

VOL. 2

NO. 37

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

Before we begin today, I have the pleasure of welcoming to our galleries thirty-two students from Caribou Hill School in British Columbia with their two teachers, Ted Palmer and Jack Showers, and also thirty students from Grand Falls Academy, in the historic district of Grand Falls, and their teacher, Calvin Coish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions, but in the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. House) it is a little like the play Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark in it.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could tell me is the Minister of Health due in the House today? If so, I will wait a little later in Question Period because they really are fairly detailed questions on the hospital situation. Does the Premier or the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) know whether the minister will be here?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, I am not sure whether the minister is going to turn up or not. I will check on it.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, I will pass to my colleague, then, Mr. Speaker, and if the minister comes I have some questions on the situation with hospital beds. But it is unfair, I think, to expect the Premier to know that kind of detail, and so I will not address the questions to him.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
Nova.

The hon. member for Terra

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), and it has to do with student aid. The minister will recall how concerned students and parents were in this Province when the government made some changes recently in the Student Aid Programme. It was my recollection that in a meeting with some of the students that the minister indicated that the government would be willing to change some of the rules. So I am wondering now, particularly in view of the recent decision of the federal government to bring about some changes with respect to student aid, what changes the minister has made or what changes she contemplates to make student aid more available to the students of our Province?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, what I said in this hon. House and to students with whom I have met over the last couple of months is that the changes in our Province's Student Aid Programme announced in the Budget Speech on March 17 will not be finalized until students have made their full input. The students, particularly the CSU of Memorial University, asked to have some time to prepare their submissions, they asked to have time after the completion of final exams and we agreed on a May 9 deadline - of course, today is May 10 - and later this afternoon I will be meeting with representatives of the CSU to receive their submissions. What I told the students is that the money included in the estimates for 1983-84 cannot be significantly deviated from, but that above the bottom line dollar entry there may be room for considering some changes in detail. I told them that I, personally, would be willing to recommend to my colleagues in Cabinet that we consider their input in re-examining some of the detail, particularly the eligibility criteria. Now, Mr. Speaker, the combined effect of the proposed changes in our Province's student aid plan would still leave the Newfoundland and Labrador plan better than those of most of the Provinces of Canada and at worst on a par with plans in some of our sister Provinces. You see, Mr. Speaker, until now Newfoundland and Labrador has had by far the most generous plan of assistance for post-secondary education students in that our students have received the highest average grant paid by our Provincial Government compared with bursaries paid by the governments of other Provinces, and our Province's students

MS. VERGE:

have received the highest percentage of aid in the form of grants and the lowest percentage of aid in the form of loans than students in any other province of Canada.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the changes that the federal government is proposing in its end of the student aid plan, namely the Canada Student Loan Programme, are changes announced by the Secretary of State, the hon. Serge Joyal, on March 18, which were known by me a couple of days before that, and they are changes in simply the loan programme. One of the major changes is allowing students to borrow more per semester or per year than was permissible before. And that change is prompting several of our sister provinces to further increase the minimum borrowing requirement which would leave our Province having a superior Student Aid Programme overall than those provinces should they go ahead and make those moves.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, it looks like we have heard the speech that the minister is going to give the students this afternoon and one that she has given several times. I take it then, Mr. Speaker, that from the minister's answer, all that she plans to do, all that the government plan to do is to just make some slight changes with respect to the eligibility criteria. In other words, it seems to me that all the government are going to do is just redistribute the misery, just redistribute, Mr. Speaker, the anguish the students are now going through.

My question is does the minister contemplate doing anything with the loan ceiling, which is

May 10, 1983

Tape No. 1956

SD - 2

MR. LUSH: now \$900? Does the minister or
the Department of Education or the government intend to
decrease that loan ceiling?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, right at the moment, and until August 31, 1983, this Province's loan ceiling, meaning the minimum amount a single student has to borrow for one semester of post-secondary study to go on to qualify for provincial government grants, or free money, is \$575, and the current proposal, as announced the in Budget Speech on March 17, is to raise that to \$900, which is the minimum borrowing requirement in about five or six other provinces of Canada. And, as I just indicated, some of those other provinces in the wake of the announced federal government proposal are contemplating further increasing that amount beyond \$900.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, again the minister's justification for these tremendously discriminatory measures with respect to student aid was based on the fact that we have had the most generous aid student programme in Canada. Now I wish that the government accepted that philosophy in other areas like, for example, with respect to unemployment.

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

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

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making a speech. This is supplementary questions. There is a procedure, if the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with an answer, that he can avail of on Thursday, as yet I do not think he has availed of it this session, but he is certainly out of order, Mr. Speaker, because he is making a speech and this is supplementary questions.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I would remind the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), and all other hon. members, that in supplementary questions preamble is limited.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Terra Nova,

MR. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just getting into the substance of my question. The question, Mr. Speaker, is this, that based on the fact that we have the highest cost of living in Canada, based on the fact that we have the highest levels of unemployment, should not the policy of the government with respect to student aid be aimed at making it more generous than in other areas of Canada and not less generous?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I have to agree, that is incredible. I mean, what are we going to use to pay for this most generous scheme in Canada since we are the poorest province of Canada and since the federal government has just reduced Established Programmes Financing for our Province as well

MS VERGE:

as all the other provinces, money designed for higher education? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that our Student Aid Programme, even after the announced changes, will still be superior to programmes in several of the other provinces, and the changes will have absolutely no impact on those students who all along were receiving the maximum aid, who were drawing the maximum in loans as well as receiving the maximum provincial government grants. Until now about one-third of our post-secondary education students receiving aid have been in this most needy category and for these most needy students there will be no reduction, no change.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in meeting with one of my officials earlier today, I was told that the students who are applying for aid for study this Summer in the third semester at Memorial University are applying in ever greater numbers for aid and are being approved for the maximum aid in ever greater numbers, which is probably a reflection of the difficulty students are having in earning any income prior to study which they have to contribute to the cost of their own study. So again, Mr. Speaker, the changes this government is proposing have been dictated out of financial necessity simply because we are the poorest Province of Canada, and it is no longer realistic for us to be carrying a more generous Student Aid Programme than Alberta, than Ontario, and Nova Scotia.

And, Mr. Speaker, the changes are not going to hurt in any way, shape or form the most needy students. Those students will continue to be able to get the same amount of free money, grants or bursaries, whatever

May 10,1983

Tape No. 1958

ah-2

MS VERGE: you want to call it,from
the provincial government and they will continue to
draw the maximum available in Canada Student Loans from
the federal government.

MR.LUSH: A supplementary, Mr.Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Terra Nova, a supplementary question.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it seems obvious from the minister's answers that this government is moving away from the universally accepted policy that education is a right, to the policy that education is a privilege, a privilege of the few. My question now is directed towards the announcement that we saw in the paper today of some twenty-nine vocational instructors being laid off. I think that is just short of fifty instructional people who have been laid off from the vocational schools in the past twelve months, in less than twelve months; I think it was last year this time that the government announced they were laying off eighteen, today it is twenty-nine. So I think that makes forty-seven instructors laid off from our vocational schools in less than a year. Can the minister indicate what set of circumstances led to the layoff of these twenty-nine instructors which was announced today.

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, there was no official announcement today of personnel changes in the Province's vocational schools. I can now tell hon. members, however, that there will be changes in the programmes offered by our vocational schools in the next school year and there will be resulting personnel changes. There will be some instructors laid off and there will be some new instructors hired. Some of the new programmes that are being added in our vocational schools are being chosen because they are relevant to the current employment situation. There will be added a number of simulated work projects for unemployed apprentices, which I am sure will greatly benefit this group of people who are having difficulty meeting the requirements for their trade. There will be a number of other training and

MS VERGE: education programmes for particular groups and all of these will prepare people for the changing nature of the unemployment market.

As for courses that are being eliminated, those which are being eliminated permanently are considered no longer necessary because of an over-supply of people with the qualifications provided by those courses currently in the labour market and unable to find work, and because of the projections for the labour market indicating that there is no reasonable prospect that the job market will be able to absorb any more people with these qualifications

MS. VERGE: and because of a record of low student demand. These criteria, Mr. Speaker, were set out in a formal directive a couple of years ago, were, at that time and since, well circulated in the vocational education system, and were applied fairly and objectively. Mr. Speaker, there are some other vocational school programme reductions which will be reviewed after a year, and most of these reductions are triggered by the transition in the high schools where this Summer there will be no graduates because everyone presently enrolled as a full-time student in high school will be progressing to Grade XII in September and will not be graduating until June of 1984. Mr. Speaker, all of these programmes require high school graduation for entrance. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there are three types of changes being made for our vocational school programmes and personnel; number one, additions of programmes which meet particular needs and which respond to changes in the labour market; number two, permanent reductions because the courses are superfluous and irrelevant to the current labour market; and, number three, temporary reductions in response particularly to the phase-in of Grade XII in the high schools and the resulting drop in applications.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it certainly seems strange that during a period of high unemployment, when Newfoundland, and indeed the whole of the country is short with respect to skilled labour, that we in this Province should be laying off forty-seven instructors at our vocational schools.

The minister said it was not announced formally, so can the minister indicate whether that

May 10, 1983

Tape No. 1960

MJ - 2

MR. LUSH: figure is right, whether there
will be twenty-nine instructures laid off or whether there
will be more or less?

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the figure is wrong.

The correct figures are as follows: There will be thirteen instructors hired to staff new programmes being introduced in our vocational schools around the Province in September. There will be twenty-one instructors permanently laid off because the programmes they are presently staffing are judged to be superfluous to the current labour market needs and the projected future labour market requirements. And there will be fourteen personnel reductions, which will be reviewed after a year, which are necessitated by the anticipated drop in student applications because of the phase in of Grade XII.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering whether there is no way to train those instructors to do the new courses which the minister has indicated will be offered in the various trade schools throughout the Province? Certainly goodness, if we have any kind of planning going on, we know the courses that are going to be offered in the future in the trade schools, so is there not some kind of effort by the department to assist and to encourage those people whose courses are becoming outdated and obsolete to retrain themselves so that they can teach those courses so that they do not become among the unemployed? I imagine some of these instructors have been teaching for a long time and certainly there must be some programme or some system whereby these instructors can be retrained to teach the new courses rather than throwing them to the wolves.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, actually there has been some moving around in the system whereby instructors

MS. VERGE: laid off have been successful in gaining employment staffing other courses. That happened last year and it is expected that it will happen in the months ahead.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated previously, there were eighteen instructors laid off last year somewhere around this time, I think it might have been a little later, maybe in June, there were eighteen laid off. In the minister's official figures today are

MR. LUSH:

twenty-one, so that makes thirty-nine, thirty-nine instructors laid off in a year or less. Can the minister indicate what is going to happen over the next year with respect to instructors at vocational schools? Thirty-nine; I am sure that makes for the staff of a large vocational school. So having said that, are we going to have any vocational schools that will close? Just what are the circumstances with respect to vocational training in this Province?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, all sixteen vocational schools around the Province are alive and well and are having programmes improved, programme selection modernized, the mix changed, a better selection to prepare students for the changing nature of the work place. All sixteen vocational schools will be open for business in September. And all sixteen schools are now participating in Join The Class Of '83 Campaign, which is aimed at mature students, people ranging in age from, say, twenty up to eighty who have been out of high school for a while, and who will have special opportunities in September opened up because there will be a big drop in applications from high school graduates, in fact, there will not be any applications from students now in full-time attendance at high school because all of those students will be staying in high school to do Grade XII next year.

So, Mr. Speaker, all sixteen of our vocational schools will be continuing to serve the students of the Province and all sixteen schools are aiming to have a higher percentage of mature students in September.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), the Opposition Education critic, just referred to some layoffs last year. I do not have figures

MS. VERGE: at hand, but I can assure the hon. member that there were new programmes added last year, starting September, 1982, and there were new instructors hired to staff those programmes. And, Mr. Speaker, among the programmes that we added last September were courses in computer studies, courses in accounting more advanced than the selection previously available in vocational schools, courses in electronics technology, which formerly had been offered only in the colleges in St. John's. And, Mr. Speaker, the response to those new courses added last September was excellent, and two of the programmes I mentioned, the accounting programme and electronics technology, are more than one year in length, and therefore those new programmes will continue to be phased in, with the second year being added in September 1983.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), the Minister responsible for wildlife.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, this time of the year a lot of individuals are planning their vacations and they try to plan them around the moose hunting season. I am just wondering if the minister could advise the hon. House at approximately what time will he be making an announcement concerning the successful applicants for moose hunting licences?

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say that we indeed are progressing along the lines that I described when I made the announcement several months ago of some improvements to our computer license draw system. Indeed it is hoped that the draw this year will be concluded at least two months in advance of when it has been done in previous years. But I hope to be in a position, perhaps towards the latter part of this week, to make a statement in the House giving details of numbers and everything else as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Has the minister given any consideration, not for this year's hunting but probably for the following year, of having a three party license? This year, I think, there is a single individual license and a two party license. Is there any consideration for a three party license, because in doing so more people would probably avail of the outdoors and be able to go hunting? Is there any thought of a three party license?

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

MR.SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, the Wildlife Division, I think, has proven in recent months in particular, and in recent years as a matter of fact, that they are quite prepared to consider any suggestions that are made, sensible suggestions in particular. Personally as minister that suggestion has not been put forth to me before so I am not aware of any consideration being given to that particular suggestion.

MR.LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR.LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and it follows along the line of questioning that I was on to a couple of days ago about the MED programme, when the minister outlined for hon. members the way people were selected for this programme, one of the most important programmes in the Province right now in order to get jobs with the offshore and other marine related activities. One of the main problems with that course, Mr. Speaker, is that it can only be acquired here in the city of St. John's, like many of the requirements with respect to the offshore. I am wondering if the minister can indicate to the House whether there are any plans by the government to extend this programme to make it more available to other areas of the Province? Because, as the minister can appreciate, by just offering this in St. John's, number one, that sort of crowds the facilities that are presently available, I expect, I understand there is a long waiting list, possibly up to 1500, so I am wondering if the minister can indicate whether they plan to expand the programme to make it more available to other areas of the Province?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker if the hon. member was here the last time that question was asked in the House, he would know that all the information that he asked for in his question was answered several days ago.

