

VOL. 2

NO. 15

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that last year this Government established a new policy of early tendering capital projects. This policy was adopted in response to the recessionary economic climate and the effect it was having on employment, or unemployment. Early tendering ensured that capital projects get underway as soon as the Legislature approved the allocated funding. It also ensured that, as far as possible, capital funding approved for a given year was expended during that year's construction season. Thus, it would have the effect of boosting the Province's important construction sector and creating employment for Newfoundlanders involved in the construction industry.

Mr. Speaker, this Government intends to proceed with this policy during the current fiscal year and do everything possible to ensure that it is implemented to the fullest possible extent. Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House of the capital projects which have been tendered to date, because we are even ahead of ourselves, and give an indication as well to those capital projects ready for tender call.

Mr. Speaker, the first category, with a few exceptions, involves capital projects tendered to date. There are five components to this category.

A. Trans-Canada Highway Upgrading (75/25 Transport Canada).

To date, Mr. Speaker, Trans-Canada Highway Capital projects amounting to \$22.6 million, including a \$3.9 million carry-over, have gone to tender so far this year, thanks to the excellent work of the Minister of Transportation

(Mr. Dawe)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

These projects include

the carry-over which you can see when you go out on the Trans-Canada; it just barely got started last Fall from the Fort Motel to the Foxtrap access road and is worth \$2.3 million.

Then we have other ones that have gone to tender - Paddy's Pond Overpass, Roaches Line Overpass, Manuels River Bridge, Manuels River Culvert, Gander/Glenwood, \$1.8 million, Bishop's Falls/Grand Falls \$1.5 million, Carter's Road - Flat Bay, \$4.9 million, Carter's Road (Grading) with is a carry-over, \$200,000, Flat Bay - Fishells, \$5.7 million, Roddickton carry-over \$1.4 million, Roddickton

PREMIER PECKFORD: again \$1.9 million, the Roddickton Road, again, \$1.8 million, for a grand total of \$18.7 million, including a \$3.9 million carry-over.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation will tender two other projects in May including paving from Pasadena towards Humbermouth - \$1.1 million - and various bridge repairs of \$200,000. This brings the total expenditure on the TCH upgrading to \$23.8 million.

'B', the second component of that first category that we are talking about, is DREE Transportation Projects. Most of it is the Coastal Labrador agreement which we negotiated ninety/ten after a difficult hassle.

In this area, Mr. Speaker, projects valued at \$5.5 million involving carry-over from last year will be conducted during the current year. They include: the Corner Brook Industrial Park Extension Access Road of \$1.7 million, a carry-over from last year; paving the Labrador South Straits Road, which will continue and be completed for \$2 million; Williams Harbour - George's Cove of \$600,000; the Lodge Bay - Mary's Harbour Road of \$1.2 million, giving a total of \$5.5 million.

I must remind people here, Mr. Speaker, the negotiations on the Lodge Bay - Mary's Harbour Road, which nobody wanted to get involved in except this government, and we pushed the issue, we thought that that road should go ahead, even though you can do very little else on the Coast we were adamant when we were negotiating the components of this agreement that the Lodge Bay - Mary's Harbour section be put in there. At least you could do that. It is very difficult to build roads in other areas on the back of these communities. But in the Lodge Bay - Mary's Harbour

PREMIER PECKFORD: area you could, and whilst it costs \$1.2 million it does give the people in that area a lot better access than they would otherwise have.

Mr. Speaker, remaining projects having a value of \$2.3 million will be tendered in June. They will include paving of the Corner Brook Industrial Park of \$1.8 million, and grading the Red Bay Road of \$500,000.

C, the third component in this, is 100 per cent

PREMIER PECKFORD: Transport Canada financing, Airstrips which we have to then take over and run, airstrips projects valued at \$6.2 million, including a carry-over of \$2.9 million have been tendered up to this time.

Rigolet going to tender at \$1.2 million, Port Hope Simpson \$1.1 million, Davis Inlet carry-over to continue and complete \$1 million, Postville, a carry-over from last year because it started then, of \$1.9 million.

Mr. Speaker, remaining projects valued at \$2 million will be tendered in May and July. They involve four airstrips maintenance projects at Davis Inlet, Postville, Port Hope Simpson and Rigolet, each valued at \$500,000.

The fourth component, Mr. Speaker, is Confederation Complex. Honourable members are familiar with government's decision to construct the new Confederation Complex which is already underway. Mr. Speaker, construction valued at \$10 million will be undertaken on the site during the current fiscal year, and this has already been tendered. So the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) is on the ball.

'E', St. John's Regional Water Supply and Sewer System-Phase 1, Tenders have been issued already in the last couple of weeks for the construction of a water supply to the St. John's Northast Expansion Zone valued at \$3 million.

These projects represent a total value of \$52.8 million which, for the most part, have gone to tender or have been carried over from last year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in Category 2, I want now to outline for hon. members the major capital projects which are now ready for tender call and will go over the

PREMIER PECKFORD: next couple of weeks. They involve a total expenditure of \$16.3 million and they include: Clarenville Hospital \$5.5 million, Labrador Constabulary Building , Labrador City-Wabush \$2.5 million, Bonavista Hospital \$2.4 million, Labrador Water and Sewer Systems - L'Anse au Claire and L'Anse au Loup \$1.7 million, (90/10), Forests Access Roads \$1 million (90/10), The Markland Clinic \$1 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Wooddale Nursery is part of our DREE programmé of \$1 million, Cartwright Medical Clinic DREE programme \$500,000, Her Majesty's Penitentiary-Centre Block \$500,000 and the Cottage Land Development Programme of \$250,000. So that is \$16.3 million there which is now ready for tender and will go to tender quickly to try to do what we can with the money that we have at our disposal.

 Also under School Construction, Mr. Speaker, school construction will account for a significant amount of activity in the construction sector this year. The value of

PREMIER PECKFORD:

school construction tenders including commitments carried forward from last year, projects recently tendered and projects to be tendered in the next several months amount to \$30.5 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Additional capital projects, Mr. Speaker, which I have just outlined do not include two major areas of construction activity. They are government guaranteed municipal capital projects and provincial highways projects. Twenty-five million dollars has been allocated for the estimates for municipal capital projects and we have allocated twenty million dollars for provincial highway construction. Decisions on these specific projects will be made over the next couple of weeks and then they will be tendered.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the new Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology will have a further impact upon the Province's construction sector this year. The institute is ready now for tender call with planning having been already completed because the Province went ahead and did that planning over the last couple of years. Cash flow for the current fiscal year associated with this project is expected to be \$10 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear the provincial government is doing everything it can to boost economic activity and job creation in this Province. The impact which government related capital construction will have on the Newfoundland economy is very significant indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the capital projects which have been tendered to date, as well as those capital projects ready for tender call, amount to \$154 million in the next month or so.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To those who say we are not doing anything to help the Newfoundland economy and alleviate the Province's high level of unemployment, I say, Mr. Speaker, they would do well to look again. I happen to believe that \$154.65 million represents a very substantial indication of our sensitivity to and understanding of Newfoundland's economic situation and I am proud of our efforts in this regard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we saw last year the immediate impact which our early tendering policy had on the construction sector by being able to release capital projects as soon as moneys were voted by the Legislature. I have full confidence, Mr. Speaker, that our early tendering policy will be similarly effective this year and will have the immediate impact on jobs and economic activity that so many Newfoundlanders are seeking.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my first reaction to the hon. gentleman's Ministerial Statement is: Thank God for Ottawa. Ninety per cent of the funding just announced by the hon. gentleman is Ottawa money, money supplied to this Province by the Canadian taxpayer by the Government of Canada and by the taxpayers of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what has happened here. What the Premier has done is he has put in one statement all the various statements that have been made by ministers in the last several weeks and several months. There is nothing new in the statement

MR. NEARY: just made by the hon. gentleman.
It is a desperation move, as far as I can see, to try to
prop up the morale of his troops. It is a desperation
move, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman must really

MR. S. NEARY:

be desperate to make a Ministerial Statement today to try to convey at least some semblance of good news because the government is under siege and in order to prop up the bankbenches on the government side of the House and to try to head off people taking to the streets because of the economic mess and the mismanagement caused by the mismanagement of this administration. The hon. gentleman brought in this Ministerial Statement, a rehash of things that have already been announced, Mr. Speaker. It would seem to me, Sir, that it also points up one very important thing and I believe that you will find that the feeling on this particular point is widespread in this Province and that is how much better would things be in this Province if we had improved federal/provincial relations. Mr. Speaker, most of the money in the projects -

MR. W. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: I realize that the hon. gentleman loves to be apologist for Ottawa at all times and all places, Mr. Speaker, but what the hon. gentleman is doing now is debating this statement given by the hon. the Premier rather than making comments upon it. He is entering into the realm of general debate and that is outside the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council rose on a point of order, I would just remind the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that he may have been straying a little from the Ministerial Statement, perhaps he should get back to comments confined to the statement.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will wind up

MR. S. NEARY: my few remarks because there is really not much else I can say about the so called Ministerial Statement except that it is a rehash of things that we have heard before. But I believe it points up a very important matter in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and that is if we had an improvement in federal/provincial relations in this Province how much better would things be throughout Newfoundland and Labrador? And I believe that it is time, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland politicians shake hands with Ottawa and the Ottawa politicians shake hands with the politicians here in Newfoundland and Labrador and that we all become friendly Canadians, and once again attempt to work together in harmony and peace in the best interest of this Province.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. In view of the very serious statements that were made by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) at a committee meeting there last week in connection with the future of the Bowater mill in Corner Brook, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the Premier could tell the House and the people of this Province, especially the people in Corner Brook, if the government intends to accede to the wishes of the people of Corner Brook and grant their request for a Commission of Inquiry into all aspects of the Bowater operations in Corner Brook and the logging operation that supplies the raw material for that mill?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in meetings that I held with the leaders of the community on the West Coast, both in Corner Brook and the Bay of Islands area some time ago, I told them we would let them know in a couple of weeks our decision relative to that matter. I would say that in another two or three days or so we will be in a position to indicate to them what our position is on that request.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. Premier tell the House if any of the discussions he had with the Bowaters people he has come to the conclusion that the shutdown of No. 7 machine may place the rest of that mill in jeopardy?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, nothing in the discussions that I have held with Bowaters has indicated that by closing down No. 7 puts the rest of the mill in jeopardy. What the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) and I have said to the people of Corner Brook in a meeting that we had with the Mayor, and the leaders of the whole community over there, from Deer Lake and Pasadena, the whole Bay of Islands area, the City of Corner Brook itself and other leaders at the two or three or four meetings that we had was that it is our view that down the road, in order to ensure that Corner Brook remains viable, and not only Corner Brook but most of the mills in Eastern Canada, there is going to have to be a new industry-federal-provincial government agreement for further modernization, and that those four machines that are now in the Corner Brook mill can perform well and produce a good product that can be sold on the market in a competitive way over the next five, eight, ten years. But somewhere beyond that point we have to start

PREMIER PECKFORD: planning now for continued technological improvement to keep them at the leading edge of pulp and paper technology so that they then still would be competitive beyond the ten year period. But nothing in what Bowaters has said to us indicates No. 7 in anyway jeopardizes the long-term future of Corner Brook.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Has the hon. the Premier been able to determine in any of the discussions that he held with the Bowaters people why the down-time in the Bowaters operations is not shared amongst all the mills in the whole Bowaters operation rather than borne by the mill in Corner Brook?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The primary reason, as the Leader of the Opposition must know -he is a bit late in asking this kind of a question, this is the kind of question that was posed by us to Bowaters months ago and which the people in Corner Brook have been posing to us even months ago.- the major reason from Bowaters' point of view is that most of the other mills have an ownership by newspaper, and therefore that newspaper has committed to it the paper from the mill that it partly owns. Therefore it is going to ensure that its investment is covered in its own mill before it starts taking paper from another mill that it does not have any shares in. So the main reason for not sharing the down-time as given

PREMIER PECKFORD: by Bowaters is because they do not own the other mills like they own Corner Brook. They own Corner Brook outright and there is no newspaper chain which has an interest in the Corner Brook mill. Most of the other mills that Bowaters are involved in in North America have other newspaper chains as part owner of the mill. And obviously that newspaper is not going to vote to see its own mill go down, it is going to vote to see that its own mill stays open. And that is one of the problems we have had in trying to persuade Bowaters to share the down-time in Corner Brook with its other North American mills.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, has the hon. gentleman been able to determine if it is true that the Corner Brook mill has the highest profit per ton of all Bowater mills?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not have that figure on the top of my head, Mr. Speaker. I would have to see what period of time is involved. Is it for last year, the last two years, you know?

MR. NEARY: The last five years.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There are lies, damn lies and statistics, Mr. Speaker. So, you know, you can get into a great battle over figures all you like, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) can imply same in his question. All I know is simply this, that we took the position and still take the position that Bowaters should persuade some of its partners in its other mill help share some of the down-time in Corner Brook. They have refused to do it. Now we cannot order

PREMIER PECKFORD: them to do it. We have also indicated to them that we want them to continue to contribute to silviculture and all the rest of it and we are continuing our battles with Bowaters on all those fronts. But whether the Bowater mill made X million dollars in 1967 or 1976 is not at issue. What is at issue now is today and tomorrow. The fact of the matter is today they cannot sell all of their paper. One of the reasons for that is the Bowater organization in North America took a corporate decision a number of years ago to dedicate the paper from Corner Brook to offshore markets. When I say 'offshore markets' I mean markets outside of the United State and some of those markets are in areas that have really had a serious economic recession. I think of countries in Central America and South America, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico to name three countries which are almost bankrupt now and are being bailed out by the International Monetary Fund.

So the question is not about how much money was made yesterday or the day before, there is no way you can get that back, the question is today and tomorrow. And today we have had meetings with Bowaters, and we have pushed them to try to get them to do more marketing efforts on behalf of Corner Brook. They did get some extra markets, by the way, for Corner Brook which kept it open longer in the last few weeks than it would have been open. They are continuing to do that and we are continuing to monitor the situation. So the relevant question is how can we ensure that

PREMIER PECKFORD: is how can we ensure that Corner Brook remains open today and remains viable tomorrow and that is the policy that we are committed to to ensure that those two things happen in Corner Brook.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary in connection with silviculture that the hon. gentleman mentioned in his answer to my previous question, is it correct then to say that Bowaters have no money to spend on silviculture this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No. I am pleased to say that as a result of our arguing and arm twisting and pushing and shoving and fighting on behalf of the people of Corner Brook, Bowaters are going to spend \$600,000 or \$700,000 this year on silviculture, whereas before they were going to spend zero. So we have been able to change their minds on the silviculture thing and they will be spending about \$5 million on capital besides that.

