



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 44

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Tuesday, 13 November 1984

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Now that he is back he has had an opportunity, I am sure, to go through Mr. Wilson's economic statement very carefully. I wonder if he would inform this hon. House when the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador will be commenting in detail on this statement, whether the government is going to roll over and play dead and avoid making any representation upon the adverse impacts that this minibudget will have upon this Province, and whether he agrees with the Premier that it is too early to say whether changes in programmes such as the unemployment insurance programme will have an adverse effect on this Province.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I was not here on Friday, but I believe it was on Friday the Premier discussed the statement in some detail in the House in response to questions put by the Opposition, and I believe that most people felt that the whole matter had been given quite an exposition at that time.

If there are any specific areas that the Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Barry) is unclear on, I will do my best to try to add something. But, as I say, that was my understanding although, obviously, I did not hear the remarks made.

In terms of rolling over and playing dead, I do not think that this government has ever rolled over and played dead and I do not think that is our plan for the future. As a matter of fact, I seem to remember that the Opposition said that we have been too sparky, we have been too cracky-like, we have been too confrontational, I think was the word used. So I think that rolling over and playing dead is not something that we have done, and it is a rather unique challenge to have thrown at us. But I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that we will not roll over and play dead on any matter that is of concern to the people of this Province. In regard to whether I agree with the Premier in certain assessments, yes, I usually do agree with the Premier. He usually has the right approach to matters, he usually has a right analysis of matters done, and, in most case, I must say, I am not only forced, but I am glad to agree with him.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, if I understand the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) correctly he is saying that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador does not intend to prepare a detailed response to the statement by Mr. Wilson, the economic statement or minibudget. Is this what the minister is telling this hon. House? And would the minister tell us whether this is a conscious change of

approach from the approach that government has taken with respect to other budgets, where not only have they prepared statements but they have been prepared to respond immediately upon receipt of a budget, or a minibudget, or an economic statement, and whether, as the minister pointed out, this decision to be less confrontationist has anything to do with the fact that there is now a Conservative government, a Tory government in Ottawa as opposed to a Liberal government? Is this the reason and the basis for neither making a detailed response nor engaging in any fashion, in any manner, in any way in confrontation? Is it because there is a purely partisan, political motivation here underway?

And with respect to agreeing with the Premier, do we understand the minister correctly, that he agrees with the general thrust of the minibudget prepared by Mr. Wilson? Is this what the minister is saying?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, on the latter point an emphatic yes, we agree with the thrust absolutely and without any hesitation whatever. It is an extremely good thrust. At last we are going to get some clear analysis and clear policies on the economic mess that this country is in. And I think that everyone, even members opposite - I presume they read newspapers, I presume they look at television, I presume they hear radio, I presume they talk to people, I presume they travel around and even go abroad sometimes and hear what people are saying - I think even members of the Opposition understand that this country is in a total and utter mess that has to be

straightened out, and it is in a mess because of federal policies. So the fact that there are going to be new thrusts at the federal level, we are overjoyed, we are absolutely delighted about it, and we say, about time!

Now, obviously, no one can bring about a change in the situation such as we have overnight. It is going to take a lot of hard work, and I must say that, from what I have been exposed to now, I am impressed by the amount of work that has already gone on in Ottawa in a short period of two months. And in terms of making a response to what has been done to date, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) knows that immediately after the federal Finance Minister (Mr. Wilson) brought down his statement he had already arranged for the provincial Finance Ministers and Treasurers to meet with him, which we did, and we discussed in considerable detail, although obviously it had to be on a general basis because it was very shortly after his statement, but we did discuss in considerable detail after he had expanded on his statement somewhat in that private meeting and gave some clearer and larger ideas of what he has in mind, we did respond in detail to what he stated.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition also knows that at this very moment the Premier of this Province, in association with other Premiers, is meeting with the Prime Minister to go into the same types of matters. To say, therefore, that we are not responding to what the federal government has done in the short time they have been in power and have been able to get information from the federal public service and so on, is very far from the truth. We have already responded in two vital ways and we will

continue to respond as needs be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, I think, brought up another point. It just slips my mind at the time, but if he will remind me, I will certainly try to answer that also.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the point I mentioned that the minister did not deal with is whether his decision to play dead, to be quiet, to be a pussycat, is because there has been a change of government, and was the previous ranting and roaring based upon the fact that there was a government of a different stripe in Ottawa rather than because this government disagreed with the policies or the approaches of that government on any principled basis? And I would like to ask the minister, since he agrees with this statement and approach by Mr. Wilson, does he believe that the 40-odd thousand unemployed Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will agree with this approach? Has the minister been able to confirm, speaking about reading the newspapers, the report in *The Globe and Mail*, that when you pull together all these various items, and it is going to take weeks to do it with exactitude, you are talking about slashing some \$428 million from federal programmes for the unemployed? Does the minister agree with, specifically, cutting industrial incentive programmes by \$200 million? Does the minister agree with cutting the unemployment insurance programme by \$30 million because of the way they deal with employment pension income, \$60 million because of the way they deal with separation payments,

\$200 million because of certain employment entitlement criteria being changed, \$5.8 million with respect to shortening the period within which people will be eligible, \$2.8 million in changes to the mobility programme, \$1.3 million programme delivery? Does the minister agree with all of these cuts, and would he tell the House what impact they will have upon the unemployed of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) reminded me about the third point, because I think I can get in a good crack there. He asked if our response is different because the P.C. Party is in power in Ottawa. I can tell him quite straightforwardly that yes, it is different. Our response is totally different because the P.C. Party and the attitude of the P.C. Party is totally different from the last one. The party last time around was impossible to deal with. They had a so-called philosopher king there who had his own - I think someone remarked on it a little while ago; it might have been in Question Period in the House of Commons that I had a chance to look at on T.V. when I was up there the other day - twisted view of the Canadian confederation. And I think that, even though the media whilst Mr. Trudeau was in power was very loathe to say this, if you read the media since the new party has come into power in Ottawa, all the media are saying the same thing, He did a hopeless job. Mr. Trudeau did a hopeless job. He was confrontational. He caused unnecessary strife and unnecessary tensions throughout Canada. Everyone is saying that. Everyone

has now seen the light that this party and provincial parties like it have seen for years. Because we had to deal with that type of federal government, we knew what an impossible task it was. So the fact that we are taking a different attitude, yes, we are, we are finally dealing with some sensible people in Ottawa.

Now, in terms of unemployment insurance, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) says there are going to be all these changes to UI and he is implying by that that all these changes are necessarily negative. I do not think we have all the details as to exactly what those changes are going to be. There are going to be changes in eligibility, and we do not know exactly what those changes are. The way it has been presented to us, but we need the details, is that the eligibility does need tightening up, that there are defects in the present regulations and that in tightening these up there will be a savings associated with it. Now, I think that hon. members will understand that the UI was never meant as a giveaway. The UI was meant to tide people over temporary periods of unemployment and, also, to some extent, to help them to gain new skills and new work abilities. It seems that over the years the UI system may have gotten sloppy and is not performing exactly toward the objectives for which it was originally put in place and this is going to be reviewed. Now, that is just one example.