The course has been expanded in the past couple of years from twelve per year to thirty-five per month, to seventy-two per month, and it is now up to over 100 per month. Indeed, since this year started, up to the end of April we have trained 1,039 people in the MED course. Now, we are certainly having a look at the possibility of expanding that course to other areas of the Province, but there are some things that right now we do not have the capability of expanding the course to. The course is made up, as the hon. member knows, of three parts, Life saving appliances is with respect to lifeboats, life jackets and life rafts, a five day portion; fire-fighting is five days, and there are basically only two areas in the Province where we can successfully put that off; there is rescue and survival, which is two days, and first aid, which is three. There are parts of the course that we can do in other parts of the Province and we are certainly looking into that possibility. There is also a mobile training unit that is used in other parts of the Province but it cannot cover all the aspects of the course - would that it could - it just does not have the capability, and that part of the course is being done by the mobile training unit which is sent to different parts of the Province.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated that he answered some of these questions on a day that

MR. LUSH:

I was not here. I have read the answers and the minister did not come well armed with the facts on a couple of these questions and that is why I have had to repeat these questions about this most important course, this MED course, which thousands and thousands of people throughout Newfoundland are trying to get so that they can qualify for jobs on the offshore and other marine-related activities.

MR. LUSH: I would ask the minister if he can tell the House just how many are now on the waiting list? How many people are trying to get into that course? And secondly, I certainly am delighted to know that the minister plans to expand that course to other areas of the Province, not talking about expanding the course here in St. John's but expanding it to other areas of the Province, Can the minister indicate what timeframe we are talking about? How soon can people expect that course to be offered in other areas of the Province? So two questions, Mr. Speaker, How many on the waiting list, and how soon can we expect this course to be expanded to other areas of the Province to make it more accessible to more residents?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult question to answer, how many people are on the waiting list. One would have to go to all the Canada Manpower Centres and see how many people they have on the waiting list, but the latest figure that I got was about 1,500, there are about 1,500 people on the waiting list. The fact of the matter is that right now there are 11,000 people who have registered for jobs in the offshore and I am very surprised that the hon. member would even ask questions as to why we do not train people in the Marine Emergency Duties course for work on the offshore when he is totally opposed to, apparently, the local preference policy that we have in place in order that we can get some Newfoundlanders working on the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: A red herring. A red herring. You do not know the facts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Question Period has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to question 99, and also to question 113 asked by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, an answer to question number 84, asked by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), on April 12, I would like to table that; the answer to question number 15, asked by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question asked yesterday during Question Period that was responded to by the Premier and subsequently indicated that further information would be available. It relates to the question of the information in the salary detail of government's estimates, it indicated that the salary positions had been funded but the question, Mr. Speaker, indicates

MR. DAWE:

indicates, to me at least, why the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) in attending the Estimates Committees failed to ask relevant questions. Because had he taken the time to go through the salary details and subsequently through the detailed estimates, by simple use of arithmetic he would have discovered where in fact the reduction relating to a number of positions, which also included the positions where the Transportation watchmen were located, and he asked that question, which was, I think, an obvious one, during the Estimates Committee then the full details could have been given. However, Mr. Speaker, I have outlined the answers to the question, I have taken copies of the relevant pages from the Estimates and underlined the appropriate numbers that the member can subtract from and I am sure if he takes the time to go through it he will have a satisfactory answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Communications.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to a question asked by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) which is Question No. 40 on the Order Paper of March 21, 1983, and also I would like to table the answer to another question asked by the hon. the member for Eagle River, Question No. 34, Order Paper March 17, 1983, also I would like to table the answer to a third question asked by the hon. the member for Eagle River, I do not have the Order Paper date on that one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question 26, Order Paper No. 8 dated March 17, asked by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to elaborate on the answers I gave yesterday in Question Period, to a couple of questions posed by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) district about the design of the proposed new facility for the College of Fisheries.

First, with reference to his question about access to the roof for celestial navigation, I am pleased to advise that according to the President of the College of Fisheries Marine Engineering Navigation, etc. the design of the new building does provide an access to the roof through the nautical science department for compass bearing and celestial observation, I guess when there is no fog and there can be such observations.

MS. VERGE: And further, Mr. Speaker, the college now has a modern \$750,000 radar simulator which was obtained through a special agreement with the Ministry of Transport of the federal government. A more elaborate bridge simulator while considered desirable, it is certainly not strictly essential to the operation of the college. The college has applied for a \$3 million grant, to enable purchase of this more sophisticated bridge simulator, to the Canadian Employment and Immigration Commission through its skills growth fund. And in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the President of the College of Fisheries that the design of the new complex for the college, which will be renamed the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, contains provision for all the equipment and instructional facilities and administration considered necessary. And I would remind all hon. members that the cost of the proposed facility is over \$40 million and the provincial government is contributing over \$14 million to that new complex.

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

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Question 86 asked by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). And I may add, Mr. Speaker, that this question was asked in the House of Assembly in 1979 by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. ROBERTS: Why was it not answered then?

MR. YOUNG: It was answered in 1979 - Question No. 91 asked by the hon. member for Eagle River, Question No. 110 asked by the hon. member for Eagle River, Question No. 96, Question No. 97 and Question No. 95 pertaining to my Christmas cards. I must tell the hon. member that my Christmas cards were paid for by me personally, my postage

MR. YOUNG: was paid for by me personally.

I had beautiful Christmas cards and I have no intention of asking the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who he sent Valentine's cards to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: He sent them with kisses and everything on them.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have the answer to Question No. 79 asked on the Order Paper of March 29, 1983, and answer to Question No. 127 on the Order Paper of April 28, 1983. I hereby table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1, Budget Debate,
The debate was adjourned yesterday by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Unlimited time, Mr. Speaker.
Unlimited time.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have a few more words to address to the non-confidence motion given by the hon. gentleman that has turned into really a confidence motion because the hon. gentleman, first of all, yesterday, I have reiterate, was talking about last year's Budget rather than this year's Budget. And I am not going to let his mistakes of yesterday -

MR. PECKFORD: A type! A typo!

MR. MARSHALL: - be lost in today.

Now, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, in the speech that was so well appreciated by the hon. gentlemen there opposite yesterday, first of all I made the point that collective leadership and responsibility in this government today is alive and flourishing as witnessed, Mr. Speaker, in the number of Cabinet meetings, the number of caucus meetings, the number of Committee meetings that have had occurred. One instance of where there

MR. MARSHALL: were myriad caucus meetings after this House adjourned, during the teacher's strike itself, when there must have been at least a half a dozen Cabinet meetings within the space of about twelve days.

The collective leadership, Mr. Speaker, and the way in which the Premier conducts the government and seeks advice not just from his Cabinet and his caucus, but from all elements of society is and was and will be evident in the very innovative proposal we are making to the federal government with respect to the fisheries, where the Premier and the Standing Priorities Committee in Cabinet consulted with the Fishermen's Union, with fishermen, with company officials, with the federal government, with officials of the federal government, with municipalities, with the banks, with everybody. Now that is not the mark, Mr. Speaker, of a government that is a one man concern.

MR. WARREN: A one man dictatorship. Also very much, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman can say that - that is what the hon. gentleman is trying to perpetrate. But it is also shown,

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, in the offshore situation where the hon. the Premier on this most vital issue legitimately required, Mr. Speaker, that the offshore issue was to be a matter to be handled not by one man or two men but by the Planning and priorities Committee and by Cabinet itself. "

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I regret, as I say, as I refer to yesterday, to the remarks made from certain quarters and particularly the NTA with respect to this matter and the attempts to personalize the dispute. This was not a personal dispute as no dispute in this Province is, Mr. Speaker. That decision as well as all other decisions of this Province are collective decisions of Cabinet and if people want to criticize them that is their right and that is what we welcome. We welcome all sorts of criticism but levy the criticism where it should be directed, and that is to the government itself rather than individuals in the government, not try to propagate one's own position by personalizing the dispute, as happened. The hon. gentlemen do not understand this because this is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that we have had a truly collective leadership in government, it is based on policies rather than personalities and the hon. gentlemen cannot understand it. So, Mr. Speaker, having yesterday, hopefully, put to rest the impression that the hon. gentleman and others are trying to build up from time to time, that this is a one-man government, which it is not, I then dealt with the allegations with respect to negotiations and the capacity of this government to negotiate. This government has a real capacity to negotiate and the people on the other side and other

MR. MARSHALL: persons simply, because in certain cases where they cannot get their own way, because they do not get everything they want, try to perpetrate the myth that this government cannot negotiate.

MR. WARREN: Look in the mirror.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, let us look in the mirror. Let us look into the mirror of the ERCO agreement. Let us look into the mirror of that scene from the re-negotiation of the Bowater's agreement, and that scene from the re-negotiation of the Price agreement. Let us look at the mirror of the Canadian constitution and that will show you, Mr. Speaker, what the image of this government is with respect to negotiations. Mr. Speaker, we can negotiate as witnessed in these elements and these achievements. We cannot and we will not, Mr. Speaker, give it away, and those people on the other side of the House and elsewhere who try to paint us as not being able to negotiate are really in truth saying that we did not give it away. From the hon. gentlemen there opposite and the sources from which it comes, I regard it as a supreme compliment, because really what it amounts to is an endorsement of the fact that this government is not prepared to give away the resources or anything else in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Listen to them, Mr. Speaker.

Now, is that not edifying for the House, Mr. Speaker? Is that not marvellous? The hon. gentlemen have an opportunity to participate in the debate. I would hope that they are able to participate in a much better and a much more convincing way than their two colleagues have done.

MR. WARREN: I have not been up yet.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, you will get your opportunity.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I was saying in my remarks yesterday, which I shall continue today, is that the major thrust of this government is for a fair deal in Confederation and nothing else, for the people of this Province. We want to reverse the tragedy of a Province that is very rich in resources but at the same time, for some reason or other, finds itself with the highest debt, the highest taxes, the lowest per capita earned income, and the lowest opportunity for our young people in this Province to find meaningful jobs. It has been brought about, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to a large degree -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like, from both sides of the House, if I could perhaps have the opportunity - it is very hard talking over various people, particularly on the other side but, also, people on ours as well.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: But, Mr.

Speaker, I am afraid the Province has a history of going to Ottawa from time to time, as I said, going through the charade of negotiation with Ottawa and in effect just gathering up the scraps from the Cabinet table in Ottawa itself, and being content with those scraps. And what has resulted after thirty years of Confederation is nothing but equalization payments and welfare payments, and that is

MR. MARSHALL: the only future that the people of this Province face for the rest of eternity unless they realize that we have to get our rights within Confederation, which are really, Mr. Speaker, the same rights as Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, British Columbia and all the other provinces have. And the reason why we find ourselves in this position, and Mr. Speaker, I would characterize it as a modern day fishing admiral syndrome, and the fishing admirals, Mr. Speaker, are not located and sailing out from Britain, but they are sitting, and they sally forth from time to time from Ottawa, in the central Government of Ottawa.

MR. WARREN: That is down on Water Street -

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, on Water Street. The reason why we find ourselves in the position that we are in with these so-called fishing admirals is that unfortunately there are some people, the hon. gentlemen there opposite and certain other people in this Province, who are prepared to take the bait, to look at the worm, to take the worm and then they find themselves hooked. The only unfortunate part of that, Mr. Speaker, is that it not only hooks them but it sinks this Province to the very bottom and it results in the fact that our young people have the highest unemployment rate in Canada, that historically our people have had to go to other provinces of Canada to find gainful employment, and that other parts of Canada are supplying to a large degree that employment, to a

MR. MARSHALL: great degree from the resources that we had which have been given away. This modern-day fishing admiral psyche in this Province today is being supported by people who want to embrace the status quo and there are a certain number of the minority who want to maintain the status quo because it is very comfortable for them. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am all for maintaining the status quo provided it does not result as it has resulted in the past, in the lowest per capita earned income in Canada, in our young people not being able to get jobs and having to go elsewhere. Instead of the Boston states, as it was in our grandfathers' day, and to Ontario, recently it has been Alberta, but it should be here in this Province with the resources that we have. Unfortunately, we have a large number of people in this - not a large number, I retract that, a minority of very vocal people in this Province who are interested in maintaining the status quo and they want to maintain the status quo and consequently, they submit and they acquiesce to the anvil of Ottawa, which has been perpetrated on us since Confederation. They go up and there is all this hoo-haw about negotiation. The people of this Province are not really aware of the true meaning of negotiation within Confederation, because negotiation really did not occur before this administration took office in this Province. What happened was they went up and they went through the charade of negotiation but they came away with only what Ottawa was prepared to give and, unfortunately, what Ottawa has been prepared to give has only been equalization payments, welfare payments and transfer payments. To the Peckford administration, Mr. Speaker, that is not enough and that is not good enough. And if people want to talk about us confronting, I make no apologies for confronting for jobs for the younger people in this Province, I make no

MR. MARSHALL: apologies for confronting and standing up and asking that we have taxes equal to the average of Canada, I make no apologies and neither will this government make any apologies, Mr. Speaker, for us being in the position we are in, with the highest debt in Canada, with the greatest number of resources and yet not being able to supply the bare necessities of life to the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, if people want to accuse us of confrontation on that, they can go ahead and do it. It will be the pride of this administration when the history of this Province is written that we did confront. Because we are not going to be put aside by the 'Uncle Toms' of this world that are represented by the hon. gentlemen there opposite and many people outside who are interested in maintaining the status quo for the comfort of their own hides at the expense of the people of this Province who wallow in welfare and who are unable to make a gainful living from a Province which has the greatest degree of resources in Canada.