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

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

MR. NEARY: In view of the serious nature of this matter, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) let the cat out of the bag, and in order to restore confidence and faith in the community of Corner Brook, especially as far as the Bowater operation is concerned, could the hon. gentleman set a date, tell us what date he expects to make an announcement on the commission of enquiry?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have already indicated to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that we will be making a decision on that in the next couple of days. I cannot zero

PREMIER PECKFORD: it down. It will be tomorrow or the next day. It depends just on scheduling meetings and talking to ministers, but we have already had a number of discussions on it.

The other thing is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is saying that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) let the cat out of the bag; he did not. Long before the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands made his comments, I made the same comments in Corner Brook to all the people of Corner Brook, both on television and radio, and before all the leadership of Corner Brook, the city council and everybody. I indicated to them that the big thing that we have got to try to do in Corner Brook - the past is past and while we can argue over it and take our own points of view and most of mine would be a lot different than the ones that Bowaters have taken, that is not going to help today and tomorrow and to secure the jobs - what we have got to do in Corner Brook is what we have got to do in Grand Falls and Stephenville, the same thing, to ensure over the next ten years that we continue to modernize those plants so that they are competitive with Finland and Sweden and especially competitive with some of the plants in the Southern United States where they can get a cheap wood supply. And that is what we have to do. Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Northern Ontario have to do the same thing, and that is why I think we are going to be successful in getting the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, plus the federal government and ourselves and the other provincial governments together to sign a more

PREMIER PECKFORD: long-term modernization agreement which looks at the realities of the situation we are going to be faced with in the pulp and paper industry, as we are in every industry; you have got to be technologically advanced, and to that end this government is committed and we are going to ensure that Corner Brook always has a pulp and paper mill by ensuring the long-term future of that place with technological advancement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Since the minister brought in his mid-term review on November 18, 1982, can the minister tell the House

MR. WARREN:

if he has received very many complaints from retail business in the Province, in particular concerning the changes in the sales tax regulations? Have there been many complaints from business?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in the early days there were some complaints specifically over some difficulties with the way their cash registers were set up and that type of thing, and I believe, myself, that there was a bit too much made of that in the media in particular. I say that because we had some of our inspectors go out to just check and see what was going on and we had reports back from them and it really did not seem to be as bad as one would have otherwise detected by reading newspapers. But in more recent times, I have not been made aware of any substantial body of complaint and I think that if there were a substantial body of complaint, the officials in the department would have let me know.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. The form that the retailers or the cashiers are supposed to fill in for exemption on children's clothing, has the minister taken another look at this form, this exemption certificate that is supposed to be filled in by the cashiers? And if he has taken another look at it, is he going to try to simplify the form?

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

DR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We indicated that we would be seeing how other jurisdictions handle this matter and, of course, we did look at the methods they use

DR. COLLINS: prior to bringing in the form. We said that we would continually monitor the situation and be in touch with other jurisdictions to see how they handled it, if they had any new wrinkles we would be glad to look at them and try to put them into our form. I do not think we have in actual fact modified it as yet, but we are continually looking at it and we are quite willing to accept any good suggestion that might come forward.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, it was on November 18th. that the minister brought in the economic recovery programme and since then there has been, with all respect to the minister, quite a bit of confusion on the part of the retailers about completion of this form.

Knowing that the Board of Trade has gotten information from other provinces and that a submission was made by a section of the Board of Trade to the minister suggesting Newfoundland use a form like the Manitoba Government uses - and I will table a copy of that form, Mr. Speaker - I am wondering why could not our Province use a form similar to the

MR. WARREN:

form that Manitoba is using? All that form requires is the name of the item, the price, the name of the purchaser and the address, whereas our form is overly complicated. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this year we are talking about trying to entice tourists to come to Newfoundland for the 400th anniversary. I am just wondering how complicated is it going to be for tourists to purchase clothing for their children as one of the requirements on our form is the MCP number?

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I really do not think this form is complicated and I say that because I have on occasion had to fill in the form because I just did not have my child's MCP card with me. And if I can fill it in without too much difficulty, I am sure most people in the Province can fill it in without too much difficulty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Thank you. The other point I would like to bring out is that the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) tells me there have been more enquiries from tourists - and I think this would be backed up by the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) who is responsible for Tourism - there have been more enquiries from prospective tourists to come to this Province for the 400th anniversary of the landing of Sir Humphrey Gilbert this year, more enquiries about this year than there have been in our history. So I do not think it is going to impact negatively on tourism.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, did I hear the minister correctly say that he purchased goods for his child without an MCP card?

MR. SIMMS: No.

MR. WARREN: My next question to the minister is that in most provinces the retailers are given a rebate on the sales tax they collected. I think it could average anywhere from one half a per cent up to, I think, one province a 3.5 per cent rebate on sales tax collected on behalf of the government. With all the regulations and all the cost involved to the retailer to collect and rebate the retail sales tax, has the minister given any consideration to a rebate to the retailers for collecting taxes for the Government of Newfoundland?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there was a commission such as the hon. member mentioned in place in this Province. I think up until 1977, In the Budget of that year that commission was withdrawn, I believe just purely from a revenue point of view, the extra revenue was required. Since that time each Budget we have reviewed the possibility of reinstating that commission. We have reviewed it quite sympathetically because there is a certain amount of administrative work that each vendor has to put into filling in the forms and so on and so forth, and we have reviewed it sympathetically from that point of view but to date we have not felt that we could reinstate it. If we did make outlays there, we clearly would have to offset that by getting revenues in from some other source and it was just a case of not finding a practical source for offsetting the commissions that might be paid.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). My question to the minister is centered around the Student Aid regulations and my question is, in view of the tremendous concern that has been demonstrated by post-secondary students throughout the Province in reaction to the changes brought in by the government concerning the Student Aid regulations, I wonder now in view of that concern whether the government have decided to make any changes, whether they have decided to make the Student Aid now more generous than the changes had made it? So, are there any changes by which the government intends to make it more generous, more in line

MR. T. LUSH: with the economic and financial needs of the students of this Province?

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the demonstration of concern on the part of post-secondary education students in our Province about their Student Aid Programme has been conducted very responsibly. Friday a couple of thousand students from Memorial -

MR. E. HISCOCK: Four thousand.

MS. VERGE: - University and the two colleges in St. John's gathered in front of Confederation Building and conducted themselves very responsibly, were polite in listening to what I had to say on behalf of government. What I told the students, Mr. Speaker, and what I will repeat here today is that because of the serious economic problems facing the provincial government, problems that have been worsened over the last couple of years because of the recession and also because of the mistreatment by the federal government, we have been left with no alternative but to change our Student Aid Plan to bring it in line with those in other provinces of Canada.

MS. VERGE: The increase in the borrowing requirement, the change in the loan/grant split, is a definite. However, the proposals for changing the eligibility criteria are subject to review after we receive input from the students. I told the students that two of the proposals for the eligibility criteria, specifically, will be reviewed. They are limiting to five years or ten semesters of undergraduate study as the periods for receipt of provincial government grants and also the arrangements for students presently studying outside the Province programmes available within the Province. But I have to stress again, Mr. Speaker, that the total impact of the proposed changes to our Student Aid Plan will have no affect whatsoever on the students in our Province who have the most need. And the percentage of our students getting aid who are in this most needy category amount to about one-third. They are students who all along were borrowing the maximum from the Canada Student Loan Programme and getting the maximum from our provincial government in the way of grants. Those students will not be affected. A single student in that category will still be able to get \$1,000 per semester from the provincial government as an outright grants that does not have to be repaid. The total aid available to the most needy students will not be diminished, the total grants paid to them will not be any lower than they are now. And for the other students who have less need, they will be left in, at worst, the same position as their counterparts in other provinces.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - provinces that are richer than ours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, is the minister telling hon. members, telling the House, that there will be no change in the loan ceiling, that there will only be a change in some of the regulations? Because it was my understanding that students wanted the loan ceiling changed, that they felt that the loan ceiling was now too high and it was going to drive them in debt, Mr. Speaker, drive them in the hole, it was going to ruin their chances of getting an education. So the minister is now saying that the loan ceiling will not be changed, that it will only be the regulations and, if so, what regulations?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I have outlined very carefully and thoroughly the proposed changes to the Newfoundland and Labrador Student Aid Plan and I have to emphasize that these changes are not going to have any effect on the poorest students, on the students who themselves, because they have not been able to get a Summer job, cannot contribute much or anything to the cost of their study or whose parents cannot contribute much or anything to the cost of their education.

I would like to illustrate this, Mr. Speaker, with the case of a twenty year old student living away from home whose parental income is \$27,000

MS. VERGE:

a family of four, and the student is unable to find a Summer job. In that case, Mr. Speaker, the student at present for one semester or half an academic year of study, may borrow \$575 from the Canada Student Aid programme, then get from the Provincial Government a \$1,000 outright grant and go on to borrow another \$325 for a total amount of aid of \$1,900, \$900 loan, \$1,000 grant from the Provincial Government. Effective September 1, 1983, under the current proposal the same student will have to borrow \$900 off the top to get the \$1,000 grant and end up with the same \$1,900 in aid, will end up with the same \$1,000 outright grant from the Provincial Government. No change. And a third of our students having the most need are in that category, Mr. Speaker, and will not be hurt, will not be affected, will not get any less free money from the Provincial Government. And those most needy students, Mr. Speaker, are the ones who most deserve our support and who will continue to get our full support. Students having less needs will be put on a par with students in Nova Scotia, P.E.I., New Brunswick, Manitoba, Alberta, provinces richer than ours. Those other students will continue to have access to the same number of dollars, it is just that they will have to borrow more, the same as their counterparts elsewhere in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, there is something not right about this. There is a great degree of misunderstanding that comes from the other side. This morning in Committee, for example, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said, and I quote, and I have written it down here, in talking about the Student Aid programme, he said that a graduate under the new regulations brought in now, that a person graduating under

MR. LUSH: these new Student Aid regulation will have a higher debt load when he graduates . And, he said, "He will carry a great debt load into the future."

MR. HODDER: Now is that true?

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, is that true? Is that correct or is it not that a student entering the programme today will carry a great debt load?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, for the one-third of our Province's students getting aid who are in the most needy category, who all along were borrowing the maximum available under the Canada Student Loan programme, the answer is no, no more debt load, no change.

MR. LUSH: Tell the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that.

MS. VERGE: The same amount of Provincial Government free money grants or allowances, the same amount of loans, the same debt load. The answer is no.

So the other students who could be categorized as middle need or less need, the answer is yes. The same dollars, more debt, less Provincial Government grants, the same

MS. VERGE: as their fellow students in the Maritime Provinces, Manitoba and Alberta.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is for the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms). The majority of students in our Province would prefer not to get any grants, not to get any allowance or not to get any loans but prefer to have jobs, particularly in the Summer and during the holidays. In view of the economic situation and the high unemployment among our youth between the ages of fifteen and thirty, what programmes is the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth bringing in this Summer over and above the normal hiring practice of each department, the parks, the Department of Education and temporary jobs in Confederation Building and so on, what job creation projects will the minister be bringing in for this forthcoming Summer so that some students can make money to get into university and post-secondary education institutions without getting loans?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, in terms of my own department, we will be providing the same kind of encouragement as we always have in recent years. We will be hiring somewhere in excess of 125 students around the Province to work in parks during the Summer. That will create some employment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to these 125 jobs, whether it be this administration or any other administration,

MR. HISCOCK: these jobs would be there. We are more concerned about the thousands and thousands of students who are coming out knowing that there are no jobs, knowing that there is no opportunity. They want to further their education and be prepared for the promised land of Hibernia and in this regard they want a little bit of help but not loans.

I would like to ask the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), since from the Loto tickets in this Province we bring in \$3.1 million in revenue on Provincial, Atlantic and Super Loto, is the minister making representation on behalf of his own department to the Premier and to Cabinet that this money be allocated and earmarked entirely for youth job creation projects this Summer?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I am constantly making representations to the Premier, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and my Cabinet colleagues to get additional funding for additional projects and I have had a considerable amount of success. If the hon. member had been in attendance this morning to debate the estimates of my department, he would have clearly understood what is transpiring with respect to our efforts to provide employment for Summer students.

In addition to that, I should point out to the hon. member that the responsibility for the revenue from Loto is not mine, it comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, one cannot serve two masters, and the problem with these Estimate Committees is this morning I happened to be with the Department of Finance and of course I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) the same question, whether he was going to create any job projects for the youth of our Province, and I got the answer from him no; when I asked the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) that, the answer is no; to the Premier, no. So obviously I would assume by directing it to the Premier there will be nothing over and above normal hiring practices for our students this coming Summer.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are doing all doing all we can to provide as many jobs as we can to all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians regardless of age, but more particularly we appreciate the problems that we have with youth unemployment both in Newfoundland and across Canada and we will do all we can in our power to put as many young people to work as is possible within our means. We have been doing that for years. We will continue to do it, Mr. Speaker. We fully recognize the problems that the youth have and especially those who want to go on to post-secondary institutions and so on, and their financing requirements. So we will do all that we can within our power. I would say if you took dollar for dollar and see what we are doing in this Province in that regard it could match up proportionately with any province of Canada, or any jurisdiction.

We are not ashamed of the job we are doing, Mr. Speaker, in this regard and we will continue to do it as much as we can in the future.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The time for Oral Question Period has expired.