As I say, we do not have the specifics yet. I suspect strongly that when all this exercise is completed it will not have that negative an effect on the workers in this Province and, indeed, the UI programme probably will be more directed to their benefit, that is, it will get them back to work

more quickly than the present arrangement is doing.

Now, in terms of incentive programmes again the same attitude is coming through from the Opposition, that any change we must raise the flags, everything is terrible. We have to change. Things have not be going well. I hope that over the next few months we will be able to drum that thought into the Opposition opposite, that things have not been going well and there has to be change. If we go on as we are, if we do not change, if we leave things exactly as they have been for the last number of years, we will never get anywhere. We have to change these incentive programmes and make them more effective, and one of the big changes that has to be made is that the private sector has to pick up the ball and run with it. We now know that if we rely unduly, as the previous Liberal administration did, on the public sector, it will not achieve the economic development that other countries are achieving which are not taking that route.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has said that he does not yet know what the changes to the UI programme are or what their effect will be, and yet he is saying that he agrees with Mr. Wilson and Mr. Mulroney. I ask the minister does this mean that he and his government, the government of this Province are giving a blank cheque, a blank Tory cheque to Mr. Mulroney and to Mr. Wilson? And would the minister at least admit, would he have the honesty and decency to admit to the unemployed of this Province that there is going to be

hundreds of millions of dollars less paid out to the unemployed? Would the minister have the honesty to admit that? And would the minister indicate whether he agrees with the statement by Mr. Wilson that these cuts, these hundreds of millions of dollars in cuts are okay because the unemployed are not looking hard enough for jobs?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that there are millions and millions of dollars less in UI payments in Canada and in this Province. I hope there are no UI payments in Canada and in this Province on the basis that these people who are now drawing UI will be given jobs, will be given employment. And that is the whole thrust of the new administration in Canada. There has been a failure to create employment in Canada and the failure has largely been due to the miserable economic policies of the previous government. Now, this present government is going to change those economic policies: It is going to attempt, in association with the private sector, with labour, with special interest groups and so on and so forth, to get employment going in this Province, and when they do I hope UI payments will decrease and I hope there will be no need for UI payments. So that is the main thrust.

Now the other point - and this is what the Leader of Opposition (Mr. Barry) is trying to hang his hat on, some small point - there will be some decreases in UI payments because the system is now not 100 per cent efficient and there are going to be corrections brought in so that it will be more efficient. As further details

come in we will be in a position to lay out, if it is not done directly done by the federal, what those changes will be to make it more efficient. So when we say that we agree with the thrust without knowing the details, that is it, we agree with the principle, we agree with the idea, we agree with the thrust, the thought, and we will then look at the details and if there is any particular part of the details that we do not agree with we will say so.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed towards the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) although I am not entirely sure he is capable of answering it, so if any other minister wishes to he can jump in.

In a recent television interview the Premier of the Province, when asked what interventions he would make in behalf of the mill in Corner Brook if no private buyer were found to take it over, indicated that they were willing to see the mill close rather than make any direct intervention on the part of the government. In view of interventions that this government has made over the last couple of years, specifically with regard to the fishing industry which it has put quite a bit of the people's money into and has assumed responsibility in that particular industry, I would like to know if this is a new policy on the part of the government, that they are not going to intervene directly in the economy in the future, or whether it is a particular application to Corner Brook for some things that the

people of Corner Brook may or may not have done.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to welcome the hon. member to the House and I do so most sincerely.

In regard to his question, I think the terms in which it was posed really now make it not very relevant because the mill in Corner Brook is in actual fact in new private hands. So whether or not government would have done something if that had not happened I think is so hypothetical that really it is not possible to respond to it in any sensible way.

On the bigger question, the hon. the member I think is asking have we a new policy that government will not intervene in business in this Province? I think our approach has always been that we will intervene the least possible. We will only intervene if private business cannot do the job but the job needs to be done. We will intervene in that respect, but reluctantly and with care. Secondly, we will intervene where it is obvious that government has a role to play rather than the private sector; for instance, in utilities, in the generation and distribution of electricity and so on and so forth, mainly the generation, I suppose. That is not appropriate, strictly speaking, in our type of milieu for the private sector, so that we intervene and then it is a public sector activity. But in the ordinary type of business activity we will only intervene if there is no credible private sector

mechanism to do the job.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, I want to get back on the unemployment insurance cuts again. Could the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) assure this House that the administration of which he is a part will not agree to any cuts or any changes in the eligibility of applicants for unemployment insurance until the jobs are out there? The hon. gentleman is indicating that Mr. Wilson and the Tories are not satisfied that people are making enough effort to look for jobs and that is one of the reasons they are tightening up. Could the hon. gentleman assure this House and assure the unemployed in this Province that there will be no cuts, that this administration will not agree to any cuts or any changes until the jobs opportunities are there for people to take advantage of?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly certain what perspective the hon. member, former House Leader - I have difficulty in referring to the hon. member. I referred to him for quite a long time as Leader of the Opposition, and that is the thought that springs to mind when I see the hon. member. But in any case, the hon. member, I do not know what perspective he brought to the statements in regard to UI. I suspect he brought to what was said the thought that there will be people who should be eligible will be cut off the rolls. Well now, that is not the perspective I brought to what I heard. What I heard was that there will be a look at the

criteria to make sure that only those legitimately eligible for UI will continue to receive it. In other words, there has been some inefficiency in the system, there has been some waste of public money, there has been some misdirection of public money in regard to the UI, not in regard to worthy and eligible people receiving UI but there seem to be a considerable possibility that there are some people receiving UI outside what was intended under the original arrangements and the original rules and that is what is to be looked at.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman inform the House if one of the items on the agenda concerning the slashes and cuts in unemployment insurance, if one of the possibilities that he keeps referring to is bringing the eligibility standard up to twenty stamps. It is now twenty and ten. Those people who have been on unemployment insurance benefits before only need ten stamps and those who are going on new applicants need twenty stamps. Is that one of the criteria that is under review that the hon. gentleman is referring to? And if it is, I believe the hon. gentleman knows that the biggest industry in Newfoundland is unemployment insurance benefits-

MR. TULK:

Since the Tories took over.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, since the Tories took over - and this year it is estimated at \$650 million. Some \$650 million

will come into this Province in the form of unemployment insurance benefits. Now if they change the criteria, as the hon. gentleman suggested, and make the entitlement twenty weeks for everybody, would that not cut that \$650 million down by approximately \$300 million coming into this Province every year? Now is the hon. gentleman happy and pleased about that?