Now, if we want to see, Mr. Speaker, why we are our own worst enemies, just let me give you one or two little examples. We are our own worst enemies, we have seen it in one instance in the recent negotiations that occurred, the negotiations that we would wish to be resumed, which

MR. MARSHALL: we will resume when Ottawa will put in writing what it has said orally. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, until the day I die I am sure that the reason why that agreement was not delivered was mainly, to a large degree, because the hands of other people in Ottawa, other than Mr. Chretien, those people who have only seen this Province, people who are prepared to gather up crumbs under the Cabinet table of Ottawa, they thought they could perpetrate it again because the hands of those people were strengthened by the fact of rumours of the outcome of the court case here. I said it before and I will say it over and over again and I will continue to ask, the question, Mr. Speaker, 'Where is the investigative press that it has not traced down the source of these rumours?' I repeat again I will give them a lead; two days after I came back from the negotiations in Ottawa no less a personage than the Mayor of the City of St. John's said St. John's was rife with rumours. Well, let them go to the Mayor and trace wherever those rumours lie.

Secondly, another instance of people being very quiescent and just accepting the situation occurred recently with respect to British Petroleum and the drilling. Now, it happens to be a fact that at the first meeting that I had in Ottawa with Mr. Chretien on the offshore there was just one other subject outside of the negotiations that I mentioned and that was the necessity of having approval with respect to the permits for British Petroleum off the Northeast Coast of this Province. And why did I do that? I did that, Mr. Speaker, because I had been advised through British Petroleum itself, that if the approval was not forthcoming in the reasonably near future there was little chance of getting a drilling programme going. So what happened? Mr. Speaker, I have told

MR. MARSHALL: the people and I have told the hon. gentlemen there opposite, I kept quiet about it when British Petroleum first of all came along and said to us, 'Look, because the ice has come down and all of this, it looks like we cannot drill now, and yes, indeed, while we could have had our site surveys done during December, our partners have put their financing in, if we had it earlier - the approval came too late.' And what happened afterwards? All of a sudden British Petroleum from that meeting with me go up to Ottawa and they see Mr. Chretien and now they tell everybody, 'Oh, no, no, no, it was not because of the late approvals, the site was not prospective enough', and we poor little people with our fishing admiral syndrome, are prepared to take that bait and accept it after that information? The net result of that, Mr. Speaker, is that there are 250 people in Central Newfoundland who are going to be walking the streets this Summer on Social Assistance while we are not able to use our own resources that we brought into Confederation to buy 250 jobs. And this is the type of quiescence and acquiescence that we have in this Province, that is leading us to the position in which we find ourselves. There is a mute acceptance of the positions that are given and I just cannot understand it, because it has put us on a slope; we are on a slope that this administration is trying to reverse and it is much more difficult going uphill than it is going downhill or on a level, but we have to go uphill, we have an uphill battle all the way in order to try,

MR. MARSHALL: first of all, to reverse the trends of what has happened in the past and to put the Province on a firm foundation, a lot of which has been aided by the attitude of certain people in this Province. I say people with a great sweep but I do not mean that, it is the minority, it is the vocal minority in this Province that are just prepared to accept it. Now, how can you accept, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have \$230 million in retail sales tax that we have to extract from the people of the Province this year? We have the highest retail sales tax in Canada and it is \$230 million, as the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) read out with great glee yesterday, he exulted in it, This is great Liberal philosophy - 18 per cent of our income comes from retail sales tax. Now, how can we justify, Mr. Speaker, everything that has gone on, where there are \$600 million belonging to the people of Newfoundland flowing into the Province of Quebec because we were not treated as equal partners in Confederation, and because we had a bunch of 'Uncle Toms' on the other side who were prepared to accept it. If we had had a few people who had been prepared to confront and recognize the true meaning of Confederation and our rights in those days, Mr. Speaker, we would not have to be travelling uphill, we would be travelling on a level. Now, that is all we want to do, we want to travel on a level, on the same basis as other provinces of Canada - nothing more, nothing less. As I say, I cannot understand how people can put up with on the one hand, us being treated on the Western boundaries of our Province as if we were a foreign country. We might just as well be on the borders of Outer Mongolia insofar as the transmission of our electrical power is concerned. Now,

MR. MARSHALL: that happens to be a fact, a fact that Newfoundlanders are prepared, up to now, to accept. But on the other hand, out there in Hibernia where all of a sudden we find oil a few years later, oh, no, out there, boys, we are no longer a foreign country or anything you are all one big happy family. And incidently, of that happy family you are a junior member, and the putative father has got to take that resource up with it, up to Ottawa, and it will continue to dole it out to you by way of transfer payments and equalization payments. Now, that is what we are faced with today, Mr. Speaker, that is what we were faced with in the offshore negotiations, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that while there is life and breath left in this administration, and there is a lot of that left, we are not under any circumstances going to accept or buckle down to a regime such as that, no matter what anyone may say, no matter what anybody may say, no matter what any courts may say, the answer to this is in the will of Newfoundlanders. And Newfoundlanders have to show and have to show quite clearly that

MR. MARSHALL: they are not prepared to accept the regime that we have had to bend under for the last thirty years, which has been brought about by governments that have been in here and have not understood the full meaning of Confederation, did not realize the fact that you have to stand up for your rights because you only have seven members in Ottawa as against, at any given time, seventy-five or eighty-five in Ontario. So it has to depend, Mr. Speaker, on the will of Newfoundlanders if we are to reverse this. And I hear the hon. gentlemen their opposite absolutely exulting, if you can believe it, Newfoundlanders, exulting from time to time that the Court of Appeal of this Province ruled against Newfoundland in the offshore.

MR. SIMMS: Shame. Shame.

MR. MARSHALL: And they get up and they hypothesize that the Supreme Court of Canada will rule against Newfoundland on the offshore, and they are absolutely delighted with it. But, Mr. Speaker, I say over and over again that that does not make one iota of difference. It puts us in no different position than Alberta and the Western provinces were in prior to 1930. If they had any court case—there was no need of any court case prior to 1930—it would have been dismissed from the bench. When Alberta came in asking for its resources they would not have even heard them because the fact of the matter is, they were owned by the federal government - Alright? - they were owned by the federal government but then logic prevailed, and it is only logical that the people above the ground should own the resources underneath. So this is after 1930 and what happened? They were given it. Now, is it not just as logical in this Province that the resources on the Continental Shelf,

MR. MARSHALL: the reason for which this place was settled in the first place, the sea, the marine life around it, is it not just as logical that on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland the Province of Newfoundland should own the resources underneath and be able to deal with them? And when we say own them we do not mean to sequester them to ourselves, what we mean is that we share them with the rest of Canada. There was a deal made, Mr. Speaker, with Mr. Chretien, 75 per cent of the total government revenue for Newfoundland, 25 per cent to the federal government until such time as the rate of employment for our young people is the same as the average in Canada, the average per capita income is the same as the average of Canada, our debt load is the same as the average of Canada, our retail sales tax is the same as the average of Canada. In other words, until we were average Canadians. And then when we got to that stage it would flip-flop. I did not want it to flip-flop as soon as they did, Mr. Speaker - it was supposed to flip-flop about ten or fifteen years down the road - and the flip-flop was 75 per cent to Canada and 25 per cent to the Province. Now, what is wrong with that? I cannot understand hon. gentlemen there opposite, I cannot for the life of me understand how in their blindness to support their party right or wrong they cannot support this position that has been put forth by the Province with respect to revenue sharing, with respect to joint management and joint management control. But,

MR. MARSHALL: most of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen there opposite have proven themselves hopeless, I am afraid, in the past. All they want to do - they are with the status quo people, the people who for some reason or other want to keep it as it is and keep Newfoundlanders on welfare. But the ones that I make my pitch to are the general Newfoundlanders who are out there, Mr. Speaker, who must realize that we are a part of a great country, and at the same time we have equal rights in that country with other provinces, and that if we continue on in the same bent that Newfoundland has during its sojourn in Confederation over the past thirty, thirty-one, or thirty-two years, that we are going to get what we deserve. We are going to reap what we sow and, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be an eternity of welfare payments and equalization payments and our young people having to find jobs elsewhere while other parts of Canada live off our resources.

Now, I do not think hon. gentlemen there opposite really want that and I think it is time for hon. gentlemen to break ranks on this one issue, if nothing else, to break ranks on this one issue with their friends in the Government of Canada and see what they can do to deliver the goods to Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before I begin the gist of what I want to say in this debate on this amendment, let me first of all deal briefly with the point which the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) just made in the course of his remarks. I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at this precise moment, I guess he is - he has not gone out for a cigarette, he does not smoke to my knowledge.

MR. STAGG: He is around.

MR. ROBERTS: His friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), who is sort of a shadow to a number of ministers, says that the minister is within the precincts and I am pleased with that. I want to say this very seriously, both as a member of the House and as a member of the Bar of the Province, and I am sure my friend from Stephenville who shares both capacities - we may not share a common political viewpoint from time to time but we do share common membership in both this House of Assembly and in the Bar of this Province, or the trade union which constitutes the Bar, the most powerful trade union in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, the minister, who after all speaks not simply as an ordinary minister - he is not just a minister like my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) or my friend from St. John's South (Dr. Collins), or my friend from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), who are sort of common every-day, run-of-the mill ministers, doing the best they can. They are on the steps of the throne of power but there sitting on the right hand of the throne of power is the minister from St. John's East himself. I am not sure if he holds the official title of Deputy Premier, I am not sure, in fact, within the British system it is constitutionally possible to have a deputy premier, or a deputy prime minister, although that title seems to be coming more and more into use and perhaps, given the way constitutional conventions develop, there will in due course be a constitutional convention that we can have a deputy premier. If we had one today though it would be the gentleman from St. John's East.

He stood in the House and he is not one given to statements in the passion of the moment. I am not sure there is any passion or compassion, for that matter, in the man, but he said that he was concerned about rumours

MR. ROBERTS: which had emanated from the Court of Appeal of this Province with respect to the decision of the three judges there on the offshore reference matter. And it is not the first time the hon. gentleman has made these references, as he himself acknowledged when he spoke, Sir.

Now, I cannot conceive of very much that does more to threaten the integrity of the administration of justice in this Province than that kind of comment coming particularly as it does from a very senior member of this administration, and in addition, of course, a member who in private life is not only a member of the Bar of this Province but a very senior member, a Queen's Council, distinguished lawyer, a man long in practice.

DR. COLLINS: Suppose it is true?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I hear the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) say, 'Suppose it is true', and that is precisely the point, I shall deal with that in the course of what I say. I say to him, suppose he just listens for a moment and does me the courtesy which I did his colleague, his friend, his intellectual bed mate, the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). Because the two of them intellectually share the same view points, the same political bed very much, and that is their problem and nobody else's. They should not blame anybody else for that.

If in fact either minister has anything at all on which to base such rumours, and they are now being given currency by being brought to the floor of the House, and I did not bring them, Mr. Speaker, in fact, other than the hon. gentleman for St. John's East, in the remarks emanating from him inside and outside the House, I have not heard these rumours at all. That may merely show that in the part of the legal world in which I live these rumours did not percolate. I do not doubt they are around if someone says they are around, I can simply say I have not heard them. But they are being given currency by the minister.

In common decency and integrity the government should use the weapons to their hand to investigate them, and I say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and to all hon. gentlemen and to the House and to anybody who cares to listen, that if there be truth in these rumours then whatever need be done must be done. But if there be no truth, Mr. Speaker, then these vile, base, dirty, canards ought to be exposed for what they are. The Benchers, Mr. Speaker, I am not a Bencher, but the Benchers have no control over the Bench nor ought they to. Nobody has any control over the Bench in this Province nor ought they to, nobody has any control over the Bench in Canada except the

MR. ROBERTS: - the Parliament of Canada, nor ought there be any control.

The very fundamental basis of the judiciary in this Province and in this country is that they are independent. Mr. Speaker, the government have to hand methods which would legitimately and properly and fairly enable the matter to be looked into.

MR. CARTER: Do not be abusing yourself.

MR. ROBERTS: The matter will properly, fairly, legitimately and regularly be looked into, instead of the vile, base, dirty, scurrilous, canards that are slithered out on the floor of this House.

And that is all I want to say, I have only half an hour, Mr. Speaker. That is all I am allowed. Look, my friend for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is back again. Now, you know, you cannot trade insults with a half wit, you cannot talk to a man whose collar size exceeds his I.Q. All I want to say about him, not to him, is that I have a few remarks I wish to make and if he is not prepared to be as courteous as I try to be, and I get provoked and sometimes I say things in the heat of debate, but I listened carefully to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, when I was not in the Chamber I was listening as he doubtless was, now that he is back he will acknowledge, outside the precincts. I take what he said with great seriousness because he meant it with great seriousness and I will try to make a few comments in equal seriousness, I hope with greater merit. But that is a matter like beauty, in the eye of the beholder.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, this question of these rumours: I have heard no such rumours and I will simply say that the minister owes it to himself, he owes it to the House, he owes it to the administration of which he is such a leading part, he owes it to the Bench if he cares for them, and I believe he does, he owes it to the Bar, he owes it to the country and he owes it to the system under which we have all chosen to live, to use the methods and weapons that are within the power, the legitimate, proper and regular power of the government to allow these to be dealt with and be exposed. The judges are defenceless. The last thing in the world a judge can do is reply to the kinds of comments that are being made by the hon. gentleman opposite. Mr. Justice Berger, I do not know if he is the former Mr. Justice Berger or not, he has announced he is resigning, in essence because he was criticized for making comments on political issues.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: It is a point of order that I know the hon. gentleman will appreciate by way of clarification. I heard the hon. gentleman outside the House make a statement to the effect that I had indicated with respect to the court that rumours from the court - I half heard him, I assume that is what he said, and he is using the same tenor now that I owe it to the court. I just want to make it perfectly plain because I do not want him putting words in my mouth and I know he does not want to himself. If these are his words they are his words, they are not mine. All I have said is that there were rumours. I did not at any time indicate the source of the rumours other than to say that the Mayor of the

MR. MARSHALL: City of St. John's, which is a verifiable fact, was on radio within forty-eight hours of when I had returned talking about rumours being rife and I had heard that there were rumours around. But the hon. gentleman - you know, I know he would not wish to - is certainly not going to put words in my mouth, impute that I was saying that these were coming from the judges.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Does the hon. gentleman wish to speak to that point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that is, of course, no point of order, as my hon. friend realizes, so I do not need to respond to it. What he said in the House is in Hansard, and what he said in the House leaves but one inference and one implication. Can a bit of but one inference and but of one implication - and in fact, the words he used were that the rumours emanated from the court. I am not purporting to quote, what I am saying is that this is what he said. And for him now to try to be Pontius Pilate is really completely unacceptable. Now, I do not want to say anything more on it at this stage. If the administration feel the matter ought to be debated, I would love nothing better, Mr. Speaker, than to participate in a debate here in the House on this matter; if the government feel the appropriate motion ought to be put down.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): I interrupt the hon. member to rule on that point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, of course.