I would like to welcome to the galleries today, I do not have all their names, a delegation from the South Coast, from Grand Bank, Fortune and St. Lawrence to meet on a very important matter to them, namely, of course, the fisheries. I would like to welcome them to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), on Order Paper Number 60. It has already been tabled and made public years ago.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 3.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Public Works And Services Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 32)

On motion, Bill No. 32 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this morning I had the honour and the privilege of attending a meeting that was convened by the Fishermen's Union and the joint town councils on the Burin Peninsula who brought together representatives from all the communities in Newfoundland who are dependent upon the deep-sea fishery. It was a great honour and a privilege for me to be there, Mr. Chairman, to see these people brought together for the first time so that they could put up a united front to try to bring about some resolution of their problem. The administration have failed to date to lay upon the table of this House a plan to deal with restructuring the processing sector of the fishing industry. We have raised the matter. Last week we raised it, I believe, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday and we failed to get a response from the government or to find out what plans they had to deal with the restructuring of the deep-sea fishery, the processing sector. This morning over at the Holiday Inn, at this meeting, I was happy - my colleague, our spokesman on fisheries was with me, we were very pleased to be able to support a resolution that was -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, they are going down to meet with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) just in case. That was one of the decisions we made this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if I could have order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentlemen on the other side know that there is a meeting on in the Cabinet room to discuss this resolution, because this morning it became very evident

MR. S. NEARY: that last Thursday when the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier went to Ottawa all they did was muddy up the water. A decision, Mr. Chairman, was about to be taken -

MR. STEWART: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: That is true.

- a decision was to be taken last Thursday on an amended version of Option No. 3, the one that I outlined in the House last Thursday.

MR. J. MORGAN: I cannot listen to you I have to go to a very important meeting instead, to meet with all the delegations concerned.

MR. NEARY: The minister should try to undo the damage that he did last week. Now the amended version of option number three had to do with a combination of companies comprising of Nickerson's, The Lake Group of Companies, Penny's and Fishery Products. Now, we hear the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) making statements like 'Option would spell death for the Peninsula fish plants.' Now, you would not know but that was the only option on the table, the minister knew the difference, The minister knew that Option number three was on the table, which seems to be the one that the majority of delegates at this meeting, this morning, were in favour of. Now, this was a negative statement that was made by the minister, Anyone can make a statement saying they were against something, What the minister should have told the people in these communities was what he was in favour of, what he stood for. This morning he was forced, for the first time, to vote for an amended version of option number three. We do not know yet whether the Premier is going to sign that Resolution or not, The minister could not give us a straight answer this morning as to whether or not the Premier would go along with his agreeing with the Resolution and whether or not the Premier would agree to put up a united front so that we could persuade the Cabinet Committee in Ottawa that we were united down here in our request to have option number three implemented as amended. The amended version, of course, is that no plants would close and that all the plants would reopen.

This is something that we have been saying here in this House for the last two weeks and we have not been able to get the message through to the administration until this morning. It took the union, the plant workers, the trawlermen and the Newfoundland Federation of Labour, the clergy, the M.P's. in Ottawa, Mr. Simmons and Mr. Tobin, to

MR. NEARY: persuade the administration here
to go along with an amended version of option number three.
This is the first time that they have done that.

MR. NEARY:

that. All they did last Thursday, when they went up to Ottawa was to muddy up the water, they brought in all kinds of new issues that would take years to unscramble , to unravel.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that we have everybody on the same trend of thought, we hope that success is just around the corner. Well, what the meeting pointed out this morning, Mr. Chairman, more than anything else and, as I said in this House earlier today, there is a consensus of opinion, a consensus of opinion throughout this Province that -

MR. TULK: There is a radical change.

MR. NEARY: That is right - there should be improved federal/provincial relations, that this can help a great deal to resolve the crisis in the fishing industry, it can help a great deal to resolve the crisis in the offshore, it can go a long way to resolve the difficulties between the provincial government and the federal government on the financing of the development associations in this Province. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is time to forget blaming things on Ottawa, blaming things on the province of Quebec and blaming things on the province of Nova Scotia. I forget who started this row between the federal and provincial governments. This message came through loud and clear this morning, we should forget whose court the ball is now in and forget political one-upmanship. It is time, Mr. Chairman, that both parties started off with a clean slate and for the sake of all the people of this Province , for the sake of those who are unemployed, for the sake of those who cannot cope with the high cost of living,

MR. NEARY: for the sake of those who cannot cope with the high cost of electricity in this Province, for the sake of our students who are now out demonstrating in the streets against the increases in student aid in this Province, for the sake of all the people, for the sake of people on social assistance who cannot make ends meet, for the sake of all the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Chairman, we should follow the example that was set at the Holiday Inn this morning when this group of fine Newfoundlanders were brought together and put up an united front, passed a resolution that Ottawa and the provincial government should shake hands, forget who started the row, forget the one-upmanship, that Ottawa shake hands with Newfoundland and Labrador and that Newfoundland and Labrador shake hands with Ottawa and that we all become friendly Canadians once again, trying to work together in unity and harmony and peace, Mr. Chairman.

This should be the primary and immediate objective of this administration and indeed of all politicians of all stripes, both in this Province and in Ottawa, Mr. Chairman. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and, indeed, Mr. Chairman, all Canadians are fed up with the ongoing game of political squash. The only ones who are getting squashed are the ordinary citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador - the man in the street looking for work and the man down in Burin and the woman trying to get their plant open and the people out in Corner Brook who are worried about whether or not the mill will last for any length of time in that city. It is time, Mr. Chairman, that this nonsense of squabbling and bickering and animosity between the two levels of government ended now once and for all. Mr. Chairman, if it continues, if the squabbling continues I would not

MR. NEARY: at all be surprised but in due course the people of this Province will take to the streets. That is how serious they are taking this situation, Mr. Chairman. So I am hoping that the number one priority

MR. NEARY: of this House, and of this administration will be to try to bring about good will and improved relations between the provincial and federal governments. so that we can take advantage of the federal programmes, so we will not be leaving millions of dollars on the Ottawa table every year, Mr. Chairman.

I hope that the Provincial Administration, especially the Premier, will be big enough to lay aside partisan politics in the interest of getting projects started in this Province and shake hands with Ottawa, and that Ottawa will be prepared to do the same thing, and with a handshake, Mr. Chairman, get on with the business of governing this Province, and get some projects underway to try and help alleviate and reduce the suffering and the unemployment in this Province at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I know the administration, the hon. gentlemen on the other side will get up and they will attempt to lay blame and they will try their little political games again, but I make this statement today, Mr. Chairman, in good faith, in all sincerity. I know the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the President of the Council is there with a little silly grin on his face; he has no intention of trying to patch up the deteriorating relations between the provincial and federal governments. I know what they want to do, I know the game they are playing; they want to carry on certain issues in the next federal election, Mr. Chairman. It is getting us nowhere. These little political games are getting us nowhere. We are not taking advantage of all the federal programmes that are available, other agreements are expiring, are breaking down. Like the other day we saw the bickering - a ministerial statement in this House, and then an announcement by Mr. Rompkey.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, that was really a pathetic performance. I almost feel sorry for the hon. Leader of the Opposition. It was really so out of character, that here is someone who wants to spread peace and sweetness and light and harmony in federal/provincial relations, when the whole time, whenever the Province dares to raise its voice for quite a legitimate wrong, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and our friends opposite lash into the government and say you are being obstructionists, you are being nasty, you are being anti-Canadian, give in, give in, give

DR. J. COLLINS:

it away. That is the way Newfoundlanders should behave, give everything away, succumb to what the federal government says. Do not raise your voice in protest. Do not demand. Do not look for your rights. Do not do that. If you do that you are being a bad Canadian, a bad Newfoundlander and it is a terrible thing to do. Well, now, why has the Leader of the Opposition taken a different attack now? It is so obvious. He has been groping around trying to find out what he should say about the fisheries. He has no idea whatsoever. Of course, the Liberal Party has no idea what to say about the fisheries.

MR. DINN:

They had a different line in December month.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes. They say one thing one time and an absolutely different thing another time. So having lost every possible point they have made about the fisheries and knowing that after hard slugging and persistent application to the federal government and pushing our case forward and putting in logical, rational briefs time and time again, finally we are getting the message through to Ottawa up there that you cannot run a fishery which is in two parts, one part controlled by the province and that only the processing part, which is totally dependent on the supply of fish from the waters, obviously, and the other part run, essentially by an organization that is 1,500 miles away, and that is the main part of the fishery, the harvesting sector, because that, obviously, has to precede all the other parts. We are finally getting that message through to the federal government that there has to be a co-operative approach, there has to be a conjoint management approach to the fishery. You cannot break it up into two parts and say that this will be totally federal and this will therefore be

DR. J. COLLINS: provincial but, of course, dependent on the federal side, and expect to run the thing. And as the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) points out, the Burin Action Committee has welcomed the Provinces' proposal. They said that our proposal is a very logical one. Indeed, it is the only proposal that makes any sense whatsoever. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been sort of whizzing around trying to find something that he can hang his hat on. The only thing he seems to have hung his hat on so far is that somehow or other we should forget about the fishery insofar as the people of this Province are concerned, insofar as the workers of this Province are concerned, insofar as the fishermen of this Province are concerned and we should only concentrate on saving the companies. Now, even that is a total, 180 per cent, about-turn from what he said a little while. Because, a little while ago he said, 'Let the companies go.' So one month, 'Let the companies go', the next month, 'Save the companies.' But what about the people of Newfoundland, a large proportion of the population which depends on the fisheries? That is where this government has always put its emphasis. That is where we have got to try to get the message through time and time again to the federal government. And I think we are finally getting it through, that it is not that the fishery is for companies and it is not that the fishery is for markets, the fishery is designed to assist

DR. COLLINS:

the rural aspects or some of the rural aspects of Newfoundland and that is where the emphasis has to be. The fishery will prosper where it supports, where it gives employment, where it gives a good life to those parts of rural Newfoundland which are dependent on it. That is the starting point. You have to start with the parts of rural Newfoundland which depend on the fisheries and then go on from there. You do not work back from the companies and say, 'What is good for the companies, somehow or other we will try to make it good for the fishermen and the people who work in plants in a few of the communities around the Province.' You do not work back that way.

We are finally getting the message through to the federal government, and, of course, once the federal government begins to agree with our very reasonable, very rational position, then the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has to throw in the sponge and say, 'Oh, well, now let everything be sweetness and light.' I mean, it is like taking candy away from a kid, trying to argue against the Leader of the Opposition's position.

The other point that the Leader of the Opposition is pushing, of course, is that if the federal government makes a statement about the fisheries and we raise a reasonable objection to it, we are the worst in the world. However, if we put our position forward and our position is not agreed to by the federal government, we are squabbling and the people are fed up with us. We have to cave in, we have to throw our very reasonable position out the window and accept whatever is presented to us from Upalong. Well, I think the people of the Province now are seeing that these debating points do not cut any ice any longer. They know that the credibility of the Opposition's position on the fisheries, if there

DR. COLLINS: is a position - I have not been able to detect any position so far, but if there is a position on the fisheries by the Opposition, the people of this Province now know that it can safely be ignored and they are content, they are pleased, they are indeed overjoyed. As the Burin Action Committee has said, they are overjoyed that the position and the plan that this Province is putting forward with regard to the fisheries is finally being accepted, because the conditions of the times demand that sensible solutions be accepted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Up to now it was all very well, you know, you could say, 'Well, let us give them U.I., let us put them on unemployment insurance; that is good enough for the Newfoundland fishery except for the height of some season or other. But once you get into a recessionary period, when every dollar has to be watched, you can no longer afford to go with that sort of policy. Now you have to sit down and try to find rational, reasonable policies and programmes which have some expectation of having in them long-term solutions. So in some respects the hard times we have come to are going to pay off in terms of benefit for our fishery, and I am only too glad to see it.

DR. COLLINS: Other than that, I do not know what other points one might respond to in terms of the Interim Supply Bill. We have not really gotten into the details of it, I suppose, but the Supply Bill is a matter of giving the government the authority to spend for that two month period until the main estimates come down. It is just really to allow government to carry on until the House decides in its wisdom whether or not it will accept the main estimates. I think that we have talked this out, in my view, to the degree that is necessary, and I would now hope that the resolution and the bill related to the resolution will be accepted and then, perhaps, the House can get on to either the main estimates, if it so wishes, or perhaps get on to other matters that are worth discussing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I was just listening to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and he gave a couple of enlightening statements. One was, of course, the reaction of this side of the House every time there is a squabble with Ottawa, and the way that he put it was 'a little squabble', and the people on this side jump up and say, you know, we should not be having this squabbling, we are all for harmony and peace. Then he goes on to say, 'give it away', we want to give it away. Well, you know, that phrase is wearing thin now with the people of this Province. Because there is one thing, for sure, they realize about this government, about this Tory government, and they are beginning to realize this now, that this Tory government does not give away anything. They do not give away anything, Mr. Chairman, not even education. They do not give away education, they do not even give away health services.

MR. LUSH: There are a lot of things, Mr. Chairman, that this government does not give away and the people of this Province are fast coming to that conclusion now. We do not have to worry about this government giving away anything, be it education, health services, public services, municipal services. Mr. Chairman, they do not give away very much.

What we are now seeing, Mr. Chairman, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador after close to a dozen years of Tory reign what we are now seeing, and we are just beginning to see it, is the execution, the enforcement, the enactment of Tory policy that we have not seen before. It has taken them

MR. LUSH:

this long, Mr. Chairman, to wipe away all of the Liberal policies that were abroad in this land . It has taken them this long. It has taken them ten to a dozen years to bring in their own policies. And now the people of this Province are seeing what Tory policy is all about. They are beginning to see it for the first time, Mr. Chairman. They are beginning to see the enforcement, the enactment and the execution of pure, unadulterated Tory policy. That is what they are seeing, Mr. Chairman. It took the government that long to wipe out Liberal policy . It took them ten to twelve years to wipe it all out. And now, Mr. Chairman, we can see, the people of Newfoundland can see for themselves that this government does not give away anything. There is no question about that, Mr. Chairman, they do not give away anything. We have seen increases in just about every area of government involvement since this government took over. And what they are now doing is using the down-turn in the economy as the excuse to bring in Tory policy, to bring in regulations, Mr. Chairman, affecting education in this Province, post-secondary education. They have moved now from what was a policy, or what was regarded as a policy and a philosophy of education, in a sense, being a right. Education, Mr. Chairman, was viewed in Newfoundland for the past number of years as being a right, a right for everyone. And now what has happened, of course, is that it is looked upon as a privilege. Education is now a privilege , a privilege for the few , for the rich and the wealthy and the elite. That is what we have done with education. And, Mr. Chairman, this nonsense of the increase in Student Aid not going to affect the students of this Province is pure nonsense. It is going to affect the students, it is going to harm many students in this Province. It is going

MR. LUSH: . . . to put a financial hardship and a financial burden on many, many students throughout this Province. And, Mr. Chairman, that is an example, that is just one example of Tory policy, of what Tory policy has done to this Province in the last ten or twelve years. They are now using the economy, the down-turn in the economy as an excuse, Mr. Chairman, to bring in Tory policy. So we are seeing the full enactment, the full enforcement of Tory policy for the first time, and the people of Newfoundland are beginning to see; they are seeing an escalation, Mr. Chairman, all along the way in their services. And one wonders what the reason behind a couple of statements in the Budget was, what

MR. LUSH: the reasons behind these statements was when they talked about the increases in student-aid, It has already been alluded to that this was to bring student-aid more in line with that of other areas of Canada. And in the Budget Speech there was some specific reference to the fact that in two areas we are taxed the lowest in Canada, with respect to municipal services and with respect to school taxes. And one wonders, Mr. Chairman, whether that again was not a gentle hint to municipalities and to the school tax authorities to bring these areas in line with services in other parts of Canada, with respect to municipalities, and with respect to school taxes. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, what was the purpose of mentioning these two items?