First of all, I want to ask the hon. gentleman again to state whether that is one of the possibilities, if that is one of the items that is on the table, to require everybody to have twenty stamps instead of new applicants requiring twenty stamps and people who were on unemployment before qualifying with ten stamps? Is that one of the things that is on the table?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, it may clarify this matter somewhat if I just read a little bit from a document that was put out by the Federal President of Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotret), **Employment Assistance and Entitlement**. It states here, "The Unemployment Insurance Act provides for the establishment of an employment service and for certain entitlement criteria." In regard to the \$200 million savings being looked to in 1985/86 - not in 1984/85, the present current year, but the next fiscal year - the comment is, "Through intensified interviews this programme will provide employment assistance where required and will ensure that only those entitled will receive benefits."

So the thrust here is not to take unemployment benefits away from those who require them or who are

entitled to them, but the whole process will be assessed to make it more efficient and to make sure that implementation fits in with what the Parliament of Canada decided should be put into the programme when it passed the particular act. So that is the thrust. The hon. member opposite asked me will certain things be changed and so on during the review. We will get details of what it is proposed to change. The details will come to us; if we agree with them we will say so, if we disagree with them we will also say so.

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

All I want from the hon. gentleman is a simple yes or no answer. Was this one of the items that was discussed, making the eligibility twenty stamps for everybody, instead of twenty and ten as it is now? Would the hon. gentleman tell the House whether that matter came up? A simple answer, yes or no?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, if he has asked me if that particular matter came up in discussions with the federal minister I will say no, it did not, that particular matter did not come up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question also for the Minister of Finance. Last Friday I believe the Premier was saying that there was good co-operation between the new government in Ottawa and this government, and he also said that there is consultation taking place. I was just wondering if the Minister of Finance can advise if there was any consultation with this government when the minister responsible for post offices announced that 194 post offices in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will have the hours reduced from 40 hours a week to 30 hours a week?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there was an announcement to that affect, that there will be changes in the hours of the post office. I am not aware of it. I do not know if anyone else is aware of. The hon. member is obviously aware of it and I have no reason to doubt that he is not saying something just out of his own imagination. I think he must have gotten the information somewhere but I am not aware that there was such a change.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I will advise the hon. minister if he does not know himself that effective January 1, 1985, 194 single employee post offices in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, will have their hours reduced. Now, seeing that this government is in

bed with the government in Ottawa, will the minister take every step necessary to see that those 194 employees will be given a minimum of forty hours per week?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I can assure that, and I do not think anyone can because the post office is a federal institution. The Province does not run the post office. I can certainly assure him that we will look into this matter, if he will give us the necessary reference, and we will make sure to the extent possible that necessary postal services are given to the people of this Province.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I would like to direct a quickie to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in connection with a project that I heard is taking place down at Her Majesty's Penitentiary, that they are going to install metallic ribbon, known as razor ribbon in the penitentiary industry, around the walls of the penitentiary. It is as sharp as a razor, so I am told, so it can cut people to pieces. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if indeed it is being installed and why it is being installed?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, there are some renovations being undertaken at the penitentiary from a security

point of view, and one of them is the installation of some kind of ribbon around the perimeter. It is not, of course, intended for people who are going in to visit, or to preach, or to do whatever they can, they will continue to use the door. And it is not intended for people going out when they are going out legitimately, having served their period, having gotten a day release, going to visit their parents, going to the doctor, going wherever it happens to be. It is only intended to prohibit and discourage illegal exits by what is generally known as a prison breakout. But if any of the hon. members opposite wish to go down and visit any constituents, they will not be required to go over the razor but will be able to go in through a very comfortable door.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, Please!

The time for the Question Period has expired.

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER:

The Hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Provide For The Exemption Of Baie Verte Mines Incorporated From Tax Imposed By The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1978".

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce two bills: "An Act To Revise The Judicature Act", and "An Act To Provide For Arbitrations".

000

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could revert to Presenting Reports By Standing And Special Committees? I would like to table the Statutes and subordinate legislation which has come into effect between November 25, 1983 and November 2, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

I am assuming the hon. minister has leave to do that.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 5, Bill No. 2.
Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Boiler, Pressure Vessel And Compressed Gas Act". (Bill No. 2).

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. the minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, as I say, there are only three items in this and they were explained fairly clearly and succinctly when I introduced the bill. I answered most of the questions in my introductory remarks and with that I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Boiler, Pressure Vessel And Compressed Gas Act", (Bill No. 2), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Award Of Bravery". (Bill No. 25).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to

establish in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador an award for bravery. The hon. gentleman over on the other side can smile all he wants to. I think the first, and probably one of the most eligible applicants is going to be the member for LaPoile -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- because of his great service as Leader of the Opposition and his perseverance despite the way that he has been pushed around in recent times.

Mr. Speaker, in February of 1981 this government announced the establishment of this particular award. It is an award that is intended to offer recognition to residents of the Province who have risked their own lives and safety in performing acts of bravery and courage while rendering assistance to other people. In its physical form the design of the award, which is depicted on this pamphlet I have, is designed by a Mr. Ian Stewart of Memorial University and is unique. It is square in shape and it depicts on the obverse a stylized drama at sea symbolic of the long history of valor associated with our environment. The reverse bears the wording, 'Newfoundland and Labrador for bravery.' It is produced by the Royal Canadian mint in Ottawa. The bravery award is minted in bronze, gold plated in a matte finish and suspended from blue ribbon. The award is presented with a case for display purposes. As hon. members will see under the Act there is provision for an awards or review panel and the panel, which has been appointed for the purpose of accepting and considering nominations, consists of the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, the President of

Memorial University, the Chief of Police for the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, the Chief Superintendent of the RCMP, the Deputy Clerk of the Executive Council, the Private Secretary to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, and three members at large. Individuals and organizations are invited to nominate residents of the Province who during the current calendar year have risked their own lives and safety in the performance of acts of bravery and selfless courage. Nomination forms are available through the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Secretary for the Newfoundland and Labrador Award for Bravery at the Cabinet Secretariate.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is an award that is intended to give recognition where it is due in this Province, and particularly where we have a real marine history and acts of bravery that are second to none, and that have gone unrecognized from time to time in that particular area. It is an indication of the commitment of this government to foster, nourish and build up the social and cultural heritage of this Province and give recognition to it. I can state that the panel will be meeting very shortly with respect to nominations that are already in for the year 1983.