MR. SPEAKER: There is not a point of order, merely a clarification on behalf of the President of the Council.

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

MR. BAIRD: Sit down, boy, do not be crude.

MR. ROBERTS:

Thank you.

Your Honour, you know, the hon. gentlemen on my right, one of whom attempts to be funny and sometimes is, my friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird), who is a genuine half-wit and who brings what he can to the feast -

MR. BAIRD:

That is better than a quarter-wit.

MR. ROBERTS:

The other gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is, of course, playing his game. I wonder if Your Honour would simply draw to their attention - I do not consider it particularly funny - we only have half an hour in the House and if the hon. gentleman from St. John's North wants to be rude and boorish and ignorant, I would ask only that he do it quietly. He is really

MR. ROBERTS: most annoying, Sir, he is a little like something that has to be scratched and yet you cannot in public because it is not decent to do it, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder if Your Honour would simply -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I would like to remind members on both sides of the House that each hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I once heard a Speaker say, Your Honour, that every hon. member has the right to speak in silence and having heard some of us speak from time to time, I am sure Your Honour would second it.

Mr. Speaker, the few remarks I want to make in the relatively few minutes left to me deal with the substance of what the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) said in his remarks. We hear a lot about history in this House and that is only right and proper and, in fact, we are now all wearing a badge, a symbol of the 400th anniversary, this coming Summer, of Gilbert's landing here in St. John's and claiming the Island. I do not know if he knew it was an Island or if he knew what he was doing beyond claiming a bit of soil, a bit of territory and claiming it for the British Crown. And if you look back through our history, Mr. Speaker, you cannot help but be impressed, I suggest, at a theme which runs throughout it, and that is the fact that throughout our history the political leaders, and for 150 years now that has been the men and women who sat in this House of Assembly - we had a sixteen year hiatus in the 1930s. The last time we had

MR. ROBERTS: a Tory administration in power they drove the country under, and we had that sixteen year hiatus. But, Mr. Speaker, the one common theme which underlies our history, there are others, but the one which underlies all our history is the one into which the Peckford administration has entered and subscribed with full enthusiasm and that is this, the one big boom theory that if only we can achieve this particular point of public policy all will be well. You know, the mining boom of the 1860s and 1870s was going to be the answer to all the problems of Newfoundland. When that did not work it was going to be the railway. We just about bankrupted ourselves in this country which was what it then was legally, to build a railway. But if you read the speeches, Your Honour, of that period it was going to solve all the problems of Newfoundland, all of the problems of our people - the railway. When that did not work then the French shore settlement, if only we could get the French shore question settled. And in 1904 that was settled, we got rights, the uncontested rights, sole possessive rights to the French shore. In return, I believe, the British government gave the Government of France some rights to the Cameroons or Togoland or some country in Western Africa. Then it was the Grand Falls mill that was going to be the salvation; after that it was the Hum on the Humber and then came Confederation and the new industries programme; the oil refinery, Churchill Falls, you know, we can go on and on and on down the list. And now here we are with this administration, perfectly consistent historically, perfectly in order with everything that has gone before, in the 400 years since Gilbert stumbled ashore here in St. John's and claimed this

MR. ROBERTS: country for the first Elizabeth.

So there is nothing unique in what this administration are doing. In fact, I can sit over here, Mr. Speaker, and I can close my eyes when the Premier is in full oratorical flight and I can go back ten or fifteen years and I can hear a former Premier -

AN HON. MEMBER: Frank Moores.

MR. ROBERTS: - not Frank Moores, the other former Premier saying exactly the same thing. All you have to do, Mr. Speaker, is close your eyes, the accent may be a little different, the inflection may have changed somewhat, the message is the same, so is the verve and the vigor and the enthusiasm. There are differences between the two men -

MR. CARTER: All stand.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, if the hon. gentleman wishes to stand for his Premier, he can, His normal posture with his Premier is not one of standing, of course, it is one, with the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), bent from the waist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is unique about this government, and the minister's speech exemplified it is the mean spirited, narrow-minded, smug, the spirit in which they approach public affairs in this Province, the complete lack of generosity. You know, the hon. the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) stood here and he is not given to careless utterances, ignorant utterances perhaps but not careless, the man knows what he is doing and what he said, he said it yesterday and he said it again today in his peroration, was that nothing good has ever been done by anybody who has gone before in this Province. He took the thirty-four years since we have become part of Canada and washed away the first thirty and not even did they achieve nothing good, these men and these women, but their intentions were nothing but evil or dishonourable or at the very least, weak minded. Now, I am not going to defend these men and women, they do not need a defence, particularly from the likes of the hon. gentleman from St. John's East but I will simply say, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks which he made exemplify his whole approach And I will tell you now, it is no secret that this man is, of course, one half of the intellectual team which sparks this administration, the other half is Mr. Cabot Martin. The Premier for all his undoubted talents has never held himself out as an intellect or an intellectual, a very bright man all of these things, but the intellectual spirit, Kropotkin of this particular administration is the gentleman from St.

MR. ROBERTS: John's East and we saw vintage Marshall yesterday and again here today in the House. He is unable or unwilling to admit that any others can even share the goals that he so piously claims as being his sole prerogative. Everybody is to blame but himself, even British Petroleum. He came close, he did not use the word but he came close to calling the British Petroleum Company liars-I have no idea whether they are liars or not, but I do know that the hon. gentleman has no cause to say they are liars, he just stands up, backhands them, blackguards them, I know not why they chose not to drill or why they did not do their seismic work last Fall or last Winter, I do not know at all. I know what they have said publicly because I have read it in the newspapers as has the hon. gentleman, and I will say that unless he has some justifiable cause to refer to the spokesmen for that company as being liars and people who tell untruths then he has no right to do so, nor should he be

MR. ROBERTS: reminded me of a former Premier whom I have had occasion to know relatively well in the political sense.

MR. BAIRD: And you supported.

MR. ROBERTS: I supported him as did the gentleman from Humber West (Mr. Baird) before he was converted.

AN. HON. MEMBER: He did not, did he?

MR. ROBERTS: He certainly did.

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

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order. The hon. gentleman can only be heard from his seat as opposed to being heard through his seat which is his usual approach. But, Mr. Speaker - that will cost me on the Public Accounts Committee. If there was any hope now of a unanimous report, gone, on the Public Accounts Committee. He finds his way back to his seat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that I could close my eyes and hear the former Premier speaking in this House when the present Premier speaks. But there is another analogy that Your Honour may wish to reflect upon, and other hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! A point of Order. The hon. member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. It was just stated that I was a supporter of the former, former Premier. Never, Sir. That is an untrue statement. I never was and never will be.

MR. CARTER: The man should apologize.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member to that point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let me say that if the hon. gentleman

MR. ROBERTS:

gives us the assurance here in the House, of course I accept it without qualification. I will say that there is a legal maxim called *res ipsi loquitor*, the thing speaks for itself, and my friend and I could go to Corner Brook and we could look into that. Perhaps we should have a PAC hearing in Corner Brook. Of course I accept what he says without hesitation.

MR. SPEAKER: (Aylward): To that point of order. I rule there is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying there is an analogy between the present administration and the Smallwood administration and hon. gentlemen opposite might do well to ponder it, particularly those who swept in not on the coattails of the present Premier last April but swept in on the sweepings of his coattail and thus came into this House. The analogies are just striking, the closing of the hospitals, the bunker mentality. We have even got the Les Curtis, the hon. Leslie R. Curtis, who in many ways was a superb legislator - the hon. Leslie R. Curtis will never die I am relieved to know, as long as the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is with us. I can close my eyes and I can hear Les Curtis move the adjournment of the business of the House everytime the gentleman from St. John's East does it.

Mr. Speaker, though the real problem, Sir, the real problem is that this government have led the people of this Province up a blind alley and the blank wall is not very far ahead from it, and it is in the minister's budget. The minister's budget this year was

MR. ROBERTS: less forthcoming, less truthful,
in my view, we will see that when the time comes, but the
minister's budget this year was bleaker than last November's
which was bleaker than the one before, and I say to the
minister, if in fact for his sins he is permitted to
continue in office until he brings in another budget,
the mini budget in the Fall or the budget next May when
we finally get the results, or March, April or whenever
it comes, of this year it will be bleaker still because
we are up against the blank wall. The offshore policy has
come to a complete dead halt in the water. This government
were given a mandate by the people of this Province,
a terrific mandate, a terrific vote of confidence and
instead of being able to use that, instead of being as
big men or women,

MR. ROBERTS: saving the lady from Gander (Mrs. Newhook), and the lady from Twillingate (Mrs. Reid), as big men in spirit and in policy, as big in themselves as they were in numbers, they have blown it, They have put us in the court and we lost. No exaltation there, no joy no exaltation, no despair. You go to court, you submit yourself to the court, if you then invoke the legal process - "Those who live by the sword shall die by the sword" - if you invoke the legal process you cannot be heard to whine and snivel as the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) did. Now they are at the point that we advocated five years ago, we poor band of traitors over here saying, "Let us do a deal." The only hope they have is that somehow the people of Canada will elect a Tory Government. Well, well they might. Given twenty-five points of the gallop poll - gentlemen, even the Tories may manage to get elected with a twenty-five point difference in the gallop poll. But, mind you, there is a year to go yet. You have got to have faith in the Tory Party to blow it. They will re-elect Joe Clark and it will all be down hill from there.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that that is the only throw of the dice left now, and it is a throw of the dice. This government's policy has brought us up to the blank wall. The same in energy - why did we not pull the plug years ago? Again something we on this side have advocated? The gentleman from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is out of his seat but he may remember being at a Liberal public meeting in Gander in 1977 when that was clearly stated as being the policy of this party. The only bright spot is the fishery. And do you know why? Because at long last the Minister of Fisheries

MR. ROBERTS: (Mr. Morgan), a gentleman with whom I have had my differences, he and I have certainly had our differences of view and we doubtless will again, but at least he is talking, at least he is dealing with Ottawa. I do not think he is selling the side, I do not think he is going to give up anything he feels he ought not to give up, but we are seeing -

DR. COLLINS: We have a sensible federal minister.

MR. ROBERTS: There are a number of sensible federal ministers if only there were an equal number of sensible provincial ministers. I mean, most of the provincial ministers opposite, Your Honour, could not get hired as the second man in a one many team.

Mr. Speaker, the only bright spot in the economy right now is the fisheries with all the horrendous problems it faces. And, Mr. Speaker, in each case the same causes have led us to this problem, an unwillingness to negotiate in any real sense of the word, an inability to give and take, a lack of generosity and a lack of open-mindedness. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that it is not too late to change, they have got three and a half or four years left in a mandate. They no longer have the confidence of the people of the Province but they have the mandate. If they do not change their ways, and I say this to the backbenchers, if the caucus do not change their ways, if the caucus cannot persuade the Savonarola of this administration, the

MR. ROBERTS:

Svengali of this administration, the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and his intellectual bed mate, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and those of who are of that ilk, if they cannot persuade them to change their ways I will tell you what is going to happen, the teachers were but the first, there will be group after group and each one, we can hear them now being denounced in this House by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and at the end there they will be, there will be forty-four of them left - let the three or four or five or six or eight who see the light and leave, but there will be forty-four of them alone with the tide lapping up around their ankles. And as they do they will be hanging on by their fingernails - and as they do the gentleman for St. John's East, with the gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) at his feet washing - if only the hon. gentleman for Stephenville would let his hair grow longer he would be able to perform that service along with the others he performs down in the flesh pots of New York on the people.

But, Mr. Speaker, there they are. There they are, Mr. Speaker, The tide will be lapping, and they will go out with the tide.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one other point on health, Sir, very simply.

MR. BAIRD:

His time is up, Mr.

Speaker. His time is up.

MR. ROBERTS:

No, the hon. gentleman has

a minute or two yet, where they may yet learn something.

The health estimates, Sir, are the real sleeper of this Budget. The problems are only now beginning to emerge. The cutbacks are drastic. And anybody who knows anything about the health system in this Province, anything about them knows that we do not have in our health

MR. ROBERTS: system the kind of excess capacity which will allow the cutbacks to be absorbed without hurting the ability of the system to serve the legitimate needs of our people. I am just going to repeat a suggestion that has been made by my colleagues before. Subhead 13.2.1.01.01 is the teachers' salary vote, \$250 million cut out. The teachers through the stubbornness of this government, deliberate or not, were out of the classroom for fifteen days, I believe it was, out of 195. That is one-thirteenth - round it off to a tenth, Sir, because not all of the teachers were out and, of course, not all of the salary bill was saved. The government are \$26 million in pocket. All I say to them is take a portion of that, \$10 million, \$12 million, \$14 million and give the hospitals and the medical care systems, doctors and everybody involved in that system, enough money to enable them to carry on at the levels we reached last year. We all know and we will all agree that is not enough but the cuts the government have imposed are wrong, they cannot be taken by the system without inflicting damage that will be irreparable to the system and may well cause grave harm, not just inconvenience

MR. ROBERTS: or discomfort, but grave harm to many people in this Province, and I will have an opportunity to talk about that again later, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are my few modest contributions to this debate. I think the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) gave us the very distillation of his philosophy. And if anybody wants to know why this Province continues to be in the trouble it is in today, his analysis of the past is wrong, his prescription for the future is even more wrong, but his revelation of why we are where we are today, nobody need ever look further than the hon. gentleman's speech. That, Sir, is the trouble with this Province and that is why I, along with my colleagues, will gladly support this non-confidence motion. In doing so, Sir, we believe - and we are prepared to put this to the test anytime the Premier wants - we speak for the majority of the people of this Province.

Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the Minister of Culture,

Recreation and Youth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak

briefly on the amendment. I will have another opportunity, of course, when the amendment is defeated, to speak again on the main motion.

MR. WARREN:

You will never.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, I will, and so will the hon.

the member for Torngat Mountains,

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, I see.

MR. BAIRD: Just ignore him.

MR. SIMMS: I cannot ignore him. I cannot ignore my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). He is a tremendous member, one of the best members on the other side of the House, without a doubt, without question, the most dedicated member they have there, looked upon in the eyes of the Liberals in Newfoundland and Labrador as a potential leader, without a doubt, without a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: He is a man who works very, very hard on behalf of his constituents, has even learned their language, I suggest, without question, I have heard him speak. And he is a fellow whom I have known for a long time, Mr. Speaker, known him for a very, very long time.

MR. STAGG: Do you need any help?

MR. SIMMS: I have seen him debate in other forums and my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), of course, has also seen him debate in other forums outside of this House of Assembly years ago, many, many moons ago.

MR. BAIRD: At the Kinsmen Club?

MR. SIMMS: Somebody mentioned the Kinsmen Club. Yes, that happened to be one of the forums where I have seen him debate and, without a doubt, he always gets his point across, is an excellent worker, works strongly on behalf of his constituents and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the members of this House and indeed through the media to the people of this Province that the member for Torngat Mountains would make a superb leader for the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: And in view of the fact, of course, that the recently heralded Youth Conference held by the Liberal Party in Gander just last weekend strongly passed a

May 10, 1983

Tape 1984

EC - 3

MR. SIMMS: resolution that there be a
leadership convention so that they can decide and determine
their future, I would suggest to the hon. the member

MR. SIMMS:

for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) that he should give it very, very serious consideration. If the hon. member for Torngat Mountains would assure me that he will be a candidate for the leadership of the Liberal Party, I will personally give him a contribution and I have a feeling I might even be able to get a bit more over here, from hon. members on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SIMMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the comments of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), and I had an opportunity to read some of the reported comments of the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) who put forth that now infamous amendment to amend the budget of the year before and not this particular year, which I thought was a very, very wise move on his part. In any event, because of some technicality, of course, Your Honour, you wisely decided that the amendment was still in order. And what I read and what I heard today spoken by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle was what I have heard and read for the last number of years. It is the same old stuff, same old story, criticize simply to criticize, for no other reason at all just to criticize. Obviously nothing has been put forth at all of a constructive nature. We all know that Oppositions are meant to constructively criticize and to offer alternatives and offer suggestions, but, Mr. Speaker, I would challenge anybody in this House or outside the House to name me four or five good credible alternative suggestions put forth by the members opposite in this particular budget debate. There have been none.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to just talk generally about some -

May 10, 1983

Tape No. 1985

SD - 2

MR. WARREN: Tell us about pork barrelling.

MR. SIMMS: Tell you about what?

MR. WARREN: Tell us about pork barrelling.

MR. SIMMS: Pork barrelling? Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, if there is any pork barrelling going on it is as a result of some great experiences gained from a prior administration which the hon. member should be very, very familiar with, although he was not a member of that particular administration.

MR. DOYLE: Former, former administration.

MR. SIMMS: Well, former, former administration. I know he was not a member of that administration.

MR. WINDSOR: Speaking of pork barrelling, he was probably only a piglet when that particular administration was in.

MR. SIMMS: I believe he was a member of the Liberal Party and a member of this House of Assembly as a Liberal and then - I am sorry may be it was as a

MR.SIMMS: Liberal reform before he resigned his seat to let the other leader come back.

MR.CALLAN: There was an election called.

MR.SIMMS: There was an election called, I see. And the hon. member did not run again.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.SIMMS: Mr.Speaker, these dastardly interruptions by my colleagues and by members opposite are not helping me at all.

I want to address a couple of matters, Mr. Speaker, that have often been commented on by members opposite, specifically the question of youth unemployment, which has been raised on a number of occasions and questions have been directed at me as to why I as minister responsible for youth services have not created employment for young people in this Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important, first of all, for members to realize the process that is underway with respect to the Youth Advisory Council's project concerning youth unemployment in the Province. The process is such that first of all the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth specifically provides youth services, services in an advisory capacity, financial capacity, consultations and the like. We specifically try to promote training for our young people, leadership training and training in preparation for their futures emphasizing in particular the resource industries in our Province as evidenced, for example, by the 4-H programme, which I am sure a lot of members are very familiar with. We also provide financial assistance to some thirty or forty youth organizations and groups in the Province

MR.SIMMS: who are primarily involved in leadership training for the future. I am talking about groups like Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, the boys' and girls' clubs, and these kind of groups, and we provide assistance to the Youth Leaders' Association in the Province as well. So the purpose of the Youth Services Division, Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear, is to provide those kinds of services to the youth and to the youth leaders and their respective groups. Incidentally, I should point out for the information of hon. members that this Province is the only province that has a Youth Services Division full-time, something that, I think, we should be relatively proud of if not greatly proud of.

MR.CALLAN: Like the rural development associations.

MR.SIMMS: No, it is not, Mr.Speaker, at all like that. It just goes to show how much the member knows about it, which is absolutely nothing. I do not know if he has ever been down there, so it is unfortunate that he would make that kind of a comment because he has no idea at all

MR. SIMMS:

what he is talking about, and I do not mind saying that right here and now. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, that is what the Youth Services Division does. As a part of the commitment of this government, we also appointed a Youth Advisory Council, a group of young people, incidentally, with some very impressive adult advisers working with them, and the Youth Advisory Council itself, which is doing an excellent job, undertook this project on their own, and it was a project that they wanted to undertake, where they conducted a survey of young people around the Province to find out what their biggest concerns were. This particular process, by the way, was funded by us so we certainly had no fear of it, we were the ones who funded the council and funded their project and we have an excellent rapport with the Youth Advisory Council and meet with them on a very regular basis. As a matter of fact, my own daughter is one of the ones who was surveyed, ironically enough.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the first phase of that project by the Youth Advisory Council was to present their report to me as the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth and we have had consultations with the Council, at least the leadership of the Council, the President and the Executive Director and so on, and as a government department, of course, we have had numerous discussions with other interested and related departments, the Department of Labour and Manpower, the Department of Education, and my own department, and we have had several Cabinet discussions with respect to the project undertaken by the Youth Advisory Council, which is still ongoing because it is not a simple problem to address, Mr. Speaker, it is highly complex. We are analyzing the kinds of programmes available in other provinces. But the important thing to remember, Mr. Speaker, is the process, and the process

May 10, 1983

Tape No. 1987

NM - 2

MR. SIMMS: is that the Youth Advisory Council themselves undertook the first phase, which was to do the survey, and now the second phase is that this report has been sent out to eight or nine regional councils of young people across the Province, where these young people themselves will analyze what is in that study and that report and by late Summer or early Fall they will then be reporting back to government, through me, with their own recommendations and suggestions as to how we can go about trying to address this very, very important and difficult problem.

MR. SIMMS:

So, Mr. Speaker, while we recognize that there have been some initiatives undertaken by the federal government during their recent federal budget, most of the programmes that they have identified for assisting youth who are unemployed relate to projects themselves that they will have direct control over and which we, of course, will not have any particular input into. So what we have to try to do, Mr. Speaker, is try to consult with the federal Department of Employment and Immigration, Mr. Axworthy's department, to see if we cannot attempt to get a better share than the 2.8 per cent or so that we are expected to receive over the next two years out of those moneys that they have allocated. And we are pursuing that, Mr. Speaker. But we do not wish to undermine the efforts of the young people of this Province who undertook that project and have done such a tremendous job with it. We want to continue to have our consultations with them, at their request, and hear back from them with their recommendations and suggestions. In the interim, we will also be looking at it from a government point of view to see what kinds of recommendations and ideas that we can come up with.

So I think it is important that I clarify that for members of the House in particular so that they themselves do not undermine the efforts of our young people, because it is their project, something that they are very, very proud of.

Mr. Speaker, the other matter that I want to deal with, briefly again, is a matter that irritates me considerably and it is probably because I am personally involved with the project. But I am sure hon. members in this House have heard frequent comments from members opposite in particular about the 400th Anniversary

MR. SIMMS: celebrations which we are undertaking in this Province this year. I have frequently heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) in particular, and, if I am correct, other members opposite, including my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), make comments that have not been very, very supportive of the anniversary celebrations which we are undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, we have to this point in time, received a tremendous amount of co-operation and interest from many, many parties with respect to our planned celebrations. We have received support from the tourist industry people, we have received a tremendous amount of support from the federal government which has provided some assistance

MR. SIMMS:

for us, tour operators in the Province in the tourism industry, transportation companies in the Province dealing with tourists on a constant basis, we have received support during our recent promotional tour from all the receptions that we held, from all the people in attendance at those receptions, we have received excellent coverage, excellent support, excellent response. Mr. Speaker, we even received support this morning from The Daily News who have commended some individual Newfoundland Cabinet Ministers, including my colleague, the Minister for Tourism (Mr. Windsor), who has exhausted himself over the past number of months, absolutely exhausted himself in promoting tourism for this Province, doing a tremendous job, recognized by the tourist industry people, recognized by the federal government, recognized even now, Mr. Speaker, by The Daily News, everybody.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is a breakthrough.

MR. SIMMS:

I mean, that is a significant breakthrough I think even members opposite would have to agree. So, Mr. Speaker, the point is that it appears everybody, is on side and in support of this particular project - everybody, that is, except our friends on the other side. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how they can justifiably defend that kind of a position during a year which is going to be so significant for us, The small amount of monies expended we expect to get back, because a one per cent increase in our tourism trade, Mr. Speaker, will mean over \$2 million in revenue to this Province, and we expect of course to have more than a one per cent increase.

Mr. Speaker, I plead and beg the hon. members opposite to get on side and support us in

MR. SIMMS: this effort so that it can be a provincial effort. We have got some great projects coming up, some great activities arranged, lots of participation.

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible) New York.

MR. SIMMS: I have not been to New York, I am sorry. Jealousy gets you nowhere, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) should be well aware of that by now.

We have the Royal visit scheduled, which is going to be a significant event associated with our anniversary celebrations, and the Canadian Heritage Festival, which, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, is going to employ people. To begin with all the monies spent on that project, some \$300,000 cost-shared with the Province at a 90/10 ratio with the federal government, will be spent in this Province. Food, accommodations, people, Mr. Speaker, everything has a positive note to it, yet the members opposite continuously try to suggest that it is a waste of time and a waste of money. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that when the time comes during the next couple of months to issue invitations to all these celebrations, all the various activities, I am willing to bet my bottom

MR. SIMMS: dollar here and now
that we will have all kinds of requests for them from
members opposite like we had from the member for
the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) today. He is
very interested in the lapel pin of my hon. colleague
the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). He is a
member with a great deal of interest in tourism,
especially as a result of his own involvement on the
West Coast and with the Stephenville festival, which
I commend to the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan),
by the way. I do not know if he has ever been to
Stephenville. Has he ever been to Stephenville?

MR. TOBIN: He does not know where it is.

MR. SIMMS: Well, I would commend the
Stephenville festival to him. It is a
highlight of our anniversary activities this year and
I would commend it to the hon. member for Bellevue.
Anyway, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle,
of course, was anxiously looking for more of these
anniversary pins, yet his own leader a day or so ago
said it was a waste of money, it is a waste of time,
it is a bunch of foolishness.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest
that the hon. members opposite get their act together
and see what they can do to try to help us in promoting
this celebration period because it is going to be a
significant time for the Province, a significant event
and we want to get the co-operation of not only the
Daily News, and not only the people in the tourist industry,
and not only the Federal Government, not only the Province,

MR. SIMMS: we want to get the support of the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the proceedings any further because I have an appointment, unfortunately, at 5:00 o'clock so I just wanted to make those couple of points. I look forward with a great deal of interest the vicious attacks that are likely to come forth now from members opposite assailing the comments that I made and, of course, those comments that were made by my predecessors.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward) The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) who just finished speaking, and I just want to refer to a couple of his comments. Along with a lot of other members, he seems to take great delight in the fact that when my hon. colleague and friend, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), drafted and submitted this non-confidence motion that there was a typographical error referring to last year's budget. Now, if I were hon. members I would take no consolations in that because the same amendment and the same motion could apply equally, as a matter of fact, possibly more so to the last budget than to this present one, because that was the one, Mr. Speaker, that really raised some of the taxes that the people of this Province are finding so difficult to pay. I would take no great pleasure, if I were a member on the other side in talking about that typographical error because the

MR. LUSH: same amendment, one every bit as forceful, could have been said about that particular budget as well. The hon. member also said that in reading some of the comments and listening to some of the comments he found out that it was the same old story, that members opposite were criticizing. Then, of course, he came up with his own new and unique definition of what the Opposition should be. He said that the Opposition's job is to constructively criticize and to offer alternatives. I do not know what political science author or what political science book the hon. member was quoting, but I challenge him to find anywhere in any political science book, in any political science document that the job of the Opposition

MR. LUSH: I challenge the hon. member to come up with that phrase, that it is 'to constructively criticize'. Of course, in the Western World most people accept Sir Winston Churchill's definition for an Opposition which he said was to criticize. No qualifications, no adjectives, no modifiers, it was, to criticize. So, Mr. Speaker, that was the hon. gentleman's own definition to say that it was 'to constructively criticize'. The job of the Opposition is to criticize. One hopes, of course, any kind of criticism would result in the people being criticized to accept it in the manner in which it was offered, and all criticism is meant to be constructive, because you criticize, you make suggestions, naturally, by the very definition of the word. The fact that you criticize means that there must be some weakness and then one would hope that the persons who are criticized, or the agency or the institution or whatever, that they would take the necessary steps and proceed to correct. But, Mr. Speaker, that does not apply with this government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to lay that aside, that the job of the Opposition is to constructively criticize. The job of the Opposition is to criticize. It is to oppose, Mr. Speaker, I said to criticize, I am sorry. Sir Winston Churchill said, 'The job of the Opposition is to oppose,' I am sorry, but I got off on the wrong track there, but the point still remains that the hon. member will not find in any political science book, in any political science job of the Opposition is to constructively criticize. He might find 'to criticize', but he will certainly find 'to oppose'. That is the job, Mr. Speaker, to oppose. And it does not say 'To constructively oppose' or 'sympathetically oppose', no qualification, it says, 'to oppose'. And that is the job, Mr. Speaker, and we are doing it.

