operation that is received in other provinces of Canada and is endemic in the British Parliamentary system.

So we say to the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, first of all, that the hon. gentlemen took fourteen hours to debate a simple adjournment motion, that they wanted the House to remain open for the purpose of considering the strike, yet the only remedy the

official Opposition had with respect to the strike was to suggest to us, as the Leader of the Opposition did in his speech, that everybody in this Province be arrested. This was their solution. And the net result is, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen have withheld supply, have affronted the provisions of this House, have tried to blackmail this government. One thing that this government has shown in the past, as was shown in the offshore, as was shown in the fishery, as was shown in Bowaters and shown in Labrador and in every area, is that it knows how to govern. It will govern, Mr. Speaker, and it the course of governing results in inconveniences to citizens of this Province, inconvenience that the hon. gentlemen, by the way in which they are reacting to the statements that I am making show a lack of care about well, they can put that down to the Opposition.

I say to the people of this Province that we will do our best to get their cheques out to them in a timely fashion. But if they are delayed, Mr. Speaker, the blame will lie with the official Opposition, who have proven once again, in this session, that they are completely incapable of appreciating the way government is operating, and completely and absolutely incapable of co-operating in the way in which it is traditional in the British Parliamentary system.

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:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have been a little curious as to why the Government House Leader did not live up to his commitment, given yesterday to this House, that he would reintroduce Interim Supply today. We wonder if the Government House Leader would explain to us and to the people of the Province why he has decided to keep the motion for Interim Supply, out of this House today. Would the minister respond to that?

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 can say to the hon. gentleman here and now, if the hon. gentleman wants to listen, that the hon. gentleman's statements and his theatrics in a normal ceremonial occasion in this House, as a matter of fact gave every indication of filibustering. If the hon. gentleman wishes to pass Interim Supply at the present time without debate, let us do it.

MR. BARRY:

Without debate, no.

MR. MARSHALL:

No. Would the hon. gentlemen agree to the passage of the -

MR. BARRY:

Call the Committee and we will tell you.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Sure! Some more conditions. Sure! Tell us afterwards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen may wish to play games with the lives of the people of this Province, to set the people on strike against the people who are not on strike, and possibly interfere with the cheques of people on social assistance and pensioners, but we are not going to play that game, Mr. Speaker. He has given our answer, and I ask now that the question be put.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, before he left this Legislature, in his threatening fashion the Government House Leader held out some hope of salvation for us. He held out this hope of salvation for us and said he hoped we would entertain a motion after the Budget Speech to give him Supply.

MR. MARSHALL:

Without debate.

MR. TULK:

No, Mr. Speaker, it does not say without debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Government House Leader to rise in his place and let us go into Committee and debate Interim Supply. Let us go. Put us into Committee and debate Interim Supply. Live up to

what you said yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the jealous former Tory should know that we act in concert over here. Mr. Speaker, that is why he is over there and we are over here. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter, with respect to the hon. gentleman's point of order, the hon. gentlemen have made a charade and a circus of this House long enough. We are here to govern and we are not, Mr. Speaker, going to see the peoples' House used and abused on this basis. We are not going to see the people of this Province, the social assistance recipients, who may, Mr. Speaker, receive their cheques a bit late, the hospital workers who may receive their cheques a bit later, the hospitals and the pensioners who may receive their cheques a bit late, we are not going to see them held up like this. We will deal, Mr. Speaker, and we will govern, and every single person in this Province, who may receive their cheques an hour, a day, two days or a week late can thank the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. I ask that the motion now be put.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

I have heard enough on that. I must rule that there is no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:
Question.

MR. SPEAKER:
It is moved and seconded that this question be now put.

Division

MR. SIMMONS:
I rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
We are in the middle of a division now.

MR. SIMMONS:
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those in favour say 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:
Those against 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
I was in the middle of a division.

MR. SIMMONS:
The question was not put when I rose.

MR. SPEAKER:
The matter is carried.

MR. BARRY:
Shame! Shame! Carried! Carried!

MR. SPEAKER:
All those in favour, please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of

Health (Dr. Twomey), 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 Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), Mr. Baird, Mr. Greening, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Tobin, the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt), Mr. Peach, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Warren, Mr. Mitchell.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the motion, please rise.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Tulk, the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Decker, Mr. Fenwick.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The motion is carried, 26 for, 12 against.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I recognize the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage on a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we just put the previous question.

MR. SIMMS:

We are adjourning.

MR. SIMMONS:

The adjournment motion has not yet been put, I say to the former Speaker.

On a question of privilege, I submit that the privileges of this House are being breached in that the Government House Leader is deliberately avoiding putting before this House the Interim Supply motion. He has given notice, Mr. Speaker, implicitly tonight that when they are out of here he is going to use another mechanism. He only has one other mechanism, a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant. It does not take him several days to get that mechanism triggered and so, Mr. Speaker, there is a second breach in that tonight he has used this House flagrantly to threaten people, to give notice that he intends to be late with various pensions and payments, for political purposes to manipulate the process. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in refusing to put before the House the Interim Supply Bill for the ratification of the House, he is subverting the normal process in this House; he is deliberately going outside the House to do what he must do in the House when he has opportunity. That is the whole underlying criterion for Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants, that he uses them only when the House is not available to him. The House is available to him. The second point, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, not only is he subverting the will and the function of the House but also he has made an open threat, and abusing his place in