So it is with a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I bring this bill before the House and recommend it to the House for passage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, members of the Liberal Opposition will be supporting this bill, but I have to say we have some questions as to the necessity or the importance which should be placed on passing legislation in light of the fact that we do have bravery awards for all of Canada. The question which has to come up - I know it is a subjective thing and maybe the minister could reply to it - is would it be contemplated that any lower standards be applied to these awards than would be applied in evaluating who should obtain medals of bravery, courage and valor under the federal programme? If not, then would the minister be prepared to have the programme operate so that medals from both the Newfoundland and the federal programme could be received? Because it seems to me that what we are talking about here are those incidents which deserve special recognition because of the meritorious conduct of the person involved, and if it is of that calibre that the medal is deserved, then it will probably mean that the individual would qualify for all-Canada recognition and not just the provincial one. I think it is of advantage to this Province to have Newfoundlanders recognized in the context of all of Canada for the many acts of bravery that do occur amongst our people during every year that passes. And I would not like to see the establishment of the Newfoundland bravery award mean that we would see fewer people from this Province receiving or accepting the Canadian award because I do believe that it is good for the people of this Province to have recognition on an all-Canada basis.

I would also at this time like to make a recommendation to the minister that he might pass on to the panel reviewing this award. I

have been meaning to do this and it has slipped my mind until now, but I do not believe that the helicopter pilots who were involved in the attempt to rescue the victims of the Ocean Ranger ever got the recognition that was due them. Now I may be wrong, they may have had their names put in under the federal programme. But I can tell members of this House that from what I have learned about what took place on the early morning of February 15, after the Ocean Ranger sinking, we had a number of very brave individuals who left Torbay in helicopters knowing that they were going out into the teeth of a raging gale, much higher winds than the helicopter should have been flying in even over land, and they were heading out several hundred miles into the North Atlantic, Mr. Speaker, knowing that they were not going to be able to close down their engines. Even though there were rigs out there on which they could refuel, they knew that they would not be able to close down the helicopter engines, because apparently when winds are over a certain force the blades of the helicopters as they are slowed down, actually sever the tail rotor of the helicopter. So when these pilots left to go out there, they knew that they could touch down on the other rigs that were in the vicinity of the Ocean Ranger, but they were not going to be able to close off their helicopter engines. They would have to refuel for the return flight, and they went out there hoping that somebody was going to be able to crawl out to refuel them. In fact, we had crew members on these other oil rigs having to be tied on to crawl out on their bellies to these helicopters so they could continue the search and have enough fuel to get back to dry land.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the minister, in the course of passing on the remarks that are contained in the debate here to the review committee, might consider obtaining the names of these individuals who were involved in that heroic rescue attempt concerning the Ocean Ranger. I am giving you the facts as I have received them, I have not had the opportunity of investigating them myself, but from everything that I have seen I do believe there was very great heroism involved on the part of those helicopter pilots. Perhaps the minister would have these events looked into.

In the context of the bravery reward, Mr. Speaker, and it is only of marginal relevance, I realize, but it is something that I believe it might be appropriate to mention at this time, we have large numbers of volunteer firemen around this Province and other types of volunteers - I believe the Emergency Measures Organization has volunteers as well - and I think we should be very alert to ensuring that these individuals involved as volunteers, whom we tend we perhaps to take for granted because we expect them to be there but who are there on a volunteer basis, obtain the recognition which is their due. From time to time, in the course of what might be considered routine under certain circumstances, in the case of volunteer organizations is often, I believe, very, very heroic measures such as various rescues during the course of fighting fires and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I know this matter was reviewed a year or so ago, but I would ask the government, apart from just the medal, the award for bravery, in the context of the volunteer organizations, to make sure that there is adequate

insurance in place for these volunteers. Now, I believe this was dealt with about a year ago, but I am not sure if it has been dealt with satisfactorily from the point of view of these volunteers. A medal or an award is one thing, but that is not going to put bread on the table if these individuals happen to be injured in the course of firefighting or some other emergency service.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will leave my few remarks at that. We believe it is good to give recognition to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, but we would ask the minister to keep in mind that there is an all-Canadian award, that it is good for this Province to have people from this Province recognized in this all-Canadian context and to have their acts evaluated, really. I wonder if you can have degrees of heroism? It is, I suppose, like having degrees of pregnancy; you know, you are either a hero or you are not. But I believe they do attempt to have these gradations in evaluating heroism. I notice the Sergeant-at-Arms in the Federal House recently got the highest award, I think it is the Award of Valour, under the federal programme. I do not know if it is contemplated that there will be different levels in the Newfoundland award, but I believe the federal system, which has levels, has been operating very well as far as I can see. The acts that have been recognized I believe have by and large been deserving of recognition and if the same high standards are applied in the course of the provincial award, then I am sure it will be a beneficial thing for the Province.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I can say to this bill is that it is too bad Colonel Klink is not here in this House here today.

MR. TOBIN:
Who is that?

MR. NEARY:
I am referring to the Premier, Newfoundland's answer to Colonel Klink. He should have a little medal pinned on himself with hero marked on it. Mr. Speaker, you would not know but this was the most important thing in the world.

MR. TOBIN:
That is not what your leader said.

MR. NEARY:
I will deal with what my hon. colleague said, you need not worry about that.

The trouble with this kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that nobody wants to convey the impression that they are against somebody getting a medal for bravery, Mr. Speaker, and that is what my colleague was saying. Is this the most important piece of legislation, the most important thing that we should be discussing in this House today? The Premier, the administration there opposite, a few years ago brought in their own provincial flag, then they brought in their own national anthem, Mr. Speaker, and then they expanded the Newfoundland Constabulary throughout the Province so the Premier can have his own little army. They are following the pattern, the example of Colonel Gaddafi. Mr. Speaker, this is all a move to bolster the ego of the administration there opposite. Mr. Speaker, they are as much interested now in giving

people a medal for bravery as they are in going to the moon. It is just to bolster their own ego, that is why they are doing this, Mr. Speaker, and it is the kind of a piece of legislation where you will be damned if you do and double damned if you do not. It is a motherhood issue. Everybody agrees that people should get a decoration for bravery, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe that everybody who is unemployed in this Province should get a medal for bravery, everybody who is forced on social assistance through no fault of their own should get a medal for bravery, every young person who cannot afford to get into university because of the cuts in student aid by that administration should get a medal for bravery, the fishermen who are on strike should get a medal for bravery, Richard Cashin should get a medal for bravery for standing up this dictatorship, the President of the NTA should get a medal for bravery. That should be their criteria if they are going doling out medals for bravery. We already have recognition in Canada, Mr. Speaker, for people who perform acts of heroism. All you have to do is document a case, forward it to the appropriate authorities, Mr. Speaker, have it documented by a Justice of the Peace, and substantiated by the law enforcement officers, and sometimes it does not even require that. So what we are doing here now is duplicating medals for bravery. We have the Canadian Humane Society. Mr. Speaker, the question I am asking is is this necessary? Is this the most important thing that we need be debating in this House today? I ask that question and I believe the answer is, obviously, that it is not. I am all for people being recognized for acts of heroism and whatever they do over and beyond the ordinary call of duty' but I

am sure there are more important things to be debated in this House than the administration there opposite trying to booster their own ego. First they wanted a flag of their own, then they wanted their own national anthem, then they wanted their own army, and now they want their own medal of bravery. What is going to be next? What will be next, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BAIRD:

A statue of you.