MR. BAIRD: That is the job for the Opposition not the government.

MR. LUSH: I have been here for eight years and I have done a lot of study about the job, and now I am beginning actively to study what a government should be doing. I am doing that because that day is coming nearer and nearer, Mr. Speaker, with the advent of that great youth convention we had in Gander, I can see the day when we will be in government is just around the corner. You can smell it, Mr. Speaker, we can taste it.

MR. BAIRD: You will have to straighten out your leadership problem first.

MR. LUSH: The leadership, Mr. Speaker, we are not too worried about. That will take care of itself. We are not worried about that. We have plenty of leaders. No shortage of leaders. We will have just as many running when the provincial Liberal leadership is called as is now running with the Conservative Federal Party. We will have just as many, the only difference will be that they will be more qualified, Mr. Speaker. They will be leaders, true leaders.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, about leadership. We will put that to rest. We will take care of that in due time, Mr. Speaker. But it is a great privilege, Mr. Speaker, to get up and support this non-confidence motion, this amendment to the Budget. The essence, Mr. Speaker, of the motion is, of course, that we do not agree with the Budget. And it does not matter which Budget it is, because, Mr. Speaker, every Budget brought in by this present administration was a Budget that was no good, so it does not matter which Budget it was. So it is a great privilege for me to support this motion, this non-confidence motion, which in essence, of course, means that we condemn the Budget, which in essence means that we feel that this Budget will do nothing

MR. LUSH: for the people of this Province, that it will do nothing to stimulate the economy, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I certainly support the motion and that is what the motion says. Mr. Speaker, why do I support the motion or why do I not endorse this budget as presented on March 17th? Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose one could put it a little more emphatically and ask the question who does support this budget, who does endorse this budget? Nobody, Mr. Speaker, in their right mind supports this budget, nobody. If hon. members on the other side were allowed to speak the way they feel, Mr. Speaker, all of them, almost woman to woman and man to man would stand up and say that they do not support this budget.

Mr. Speaker, what is in it to support? Mr. Speaker, who supports it? Do the school board of this Province support this budget? Do the students attending our post-secondary institutions support this budget? The people who had the student aid regulations made more restrictive, made harder, will they support it? Will the people attending technical and vocational schools, who had their fees increased to \$200 per semester, will they support this budget? Mr. Speaker, does the Newfoundland Hospital Association support this budget? Does the Newfoundland Medical Association support this budget? Does the business community support this budget? I have not heard, Mr. Speaker, of one single person, outside of the people who have to defend this budget, members on the government side, I have not heard one single person who endorses and supports this budget. Now that should say something. That should mean something. That certainly should say something to hon. members opposite, that nobody supports

MR. LUSH: this budget. Educational people, people involved in health care services in this Province, students, the unemployed, nobody supports this budget. What is in this budget for them, Mr. Speaker? What is in this budget for the business community? There is nothing in this budget, Mr. Speaker, other than a lot of misery, a lot of pain and a lot of anguish. That is what is in this budget. So there is nothing in this budget, Mr. Speaker, with which people can agree, certainly nothing substantive in the budget that is going to do anything to stimulate the economy, that is going to do anything to create employment for our people. The kinds of things that you look for in a budget, items and policies that will create jobs, that will stimulate the economy, are not in this budget, Mr. Speaker, It does not address these important matters, namely, the stimulation of the economy and creating jobs for our people. Nothing there. It is void, Mr. Speaker, it is void of anything constructive in terms of developing our economy, in terms of creating jobs for our people. And that has got to be the job of the government, Mr. Speaker, that is their main responsibility, that is their main task, to create jobs for our people. And there is nothing in this budget that will do that. What we see is a reduction in hospital services that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) stands here daily to trying to defend, trying to defend the indefensible. He is the only person in Newfoundland, Sir, who believes that the restrictive fiscal measures brought down in this budget, he is the only person who believes that these cutbacks will not affect health care in this Province. He is the only person. The Hospital Association believes it will, Mr. Speaker, and if they believe it will, who are we to say it will not?

MR. LUSH: The people who work daily administering the health care services of this Province say it is going to affect health care in this Province and the Medical Association say it is going to affect the health care of this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, who is to say otherwise? But the minister gets up here daily saying that the quality of health services will not be affected negatively by the cutbacks to hospitals in this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, certainly the people involved in health cannot support this budget, students cannot support this budget. People are going to be forced to increase their debt load to go to university, and after five years in university they are going to owe a fortune because of this measure by the government to increase the loan ceiling to \$900. And, Mr. Speaker, if the minister in her meeting today or tomorrow with the students does not come up with something more concrete, more tangible than what she said today, I am afraid there are going to be a lot of irate students in this Province in the next few days, students who realize, students who know that they are going to be denied access to an education because of these unfair regulations. Mr. Speaker, the minister gets up here daily repeating the fact that we have had one of the most generous student aid programmes in Canada for years and now we must bring it more in line. As I said today in Question Period, I certainly wish that that were the policy of this government, to bring all other areas of government responsibility and government involvement in line with that in other parts of Canada. For example, our unemployment, if we could only bring that in line with other areas of Canada. Today we are four percentage points higher with

MR. LUSH: respect to unemployment than the second highest in Canada, New Brunswick. We are four percentage points higher than that province, Mr. Speaker. So here is an area where the government could try to put things on a par with the rest of Canada. To be on a par with Atlantic Canada, Mr. Speaker, with the Maritime Provinces, one would be happy if we could only do that, if we could bring our unemployment rate in line with P.E.I., Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but we cannot even do that. And it looks like this government have no intention to, they have given up on it. The Premier himself said there is nothing he can do about the economy. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier cannot do anything about our economy he should resign and let someone else take over who can do something about the economy of this Province. There are people, Mr. Speaker, and there are parties who can do something about the economy of this Province.

I was again amused, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) when he talked about this celebration, this great celebration we are going to have. He made some reference to the fact that there were hon. members opposite who criticize this celebration, this Sir Humphrey Gilbert celebration. Mr. Speaker, I never ever made any negative comments about that particular event, and I will never ever make any negative comments about anything that this government has to celebrate about, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: because they have so little to celebrate about that when they do celebrate I am delighted. I am delighted. And notice, Mr. Speaker, the only things they celebrate of course are the accomplishments and the achievements of the past. They live in the past, Mr. Speaker. That is their problem. They live in the past, selected periods of the past in particular. But they live in the past. They have no plans for the present or the future, and all they can do, Mr. Speaker, is celebrate events of the past. And well they might, because they cannot celebrate the present and they have no plans for the future. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of a comment I heard one time when somebody asked a very prominent fisherman of this Province what the future of the fisheries was, and he said, "The future of the fisheries is a thing of the past." And this is what I say about this government, the future of this government, Sir, is a thing of the past. Let them carry on celebrating all they like, Mr. Speaker, and I will not utter any statements of condemnation or derogatory statements or negative statements or anything else, because the only things this hon. crowd can celebrate are achievements and accomplishments of the past, so let them carry on. And I suppose that they will be responsible for putting \$500,000 into the economy and thank God for that. Thank God for small blessings. I hope it is a very successful event and I hope that it will bring millions of dollars into the economy. I hope that we will see thousands of tourists, Mr. Speaker, coming into this Province from all parts of Canada, from all parts of the British Commonwealth, from all parts of the United States, from all parts of the world. I would like to see people coming in here and spending their dollars,

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, so that we can get some monetary rewards from the celebration of this great event.

But, Mr. Speaker, this budget certainly offers no hope, no ray of light, no future at all to the 50,000 people unemployed in this Province, and they do not think very much of this budget.

The business community does not think very much of this budget because they see nothing in it that is going to stimulate the economy. As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the only thing this budget offers our people is pain, misery and anguish, physical pain and mental pain, physical pain to those people who are not going to be able to get into our hospitals and the mental pain to our students who are not going to be able to pursue their education and finish their education because of the regulations and the changes which the government have made, changes which are harsh, Mr. Speaker, changes which are going to hinder and prevent many of our students from continuing and pursuing a continuing education. They are going to deny them the privilege and the right and the opportunity to train themselves for tomorrow's world. And again, Mr. Speaker, I said in my remarks that it looks like this government is drifting quickly from the universally accepted policy that education is a right to a policy that education is regarded as a privilege for the few. And that is sad, Mr. Speaker, that is a sad day when we move towards that rather obsolete and antiquated philosophy, a philosophy that has been done away with in the Western world for years and years.

MR. LUSH: It is sad that we should be moving away from that particular policy.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that one can find to agree with in this budget, or very little of substance that one can find to endorse or to praise in this budget. About the only thing that one could praise in this budget, the only thing that one could commend in this budget is it demonstrates again, Mr. Speaker, this government's skills at trying to find new sources of revenue. That is what it does, Mr. Speaker. It demonstrated the skill of this government, the ingenuity of this government in trying to new sources of revenue, taxes. Mr. Speaker, we have taxed just about everything in Newfoundland that can be taxed in the last five or six years. Is there anything else left to tax? There is only one thing left to tax now, our food. That is about the only thing left to tax.

Mr. Speaker, everything else has been taxed, government services, fees on that have been increased. So that is what they have demonstrated over the past six or seven years their skill at finding new sources of revenue through increasing taxes and increasing fees for government services. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what else will be left to tax, I do know what other fees they will be able to increase for government services, there will be nothing else left. Mr. Speaker, when a government has to hit the sick, the lame, the handicapped and then our young people, when we have to take drastic measures to do this this shows how inept a government really is. This shows, Mr. Speaker, how irresponsible a government is, it shows how bankrupt of ideas they are to try and develop this Province. When we have to hit the sick and when we have to hit our young, our students, that shows how bankrupt the government really is, that shows how devoid of strength

MR. LUSH: and political will this crowd have become when they hit our educational system, our students and the sick of this Province, the handicapped, those, Mr. Speaker, who cannot help themselves. So, Mr. Speaker, how can one support this budget when there is absolutely nothing in it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) came up with an idea - I am sure that it was his but it has been voiced by this side - that what the government could do to ensure that our health services are not downgraded is spend the upwards to \$20 million saved with respect to the teachers' strike, with respect to the labour dispute with the teachers, and put it into the health services of this Province to improve the health services or keep them at the status quo, because I understand from what the medical people say that with the monies now given them to carry on the health services of this Province they cannot even maintain the status quo, they are going to go backwards. So, Mr. Speaker, if we gave them the \$20 million or thereabouts that we saved, we would be able

MR. LUSH: to ensure that the health care services of this Province would not be downgraded, that the quality of health services would not be affected. And here is an area where the government can work.

I can make another suggestion to the hundreds of young people who are unemployed, the hundreds of young people who are trying to get into this MED course, the Marine Emergencies Duties course I think is what it is called, a course that young people must have, or anybody must have before they get a job in the offshore or other marine-related activities, who are finding it very difficult to get a job, finding it very difficult to get into this course, cannot get into it. I am just wondering what is going on. The minister told me in an answer the other day that companies have forty-five per cent of the say or they select forty-five per cent of the people who go there, the government decides something like twenty-two per cent and the federal Manpower thirty-three per cent, somewhere along those ratios. Well, Mr. Speaker, that does not coincide with the facts as I know them. Our people, men and women, are told that the companies have no say; nobody seems to know who has the say. I certainly hope the minister is right, it is something that I have to do a little more research into, to find out just what is going on, just what is the criteria for people getting into this MED course, for which there is tremendous demand. Some of the money that they have saved in the labour dispute with the teachers could be used to expand that course to other parts of this Province. Why must everything, Mr. Speaker, be located here in St. John's? Everything connected with the offshore is located here in St. John's, everything. To get your name on that list that the minister has compiled, you have to come to St. John's. You have to

MR. LUSH: come to St. John's to get this MED course, you have to come to St. John's to be interviewed by companies. Just recently I saw an ad in the paper, I think it was SEDPEX, a combination of SEDCO and Petro-Canada, and they were here interviewing people. But where did a person have to come to be interviewed? St. John's. Why cannot the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) exercise his influence and get these people to hold interviews in other areas of the Province, in other Manpower centres? Our people do not have enough money to come to St. John's. They are unemployed and it is very expensive to drive from the remote areas of this Province to come to St. John's and some of them have spent a fortune coming in here trying to get a job in the offshore. Why does everything have to be located here in St. John's? Why does everything have to be located here? This is the St. John's government, the St. John's government, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: why do they not make this MED programme available in other parts of the Province, expand it to a few other areas so that it is more accessible to people living outside of St. John's and the Avalon Peninsula? People are looking at this government as a St. John's government, because for everything connected with the offshore you have to come to St. John's. You have to come in first to get your name on the list to demonstrate that you are a Newfoundlander, that list that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) concocted, then you have to come here to get interviewed, and then you have to come here to do that MED programme. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no member who can defend that policy that anybody trying to get a job with the offshore have to come here to St. John's. Mr. Speaker, I have recommended this to the minister a thousand times, that one should be able to get registered for employment on the offshore in any Manpower Centre throughout Newfoundland. We should be able to offer this MED course in other centres. I am not suggesting that we should be able to do it in all the centres but if we could do it in two or three centres, that would make it more available to our people, make it easier, more accessible to people, Mr. Speaker, living outside of St. John's and off the Avalon Peninsula. And the same thing with companies coming here to interview people, they should have to go to other areas of the Province, to the central part of the Province, to the West Coast of the Province, to interview people. The minister should see to it that they do it because our people cannot afford to come to St. John's, they are unemployed

MR. LUSH: they have no money to spend searching for jobs and coming in here day after day. They cannot do it. So, Mr. Speaker, they are discriminated against. They cannot be knocking on the doors of the companies every day, they cannot be knocking on the minister's door, or whoever it is who looks after this list. They cannot do that. So people outside of St. John's and the Avalon Peninsula are discriminated against and discriminated against severely, Mr. Speaker, in terms of acquiring any kind of employment related to the offshore. And the minister should take immediate steps to correct that and to ensure that people living outside of St. John's and people living off the Avalon Peninsula are given fair treatment.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for Baie Verte -
White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being tarred and feathered, I rise to associate myself with the St. John's government just referred to by the hon. gentleman who took his seat. If you look at the forty-four seats on this side of the House, eleven or twelve of them comprise the representation of the metropolitan area of St. John's; if you take those eleven or twelve seats off the total of forty-four on this side, you would have to be rather magical with numbers to say that the thirty-two or thirty-three seats which come from outside the Avalon Peninsula and are represented by members of this side of the House constitute a St. John's government.