Mr. Chairman, I can assure you there are many people in Newfoundland today who are not at all pleased with what is happening in the area of municipal taxes. And that is not to say that Newfoundlanders do not want to pay for their services, Mr. Chairman. There are a lot of people not happy with what is happening in school taxes. That, again, is not to suggest that Newfoundlanders do not want to pay for their educational services. But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot compare all of these services in Newfoundland to the level of services in other parts of Canada. We cannot make these comparisons. We have a different economy, we have a different economic base. And it is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot raise these levels of taxation to the same level as they are in other parts of Canada. And it is for these reasons that we cannot put our student-aid programme on a par with that in other areas of Canada.

It has already been pointed out that our students have a more difficult time in terms of getting

MR. LUSH:

employment, it has been pointed out that we have the highest cost of living in Newfoundland, and all of these reasons, Mr. Chairman, are reasons why our student-aid programme should be kept at a more generous level than that in other parts of Canada, and not put down to a lower level. Our students do not have the same economic opportunities in this Province. They have more difficulty in terms of getting employment, they have to pay more, Mr. Chairman, for all of the things that they purchase, and for these reasons we should be keeping our student-aid more generous.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no question about it, that the people of this Province are now beginning to see, are now beginning to learn first hand that this government gives away nothing.

MR. LUSH:

That they know, Mr. Chairman, that they know. And they can look around them and see the increases in municipal taxes, the increases in school taxes, the increases in fuel and oil. They can see all around them, Mr. Chairman, that this government does not give away anything. They can see that in just about every area of government involvement there has been an increase - increase in taxes, increase in services. In just about every involvement, Mr. Chairman, there has been an increase - increase with respect to moose licences and all hunting permits. There have been increases, Mr. Chairman, in everything from getting a rabbit permit to getting a permit to burn your garbage. And that is what has happened and the people of Newfoundland are beginning to see that. An increase, Mr. Chairman, in everything from birth certificates to death certificates. And the people of this Province are beginning to see, Mr. Chairman, that this government - they are right, they are right, they are not going to give away anything. But, Mr. Chairman, in the process they are doing a lot of bungling. They bungled the offshore; they have muffed that to the extent that the people of this Province are utterly fed up with listening to this government mouthing off and prattling and saber rattling about the offshore.

Mr. Chairman, we, on this side of the House, are not concerned about squabbling with Ottawa as long as we see that we are getting something out of it. We are not concerned with arguing with Ottawa. I expect that if we were there we would have our share of arguments as well. But, Mr. Chairman, I tell you, we know how to negotiate. We know what the word means, and we would certainly ensure that Newfoundland got the best

MR. LUSH: deal. Mr. Chairman, this nonsense, as I have said, of a giveaway, it is running thin and it is time that hon. members realized that. The people of Newfoundland are getting sick and tired of hearing about a giveaway. They are asking now, they want to see, this hon. crowd do something, Mr. Chairman. They want to see some action, they want to see some productivity and they do not want to see this constant blaming, this constant laying on the shoulders of the Canadian people the cause for all the economic problems and all the economic woes of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that they stood up like men, it is time that they stood up in man fashion and started doing something for this Province rather than squabbling and prattling and saber rattling. It is time that they did something, Mr. Chairman, it is time that they did something.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. LUSH: Already?
Did Mr. Chairman say I had some time left or it was up?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. gentleman have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, every time the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) gets up to speak it drives me to rising in the debate and talking sensibly about some of the things that he apparently cannot seem to talk sensibly about. Unemployment in Newfoundland is the highest in Canada. It has been the highest in Canada for years. We have never been able to get the unemployment rate down to any reasonable, normal rate, never been able to get it down to the Canadian average. We were well on our way to getting it down to the Canadian average, we got it down to 13 per cent in 1980, but then we had a national energy programme, then we had a new federal budget, then we had a recession, not only in Newfoundland but in Canada, in North America and throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, because we had a recession the unemployment rate started to go up again. But it went up again all over. It went up in Canada. The unemployment rate, for the hon. member's information, in February, in Newfoundland, was disgraceful, it was 20.9 per cent. Nobody can really stand in the House as Minister of Labour and Manpower and say that that is great, that is wonderful, we are doing a good job. The fact of the matter is, the unemployment rate in Canada, in 1982, went up by 42 per cent, in Newfoundland it went up by 29 per cent. Now nobody thinks that that is great, but the fact of the matter is, that Newfoundland, with respect to other parts of Canada, is doing reasonably well within the economic situation that we have today.

MR. SIMMS: Yes. True.

MR. DINN: Forty-two per cent in Canada it went up by, it went up by 29 per cent in Newfoundland. Not good, but it is better than the Canadian average.

MR. WARREN: Which was the worst Province?

MR. DINN: Does the hon. member have a question?

MR. WARREN:

Which was the worst province?

MR. DINN:

The worst province in Canada, from the point of view of increased unemployment, was Alberta - 5.4 per cent versus 4.8 per cent, for example, in British Columbia, the Canadian average 3.6 per cent - that is February over February - the Province of Ontario, 3.8 per cent and here, in Newfoundland, 3.6 per cent. So you have to look at things in relative terms. The hon. member complains about unemployment. The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) gets up and gives a great dissertation about the unemployment situation in Newfoundland, yet he is against a local preference policy that we put in place for offshore. Now, it only employed 1,409 Newfoundlanders at peak last year. The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is against that. He is not for local preference. He says, "Well, everybody should have an opportunity. We have got to be good Canadians and give everybody an opportunity to have these jobs." He is against local preference. He thinks that is a good thing, for Ottawa to have control of the offshore.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if Ottawa had control of the offshore the offshore would be a disaster area.

MR. DINN: For sixteen years, Ottawa presumably thought they had control of the offshore. We had no regulations here and no Newfoundlanders worked on offshore rigs. We had a few jobs on a few of the Sedco rigs that were built in Halifax, but none of the other rigs would hire Newfoundlanders or, indeed, other Canadians.

So, Mr. Chairman, we brought in regulations in 1979 and from that point on we have gotten some employment in the offshore and we hope to get some more employment this year. There are a projected nine to ten rigs that will be working offshore this year, and if you multiply 200 by nine or ten rigs - if there are ten rigs, of course, you are going to have about 2,000 Newfoundlanders working offshore because there are about 200 per rig offshore and on shore directly related to that offshore activity, the supply vessels, the seismic vessels and the related employment on shore.

So you cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot get up in this House and complain about the unemployment rate in Newfoundland and then from the other corner of your mouth, talk about the fact that you do not agree with local preference offshore. You have to have it one way or the other. If you agree that we need more jobs in Newfoundland, that we have to get some value out of our resource, you have to agree with local preference because that employs Newfoundlanders, that brings taxes into the treasury and that allows us to carry on with educational programmes, health programmes and so on.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is nice for the hon. member to get up in his place and talk about unemployment and talk about the fact that we do

MR. DINN: not have enough dollars to provide the educational requirements and the training needs of all of our people, but then out of the other side of his mouth he says he disagrees with local preference or Newfoundlanders working.

MR. HODDER: There is nobody listening to you, boy.

MR. DINN: The hon. member need not worry about who listens to me when I speak. The hon. member is scared to death that somebody will find out that the Opposition is totally against local preference in the offshore. The hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is totally against it. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is against local preference in the offshore.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DINN: You are against local preference in the offshore.

MR. NEARY: Just because you say so?

MR. DINN: The hon. shadow member for Labour and Manpower - we might have a change in policy here now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. DINN: I certainly would permit the hon. gentleman to have his go at a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Government of Canada that brought home the Constitution, the Parliament of Canada, put into the Constitution a clause, a provision for local preference hiring in

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland and Labrador? Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? A Liberal government up in Ottawa.

MR. SIMMS: Why did they put it in?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to answer the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) question. Yes, there is a provision in the constitution -

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. Who put it there?

MR. DINN: - that was repatriated, because the hon. Premier went up and made sure that that was put into the constitution.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: That is why it is in the constitution. The hon. Leader of the Opposition stood in his place in this House and is against local preference in the offshore or anywhere else.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Shame! Shame!

MR. DINN: He does not want Newfoundlanders to have jobs. He does not want the government to collect some taxes so that we can pay for education and training. He does not want us to have a good policy on the fisheries. Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets up and talks about policy on the fisheries. Well, you heard him last Thursday and Friday do a complete flip flop. His former, former, former, former, former Leader got up and told them all to burn their boats, and he got up here in December, in this House of Assembly, and said let the fish companies go, let them all die, and then we will pick them up for a song.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, shame!

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a great fisheries policy to have.

MR. DINN: Then he talked about the poor communities.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Now, the hon. Fisheries critic from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is chiming in. He cannot get up and speak in the House of Assembly. He makes a fool of himself when he gets up to speak. But there is the Liberal Opposition - that is the policy for fisheries from the Liberal Opposition, printed in The Daily News of November 23, 'Let the fish companies go', Mr. Chairman. And the only other policy that I have heard in the last twenty-three years was from the former, former, former Leader - the hon. gentleman who is now the Leader of the Opposition went in and genuflected to him every day - and his policy was 'Burn your boats'. Do not have any local preference in the offshore, you might give some Newfoundlanders some jobs. So we have ten rigs out there, 2,000 jobs. Oh, we cannot have that. We cannot have Newfoundlanders working. And yet the hon. members can get up and say, What is the government doing for unemployment in Newfoundland?

Well, Mr. Chairman, when we try to do something we have hon. members opposite getting very excited. The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) -

MR. NEARY: What are you doing?

MR. DINN: - got up in this House and talked to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) about what is he going to do about the plant in Piccadilly? And when he got some reaction, did he get up and thank the Minister of Fisheries? No, no.

MR. MORGAN: No.

MR. DINN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and said, What are you doing about Burin? What are you doing about Fermeuse?

MR. NEARY: What are you doing?

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Chairman, things will unfold. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition need not worry when it does

MR. DINN: unfold the hon. Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Neary) will suck back and reload again as he usually does.

MR. SIMMS: Ask him to tell you about the standing
ovation he got this morning.

MR. NEARY: Boy, I will tell you, you are really
grasping today.

MR. DINN: Yes, I would like to hear about -
when the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets up to speak now I
would like to hear about the standing ovation he got this
morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes!

MR. DINN: The Burin Action Committee is delighted.
The Province's proposal welcomed by the Burin Action Committee
with respect to fisheries.

MR. J. DINN: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) did not get -

MR. N. DOYLE: He holds P and P in the washroom.

MR. L. SIMMS: The Minister of Fishery (Mr. Morgan) did.

MR. DINN: He gets all of his information from Johns, whether it is the John in Halifax, or John Doyle or John Shaheen or John Davidson. And he is apt to get up here in the House any day now with another affidavit from any old John. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition will jump up in his place now in a minute and run out to the john and come back with some more information for the hon. House. But nobody in Newfoundland is listening to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Nobody in Newfoundland believes that we should let all the fish companies die and go into the ground and close all the communities. Nobody believes that. There is nobody in this Province, to my knowledge, believes what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says. Every time he gets on TV our stocks go up about 10 per cent. So, Mr. Chairman, I would recommend to the Leader of the Opposition that if he wants to allow for some progression in the Liberal Party, if he has any interest in that rather than in himself - or the people of the Province - he would stay off TV. He is making a complete fool of himself. Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to negotiations -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. the minister's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Your time is up.

MR. DINN: Too soon.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a member making such a fool of himself as the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) just made of himself a few minutes ago.

Mr. Chairman, the minister, for five or seven minutes, spoke about the local preference policy. If I were the minister I would not blow my horn too loud. Wait until the Royal Commission is finished on the Ocean Ranger and we will find out about the local preference policy that this government has instituted. Already some Newfoundlanders have found out about it and in a very hard way too, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) today, in response to some question I asked him about the tax system that this government has implemented, has said that he received very little complaint from businesses. However, I am pleased to lay on the table of the House a draft copy that was submitted to the minister way back in the last part of the 1982 year and there on Page 1, the beginning of the third paragraph, the first sentence says, 'It is unfortunate that the changes to the retail tax regulation have caused considerable hardship to major retailers in the Province.'

MR. WARREN:

The Board of Trade have submitted this proposal to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) asking him if he would make some changes to the retail tax structure. Many retailers are faced with increased administration costs, additional clerks etc. for calculating the sales tax by hand, and bearing the brunt of public outrage at the long lines at the cash registers. Now, Mr. Chairman, talk about a hypocritical government that comes in with such tax regulations and says that there is no public concern, or there is very little public reaction to the tax structure that has been implemented by this government.

It was only just Saturday past, Mr. Chairman, when I was in one of the stores and a lady was buying - I cannot believe it really, there was a lady buying an item for a little child about ten years old, The child was there in the store with the lady and the saleslady knew that the clothes were being bought for that particular child, but because of government regulations that saleslady, the cashier, could not accept the word of the customer, even though the child was in front of her she had to fill out the form. The lady did not have an MCP card for the child she was buying the item for so she could not buy the item without paying the tax, because one of the requirements

MR. WARREN: is you must have your MCP card, it says on the form. So I think it is utterly ridiculous. What they are doing is asking the retailers to do the dirty work for the government, because the government are saying that they are trying to save the dollars. But what they are doing is causing the retailer much, much more hardship.