MR. TOBIN:

You follow your leader, now.

MR. NEARY:

The next thing they will want busts made of themselves and distributed. Another thing I forgot, by the way, just like Gaddafi he has his pictures sent out to all of the provincial buildings around the province, one down at the federal airport. So people going aboard the planes can see Colonel Klink there as they go through security down there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I interrupted any hon. gentlemen there opposite when they were speaking. I donot recall doing so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to follow up on the questions the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked about this award for bravery -

MR. MORGAN:

What! Another leader.

MR. NEARY:

Perhaps the former Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) should get a medal for bravery-

MR. MORGAN:
Yes, definitely.

MR. NEARY:
-for having the nerve to violate the Premier's code of ethics. Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that the hon. gentleman has to answer is about duplication. What happens in the event now that people are recommended for medals of bravery, for bravery awards, as they have been since Confederation recommended to the Governor General, Mr. Speaker, and they are granted a medal or an award of some kind, will they automatically get an award, a medal from the Province? Will they get two? Will there be duplication? Is it going to belittle the whole scenario of receiving medals for bravery? Is it going to belittle that type of thing? Or is it just going to look after those people who the panel feel performed some act of bravery but were not recognized by the Governor General or by the Government of Canada or by the Canadian Humane Society or by the Armed Forces? Is that what they are going to do? Are they going to provide a second medal so that in the event recognition is not forthcoming from some other authority they will provide the award? Is that what they are trying to do? Or will there be duplication? Will people in this Province automatically get a second award or get a second medal, Mr. Speaker?

Now will the next move be to provide a hockey trophy? We may as well have that, too.

MR. BAIRD:
You used to provide hockey sticks.

MR. NEARY:
They may as well provide a hockey trophy for the all-Newfoundland championship and then a broom ball trophy and then a curling trophy.

And then, if you are the outstanding curler of the year, they should provide an award for that.

Mr. Speaker, if we had a coward of the year award instead of a bravery award, everybody on that side of the House would get one, cowards of the year, when you watch their reaction to the Tory budget, the first financial statement brought down by the new Tory Administration.

MR. YOUNG:
While you up now tell us how many seats you are going to win in the next election.

MR. NEARY:
Talk about betraying a trust, betraying the people who elected you, talk about traitors! Mr. Speaker, we used to hear so much talk in this House about traitors in the last four years, everybody on this side of the House were traitors because we did not stand up against Ottawa for raping the Newfoundland people. We were traitors over here, I mean financially, economically, socially. Social and economic rape, Mr. Speaker. We were accused over here of being traitors. Now what do we see? Everything that they were opposed to in four years they now agree with it, so there should be a traitor award. There should be a medal for treachery and trickery and for being traitors, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD:
You did not fight it, you lay back and enjoyed it.

MR. NEARY:
Every one of them should be wearing a medal over there, traitor! Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague, the Leader, said that he was going to support this bill,

and what choice do we have? What choice do we have? Nobody objects to people getting medals, but I am asking is it necessary in the light of all the awards that are available for bravery in this country? Do the provincial governments and the territories across Canada need their own medal and their own army and their own flag and their own national anthem? Do they, Mr. Speaker? Where is it going to end? What will be next? The next thing will be busts of all the members will be trotted out, statues all over the Province, little medals pinned on them, hero. Colonel Klink is up in Ottawa now selling the people down the drain, betraying the people of this Province.

MR. BAIRD:

We were doing a bust of you but the horse died.

MR. NEARY:

A bust of the hon. gentleman would be the horse's end.

MR. TOBIN:

I heard you lost a lot of money on the federal election.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I ask in all sincerity is this the most important thing that we should be debating in this House today? No wonder the hon. gentleman sits there with a silly grin on his face, knowing full well that they are presenting a piece of legislation that puts members on this side of the House on the horns of a dilemma.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG:

We have outwitted you again.

MR. BAIRD:

You have not got the intestinal fortitude to vote against it, is that what you are saying?

MR. NEARY:

It is unnecessary, it is not justified, Mr. Speaker. The next thing they will have their own navy. They partially have their own air force down at the hangar in Torbay. And, Mr. Speaker, if they do not have enough planes they go out and charter them at public expense. They have a new system now, they grounded the King Air, that is only for hospital cases, and now they go out and charter flights.

MR. MARSHALL:

What has that got to do with the bill?

MR. NEARY:

It has a lot to do with the bill because what I am asking the hon. gentleman is will the next step be to have our own air force? We partly have it now. Will we have a complete air force? Will we have our own Navy? We had the Norma and Gladys and they were forced to sell that. Now, Mr. Speaker, will we get our own Navy? It is all too silly to talk about. Mr. Speaker, if it were not so serious it would be laughable. The hon. gentleman has been laughing ever since he introduced the bill because I think he anticipated this kind of a reaction, from me at least, on it. Let me make it clear to hon.gentlemen that I am all for awards for bravery. As a matter of fact I am in the process right now of documenting the case of a longliner captain from Rose Blanche whom I think should get an award for bravery. But I will document it in the proper way and I will send it of to the proper authorities. I will not send it to some panel set up -

MR. MORGAN:

Bring his name into the House. That way he will be recognized by the House of Assembly and that will help. Do it properly and bring his name in here..

MR. NEARY:

I probably will before too long but I am having the case documented now.

MR. TULK:

He is going through the right channels.

MR. NEARY:

I am going through the proper channels. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us if maybe the reason for introducing this bill is that the hon. gentleman wanted somebody recognized for bravery and they were not recognized, one of his pals or something. Is that why we are having this bill? Has anybody ever been turned down that the hon. gentleman is aware of if the proper procedure and the proper channel was followed? I do not know of anybody who has ever been rejected if the case is properly documented. Mr. Speaker, they gave out another medal here a couple of years ago, the Newfoundland Volunteer Service Medal, and they refused to give it to the merchant seamen, and the merchant seamen are still fighting that case.

MR. TULK:

Has he something against Merchant Seamen?

MR. NEARY:

Well, I do not know if he has anything against merchant seamen. I would not go as far as to say that.

MR. TULK:

He probably has.

MR. NEARY:

No, because the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were operating on ground rules that were laid down by the Canadian Legion. In a lot of cases the Legionnaires feel that unless you wear a uniform you are not entitled to a medal. But, Mr. Speaker, who was on the firing line? Who was in the front line if it were not the merchant seamen? And that administration has refused to recognize merchant seamen in this Province.

MR. TOBIN

Did you listen to Open Line this morning?