May 10, 1983

Tape No. 1997

SD - 3

MR. RIDEOUT:

But nevertheless,
Mr. Speaker, you know, the hon. gentleman made the remark
and he will have to live with it.

Like I said, at the risk of being
tarred and feathered, I stand to make a few remarks with
the St. John's government.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there are a few things that I wanted to refer to in response to items raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) in the seven days that he spoke in the House- I believe it was six or seven days. There are a few things that I wanted to refer to in what the hon. Leader of the Opposition had to say. However, he is not in his seat today, and I am sure for good reason, and I hope that I will have another opportunity to speak on the main motion when the Leader of the Opposition is in his seat. Because I prefer to say the things that I want to say in response to the comments that he made when he is in his seat, I prefer not to say them when he is not here, I prefer not to say them when he is not present, So I hope that I will have another opportunity to speak on the main motion sometime in the next week or two or three, whenever it comes up, and I hope at that time he will be in his seat and then I can say them.

Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that, you know, the Leader of the Opposition, keeps making remarks like weasel, worm, and squirm, crawl and all this kind of stuff, but I will have some things to say about that when he is in his seat, when I speak on the main motion a little later on.

To get to the gist of what I want to say today, we are speaking on the non-confidence motion that was put down by the hon. gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) yesterday. The hon. gentleman spoke, in total, Mr. Speaker, in the House for an hour and a half yesterday, and he had absolutely nothing to say.

The hon. gentleman was ill-prepared, he stumbled, he fumbled, he stuttered, and he finally fell down. When he lost whatever preparation he had, whatever

MR. RIDEOUT: notes he had, and this is the critic now for the Opposition, the Finance critic for the Opposition who introduced this non-confidence motion yesterday and he was so ill-prepared, he did so much stumbling, he did so much fumbling, he lost his notes, he forgot what year we were in, he forgot what Budget we were talking about, and finally, Mr. Speaker, he had to give up in disgust. Finally the hon. gentleman was so frustrated with himself and with his lack of preparation that he had to give up in disgust. The only things that he could zero in on were personal attacks on the Premier himself. Every now and then when somebody would say something the hon. gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) would lash out in the most vicious, mean manner, Mr. Speaker, with personal attacks on the Premier himself. And that, Mr. Speaker, to me is the last refuge of a frustrated person. If you cannot stand in your place in this House, or anywhere else in the Province for that matter, and debate issues and make your points on issues and make your points on policy or lack of policy, then it seems to me to be the final straw of frustration when you have to try to make your points by a vicious personal attack on an individual.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: And that is exactly what the hon. gentleman who introduced this non-confidence motion yesterday did. He did nothing else only spend, I would say, about 75 per cent or 80 per cent of his time in a vicious personal attack on the Premier.

MR. CALLAN: Is this not a personal attack on the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder)?

MR. RIDEOUT: He has another chance to speak, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure he will reply if he so wishes.

They talk, Mr. Speaker, about report cards. I have heard hon. gentlemen on the other side talk about some famous report cards that may or may not be around the Province in certain circles these days. Well, let me remind the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker-- they say that the report cards are completed, they say that the report cards are done up, they say they are signed, they are all just laid to one side, they say the report cards are completed - let me remind the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, that they are only yet in the first semester. Let us wait until we get to the graduation and then look at the report cards. Because then there will probably be a different mark on the report cards. There are a lot of report cards, Mr. Speaker, that could be done up about this administration or previous administrations, in the first quarter, the first year or whatever, of that particular administration. But in doing up the report card early, Mr. Speaker, one is tempted to draw all the final conclusions now, and the final conclusions that one draws now and the conclusions that will be drawn three and a half or four years from now when the graduation exercise takes place, Mr. Speaker, that may be a horse of a different colour.

So, the hon. gentlemen can talk about report cards. They can get all psyched up

MR. RIDEOUT: about report cards, but the election, Mr. Speaker, as I have been told many times in my short political career, is not going to be tomorrow. So it is just as well for them to forget the report card.

MR. WARREN: You are lucky the election is not tomorrow.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, the hon. gentleman said to me yesterday about being "lucky." You know, I am not very much concerned about whether I am lucky or unlucky in political life. I went back to the district that I first got elected in in 1975 as a Liberal and ran as a Tory and got re-elected. I did not try to sneak off to some other district that might be more favourable, Mr. Speaker. I did not do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I went back where it was considered impossible and I did it and I am here, Mr. Speaker. And I will go back again if I decide to seek public office. If I decide to seek public office again, Mr. Speaker, it will be in White Bay, it will be on the Baie Verte Peninsula, it will be in the part of part of this Province where I was born, raised, educated and grew up and where I intend, God willing, to die. That is where I will be elected if I seek public office again. I will not run away from the people whom I grew up with. So the hon.

MR. RIDEOUT: gentleman can forget about me being worried, or scared, or whatever. Like I told him yesterday when he dodged across the House and said, "Boy, you are in some trouble." I said, "My son, I was in trouble when the last election was called. I am not even supposed to be here. I was not even supposed to have survived it." Well, Mr. Speaker, I survived it. And when the next election comes, if I decide to seek public office again, we will see what happens after polling day. We will see what happens. I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of missing any sleep over the next three and a half or four years about what is going to happen in the next election. I will go on in my own humble, perhaps stunned, irrelevant way, of doing what I can for the people who I represent. I will go on doing that. And then when the time comes, not now, you do not do up report cards in the first semester, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes you do.

MR. RIDEOUT: - you do them but you do not put the final tally on them. You do not make your judgements now. Then when the time comes, Mr. Speaker, I will let the people judge just as they did the last time, Mr. Speaker, and I have confidence in the faith of the people and I will happily live by that. I am not a bit concerned, Mr. Speaker, not a bit concerned so the hon. gentlemen are not going to upset me, or rile me or get my dander up by saying that kind of thing. Mr. Speaker, my philosophy is we are here today and gone tomorrow. So you might as well do the best you can while you are here. We are here for a short time, perhaps it might be a long time, but do the best you can while you are here. So I am not worried about that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me have a few words to say about Baie Verte since I just briefly referred to the great people, the open-minded, reasonable people who live on the Baie Verte Peninsula and in White Bay let me have a word or two to say about Baie Verte. Because I have noticed recently some little darts coming from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) as only the Leader of the Opposition can shoot darts. I have noticed him, he did not get into any great debate in the seven wasted days that he spoke in the House. He did not get into any great debate about Baie Verte in particular or about anything in particular other than innuendo and half-truths and all that kind of stuff. But he did every now and then make reference to Baie Verte and to a few other places in the Province. He did every now and then make reference to the mining industry. Ever so veiled but every now and then he would make a very veiled reference to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say in this House, as I have said in other parts of the Province from time to time, Baie Verte is a miracle in the making. Eighteen months to two years ago Baie Verte was a disaster and that is why you do not hear too much except the guarded word every now and then from the Leader of the Opposition. That is why you do not hear too much about Baie Verte. Because every day now that that mine survives is a day closer to its making, it is a day closer to the miracle finally coming to fruition. And I am very proud of that, Mr. Speaker, because when the going was tough the people of Baie Verte hung in there. There were those who said that we were

MR. RIDEOUT:

building a stack of cards on sand when we talked about putting together that operation in Baie Verte. There were those who were continually the pessimists and said, 'It cannot survive, it will not survive.' There were those who said, 'You are taking useless, unreasonable risks with the taxpayers' money.' And the biggest problem we had as a Province and as a people, because the people of Baie Verte were very much involved in it all along, was convincing the Government of Canada that this place had a chance to make it. I have said before and I will say again, Mr. Speaker, that we are very, very thankful for the role that they played in helping us put that project together, without the help of the federal government it could not have been done - I never have been hesitant in saying that and I never will - but the biggest stumbling block that we had in the whole thing was convincing those people, especially at the bureaucratic level, federally, that this is a risk we are taking, that the \$12 million or \$14 million that we will put into Baie Verte mines would only be \$12 million or \$14 million that would have been spent on UIC payments \$12 million or \$14 million that would have been spent on mobility grants to go to other parts of the country - to other parts of the country, I might add, where the mining industry was equally as sick. So this is a risk, yes, a great risk, but it is a risk worth taking. And what do we have? What is the situation May 11, 1983, Mr. Speaker? We have not been doing very much boasting or blowing about it but the people of Baie Verte know. The situation today is that there are over 200 people employed at that operation - I believe it is 176 hourly paid and 35 or 40 staff - where this time last year there was a caretaker crew of twelve or fourteen. What is the long term situation

MR. RIDEOUT: as it relates to that operation,
Mr. Speaker? We do not hear too much about that.

MR. CALLAN: It is rough, I would say.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, the hon. gentleman, Mr.
Speaker, will have to eat his words, I am sorry.

MR. CALLAN: You worked hard for Buchans.

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not represent Buchans.
If the hon. gentleman could keep quiet I will continue
my few humble remarks, Mr. Speaker.

What is the long-term future facing that operation? We know, Mr. Speaker, that the asbestos markets have continuously improved all through 1983, we know there has been strengthening of the asbestos market through 1983, we we know that the asbestos market is predicted to improve even further in the second half of 1983, we know, Mr. Speaker, that the new operators have done a fantastic job. - You can go out and talk to any of the 200 people who work there now, talk to anybody in the community who worked there the veterans who were there for eighteen or twenty years and they will tell you that they never saw an operation run so well, so efficiently, so productive as this operation has been run. We know that they have made a gigantic effort in trying to market the Baie Verte fibre in parts of the world where the Baie Verte fibre was never known before. We know that. Previous to the shut-down the Baie Verte fibre was marketed only to the Eternit Group of Companies in Belgium and to Johns-Manville themselves, two customers using 78,000 tons of fibre that was produced there per year. What is happening now, Mr. Speaker - and, remember, this new company have only been in operation since October of last year - what is happening now is that the fibre is being shipped out to fifty consumers, Mr. Speaker, in thirty different countries in the world. The fibre is no longer a fibre

May 10, 1983

Tape No. 2001

MJ - 3

MR. RIDEOUT: that nobody knows, a gigantic marketing effort has been undertaken and, Mr. Speaker, it is paying off. The order book for that company looks tremendous for the second half of 1983 and on into 1984 and there after. Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge and you know when you

MR. RIDEOUT:

make those kinds of decisions and it still falls flat on its face you have to take the result of that fall out. But I suppose if you make those kinds of decisions and it is a success then you can say something positive about that as well.

We are on the verge, Mr. Speaker, of seeing in Baie Verte a major miracle. I never thought that it would happen. I know the people of the area never thought it would happen. With all the pessimism, with all the bad words that were said about the proposed new operator, people just did not know what to think, Mr. Speaker, but now it is there, it is operating and what do we get? The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) talks about - the only thing he will say about Baie Verte, I have not heard him say anything positive, the only thing he will say about Baie Verte is, 'What about work sharing?' Now, Mr. Speaker, we have answered that question to the people who have asked us, and work sharing is certainly something that I have a great deal of sympathy for and I see no reason why it could not be put in place. But we have to face reality, Mr. Speaker, we have to face facts. We cannot be like the Leader of the Opposition and get up and say, 'What about work sharing?' and not answer the question. When we are asked about work sharing we have to answer the question. And the answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is that the collective agreement between the Steelworkers of America and the operator of the mine says very simply, in plain, everyday language, that anybody who is hired back to the property has to be hired back on the basis of seniority. Those are not my words, those are not the words of somebody who just invented them, they are in the collective agreement that was ratified when the new operators took over last October and it is a two year agreement. And, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, it

MR. RIDEOUT: is quite normal. It is quite normal that a seniority clause for layoffs and hirings would be in any collective agreement.

So while we can talk about work sharing, while we can support work sharing, while we can believe in the concept of work sharing, if there is going to be any work sharing then it is something that is going to have to be worked out between the employer and the representatives of the employee. The federal government or provincial government cannot go into Baie Verte and say to Baie Verte Mines, 'Institute a work sharing programme,' and if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) were being totally honest and aboveboard to people who question him about it, he would say that. We cannot go into that operation and say, 'You must.' We can go in and say, 'We would like, we encourage you.' But if neither one of the parties to the agreement agree that they are going to do away with the seniority clause and go on a work sharing programme then it cannot be done. It is as simple as that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that answers the little innuendo that from time to time the Leader of the Opposition likes to slip across the floor - and not only slip across the floor, Mr. Speaker, but the kind of little innuendo that he likes to leave with people out there in the field, when he is talking to them in person or over the phone or whatever, he likes to leave the impression that, you know, if the government would only institute a work sharing programme, you could have that work sharing programme tomorrow. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not so. That is not so. It can only be done if both parties to that collective agreement - and the government is not a party, by the way, to the collective agreement -

MR. RIDEOUT: it can only be done if both parties to the collective agreement want to mutually agree to do it. So therefore, the truth should be known and the truth should be told.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the story of what is going on in Baie Verte at the moment.