Mr. Chairman, the recommendations that were made by this section of the Board of Trade - there are six recommendations and I will just mention two of them. The retail industry should receive a commission for collecting the government sales tax, because the government is causing the retail industry to collect the taxes. So if the retailers who sell beer products can receive a commission - beer retailers receive a commission, do they not?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. WARREN: If the stores that sell beer receive a commission, surely goodness the retailers who are selling hundreds and thousands of commodities should also receive a commission for collecting the taxes.

Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), said that this government will not give away anything - I think he referred in particular to education and health. I am going to just strike on one little thing where there is \$424 million being spent. The government talk about all the money they are spending in health. However, I am shocked that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) could not see fit to attend a meeting in North West River over the past weekend. Some 200 people to 350 people were there, and they even had a chair with his name marked on it - they were addressing an empty chair. The minister said that he did not have the facts and figures to back up why the hospital was closing down.

MR. WARREN: And here we have a budget being passed, a budget presented to this hon. House, and here is a major decision made by the Department of Health, and the minister does not even know why they made the decision. The minister does not even know why they made the decision. And I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) last week, before the session adjourned, because there were conflicting reports from the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), and from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - I believe, if I understood correctly, the Minister of Finance said that all the Cabinet ministers knew what was in the budget, all the Cabinet ministers reviewed the budget, it is talked about and everything like that, but the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development said that he did not know what was in the budget about the North West River Hospital until fifteen minutes before the budget came down.

Surely goodness the least the Cabinet could have done was let a colleague in Cabinet know what kind of an effect this drastic action by the government was going to have on a town in his district. And here we have one or the other minister really not giving the full facts to the House. Now, whether it was deliberate or not I do not know. But the facts were not given. The facts were not given to the hon. House. One of the ministers said that he only knew fifteen minutes before the budget was presented in the House. And, in fact, it was repeated on the weekend in North West River.

MR. TULK: I believe him.

MR. WARREN: I believe the hon. member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), that he did not know until fifteen minutes before the budget was brought in. But the Minister

MR. WARREN: of Finance (Dr. Collins) - I will not say he deliberately misled the House, but the Minister of Finance definitely did not tell the whole truth in the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), it is too bad he is not in his seat today, because the minister brought in a fantastic increase in social assistance, a big 6 per cent increase, I suppose under the 5 and 6 guidelines. And he said, also, he was going to increase the Northern allowance for fuel for residents in Labrador who receive fuel allowance. It is going to amount to a \$1.74 per month increase.

MR. WARREN: That will buy seven-eighths of a gallon of fuel oil per month. So there, you would say, is a department that is really concerned about the social aspects of our Province.

Mr. Chairman, this government has undertaken - and I have only been in this House since 1979, but I do recall that the Premier, campaigning in the 1979 general election said, 'We will fight for the Newfoundland people.' And now, I agree, the Premier is fighting for the Newfoundland people. He is fighting to drive them out of existence. That is what the Premier is trying to do.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Chairman, we are considering Interim Supply and the expenditure of amounts of money in excess of \$400 million -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - which I would think would cause members to want to make relevant comments with respect to the matter of expenditure, and I can hardly see how the remarks by the hon. gentleman are in any way relevant to the expenditure.

I am dragging the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to his feet and I know he is going to get after me, but I would appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, if he gets the message and drives some sense into his colleague as well as himself, if that is possible.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get after the hon. gentleman. I pity the hon. gentlemen, they are such pathetic spectacles over there. They have no constructive plans to deal with the economy, they have no constructive plans to deal with record unemployment in this Province, with the high cost of electricity, the high cost of living, student allowances. They have no constructive plans and the best that the hon. gentleman can do is try to interrupt the continuity of my hon. colleague's speech. It is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman, as Your Honour knows and Your Honour has ruled so often.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is right.

All the hon. gentleman is doing is trying to use up some of the time of my hon. colleague. It is not a valid point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are debating Interim Supply, which, as you know, is wide open.

MR. SIMMS: You are using up the time of your colleague over there.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not. My colleague will have another ten minutes, you need not worry. We will be here until Easter Sunday, do not worry about it.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is no valid point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I realize it is extremely difficult to rule on relevancies. This is a money bill and it is a wide-ranging debate, so I would just refer hon. members to the bill. We are on Interim Supply.

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to enter the debate for a brief period of time. It is always a pleasure to follow my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), because he and I go back a long time with respect to debates, being associated with activities outside of the Legislature, of course. I have seen him perform in debates taking place at other organizational meetings and, of course, I have seen him perform in the House here. It is generally a pleasure to follow him, because he is not usually nasty or anything of that nature. He usually makes a bit of sense.

I want to refer to the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), to whom I always enjoy listening in a debate such as this, which is wide-ranging, as you, your hon., has already pointed out, and I remember one of his comments during his debate was how the people were fed up listening to the people speaking on the government side. Well, if I ever heard, Mr. Chairman, of people being fed up with anybody, it has always been people being fed up with listening to what the members of the Opposition are saying, not what the members from the Government side are saying.

The member for Terra Nova talked about the government not giving anything away. Well, he is absolutely right on that, because there is one thing that we will never give away, and we have made that position clear Mr. Chairman on many occasions, and that is our resources. And the members of the Opposition can try all they want to side with their friends in Ottawa, to try to encourage us to give

MR. SIMMS: it away as quickly as we possibly can, but we already did that once before, Mr. Chairman and it sits in the memory of all of us, with respect to the Churchill power situation, the situation that occurred under a former liberal administration.

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) talks about a hypocritical government. Those were the descriptive and abjective words that he used, 'a hypocritical government'. Well, I can recall some occasions that might suggest to people who are listening to debates that we may, in fact, have a very hyprocritical Opposition. I suggest to members of the House and to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) in particular, from the people that I talk to around the Province, as he usually uses as his argument, that his credibility is lowering day after day

MR. SIMMS: He says one thing one day, on one occasion, something else on another occasion. It has already been pointed out by my colleagues, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Minister of Labour Manpower (Mr. Dinn), about their position on the fishery which he is trying so desperately now to score some political points on. I recall recently, well, everybody can recall a few months ago when he criticized this government and the Premier for calling a general election, everybody remembers that, for calling an unnecessary general election because it was going to cost money and we were only, after all, into our mandate for about nearly three years. And lo and behold what did we hear a couple of months ago? All these threats:

MR. DOYLE: He wants another one.

MR. SIMMS: Yes, he was going to go to the Lieutenant-Governor, going to suggest the Premier should call another election and give the people a chance to decide what they want to do. Now, if those are not hypocritical statements, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what are.

MR. CARTER: Provocative.

MR. SIMMS: Yes, they are certainly provocative. But I say, again, it does nothing for the credibility of the Opposition nor for the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition. And I think that the people, generally, the public recognize it. Issuing five and six press releases every day; day after day ¹² press releases steaming out of the Leader of the Opposition's office, no thought given to them, absolutely no thought at all, totally negative, totally critical, no constructive comments, nothing constructive, just absolutely criticizing everything this government is doing.

MR. DOYLE: Bill Callanan is information officer for him.

MR. SIMMS: Preachers of doom and gloom, Mr. Chairman. In any event, another good example of negativism coming from the Opposition that I want to make reference to, because I really have not had an opportunity prior to now, is the criticism that comes from the other side because we are finally doing something this year to promote Tourism, and I refer to the 400th anniversary celebrations. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition has on several occasions, and everybody is aware of it, has just sort of made an aside comment about the 400th anniversary celebrations, never gives both sides of the story or anything like that, how foolish it is to be spending money on the 400th anniversary celebrations, how silly, how foolish. And on the one hand, of course, they are criticizing us because we are not doing anything to promote tourism in the Province and when we do something to promote tourism, he criticizes us for it. He neglects to talk about the fact that the one per cent increase in tourism activity in this Province would mean a revenue increase of about \$2.5 million.

MR. L. SIMMS: And of course, we expect a much greater increase in our Tourism activity during this coming year. We have received more enquiries, my colleague the Minister responsible for Tourism, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) tells me, more enquiries up to this point, in this particular year, than ever before from tourists who are interested in this kind of historical celebration. We have received tremendous support for our anniversary celebrations from people involved in the tourist industry, hotel associations, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is well aware of that support. But still he continues to say, 'Oh, how foolish it is.' The only ones to this point in time who have not - well, no, I cannot say that, that is not quite accurate. But certainly the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition members opposite show again what kind of credibility they have in this Province. A perfect example, of course, Mr. Chairman, is one of their major suggestions for a budgetary cost savings, one of their major suggestions. How do they suggest that we save some money in the Budget? What do they suggest? One of the major suggestions, close down the private elevator. The Finance critic says, 'Close down the private elevator.' The Leader of the Opposition says the other day, 'Close down the private elevator.' Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that closing down the private elevator would save, I do not know, I suppose -

MR. H. YOUNG: About eight or ten dollars.

MR. SIMMS: - eight or ten dollars at the most, the maximum, and that is a major suggestion. But again it shows the credibility of the suggestions coming forth from the other side. You never hear them talking about anything positive, never mentioning any of the positive aspects of the Budget that our friend and colleague the

MR. L. SIMMS: Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brought down a couple of weeks ago. What about the \$30 million in transportation projects that the Premier alluded to today in his Ministerial Statement? The \$10 million for the construction of the Confederation Building Complex? \$16 million in other capital projects: The Clarenville Hospital, the Labrador Constabulary Building, the Bonavista Hospital, Her Majesty's Penitentiary - there are going to be major renovations there. A total of over \$16 million, Mr. Chairman, in capital expenditures, this is going to provide employment. But what do you hear the Opposition talking about? 'Close down the private elevator,' save ten bucks. A major, major contribution, Mr. Chairman, - there is no question about that. All the other things in the Budget, and they are well aware of it, \$30 million for school construction, \$25 million for municipal capital grant projects, to be shared around the province in all those communities, \$20 million provincial highway funding, increases for Social Service recipients, increases in child welfare allowances, foster home rates,

MR. SIMMS: clothing allowances, two new group homes are going to be built for the mentally handicapped adults, changing the interest rates that are presently now available through the Fisheries Loan Board, the Farm Development Loan Board, and the Rural Development Loan Board, to improve them, funding being provided to launch and establish an economic council, which is something I am sure that the Board of Trade in St. John's and other interested parties would be pleased to hear about.

So, Mr. Chairman, we never ever hear any constructive. We never hear anything positive from the other side.

MR. TULK: We leave that to you, boy.

MR. SIMMS: But we certainly hear lost of negativisms, and the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) certainly is aware of all those negativisms.

By the way, I saw the headline story when you had your organizational meeting out in that historic district of Grand Falls, and the headlines said, "The Liberal Party is alive and well." That was the quote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Yes, it certainly is. I was asked for my comment on it by the local media.

MR. NEARY: That is the only sensible statement you made the whole -

MR. SIMMS: I thought you would enjoy it.

MR. TULK: We will elect you back in.

MR. SIMMS: I was asked for my comment out there by the local media, what I thought of the headline.

MR. TULK: We know what you said.

MR. SIMMS: What did I say?

MR. TULK: Very negative, you had to be.

MR. SIMMS: No, I did not.

MR. SIMMS: That is where the hon. gentleman is incorrect. I said the Liberal Party certainly is well.

MR. TULK: And that is all?

MR. SIMMS: And that is all I said.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS: Well, I did not say that. It did not go any further. But he mentioned that the reason for the meeting being held in Grand Falls was because it is good fertile Liberal country. Well, now, there is no mistake about that.

MR. TULK: Do not brag too much.

MR. SIMMS: I am not bragging. I am not bragging.

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), by the way, also talks about an issue that I want to address briefly, too, and that relates to the increase in fees. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) talked about an increase in moose licences. Well, Mr. Chairman, there was no increase in moose licence fees this year. We rejected that possibility, that option, because the increases would have had to be doubled from \$25 to \$50. And because of the criticisms, the very legitimate criticisms of the public with respect to some of the problems, with respect to the wildlife Division's handling of the moose hunting situation, to overcome these complaints and criticisms it was felt, and rightly so in my opinion, that we had to identify areas of revenue to offset costs associated with overcoming all these legitimate criticisms. With respect to that we introduced a \$5 fee which is going to be shared by all applicants, and I understand, as recently as this morning, that there has been no significant reduction in the number of applicants or anything, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RIDEOUT: No. According to the line-ups there is not.

March 28, 1983

Tape No. 726

NM - 3

MR. SIMMS:

According to the line-ups.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! The hon.

minister's time has elapsed.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder what has happened to the high level of debate that we used to have in this House? You know, Mr. Chairman, I have been here going on twenty-one years and I must say that here lately I am becoming awfully depressed and discouraged.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the level of debate in this House has really sunk to an all time low. If that is the biggest gun that they can put up against us over there, Mr. Chairman, I would say God help the future of this House. We have the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) get up today and make a number of illogical irresponsible statements, completely illogical, not rational, Mr. Chairman. Now we just had an example of another hon. gentleman who did not - now remember this is a minister speaking for the administration, a minister who is supposed to tell the House and tell the people of this Province what plans they have to deal with the economy, to deal with the problems that are facing our people. That is what you would expect from a minister. A minister gets up and states policy. That is what a minister does, Mr. Chairman. I do not have to give the hon. House a lecture on the responsibilities and the duties of a minister. A minister, when he speaks the media up over my head should hang on to every word that is being said to see if there is any policy in there, to see if he can detect how the government is thinking, how the government feels about certain issues. Now, did we get that from either one of the ministers who have spoken here this afternoon? Did we get it from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)?

MR. TULK: No.

MR. NEARY: Did we get it from the Minister

March 28, 1983

Tape No. 727

SD - 2

MR. NEARY: of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn)?

MR. TULK: No.

MR. NEARY: Did we get it from the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth who just spoke? Give me the answer again. No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. NEARY: All three ministers, how did they spend, Mr. Chairman, their ten minutes?

MR. TULK: Up criticizing the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Exactly. That is exactly what they did, especially me. They seem to be awfully concerned and they are awfully testy, and they are awfully sensitive about what I say and what I do, Mr. Chairman.

Now, here we are eight people over here.