MR. NEARY:

Well, I heard part of it. I was driving from the garage when I heard part of it. And a lot of it I agree with, by the way. Some of it I disagree with because I think Canada as a whole looks after its veterans probably better than most countries in the world. My late father was a veteran of the First War and so I am very familiar with the benefits and the privileges. But, Mr. Speaker, they withheld the Newfoundland Volunteer Service medal from merchant seamen and right up to this day they have refused to budge and recognize the merchant seamen who volunteered. And a lot of them gave their lives. They were right on the firing line, they were the ones who had to transport the goods and services.

MR. TULK:

Ask them if they are going to fix it.

MR. NEARY:

No, they are not going to fix it. I know they are going to get over there now and get indignant and get up on their high horse. They have no intention, at least I do not think they do up to this point in time, of recognizing the merchant seamen. And they will do

the same thing with this little medal they are developing now, they will find some way, Mr. Speaker, to bring pressure to bear on the panel. I am not happy about it. I am like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), I am not happy about this piece of legislation. I am not going to vote against it, but, as I sit here and think of all the things that need to be done in this Province, I cannot help wondering why we are forced to debate a piece of legislation that will give the administration there opposite the right and the authority to appoint a panel to make awards for bravery. Not that I am against anybody getting an award for bravery. I hope I do not pick up the newspaper or listen to the radio station, or the T.V. station and hear, 'Neary said in the House today he is against bravery awards.' I am all for it. On occasion I have recommended, by the way, to the Lieutenant-Governor, and to the Governor General, and to the administration in Ottawa that people be recognized for acts of heroism. I did not always win the case, but there are a couple I think I could claim an assist on. I am working on one right now for this man down in Rose Blanche; they were out in a small boat with two outboard motors and a wave suddenly came up and hit the boat, turned her bottom up, they were thrown into the water and he saved the life of one of his crew members. He could not save the lives of the other two who were with him, but he saved that one. And that will be properly documented and I am hoping that we will get the recognition that the man deserves from the proper authorities.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we had an adequate system in this country for giving people awards for

bravery. I believe we did. I think this is pure duplication and is designed for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to give the Premier and the administration there opposite another boost in ego. They are on an ego trip and I would not be at all surprised in the foreseeable future but they will be establishing their own air force and their own navy. What else do they have in the armed forces?

MR. WARREN:

An army.

MR. NEARY:

No, we have an army now. They are expanding their army.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Propaganda.

MR. NEARY:

Well, they have their propaganda machine, Newfoundland Information Services. They have a Doctor Goebbels down on the eight floor. Down in the Newfoundland Information Services they have the manure spreaders. They will soon have it all. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, while they are doing these, things socially and economically and financially the Province is going down the drain.

MR. CALLAN:

Here is some manure.

MR. NEARY:

Who Can't Negotiate.

MR. TULK:

How about those seven agreements?

MR. NEARY:

Those seven agreements, right! He probably thinks he should get a medal for that.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Newfoundland and Labrador tonight will not be

dancing in the streets because we passed this piece of legislation in the House today. They will probably be asking, 'Is that all they have to do up there?' And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is going to bring in another piece of legislation like this in this Session of the House, that he bring in a bill, an act to condemn government members and the PC administration for supporting the first Tory financial statement that was brought down in Ottawa a few days ago that will socially and economically rape the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to give up Private Members' Day to discuss that kind of a bill. They should have on the new medal that they bring in for themselves, with a nice ribbon on it, a nice bronze medal and stamped across it 'traitor to the people of this Province'.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on this bill. It has been my experience in the past to have recommended several people from my own district of Bellevue for bravery awards.

I have some questions, as did the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who just spoke and, of course, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) who spoke earlier. I have some reservations about the real reason behind the introduction of this bill. By way of example, Mr. Speaker, I should mention that approximately three years ago I recommended for bravery awards six gentlemen from the district of Bellevue who were on a longliner that was involved in saving the

lives of some of their friends and they were duly recognized after I sent along the information to the Lieutenant-Governor's office here in this Province. It was duly processed and sent to Ottawa and, of course, it was investigated and the RCMP reports were submitted and all of that and they were given their bravery awards. As a matter of fact, all six of the gentlemen from the town of Dildo along with their wives were taken up to Ottawa and duly honoured with their bravery awards.

I had occasion to nominate a couple of other people from my district more than two years ago and I have not heard anything since. I know that the RCMP investigation was done, but I am told there is a priority list - perhaps priority list is not the best word to use, there is a quota system on these awards in Ottawa. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, will that be the case here in this Province? Will there be a quota system whereby only a certain number can be given out each year? And another fear that I have, of course, is the fear that was raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), how much of a part will politics play in this matter?

The six gentlemen whom I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, were supposed to have come into this city back in the month of May, I was told they were going to be invited to the city to be duly honoured by the Lieutenant-Governor here in St. John's. I do not think that happened and I am wondering why. Another problem that I have for the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), who introduced the bill, besides asking if there is a quota system or a priority system, although the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not

in his seat is, I hope that these awards will not be treated the same way that the Minister of Transportation treats his capital works programme when he said publicly on television, 'Well, we give them to our friends, you know. We give the money to our friends. We do not give it to Opposition members and their districts.'

There is always that fear.

The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), among some of the jokes and some of the exaggeration he introduced into his comments, also had a fair amount of common sense and a fair number of good questions. Because I think it is a fair question to ask, even though I will support the bill, Mr. Speaker. Why is it being done? Why, at a time in this Province when we need to pass legislation that is far more important to the social and economic life of this Province and the thousands upon thousands who are unemployed, why is this bill necessary? As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said, we already have a system in place in Ottawa which not only recognizes acts of bravery by Newfoundlanders but by all Canadians, so why do we need a separate and distinct committee here in this Province? Will there be duplication? Is it necessary? I ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), and I ask him also will this bill be retroactive? When does it take effect? Does it take effect as of today, last month, last year, or next year? When does it take effect, I ask the Government House Leader.

And I also ask the Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, why is it being done when we already have a mechanism in place in Ottawa? Will it be retroactive? If so,

when will it begin? As I said, I hope that the Government House Leader can assure us that this will be done equitably and fairly with due consideration given to each and every person nominated. And perhaps another question, Mr. Speaker, that I can ask is that if this government is going to take the lead from Ottawa and set up a committee to examine acts of bravery, will this government also go the next step and set up its own equivalent of the Order of Canada? I have a lady in my district now who around Christmastime will be receiving what is now called the Order of Canada, and used to be the Order of the British Empire. Is that the next step for this government, Mr. Speaker, to bring in this other recognition process as well whereby people who have contributed of their time and talents down through the years in remote and isolated areas will also be recognized by an Order of Newfoundland award, similar to the Order of Canada award? I think these are fair and legitimate questions, Mr. Speaker, and with these two questions I invite the minister's comments.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I have the same problem as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I am a bit worried myself that I am agreeing with the member for LaPoile on essentially the point that he has made, but I think it is an excellent point.

MR. NEARY:

You should do that more and more often.