this House to do it, sending out a threat that he is going to delay those cheques so he can blame it on some people. He has time, Mr. Speaker, between now and noon tomorrow to get that Warrant processed. He knows that, there can be no delay on that account, and so he is in two respects, I submit, Mr. Speaker, abusing the practice and the procedure of this House but, particularly and most seriously, Mr. Speaker, he is walking away from the House, from an opportunity to be in line with the parliamentary procedure here and he is waiting for the House to close so he can then beg that the only recourse he has is Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants. I say to him and to this House he has another option; let him exercise it here now.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council to that point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what a lecture. This is a House, Mr. Speaker. The whole point of the matter is that this is the House of Assembly, but the hon. gentlemen there opposite have shown, so effectively, that this Assembly cannot operate in an intelligent fashion. Therefore, we shall use the laws. We shall use the law to see that we can govern from the point of view of inconveniencing people to the least possible extent and that is what we are doing. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen had their opportunity to do it. The hon. gentlemen have abused their position in this House with respect to the normal conventions,

which do not really exist because of their opposition to cooperation, any kind of cooperation from the point of view of government and seeing that government is delivered to the people through democratic institutions of the Legislature. We have brought Supply on, we have told the hon. gentlemen the amount of Supply, they have debated it, I say, for three days, and they are going to get the opportunity to debate again for three weeks or four weeks or what have you. Mr. Speaker, look, we have to help the people of this Province, but we cannot help the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the laws of this Province require that before expenditures are made they be approved by this House if this House is sitting or if it is possible, Mr. Speaker, for this House to sit. Now it is possible for this House to sit, tomorrow, Wednesday, Thursday and right up, Mr. Speaker -

MR. PEACH:

Good Friday, Easter Saturday and Easter Sunday.

MR. BARRY:

If necessary. It is not wrong to do good on the Sabbath. Mr. Speaker, the point is that we have heard from the Government House Leader on the public media of this Province a statement that he intends to go for Special Warrants when, Mr. Speaker, this House was

not closed, and when it was possible for government to continue with debate on Interim Supply. Now we would ask Your Honour to communicate with His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, to point out that this House is ready, willing and able to debate Supply between now and April 1, and that any granting of Special Warrants, Mr. Speaker, would not only be improper, would not only be unconventional but would be illegal in light of the circumstances that pertain in this House and our willingness to sit and continue to debate Interim Supply until April 1. We have had the statement, the declaration from the Government House Leader that he intends to do this and we ask Your Honour to protect the prerogatives of this House and to see that the laws of this Province are not breached by the Government House Leader going to the Lieutenant-Governor and misleading His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, by saying that the House is closed and cannot be kept open.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to that so-called point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This is absolutely ridiculous. The members opposite are trying to take this House on their back and use it for their own political gains. This government has tried through the last couple of weeks by giving them a letter, by giving them notice and having debate on Interim Supply. We have a motion before the House now to close. We went fourteen hours or thirteen hours in debate over a motion to

adjourn. I mean, we all know the Leader of the Opposition, we all know the games that he is playing. He cannot play by the rules, he does not want to play by the rules. He does not accept that the majority opinion of this House is speaking. He does not accept that. He just thinks that because he wants to be Premier he is Premier, because he wants to be leader of the government he is leader of the government, and that is the problem with the Leader of the Opposition. And this is just a complete breach of all the privileges that all of us here enjoy in this House and not just the Opposition. This is crazy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I have heard the hon. member. I have already heard enough.

A very brief submission.

MR. SIMMONS:

Very briefly, and I thank the Chair for its indulgence, the particular matter I asked the Chair to rule on is well within the Chair's competence. It has to do with whether the rights of this House are being usurped by the government, which is answerable to this House, and I have submitted, and I repeat very briefly again, Sir, for your consideration - you may want to recess the House to consider this - that it is an important precedent-setting decision you are going to make on this one. Here is a case where it

has been brought to the attention of the Speaker of the House of Assembly that the government is about to act in breach of the provisions of the House of Assembly in terms of the provision of Supply.

Mr. Speaker, that is the main reason we sit as an assembly, to be the purse strings on the Supply for the government, and if we allow that to slip from our hands there is no purpose in meeting at all. So I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider very carefully what is happening here because the government has given notice before the fact that it intends to go out and willfully fly in contravention of the requirements of the House that Supply be approved by the House, and Lieutenant-Governors Warrants only be used when the House is not available to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe you have an important decision to make. It has nothing to do with the flim-flam the Premier got on with just now, the personal attacks. It has to do with the very function of this House in withholding Supply from the government if it thinks fit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
May I briefly respond?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes this House speaks and when the majority of this House speaks this House is speaking.

MR. BARRY:
Under the rules.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We speak as a House of Assembly and there are votes taken in this House of Assembly. And when there are votes taken in this House of Assembly that is the House of Assembly speaking. If we have a division and it is twenty-six to twenty-one, or if it is fourteen to three, or whatever, the House has spoken, not fourteen to three, the House of Assembly has spoken, and the Opposition over here are trying to usurp and somehow say that the House does not speak when there is a vote where the majority has spoken.

MR. BARRY:
When it is done under the rules of this House, not on the Premier's whim.

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

I must rule that there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the motion has to be put. You know, the previous question has been passed. I realize it has been fourteen -

MR. BARRY:
But not put properly.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, the previous question was moved, it was resolved in the affirmative, and now I believe the adjournment motion has to be

passed without debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All in favour, 'Aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'Nay.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. BARRY:

On division, Mr. Speaker.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the motion, please stand:

The hon. the Premier; The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power); The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms); The hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey); 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 Education (Mr. Hearn); The

hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward); The hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett); The hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett); Mr. Baird; Mr. Greening; Mr. J. Carter; Mr. Tobin; The hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt); Mr. Peach; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Warren; Mr. Mitchell.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against, please stand:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry); Mr. Hiscock; Mr. Tulk; The hon. Mr. Simmons; Mr. Lush; Mr. W. Carter; Mr. K. Aylward; Mr. Baker; Mr. Furey; Mr. Kelland; Mr. Decker; Mr. Fenwick.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The motion carries.

The House stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m. on April 7.