There are only eight of us, there are forty-four on the government side, and yet they are more concerned about what we say and do, where we hold our meetings, than they are in articulating plans -

MR. TULK: Let me go out in one of their districts as president of the party and I am no sooner left it then - boom!

MR. NEARY: That is right. They are more interested in criticizing me and the Opposition, which leads me to believe, Mr. Chairman, that we are getting through to them, that the criticism is taking its toll, that the image of the administration is severely battered and bruised. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, ministers would stand up and do what they are supposed to do in this House, and that is to enunciate and articulate policy, and tell us what the administration stands for, what they are doing about various problems that are facing our people, what they are doing about the crisis in the fishery, what they are doing about the pulp and paper industry problem, what they are doing about the Bowaters situation, what they are doing about record unemployment amongst young people, what they are doing about high electricity rates, what they are doing about a transmission line from Labrador to bring the power down to the Island of

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland, what they are doing about the Lower Churchill, what they are doing about the \$3.5 billion debt we have in this Province. Now that is what ministers should be doing, Mr. Chairman. But for some reason or other they are not doing that. Obviously they have no ideas of their own. They have no original ideas, no constructive proposals or suggestions or recommendations to make to this House about how they are going to deal with the problems that are facing the people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a comparison is made from time to time about the present Premier and about a past Premier in this Province. We are told - and members over there, sometimes they boast about that, they tell us there is a comparison between the present Premier and a former Premier in this Province, namely, Mr. Smallwood. Now when they are comparing their Premier to Mr. Smallwood they try to latch onto the odd good little thing, but when they want to condemn Mr. Smallwood, they latch onto the so-called

MR. NEARY:

unpopular things. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say this to hon. gentlemen, and to anybody else who draws a comparison between the present Premier and the former Premier Smallwood, that in my opinion, there is no comparison.

Mr. Chairman, let me put this proposition to the House: When Mr. Smallwood sat on the opposite side of the House, where the present Premier is sitting, when the former Premier was sitting over there, was Newfoundland booming? Was Newfoundland prosperous? Was there all kinds of work for construction workers? Were there hospitals being built, fish plants being built, hydro developments taking place, vocational schools being built, roads being paved, communities taken out of isolation, rural electrification programme, new university, new Fisheries College, new high schools, new senior citizens homes? Mr. Chairman, was that what we saw from that administration headed by Mr. Smallwood, who was a builder? The man was a builder. He could only think positive. Mr. Chairman, the Iron Ore Company of Canada, Labrador West, Wabush and Labrador City, the pulp and paper industry in Stephenville, the chain of hotels that we see across this Province, was that not what happened? In the good old Liberal days, Mr. Chairman, were not these the things that were going on? Now, where is the comparison between Mr. Smallwood and the present Premier? Mr. Smallwood was a builder.

MR. DOYLE: Linerboard mills and newsprint mills.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there would not be a paper industry in Stephenville today but for the construction of that Linerboard mill.

MR. DINN: He built a Linerboard mill, that is not paper.

MR. NEARY: Well, who put it there,
Mr. Chairman? How many linerboard mills and how many
pulp and paper industries have hon. gentlemen started
in the last eleven years in this Province?

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the
matter is there is no comparison. We had a builder.
For twenty-three years there was a man who built Newfoundland,
who did not have a negative vein in his body. But what do
we have today, Mr. Chairman? We have a Premier who

MR. NEARY: has not produced one single original idea in the last three years, since he has been head of the administration. We have had a Tory administration for eleven years that has not -

MR. TULK: No credibility.

MR. NEARY: No, no credibility. And I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that what the hon. gentleman is worried about are the polls. The hon. gentleman is worried about the polls, because the polls, Mr. Chairman, of the last few weeks indicate that the administration is down in a valley. The administration is down and sliding down and going down hill pretty fast, and the image of the Premier is severely battered and bruised. And, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. gentleman is worried about, if there was an election today the hon. gentleman knows in his heart that the situation would be reversed. We would just see the reverse of what it is at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for Baie Verte -
White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I have a word or two to say. I have been listening all afternoon now, three or four times now, to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the gist of what the Leader of the Opposition is getting on with this afternoon I heard not quite a year ago - yes, about a year ago, just before April 6th last year, in the Fall session. There were polls then too, Mr. Chairman, which showed that the Opposition were -

MR. SIMMS: When their polls showed they were going to win thirty-five seats.

MR. RIDEOUT: I heard forty at one time.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thirty-five was the bottom line, but there were polls showing that it was forty. And I remember, you know, looking across and shivering here as I was sitting in my chair, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would start up in that corner of the House and come down the backbenches and head down to this corner of the House and then he would pick out various ministers. He would go in a tirade for fifteen, twenty, twenty-five minutes, Mr. Chairman, talking about who was gone - the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was gone, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) was gone, the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe) was gone, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay was gone. All you could hear was gone, gone, gone, up one bench and down the other. And he talked about polls and he talked about what the polls were showing and he talked about everything you could talk about but we were gone. We were wiped off the face of the earth, we were wiped off the map.

MR. DOYLE: And you were really gone.

MR. RIDEOUT: I was under the carpet, I was not fit to talk about I was not even going to save my nomination fee.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible)

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I never said a word to the hon. gentleman today. Now I can shout just as loud as he can but I did not say a word to him today and I am not going to get into a shouting match with him. I am just responding to some of the things the Leader of the Opposition said that, you know, this side of the House is wiped out. Well, what happened?

MR. RIDEOUT: Actually, the Premier took the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) up on his challenge at the time and he called an election. Now, where did the wipe-out occur? Where does there exist today in Newfoundland the prime reason for a NEED programme? Where does it exist? It is not over here, Mr. Chairman. Where is the other misery list that I talked about the other day? It is not over here, Mr. Chairman it is on the other side of the House.

Let me talk about polls for a second. The Leader of the Opposition has been talking about some polling he had done recently, Well, we have got some polls too, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DINN: Those are not polls, they are actuals.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, they are actuals, as actual as polls can be. I believe the popularity of the Premier It slipped from 82 per cent, in April, down to 75 per cent a couple of days ago or a couple of weeks ago, something like that. There are all kinds of things in this poll here Mr. Chairman, It shows what has been happening in the liberal vote consistently since 1949 in this Province. It consistently shows what has been happening to the vote, it shows what the split in seats would be federally and provincially in this Province if there were an election held today. It shows a whole lot of things. Some very impressive polling people over the last month or so have done some very impressive polling - there are bar graphs, there are line graphs and there is everything there you can see, if the Leader of the Opposition could only see it. I remember, Mr. Chairman, another Leader of the Opposition, a couple of

MR. RIDEOUT: years ago gloating about polls in this House, I remember that. I remember him, as a matter of fact, so gloating that he came across the floor over here and talked to some people with a copy of the poll in this hand. Polls are polls, Mr. Chairman, but polls will tell you, I suppose, exactly what you want to hear when you want to hear it. There are some very interesting statistics in the poll that my friend, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) has.

I have some advice for my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, I really picked up on what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) had to say in the first part of his second or third go-around this afternoon, and he was suggesting that he is probably getting to us on this side, because we are going back and being critical of him, critical of his leadership, critical of the Liberal party, and he was suggesting that why we were doing that is because he is getting to us. Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues keep being critical of the Leader of the Opposition. I really hope that everyone who gets up on this side from time to time, if he thinks that is what is happening, if the Leader of the Opposition really thinks that he has got us scared in our shoes on this side, if he thinks that he has got the government on the rails, if he thinks that he has got the clutches of victory in his hand, if the

MR. RIDEOUT:

Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Neary) really thinks that, then I hope that every time somebody gets up on this side they spend a little time criticizing the Leader of the Opposition. Because the best thing we have going for us, Mr. Chairman, since sliced bread, in this Province, is the Leader of the Opposition. It is the most positive aspect that we have going for us. He is the most positive aspect that we have going for us. We saw him last week in the House, and starting off this new week again, trying to squirm and worm out of a fisheries policy, or the lack of a fisheries policy, that he enunciated in this House last Fall, and was headlined in the newspapers last Fall, it was 'Let them go'. He tried to squirm and worm around that in the House last week and again this week.

We get the Leader of the Opposition up again today talking about the lack of plans that the government is putting on the table, the lack of plans for the fishery, the lack of plans for forestry, the lack of plans. For all kinds of weird and wonderful things in the Province, he says there is a lack of plans. Well, Mr. Chairman, we went through four days of Question Period in this House last week, up until Thursday. I assume the Opposition asked questions about everything under the sun. I assume they asked questions about the plans and the lack of plans, I assume they asked questions about a fisheries policy or the lack of a fisheries policy, a monetary policy or the lack of a monetary policy, fiscal responsibility or lack of fiscal responsibility, and we come to the crunch on the Late Show on Thursday - all the answers must have been perfect. The government must be perfect. The answers must be perfect. The plans must be perfect. Because Mr. Chairman, the rules and privileges of this House give the hon. gentlemen on the other side an opportunity to debate the lack of a satisfactory answer. And what did we find at

MR. RIDEOUT: five-thirty Thursday evening past?

MR. YOUNG: Nothing. Nothing.

MR. RIDEOUT: That the Opposition was 100 per cent satisfied with the plans of the government, satisfied with the answers of the ministers, satisfied with the way the government was running the economy of the Province, satisfied, totally happy, one great weird and beautiful House, one great piece of harmony. There was no disagreement for a whole week, because there was the opportunity for the Opposition to get up and to latch in once again to the ministers for their lack of answers, to the government for their lack of plans, to be devastating in its effect.

I remember being on the other side when there were sixteen or seventeen of us, Mr. Chairman, and there used to be a real rat race for who would get the three questions that were going to go on on Thursday evening. Everybody was so anxious to - you know, it was their question they wanted to get on, that it was their idea that they wanted to take some minister on about. But that seems to be gone. And there is only one thing I can say about that, that

MR. T. RIDEOUT: the Opposition must be 100 per cent absolutely happy with the job that the government is doing. Because if they have no problems with the answers, and I assume they are asking questions about programmes, I assume they are asking questions about fiscal matters, I assume they are asking all those kinds of questions in Question Period, so if there is nobody disappointed with those answers, well, then, Mr. Chairman, I would say the ministry is doing a good job, the ministry is doing an excellent job and I hope that the ministers keep up their excellent job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I must say that the member who just spoke before - I also have to say that I do not particularly like to be reminded that he was over on this side and that I was one of his colleagues at one time. With regard to the idea of publicity, obviously the publicity seekers are over on that side and are seeking it. But I would like to talk, Mr. Chairman, just for a few minutes with regard to the current account deficit of \$27 million. We find out that we are building an extension to Confederation Building, we are building an Arts and Culture Center, we are building hospitals, but we are borrowing the money.

I remember last Christmas, the Premier never sent out a coloured Christmas card. The reason why he did not send it out was that he could not afford it in this period of restraint. In this period of restraint, he was not going to have a coloured one he was going to have a black and white one and as a result he

MR. E. HISCOCK: did not go through that expense. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), in the same Cabinet, sent out a Christmas card had his in colour. So there is contradiction within the government.

MR. H. YOUNG: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG: I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that I paid for my own Christmas cards, I paid for the postage. I had a good month in the month of December and it took care of all expenses.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that that is a valid point of order. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us who paid for all the brochures and mailing pieces that went out from the Premier's office last week in connection with John Crosbie's campaign.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please!

I rule there is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for Eagle River.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order. The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to impugn something here by innuendo that he is not prepared to say directly. I work in the Premier's office, and if the Leader of the Opposition has some evidence that the Premier's office is being used as a central mailing point for any person seeking the leadership in the national P.C. Party of Canada, I think he should lay it on the table and be a man about it and not do it by innuendo.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I merely asked the question and I still do not have the answer. Who paid for -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! This is a point of order that was raised by the hon. member for White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rideout). It is not the time to ask questions.

Order, please! The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously the government is very, very testy on how they are presenting their restraint programme in this period of recession. We had the Premier, as I said, move out of Mount Scio House as a cost saving measure. We are now still paying \$10,000 rent. We also still have the dining halls and still have the cars, etc. But it does not really matter about that as such, I suppose, those are the trappings.

MR. HISCOCK: of power. But one of the things is that if we are going to encourage the people in the hospitals to save money, if we are going to encourage our teachers in the schools to save money, if we are going to encourage all the other civil servants throughout the public service in this Province to save money, then the leadership has to be shown by this government and by the Premier. And I would also like to make the comment with regard to leadership, that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) should spend more of his time in trying to create jobs for our young people instead of looking at polls that have been done for the PC Party. The only question when I hear about polls that were done by the PC Party I have asked myself the question - the Auditor General said last year and again this year - when is the \$50,000 or \$60,000 going to be paid back to the taxpayers of this Province for a poll that was commissioned and paid for for the PC Party by this government? So I would wonder if this is another poll that is being commissioned by the PC Party and paid for by the taxpayers of this Province?

MR. SIMMS: No.

MR. HISCOCK: Obviously. We only have to accept the minister's words, so I would assume the minister is correct when he says his cards are paid for by himself. But let us look at the official entertainment. In this period of restraint, Ministerial Entertainment \$51,000, Meals supplied to government guests \$23,000, Business Luncheons \$38,000, Reception tendered in connection with the awarding of the contract for the synchrolift, \$6,000, Official entertainment by the Premier \$5,000, Supplies for the executive aircraft \$3,700. When I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) today why that is so high particularly the \$3,700 for the executive aircraft

MR. HISCOCK: I was told by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that we have a culture, that when one is entertaining, it obviously means having a drink or two. Now I could understand that with regard to entertainment for the national curling events, the Naval Association, world wrestling - but \$3,700 for supplies for government aircraft! Would I assume that was coffee and tea and donuts? Yes, obviously I would assume that! That is why all the members on the government side are going around with their coats open, because of all the donuts in their pockets! Very good! Very nice!

The reception held in connection with the official opening of the St. John's Cross Town Arterial Road, \$2,600, Mr. Chairman. Civic reception on the occasion of the visit - listen to this one - of the provincial Cabinet to Deer Lake and Pasadena, this is \$1,900. And a banquet of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, \$2,000. A banquet following the sod turning ceremony of the new Channel-Port Aux Basques hospital, \$1,600. And, I may add, when the sod turning ceremony was held there the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), who is the member for the district, was not even invited to attend the function or to sit on the podium.