MR. FENWICK:

We have here a piece of legislation that I do not disagree with one bit, I think it is an

appropriate piece of legislation and I intend to vote for it and I intend to support it and so on. But it is the kind of legislation, I would argue, that you bring in in a Province in which you have an unemployment rate that is approaching zero, where you have such forms of social justice that you basically have a just society in which things are being done in a way which most people are proud of and are happy about. You do not bring in such legislation in the kind of society which we have today in which we have massive unemployment, a fishery that is veritably bankrupt at times, a mining industry that is not much better as it stands, and a paper industry that seems to be staggering along. Indeed, the largest mill in the Province just seems to have been rescued by some means in the last little while. Basically what we have, it seems, is an economy that is in something of a shambles. We have a collective bargaining situation, a labour relations situation in this Province that I think is probably as bad as anywhere in the country with the possible exception of British Columbia. And this government has come forward with, at this point, several pieces of legislation, several of which at best could be described as housekeeping in nature. The present bill, a nice piece of legislation which I think we should have somewhere along the line, certainly does not seem, to me at least, to be very high up on the list of priorities of what we should be doing. It leads one to believe that the government itself has been doing virtually nothing to prepare the kind of legislation that would be appropriate to meet the kinds of problems that we have. Indeed, in thumbing through the rest of the legislation there are a couple of pieces of legislation that seem reasonably

solid, but the rest also seems to be of a somewhat inconsequential nature. Maybe it is the fact that this is only the third day that I have sat in the Legislature, but it is quite disappointing to see the kinds of bills that we will be asked to consider, the kinds of legislation we are being asked to look at, especially considering the large degree of problems that the Province seems to be facing at this time. So, although I support the legislation, I am quite disappointed that this is the highest priority that government seems to have for today.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

If the hon. minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the words that we have heard from the Opposition are words that you would expect to hear from an opposition. An opposition tries to belittle everything the government brings in, tries to say that this particular measure that you are bringing in, yes, we are going to support it but as the last speaker indicated, this legislation does not meet the problems of unemployment, or the social justice that he perceives is not here in the Province, etc. And I say to the hon. new member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and the other gentlemen there opposite that we were quite prepared to debate with the hon. member, indeed, all hon. members, all of these issues.

Legislation does not presume to meet every problem. What government has done with respect to the social conditions in this Province is it has met them with actions, and we can debate it at another time. There is Supplementary Supply coming up in a moment and we will be quite

happy to debate it with all hon. members. But what this government has done in its actions recently is no better illustrated than what it did in Corner Brook to save the Bowater mill. But for the actions of this Government, Bowater and the people of Corner Brook would be facing an abysmal fate and future. The fact of the matter is that this time about a year ago, a little over a year ago, Bowater came to the government saying that they were going to close down the mill. And what they said with respect to it was no, they were not even interested in seeing if they could get another operator. We tried to then enlist the federal government of the time and they said, no, that is up to the company, Bowater, we are not going to have anything to do with it; we are not going to make any promises as to any commitments, or what have you, until you get an operator. So we pressed Bowater and we took the problem by the scruff of the neck, as it were, and it was us who got Bowater to put out an offering circular to all of the industry throughout the world, and it was us, it was this government that enticed Kruger into Corner Brook and, Mr. Speaker, this can be verified from the facts, and can be verified from the Kruger Corporation itself.

So we will not take a second place, I can tell the hon. gentleman, to anyone in our sensitivity for the social and economic problems of this Province. And the way in which we meet them is we meet them by actions. I just welcome the opportunity at any time to debate it with the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) or with hon. members of the official Opposition.

This is an award, and when you are looking after the affairs of the Province and you are bringing in a

legislative programme you bring in programmes that are beneficial for all aspects of society. And this particular bill may not be viewed by the hon. gentlemen there opposite as monumental, but it is an important bill. Now, there were certain questions that were raised and merit response. With all due respect, the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) got up again. I do not know why the hon. the member for LaPoile got up and spoke to the degree that he did. I mean, I heard him on the radio this weekend indicating that in effect he was not going to accept the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) as Leader of the Opposition, that he was going to speak from time to time. He is trying to act in the position now of clean-up batter to the team established, which he does not like, by the Leader of the Opposition. He has been put out to pasture, put in Limbo and he just does not like it. He finds the grass that he has to eat rather bitter and you can see it from the way the hon. gentleman is entering into the debate. He spent a half hour talking about nothing, and that is the way the House will be treated, Mr. Speaker. During this period of time, we will suffer the hon. gentleman as we have done. The only thing I can say to the hon. gentleman, with all his criteria and all his sarcasm about the award, is if the sole criterion was perseverance, all members of this House would qualify eminently by having to sit by month after month listening to the hon. gentleman in his debate and the way in which he makes his points.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) raised certain issues with respect to the bill that I will respond to. This bravery award is not intended to

try to supplement or replace the award that comes from the Governor General, the Canadian Government, but, really, to compliment it. As the member for Bellevue indicated, there are and have been times when what appears to be a quota system is operative. I do not think it is a quota system, but obviously every application that is made for an award nationally, or that will be made provincially, cannot be recognized and, consequently, because we are part of a larger country in which there are 21 millions or 22 millions of people, and we are 500,000 people, there are times when recommendations are made that are not recognized by the national award for bravery and these people should be recognized. Now, at the same time, it is not intended that this award should be supplementary, an inferior award, a secondary award, as it were, to the national award, because people who receive the national award will also be entitled, if they are Newfoundlanders, to consideration for the provincial one as well. So it is not, as I say, to supplement it, it is not to take a second place to it, it is not to supplant it, it is to be complimentary to it.

The hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) gave some real examples of people who were not recognized during the Ocean Ranger disaster. And there are many other areas, in the marine area of our Province particularly, where there have been superb acts of courage and bravery that have gone unnoticed and we want to be sure that every Newfoundlander who has responded in that particular manner, in fact gets recognition.

The same with the volunteer firemen the Leader of the Opposition referred to. The hon.

Leader mentioned the fact that these volunteer firemen should be recognized in other ways, by insurance and what have you, and I can tell the hon. gentleman he is behind the times, because this government has, in fact, recognized this and has provided insurance for volunteer firemen, life insurance and accident insurance and what have you; we have done this relatively recently.

So that is about all, Mr. Chairman, I would really have to say to this. As the hon. gentlemen tried to make it out to be political, I would point out that the members of the review panel that will be reviewing this will be the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, the President of Memorial University, the Chief of Police, the Chief Superintendent of the R.C.M.P., the Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council, and the Private Secretary to the Lieutenant-Governor. I mean, it is an insult to these gentlemen to give the indication that this is going to be purely and simply a political award.