MR. RIDEOUT:

All indications from the marketing prospects, from the latest update that we have from the company, that in another month or two - the market is still improving tremendously - we could have 400, 450 people working at that operation again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that is something to sing about. It is something to be proud about. It is certainly not something to hang one's head about. And this government, Mr. Speaker - let me say this - when nobody else believed that Baie Verte had a chance, when a lot of the former employees themselves did not believe that Baie Verte had a chance, when people in many sectors of society in this Province did not believe that Baie Verte had a chance, we kept going. We went through one potential operator after another, Brinco, the Lake Group, Lake Asbestos Group in Quebec. And when it came to the final crunch of having to make a decision to expropriate or not to expropriate when we had an operator we were not lacking, Mr. Speaker. And when it came to keeping contact with the federal government and trying to persuade them that this operation had a chance for a new lease on life we did not back off. So when all the odds were against us we kept plugging on. I believe it was the gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) yesterday who said that this government has got to roll up its sleeves and get on with the job. Well, Mr. Speaker, we did roll up our sleeves. We had to roll up the sleeves of everybody that we were in contact with, the federal government, the union people, the townspeople, new operators, marketing potentials, the previous owners and we had to finally take the ultimate step of doing something that no government wants to do and does not do very lightly, and that is to give the people of Baie Verte the chance we had, to expropriate the property.

MR. RIDEOUT:

So, Mr. Speaker, let nobody - and I will stand anywhere in this Province, this House, Baie Verte or anywhere - let nobody point the finger and say that we did not roll up our sleeves. Because there is a bit of a success story there, Mr. Speaker, you do not hear much of it. Because there is a bit of a success story you do not hear a lot of questions about it. Because it is a bit of a success story you only hear innuendo. Well, that is the story, Mr. Speaker, and I am very, very confident as is this government that we will succeed and that the future of Baie Verte will be secure for another ten or fifteen years or whatever the ore potential is in the ground.

So, they talk about rolling up sleeves, Mr. Speaker, and getting on with the job. Well we did and not only have we done that in this particular area but we have done it in many, many other areas. So, when the hon. gentleman suggests that there is going to be great difficulty for people on this side to get up and defend the budget and defend the government, Mr. Speaker,

MR. RIDEOUT: I have no problem whatsoever, no problem whatsoever in defending the actions of this government as far as they relate to my district and the Province as a whole, no problem whatsoever in defending this budget, Mr. Speaker. You kind of get sick and tired of listening, every now and then, to people talking about cutbacks in hospital care in this Province - government cutting back the hospital budget. Mr. Speaker, it is just not true. The fact of the matter is that hospitals in this Province have 12 per cent more money to operate than they had last year. Now how can a 12 per cent increase be a cutback? I mean, you know, it boggles one's imagination how a 12 per cent increase could be a cutback. Now it might not be what they want, Mr. Speaker, they might have wanted 26 per cent or 30 per cent, they may have wanted \$100 million but how can you call a 12 per cent increase in the operating budget of hospitals a cutback. It is not a cutback. It is an increase. I understand that in many provinces in this country, some of the wealthier provinces have increased their hospital budgets over last year like 6.6 per cent in one case and 7 per cent or 8 per cent in another case and yet day after day you hear about the cutbacks of the Province to the hospital boards to operate their hospitals. There was no cutback. The hospitals in this Province received 12 per cent more money than they had last year and 12 per cent more money than last year is not a cutback. That would be a cutback if it was a minus 12 per cent. But my understanding and the budget figures prove me out it is a plus 12 per cent. So a plus 12 per cent, Mr. Speaker, is not a cutback. Yet day after day you hear that kind of thing. I have heard people in this House and outside this House talk

MR. RIDEOUT: about the alleged \$20 million we saved during the teachers' strike. And I say the alleged, Mr. Speaker, \$20 million that we saved during the teachers' strike because it depends on who you talk to what the numbers really are. I have heard \$14 million, I have heard \$18 million, I have heard up as high as \$20 million. But anyway there are people who are saying now, 'Why do you not take the money that you saved and give it to the hospitals? The hospitals already have a 12 per cent increase over last year but they have problems, they say. So why not take the \$20 million that you saved on the teachers' strike and give it to the hospitals?' Well, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that this Province has not saved one cent on the teachers' strike, not a copper, not a penny, not a nickel. Why? Because we were budgeting to borrow \$28 million on our current account. We were budgeting to borrow, if they had stayed in and worked on through we would have had to borrow up to \$28 million so we could pay our current account bills. Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that there have been some savings, if there is anybody who saves, Mr. Speaker, it is the taxpayer of our Province because hopefully we will not have to borrow the \$28 million that we had to put on current account, hopefully we will not have to do that. So there has been no saving, Mr. Speaker. So how people can talk about savings and putting the money elsewhere is just ludicrous, Mr. Speaker, they just do not know what they are talking about.

The hon. gentleman from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) said that we taxed everything. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that we have. I listened to the Opposition day after day and I have no problem with it, it is their role but I listen to them day after day saying, 'We should have the best student aid programme in Canada. We

MR. RIDEOUT: should have the best hospital care programme in Canada. We should have the best social assistance programme in Canada. We should have the best highways in Canada. We should have the best schools in Canada. We should have the best vocational schools in Canada. We should have the best in the country, Mr. Speaker, in all aspects of our life. Now that is a noble goal. I do not think there is anybody who would disagree with that, Mr. Speaker. But where is the piper who must pay? It is fine to say we should have the best of all those programmes, and I would love to be able to say that too that we should have the best of all those programmes, but who is going to pay? If you do anything to bring student aid programmes in line or to bring hospital expenditure in line then you know you are the devil, you are the worst that ever came on the face of the earth. But yet you are supposed to have all those great programmes and out of the other side of his mouth the hon. gentleman can say that we are the most heavily taxed people in Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we are. I suppose we are. Because what are we getting to pay for those services from the resources that this Province has? If we do not get the money from the taxpayers, if we do not get the money in transfer payments, where are we going to get those dollars, Mr. Speaker? They just do not grow on trees. You cannot go out behind Confederation Building and pluck it off. It has got to come from somewhere. But yet the history of this Province has been such that our return on resource development has not been adequate so that we can have this great social machine that we all want to have and that we all want to support. So you cannot say, "Let us have more of it," and on the other side of your mouth you cannot say, "Well, you have to cut back taxes, we are already the most heavily taxes people in Canada." You just cannot have it both ways.

MR. RIDEOUT: Unfortunately we are, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most heavily taxed people in this country. But until such time, and this has got to be clearly understood, until such time as this Province is able to get its hands on a new chunk of revenue to be able to offset the cost of those programmes then I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, but it is going to continue. It is going to have to continue if we are going to have an semblance of a social programme at all. It is going to have to continue.

We can do that, Mr. Speaker. There are people who say we put all our eggs in the one basket and we talk about the one big boom, we are still hoping for the one big boom. That is not the philosophy of this government, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of this government is not one big boom and one big bust, the philosophy of this government is mini booms, the philosophy of this government is a fair return on hydro power, a fair return on offshore resources, a fair return from the forestry, a fair return from the fishery, develop tourism, it is resource development. That is the philosophy of this government. It is not one big boom and have it over with and be just as poor twenty years down the road.. That is what this government is trying to avoid, Mr. Speaker. That is the very reason and the very essence of what we are trying to achieve in every bargaining session that has ever taken place with regard to the offshore or Upper Churchill or whatever. It is to get away from the philosophy of one big boom and one big bust, so that we have a mini boom and that all the things that we have been endowed with in this Province come together so that one day, Mr. Speaker, we will not be the most heavily taxed people in the country, so that one day we will be able to

MR. RIDEOUT:

provide a standard of living, whether it be in social programmes or other programmes that are comparable to what you can find anywhere else in the country. But to expect this Province to be able to do it, as the hon. gentleman suggests, to suggest that this Province can do it and at the same time have taxes lower than anywhere else in Canada, Mr. Speaker, it is just not factual, it just cannot be substantiated. And the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, have been duped long enough. They know the difference. The people of this Province know the difference. They know it cannot be done and it will not be done and it will only be done by continuing on the road that this administration has been on for the last three years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it has been agreed that we call it 6:00 o'clock. So I will move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bellevue has adjourned the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

On motion, the House do adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday, May 11, at 3:00 P.M.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

May 10, 1983

Tabled 16 May '83

Question # 40
Order Paper - March 21-83

In the Honourable House of Assembly

Question: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Communications to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

List of names and salaries of Executive Assistants, Parliamentary Assistants and Public Relations Specialists appointed to the Minister's staff for the fiscal years 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982.

Answer: Honourable Norman E. Doyle (Minister Responsible for Communications):

There were no appointments of persons in the classifications identified by the Honourable Member in any of the fiscal years beginning in 1979, 1980, 1981 or 1982.

A Special Assistant to the Minister, Mr. Joseph Myers, was appointed during the 1982-'83 fiscal year during which period he was paid \$20,011.06

Tabled 10 May 83

In the Honourable House of Assembly

Question: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Communications to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

The cost of renovations to Minister's office in the fiscal years 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982.

Answer: The Honourable Norman E. Doyle, Minister Responsible for Communications:

As the Honourable Member will be aware, the responsibility for communications matters originally resided with the Minister of Transportation and Communications who had no separate office from which to discharge his responsibilities in the Communications field. Since my appointment as Minister Responsible for Communications, there have been no renovations made to the offices assigned to me.

Talled 10 May '83

ORDERS OF THE DAY 24/83 APRIL 21, 1983

QUESTION 113

Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Details of the amount of money his Department has taken in on a monthly basis as a result of the Retail Sales Tax for the years 1980 and 1981.

ANSWER

Retail Sales Tax Receipts for 1980 and 1981 are attached.

Tabled 10 May '83

REPLY TO QUESTION 113
ORDERS OF THE DAY
21 APRIL 1983
RETAIL SALES TAX RECEIPTS

	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
January	21,865,441	23,501,666
February	14,733,708	16,866,804
March	15,291,478	20,816,826
April	16,612,572	19,312,664
May	19,717,881	20,711,736
June	19,278,601	21,620,470
July	20,526,478	16,012,151
August	24,250,813	26,237,374
September	20,051,636	22,130,833
October	21,387,236	21,542,232
November	20,647,703	21,123,946
December	<u>22,081,357</u>	<u>19,740,531</u>
	<u>236,444,904</u>	<u>249,849,233</u>

Talled 10 May '83

ORDERS OF THE DAY 18/83 APRIL 13, 1983

Question 99

Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

The names of all Directors and consultants who have received fees and paid expenses from the Newfoundland Liquor Commission for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982 and why these amounts were paid.

ANSWER

Newfoundland Liquor Corporation
Directors Fees and Expenses
Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1982

Name

Frederick Russell	Attendance of Directors Meetings	\$ 605.00
Dorothy Robbins	Attendance of Directors Meetings	505.00
Charles White	Attendance of Directors Meetings	430.00
Meals		<u>1,140.12</u>
		<u>\$2,680.12</u>

Newfoundland Liquor Corporation
Consultants Fees
Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1982

Dr. Langford	Wine Consultant	\$3,000.00
B. & M. Services	Research and preparation for sketches for branch #2 on Elizabeth Avenue East	525.00
Elaine Squires	Interior design at branch #2 on Elizabeth Avenue East	<u>25.00</u>
		<u>\$2,550.00</u>

Talked 10 May '83

REPLY TO QUESTION ASKED THE HONOURABLE PREMIER RE WATCHMEN IN THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BY THE MEMBER OF BELLEVUE ON MAY 9, 1983.

In order to fully appreciate the funding situation with respect to the Watchman positions it is necessary to understand the manner in which the Salary Details document is put together.

On pages 88 & 89 of the Salary Details document are listed all permanent approved positions for the budget activity entitled "Support Services". There are five operational groupings included in this area with permanent positions and related annual salary costs as follows:

<u>Operational Grouping</u>	<u>No. of Positions</u>	<u>Annual Cost</u>
Building & Grounds Maintenance	27	\$ 424,602
Security	53	748,289
Purchasing & Control	10	163,466
Stockroom Operations	56	887,213
Inspection Station/Scale Operations	35	<u>549,670</u>
		<u>\$2,773,240</u>

The listing in the Salary Details attempts to show the permanent approved staff complement with the related annual cost if those positions were all filled on a twelve month basis.

At the end of the list for "Support Services" on page 89, the provisions for temporary employees and overtime, being \$250,000 and \$117,000 respectively, are also shown. Thus, if all permanent positions were filled for the full year, requirement for "Support Services" would be as follows:

Permanent Positions	\$2,773,240
Temporary Employees	250,000
Overtime	<u>117,000</u>
	<u>\$3,140,240</u>

.../2

However, if one looks at the very end of the section for "Support Services" on page 89, an item called "New positions, reclassifications, etc." appears with a negative amount i.e. a reduction, of \$630,240. This brings the budgeted provision for "Support Services" down to \$2,510,000 which is, in fact, the amount that appears in the Expenditure and Revenue Details document on page 128 as the salary component for "Support Services".

This reduction of \$630,240 represents the net of several items including the provision for step increases, reclassifications, new positions (if any) and perhaps most importantly in this case, savings due to vacancies. The great bulk of this number is obviously attributable to the vacancy savings that will accrue as a result of Government's decision to declare these positions redundant. There are, however, a significant number of other positions in this area which are currently vacant and will probably remain that way throughout the coming year and these will also contribute to the "offset" of \$630,240 shown in the Salary Details.

It should be noted that the vast majority of salary groupings listed in the Salary Details document have these negative "offsets" at the end and in all cases these reflect estimated savings due to vacant positions. The Salary Details document is meant to show, at a given point in time, the approved staff complement of Government departments and the associated salary costs, however, in determining the amounts that will actually go into the Estimates Government obviously takes account of projected savings due to the vacancy factor.