So obviously, Mr. Chairman, all the things we have here are for political P.C. propaganda, basically for entertaining their friends. The majority of it, which, by the way, goes up to \$300,000, Mr. Chairman -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, you know, we are talking about an expenditure of \$440 million. The hon. gentleman is talking about coffee and donuts and tea, I understand. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the eyeballs of his colleagues are rolling up in their heads and I am afraid they are going to stay there unless he gets back and he gets relevant and he stops embarrassing them. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, we are on Interim Supply and we are on \$440 million of expenditure, and I cannot see that what the hon. gentleman is talking about in relation to the public accounts of expenditures of previous years is relevant at all to the situation. There is a place for debating public accounts and there is a proper forum for it. This is Interim Supply and the hon. gentleman is being completely irrelevant.

MR. HODDER: To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, this is another attempt by the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) opposite to interfere and to muzzle my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who is making some very telling points against the government.

MR. J. HODDER: The fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is that the member is reading from the public accounts of his Province and what could be more relevant than that? Not only that, Mr. Chairman, he is outlining some \$250,000 worth of parties which this government had last year.

MR. S. NEARY: Three hundred thousand dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: With regard to that, Mr. Chairman, \$300,000 could go a long way in helping those people on welfare now cut off nonprescription drugs, \$300,000 could help the students a lot, \$300,000 could put a lot of equipment in some of our one and two room schools around this Province. It is not the \$300,000 that I am getting at even though we are dealing now with the hundreds of millions on Interim Supply. The point that I am making is that we have to show leadership. This government and this administration tell the people, 'Let them eat cake', while they are drinking their champagne and their caviar and having a great time. That is what is happening, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, I want in the next ten minutes to say that I believe today in Newfoundland it is perhaps an historical day and perhaps is a day that will go down in history as one of the days in which the history of Newfoundland and the history of the fishing

MR. B. TULK: industry in this Province may have been turned around. It is a day, Mr. Chairman, when we should congratulate the people of the Burin Peninsula and indeed of the whole South Coast. Today the people spoke. We will deal with what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) did last Thursday when the time is right, but today is not the day to deal with what happened in Ottawa last Wednesday, we will deal with that on some other day. But today in Newfoundland we saw a unity of purpose that has not been seen in this Province in some time. I think we saw federal politicians, provincial politicians, the Opposition party in this Province, we all agreed today that we would put our politics aside and indeed try to do something that needs to be done for the fishing industry.

We have not heard yet, Mr. Chairman, whether the Premier is going to support the resolution that was put forward by the people's meeting this morning, we have not yet heard but I suspect that he will. I do not see that there is any choice for anybody in this Province but to support those people. Mr. Chairman, the people spoke this morning and they said to all of us, as we have been trying to say on this side of the House for the last two or three weeks, 'You had better pull up your socks. You had better get behind the people

MR. TULK: of this province and do what the people of this Province want you to do.' Mr. Chairman, I want this evening to congratulate them, to congratulate those people from Burin and the South Coast of the Province and indeed encourage them to carry on their fight. I did that on March 9th in this House, Mr. Chairman, and I want to do it again this afternoon, because we on this side of the House believe that what has happened, and I repeat this, that what has happened on the South Coast of this Province is not of the making of the people of the South Coast. We believe rather that it is the making of governments. What has happened on the South Coast is a problem that has been caused by both governments, federal and provincial. And I want to go back once again to 1977, when we drew that line on the map called the 200-mile limit. We drew that line and all at once we said to everybody, 'Look there are thousands of fish'. We did not sit back and say, 'We have to wait for the stocks to increase.' We increased the processing capacity in the Province, we increased the harvesting capacity to the point, Mr. Chairman, where perhaps neither those who harvest the sea nor those who process what comes out of it can now make a living. And so we say to those two governments that you have to make up for what you have done. You have to pay the cost of putting those people in the place that they are in. And then, too, Mr. Chairman, we say that not a plant on the South Coast should close; indeed, not a plant in this Province should close because it is a very basic question and that is this? If you close fish plants in this Province, what else do people do?

The social costs of what would

MR. TULK: are they really making it? Is everything rosy? I want to go back and remind him again that in 1977 - was he part of the government then? - yes.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes.

MR. TULK: In 1977 his government, under another fisheries minister a little more competent than the one that we have now, drove everybody they could find into the fishing boats. The price of fish has basically stayed the same since 1977, there was a slight increase in the price in 1979, but in the meantime the cost of gear tripled.

Now we finally have the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) doing in the Budget one of the things that we have said to them that they should be doing all along, and that is lowering some of their interest rates; they may be lowering them, that is debatable, but at the present time I think they have to be lower. At least they are tying the interest rate from the Fisheries Loan Board to the prime rate of the banks, and I believe it is supposed to be 3 per cent below. That is good.

But how has this government treated fishermen? How have they treated fishermen? How did they treat them in 1980? In 1980 we had that strike, that fishermen's strike. My district, thanks to the Fogo Co-operative, escaped a great deal of it, but certainly not all of the fishermen in my district did. Then we got that Royal Commission; in August, 1980, after the Premier tried this twenty-one day cooling off period, we got that Royal Commission, that famous Royal Commission that now sits on the shelf and not one of the concrete recommendation in that Royal Commission report has been addressed by this government. It was a ploy to get fishermen off the picket lines and back into the boat.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, I want, if I can, to talk about the seal fishery, because I only have two minutes left. I want to talk about the seal fishery. What has happened to the seal fishery?

MR. HODDER: The Premier went to Europe.

MR. TULK: We have seen people travel to Europe, we have seen ourselves carry on a media fight with the likes of what we had here last week in our waters and the likes of what was in the Gulf this week, we have carried on that media battle, and I suppose it had to be done, but it was a losing battle right from the start, and we should have known that, Mr. Chairman. The writing was on the wall. If you cared to sit down and look at what was going to happen to the seal fishery in this Province, if you logically followed it through, the writing was on the wall. Because how can you with logic fight the emotions that the look of a baby seal on ice creates to somebody who lives in the United States or who lives in Europe, to some bleeding hearts, as I call them? How can you?

MR. TULK: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) says, 'If they do not accept our seals, cancel the sea quotas'. We agree. No argument. Let that be clear that we agree. And we encourage the federal minister to not go part of the way, as he has gone with the EEC countries, but to go all the way. We deplore the actions of any media that plays up the anti-hunt campaign. We have voiced our objections and we will continue to do so. But if the provincial government of this Province had done its homework and if we as governments at the federal level and the provincial level as well had done our homework, Mr. Chairman, there would have been a very small problem, if any, at the present time with the sealing industry. Because what we should have done, in my humble opinion, what we should have done was instead of trying to fight the media fight, we should have sat down and said, 'Let us set up our own processing and marketing industry for the finished product'. We have a proposal from my own district, from one of the people basically who helped form the pro-sealing group, I believe, it was in 1972, I am not sure, from Fogo Island Co-op. We have a proposal which basically says, 'Give us the money that you are spending on other things and we will show you what can be done with the sealing industry'. Mr. Chairman, what better place than Fogo Island which sits in the middle of the seal herds. Fogo Island has the expertise to carry on that kind of trade.

Mr. Chairman, that was the job of a province, that was the job of a Minister of Fisheries who was planning for the future development of the fisheries in this Province, to put together that kind of proposal and to support it rather than to take on

MR. TULK: the media experts that you have in the anti-sealing group full speed, head-on. That is what he should have been doing. But no, that has not happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK: I will get back to it,
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can take three Liberals speaking in a row. I would yield to any of my colleagues if they wish to speak, but not to a member of the Opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I think first of all what has to be pointed out again, at the risk of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) accusing me of reading a lecture to the Opposition, is that later when the time comes and we get to consider the items in the main estimates, it will not be said that

MR. MARSHALL: we had not given adequate warning or adequate position of government with respect to the matter.

Mr. Speaker, there is allotted under the rules of this House for the consideration of financial estimates, including the Interim Supply, the sum total of seventy-five hours. With the delegations that have been made to the various committees, together with the amounts necessary under the rules for concurrence debates of the reports of the estimates' committees, together with the amount of time that we have now spent on Interim Supply, which amounts to eight or nine hours, there are approximately sixty-eight to sixty-nine hours that have been expended. That leaves five to six hours, diminishing minute by minute, for considerations of the estimates that are in Committee of the Whole, which are the Legislature, the Executive Council, and the Consolidated Fund Services.

Now, you know, if the hon. gentlemen there opposite feel in their examination of the estimates that the Executive Council and the Legislative estimates and Consolidated Fund Services are such as they are set out in the estimates that they do not really need debate, well that is all fair, well and good. But at the time when we come to them I do not think that the hon. gentlemen there opposite should complain and wail as they do from time to time that not enough time has been allotted to them. Certainly if the type of debate that is going to be seen in the estimates and Committee of the Whole is being reflected in what has occurred in the Interim Supply, particularly today when you get the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) talking about coffee and donuts and various other non sequiturs that have come up, the

MR. MARSHALL: same matters being repeated
over and over and over again, not asking questions about
specific expenditures, not asking the Minister of Finance
(Dr. Collins) what is this for and what is that for and what
is the other expenditure for of the \$440 million voted,
because they are substantial expenditures and they are all
subdivided down into the sixteen or seventeen headings;
As I say, if we are going to get the type of debate that we
have been getting, I would suggest that the time that has been
expended for Interim Supply has not been expended very well
and the best thing that we could do is get on and advance and
pass the Interim Supply.

 Now in the meantime, Mr.
Chairman, since the hon. gentlemen there opposite have gotten
up and made

MR. MARSHALL:

certain comments, and since I do have about four or five minutes left to speak this time on my feet, I will pass a few comments with respect to the Budget itself. I am particularly concerned at the attitude of the Opposition with respect to the Budget. This Budget, Mr. Chairman, happens to have been greeted by just about everybody except certain specific groups that I will get to in a moment, everybody except the Opposition, as one of the best budgets that have been brought in in the history of this Province in the most difficult times of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should be complimented and praised in the way in which he has managed to put this Budget together. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) from time to time gets up and talks about the grin that I have on my face - which is rather personal; it might be congenital for all I know because it is always there when I am looking at the Leader of the Opposition, and he is over there now laughing at what I say - but it is a fact that this Budget has been greeted generally by people on the street and by the general public as a pretty fair document, not only a pretty fair document, an enormous accomplishment by this government and by the Minister of Finance himself. You only have to look at the opinion polls that were taken.

I remember the day after the Budget Speech came down, much to the chagrin of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now our friends in CBC are usually pretty good to us; we realize that and we never criticize the press. They are very, very good.

MR. MARSHALL: We do not say things like the Opposition. But it is a fact that they like to report, as all reporters do from time to time, as to what was wrong. The day the Budget came out they had a poll done as to what people thought of the Budget Speech. The next day they had to come back and report their findings that the great majority of the people thought it was a pretty fair effort. Well, Mr. Chairman, thank God for television, because you could see the disappointment on their faces when they said it. It is a natural inclination, a natural way in which reporters go. Then afterwards we were treated to a man-in-the-street interview and the people were

MR. W. MARSHALL: picked at random, I think it was out in the Avalon Mall and the Village Mall here in St. John's and in Corner Brook, and what happened then? Every single person, with one exception, indicated that that was a pretty fair speech. They praised the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and gave him his just due. Now, the Minister of Finance when I said, 'Except one,' said to me, 'A Liberal.' I happened to recognize one of the Corner Brook interviewees, an individual who had been a defeated Liberal candidate in the federal election a few years ago. Now, he did not think too much about it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. BAIRD: Not Mr. Billard!

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, it happened to be a certain Mr. Billard. I understand he has not seen the light yet, like so many thousands of people, as the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) pointed out as to the declining numbers the people who have voted Liberal and the people who are coming over and voting for the good of Newfoundland instead of for the Liberal Party. He is not one of these people who has seen the light because he had the gall to pass certain disparaging remarks about the Budget. But he was the only person, Mr. Chairman. It was followed the next day in The Evening Telegram with a sampling of opinions of people on the street about the Budget and they all thought that the Budget was a marvelous achievement when you consider the financial times.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is the Liberal Party, the Liberal members there opposite, who cannot see anything right about anything nowadays except

MR. W. MARSHALL: what emanates from Ottawa from time to time, they agree with everything then of course. The Liberal Party of this Province is so defunct, Mr. Chairman, that it takes its complete directions, it is told exactly what to do on a daily basis by the Liberal Party of Canada and the government up in Ottawa. And they will take that position regardless, Mr. Chairman, of whether or not that position is for the good and for the betterment of the people of this Province, nine times out of ten it is not, but

MR. MARSHALL:

they do it anyway. Anyway, getting back to the budget, we have heard certain comments that have been made with respect to health services. We heard a certain amount with respect to the education services, particularly with respect to student loans. Both ministers have explained the position quite adequately. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we are very proud, I can say, of that budget. While other provinces, such as the Province of Nova Scotia - wait until the Province of Nova Scotia brings out its budget - the Province of Nova Scotia that the hon. gentleman there opposite, and the few other people who would sell Newfoundland out from time to time, or completely, always pointing to it and saying, 'This is an example of development and all of the development that is going on there'. Well now, Mr. Chairman, it was not this Province whose credit rating zoomed downwards last year. Wait until this budget comes out and you see the amount that they have to borrow on current account. Compare the amount that this Province has had to borrow in the past two years, including this budget, with what the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had to borrow and then you will see who is managing their affairs. And when you add to all that the fact that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this poor Province was able to fashion a budget without increasing taxes in any degree, I think that is quite an accomplishment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Because the money has to come from two sources, only two sources, Mr. Chairman, just two. Number one, it is from the people's pockets through taxes; and, number two, is from resources. We all know that the people are paying more than they should be paying. Our aim

MR. MARSHALL: is to reduce taxes. In the meantime, when taxes are to the degree that they are now, the only way you can cope with anything, there being no revenues from our resources, is to slash expenditures, and that is what we have seen. Unfortunately, as they years go by, we will see more slashing of expenditure unless and until we can realize the benefit of our own resources. Unless we can get some of the \$600 million that flows over the Western boundaries that the Province of Quebec is take every year from us as a result of the Upper Churchill contract that the hon. gentlemen there opposite signed, and unless we get a reasonable share in our resources, our offshore resources -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL: I will get back on it, Mr. Chairman. I do not anticipate getting leave, I do not want to ask the hon. gentlemen for anything anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman wants leave to carry on, I would gladly grant him leave.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: As I say, Mr. Chairman, the revenue has to come from two sources only, it has to be said again and again and again, from taxes or it has to come from one's resources.

MR. MARSHALL: Just imagine what we could do, Mr. Chairman. I do not think that people realize that there are \$600 million, and that is rising, annually flowing over our borders to the Province of Quebec from the Upper Churchill resource. We get from \$6 million to \$8 million a year from that resource and the Province of Quebec gets that. Why? Essentially, Mr. Chairman, it gets that because the Province of Quebec has been allowed - let us call a spade a spade - by the federal government - which is our government too - to treat Newfoundland as if Newfoundland were not part of Confederation, as if it were a foreign country. That agreement would never have been signed, not even by the giveaway government that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was a member of, Mr. Chairman, if the federal government at the time had permitted Newfoundland to have the same rights in Confederation as every other province of Canada has.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: When the bread basket of Southern Ontario wishes to sell its cars -

MR. NEARY: I withdraw leave.

MR. MARSHALL: No, I have leave now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Leave has been withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave has been withdrawn.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, can leave once given be withdrawn?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, leave can be withdrawn.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that last remark, by the way, was questioning Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. Chairman, we would have gladly given the hon. gentleman leave to carry on until six o'clock, until the House rises, but he got so silly there at the end!

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Chairman, the reason we granted leave to the hon. gentleman, we wish that he would be the spokesman on everything on that side of the House, because if we ever had a friend, Mr. Chairman, if there were ever an hon. minister who helps our cause it is the hon. gentleman who just took his seat.

DR. COLLINS: Now you are taking that argument out of something that was said over here.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS: You are.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is our best friend, our best friend and supporter. And we will encourage the Government House Leader to speak on every issue as often as we can. We have really accomplished something during the day if we can get the President of the Council on television.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman was pretty critical of the way that we have handled Interim Supply so far. He told us that the clock is ticking. Well, we are aware of that. But, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this administration, when they changed the House rules, told us that the rules would be in effect for one year only and then after one year they would be reviewed to see how they were working

MR. SIMMS: You say it was only going to be in effect for one year?

MR. NEARY: We were told that, after a year, the House rules, the new changes would be reviewed. They have not been reviewed.

MR. SIMMS: That is a little different now.

MR. NEARY: No, they have not been reviewed.

MR. SIMMS: They are always reviewed, constantly reviewed.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, with the reduced numbers in the Opposition, it is virtually impossible for us to deal with the Estimates item by item in these committees that meet in various office buildings around St. John's. It is impossible, especially when you have two meetings going on at the same time. It is impossible for the press to cover these meetings. And we wanted to get an agreement this year and last year from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), who just spoke, not to have two meetings going on simultaneously, and we could not get that assurance. We could not get it again this year. So justice is not being done to the assessment, the item-by-item analysis of the Estimates. It is not being done.

MR. SIMMS: It is better than ever before.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, it is not being done. And so we are making every effort, every attempt -

MR. SIMMS: It is better than ever before.

MR. HODDER: For you guys, yes, but not for the Province.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is good for the government.

MR. HODDER: Not for the Province.

MR. NEARY: It is good for the government because they can ram the Estimates through.

MR. HODDER: Not for the Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it is good for the administration because they can cover up an awful lot of stuff. Estimates are being rammed through down in Colonial Building and here in the House of Assembly every day without proper scrutiny.

MR. HODDER: There should be no time limit on it whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: And there should be no time limit. Who put the time limit on the debate of the Estimates, but this administration?

So, Mr. Chairman, the only chance we have to make our point or to get any information is here in the House of Assembly. And the only chance we have at the moment is during the passage of the Interim Supply Bill, and we are doing that. We are asking questions of the government. We are pressing the government to lay their plans for the development of this Province on the Table of the House. We have not seen any plans for development. We are asking questions of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). As a matter of fact, I think the Minister of Finance owes an explanation to the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), and also owes an explanation to this House, by the way, as to why the member was not told that the hospital in North West River was closing. The hon. gentleman on

MR. NEARY: three occasions, once in this House, then told a demonstration in North West River, and repeated it again on Saturday in North West River that he did not know that the hospital in North West River was closing until ten or fifteen minutes before the Budget was brought down. We believe the hon. gentleman. I tried to tell the hon. gentleman that the other day, we believe him. We feel sorry for him, we sympathize with him. But certainly the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) owes the hon. gentleman an explanation and owes this House an explanation.

MR. NEARY: as to why he did not inform the hon. gentleman. We think it is outrageous Mr. Chairman, it is outrageous. You talk about arrogance. How can we in Opposition ever believe a word the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) says when he will not tell his Cabinet colleagues what he is doing? And, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance should address that question before the House rises at six o'clock as to why he did not tell the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), his Cabinet colleague, why that hospital was closing.

MR. MARSHALL: Watch it now.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon.

MR. MARSHALL: Watch it.

MR. NEARY: I do not have to watch anything in this House. I think, Mr. Chairman, that explanation should be given before this House rises today at six o'clock.

And another question I want to put to the Minister of Finance; I want to ask him if he has any letters from the Comptroller of the Treasury in relation to any matters that have been protested by the Comptroller of the Treasury. Because under the Financial Administration Act, on the fifteenth day after the House opens the Minister has to table such letters in this House. None have been tabled; I assume there have been no letters of protest from the Comptroller of the Treasury about Cabinet directives or about government spending. I can only assume, because the minister has had ample time to produce such letters and to table such letters, there have been none. I want the hon. gentleman to confirm that for me or deny it, or tell us if there were letters of protest under the Financial Administration Act -

AN HON. MEMBER: Complimentary ones?

MR. NEARY: Not complimentary. They would not be very complimentary. A protest from the Comptroller of the Treasury would not be a very complimentary matter.

MR. NEARY:

So I want the minister to tell us if he has had any letters in this fiscal year from the Comptroller of the Treasury objecting to any spending, objecting to spending of public money without sufficient information. For instance, the hon. gentleman could tell us if he has had any letters from the Comptroller of the Treasury in connection with the Order in Council which forbids the Department of Transportation to tell the House, to tell the people, to tell the taxpayers, how money is being spent on government aircraft, who spends it, who uses the government aircraft and the purpose of the flights?

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) owes it to the House. I would gladly take my seat now and give the hon. Minister of Finance an opportunity to answer both questions before we have any further discussions.

MR. NEARY:

That is the type of penetrating questions the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is lecturing us on and telling us that we should ask. Well, there are two questions and I will gladly take my seat and wait for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to give me the answers if the hon. gentleman wishes to do so. Does he have the courage to give the answers? I will take my seat now.

MR. SIMMS:

Take your seat and you will see.

MR. NEARY:

All right, I will take my seat and we will see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question! Question!

MR. NEARY:

No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD):

Order, please.

The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman clearly said he would take his seat and he clearly took his seat; you cannot speak twice consecutively in debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The point is well taken. The Chair recognizes -

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. NEARY:

Hansard will show, Mr. Chairman, that I said I would gladly take my seat to give the Minister of Finance an opportunity to answer the questions. That is standard procedure in this House, Mr. Chairman. But if the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with that, perhaps my colleague might

MR. NEARY: want to have a few words.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): To that point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I am just waiting on the ruling on the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that point of order, the hon. member did take his seat and the next speaker will be recognized now by the Chair.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I do want to have a few further words. I know the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is quite prepared to answer -

MR. NEARY: Well, let him answer.

MR. MARSHALL: I want to answer a few things that the hon. gentleman raised. I was out having a nice cup of coffee, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. gentleman was attacking me and attacking me about the rules, and I want to have a few little words about the rules of the House. And in the process I will attempt to try not to lecture the hon. gentleman because I know that drives him into heat.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the rules of this House were changed a few years ago, under the leadership of the government and with the concurrence of the distinguished High Commissioner for England, then the Leader of the Opposition, who did so much, Mr. Chairman, to raise the dignity of this House and to indicate the way in which an Opposition should work. An Opposition does not always have to be opposed to everything, always negative, always tearing things down. Opposition should be constructive at some period of time, and during Mr. Jamieson's sojourn in this House

MR. MARSHALL: we saw him able to bring this about. I do not know how he did it but he ought to get a flock of additional medals to wear when he goes to Buckingham Palace in London for the occasion, because anyone who can control the Opposition and their membership deserves exactly that.

But we fashioned rules, Mr. Chairman. Prior to the change of the rules the only way in which the Estimates could be dealt with was you would have all night sittings, and many members in this House remember the all night sittings, futile! They would go on for eighteen hours, for twenty-four hours, for thirty-six hours. It became a contest of the government wearing down the Opposition. There was no effective examination of the expenditures so we moved to change the rules. Why did we do that? To try to make the House more meaningful, to try to give a much better examination of the Estimates.

If the Opposition does not think it has succeeded I would say that you can lay the fault at the Opposition itself. What has happened is that we have put the Estimates out into committees. Instead of the Committee of the Whole House which ministers dominate, we created committees consisting of seven members and they reflect the numbers in the House. Previously when the Opposition was bigger they numbered four and three, now they number five and two. They are composed of private members from the government side and members of the Opposition. They get together in smaller committees and the idea is it would lead to a much more indepth examination of the Estimates themselves. To the degree it did not or it has not worked, Mr. Chairman, we think it has and we think as time goes on it will become even more and more effective -

MR. MARSHALL:

I lay blame entirely at the foot of the Opposition and particularly at the foot of the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who never agreed with the rules in the first place. Mr. Jamieson had to twist his arm to get him to agree with it. He agreed with it reluctantly.

MR. NEARY:

No, '.

MR. MARSHALL:

He was the one person against the change. Everyone was out of step except 'Steve'. Fifty-one of the fifty-two people agreed, the hon. gentleman did not. The hon. gentleman is now Leader of the Opposition so he persists in this. But this happens to be the best way to have the Estimates considered. The minister goes down with his Estimates and with his officials, he sits before the Committee and he is examined before the Committee on all the detailed aspects of his Estimates. The Committee can tear him apart. The examination can be much more effective than it ever could be when the House was in the Committee of the Whole.

As to the matter of meeting twice, two Committees meeting simultaneously, for the record I draw to the attention of the Committee a letter that I gave to the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) as Opposition House Leader, and at that time I pointed out the principle aim of the present administration was to

MR. MARSHALL: improve the operation and relevancy of the House of Assembly, and we regard the Committee system as one of the prime moves in these directions. It is very similar to systems used in other jurisdictions and in many respects it is superior. Indeed, it is much more superior than most, Mr. Chairman, and we are proud of them.

As to the matter of the three committees, I pointed out to him - as you are aware there are three committees in total - while we cannot give a guarantee that all of the committees would not be meeting simultaneously at one time or another, efforts were made last year to have no more than two committees ongoing at one time. We shall endeavour to continue this procedure. And the Chairmen of the committees have, in fact, continued this procedure. Then I went on with other things to say that if a member of one committee was a shadow of a certain ministry and was not on that particular committee, that arrangements would be made with the Chairman for co-operation. Because the guideline, Mr. Chairman, of all of this is co-operation. With co-operation you would get a much better examination of the Estimates, that this very much improves the examination of the Estimates and the overall scrutiny of this House, of the financial proceedings of the government.

That being so, Mr. Chairman, it getting near six o'clock, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for
Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee
of Supply has considered the matters to them referred,
has made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before moving
the adjournment of the House, I would like to advise
that the Social Services Committee will meet this
evening at 7:00 p.m. in the House of Assembly to
review the estimates of the Department of Health.
Now there is your chance. The Resource Committee
will meet tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. in the Colonial
Building to review the estimates of the Department
of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. A
very active committee again at 7:00 p.m. in the House
of Assembly, not in the Colonial Building now, there
is a difference the hon. gentlemen will understand,
to review the estimates of the Department of Mines
and Energy. The Government Services Committee will
meet tomorrow morning at 9:30 in the House of Assembly
to review the estimates of the Department of Public
Works and Services.

MR. BAIRD: Is there only one meeting of Social Services?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, look, it is the Department
of Health here tonight at seven o'clock. It is Rural,
Agricultural and Northern Development at 7:00 p.m. - no,
at nine-thirty tomorrow, I am sorry, and Mines and Energy
at 7:00 p.m. tomorrow evening here.

MR. STEWART:

No, that is cancelled.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is cancelled, is it?

Oh, I see.

MR. NEARY:

Why do you not get your act together over there?

MR. MARSHALL:

I am trying to, I am really trying to. But I will repeat it again for the hon. gentleman. Perhaps if we had a chalkboard, Mr. Speaker, I might be able to do it for him. Health here at seven o'clock tonight. Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development at Colonial Building at nine-thirty tomorrow morning and Public Works in the House of Assembly at nine-thirty tomorrow morning.

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

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

March 28, 1983

25 Mar '83

QUESTIONS ASKED IN HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
NO. 60

QUESTION: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) all correspondence and agreements in connection with the transfer of the Military Museum to the Murray Premises from the tenth floor of the Confederation Building;
- (b) the cost of the renovations to date in the Murray Premises for the installation of the Museum;
- (c) the estimated cost of the total renovations in the Murray Premises for the installation of the Museum;
- (d) the projected date that the new facility at the Murray Premises will be ready to accept artifacts and historical materials;
- (e) the number of days, months and years, between the projected opening date of the new facility at the Murray Premises, and the closing of the tenth floor Museum facility at the Confederation Building.

- ANSWER:
- (a) I have no correspondence regarding the transfer of the Military Museum to the Murray Premises from the tenth floor of Confederation Building, as this decision was a responsibility of the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth.
 - (b) The cost of renovations at the Murray Premises was \$676,888.00
 - (c) The estimated cost of total renovations at the Murray Premises is the same as (b) above.
 - (d) The new facility is ready to accept artifacts and historical material whenever the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth is ready to place them there.
 - (e) The Military Museum on the eleventh floor of Confederation Building was closed late in 1980. The closure was made at that time in the interests of life safety so as to change the occupancy of the eleventh floor to a lower density use than it previously had.

The closing had no particular bearing on the projected reopening of the Military Museum at a new location.