All members of this House, but not just members of this House, any member of the public who is aware of any act of bravery is entitled to present the name of that person or persons to the Clerk of the Executive Council who will, and is bound under the rules and the regulations pertaining to this act, pass this on to the review panel and these gentlemen on the review panel will assess the acts of bravery. Now, not every one who applies is going to automatically receive an award for bravery, that is why you have the review panel itself. But to insist and try to attempt to say that this is going to be a political award is not worthy of

the hon. gentleman. It is an insult to the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, to the President of Memorial, and to the other people on the panel. This is an attempt by this government to once again recognize acts of bravery within the Province of Newfoundland and I think it is a commendable act. Mr. Speaker. Sure it is not going to cure unemployment, and sure there are other things that you could conceive of that are not covered by this act, but it is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that is intended to recognize, as I say, acts of bravery, superb acts of that nature which have been performed from time to time. I think it merits the support of everyone, and it should not have been heaped with the sarcasm which it received from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) particularly. It is an award that will be very much part, I hope, in the future of the social and cultural history of this Province and we are very proud to present it.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Award Of Bravery", (Bill No. 25), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on Tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 3, Bill No. 34.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. House that I have received a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The following message is addressed to the hon. the Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit supplementary estimates of sums

required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the 31st day of March 1984, by way of supplementary supply and in accordance with the provisions of The Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

(sgd)-----
Lieutenant-Governor."

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

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

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the message of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of procedure, which I have discussed with the hon. the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder), I move, that the rules that will apply in this debate will be the same rules as are provided for consideration of estimates, the Committee of Supply, which would mean the minister would get up and have fifteen minutes to introduce the supply, the responder would have fifteen minutes, and then each member would have ten minutes. But, of course, each member may speak more than once, so it is not like in a Committee of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed that these rules will apply?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, in Committee of Supply we are discussing a resolution and the resolution states as follows: "That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1984, the sum of one hundred and thirty-four million six hundred and fifty-one thousand seven hundred dollars (\$134,651,700).

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, a quorum call, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

There has been a quorum call. Call in the members.

Order, please!

There is a quorum present. Is it agreed to continue or shall we wait the other two minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It is agreed to continue. The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the sum that the Committee is asked to approve and subsequently recommend to the House is for nearly \$135 million, and this refers to the last fiscal year, the year ending 31 March of this year and it is an amount that is additional to what was in the budget that was brought down the previous April, I think it was. I have details here as to what those additional amounts were to be used

for and the departments in which they were to be expended. Perhaps I could just run down over them, as I have a few minutes, and to look at the larger of the lot. In Consolidated Fund we needed nearly \$250,000 extra and this is made up of various amounts. There was an additional amount of \$120,000 required for widows' allowances, there was an extra \$11,000 for Workers' Compensation awards, there was \$22,000 for general pensions and there was an extra \$85,000 for the Hart report. The Hart report refers to a study that was done in regard to workers at the Waterford Hospital a number of years ago. That report recommended certain increases in salary under certain conditions, and over the past year some of those conditions that were not anticipated at budget time came about and that was the reason why there had to be an extra amount put in.

MR. BARRY:

What was the first item?

DR. COLLINS:

The first item was widows' allowances. These are requirements for widows due to an increase in widowers receiving pensions as well as the changes in pension policy making survivor benefits retroactive to 1975. So that is under our pension arrangement.

In Finance there was an extra amount of approximately \$2 million needed and there were three warrants that gave rise to that amount. The first warrant was for approximately \$750,000 and was required on capital account to give assistance to Cape Pine Fisheries' which was taking over, starting up and carrying out certain improvements to a fish plant in Witless Bay. There was also a smaller amount, \$43,000

approximately, required in the mail room of this building, and the Department of Finance is responsible for distributing internal mail for government.

MR. BARRY:

What was that amount?

DR. COLLINS:

That was \$43,000.

MR. BARRY:

For what?

DR. COLLINS:

For the purchase of a piece of mail equipment for the distribution of internal mail.

The third warrant was for \$1,250,000, again made up of certain items. The major one being \$963,000 for employee benefits. Those employee benefits were for Workers' Compensation. There were certain retroactive awards extending back over a number of years. These disputes, if you want to call them that, had been settled, the amount had been decided on and there were some retroactive payments required amounting to approximately \$500,000. Then there was also \$678,000, nearly \$679,000 actually, required under The Unemployment Insurance Act. This was due to increases in unemployment insurance contributions.

Another department that required considerable funding was Development. In Development the amount was \$770,000. There were two amounts there, two warrants. One was for \$277,000, and that related to the National Sea Plant at Burgeo. When that plant was sold to National Sea there were certain conditions put on the sale, that is National Sea required those conditions, that government would pick up a certain

amount of loss if there were losses at the plant, over a certain sum, losses in excess of half a million dollars, in actual fact. That agreement was to extend over a three year period. As a result of that we did have to make that extra expenditure there. There were losses at the plant. I believe this is the last year we will have to make such expenditures.

The second one was for a half million dollars, and that related to the purchase of Easteel by Metal Craft Holdings Limited. Easteel Industries Limited unfortunately went into bankruptcy and the operation was to close down with considerable loss of employment. Metal Craft Holdings Limited undertook to take it over, but they did require capital assistance and that was given to them under the Marine Industrial Incentive programme.

Under that programme, the money is actually given as a loan and it is paid back in 25 per cent amounts, but the amounts are forgiven if the operation continues in existence over a number of years. Ultimately, if the company is successful, the total amount can be forgiven.

MR. TULK:

Is that company still called Metal Craft?

DR. COLLINS:

As far as I know it is called Metal Craft, Metal Craft Holdings Limited.

Another item related to the Department of Transportation, and there were three warrants for Transportation. The first warrant was for \$13.25 million. The main amount there was for \$12.75 million, you know, almost all of the \$13.25 million, and that was

related to the three year agreement that we entered into with the Government of Canada for the construction and improvement of various highways in the Province. That agreement had not been put in place by the time the Budget of that year was brought down. We ultimately entered into the three year agreement and the cash flow under that agreement for 1983-1984 amounted to \$12.75 million, so we have to have a warrant put that in place.

There was another warrant of just over \$5 million, and this related to expenditures on roads that are the provincial government's responsibility. There was an extra \$1 million put in for the improvement and the construction of roads under Supplies, and an amount of just over \$4 million put in for the improvement and construction of roads under Purchased Services, that is the actual construction company expenditures. Then a small amount was put in for snowblowing machines. I should not say a small amount, but it was small compared to the others, approximately \$250,000 as a matter of fact went in to purchase two snowblowing machines.

There was a very large amount under Education, amounting to \$90.5 million. I am sure hon. members will recall that that \$90 million was required to refinance the debt associated with previous school construction. In actual fact it was in our contingent liability already, in our indirect debt, shall we say, and this was then transferred to direct debt. So really there was no change in the bottom line debt of the Province, It just went from one column to another, but in doing so we did realize certain savings in interest payments. I think \$1 million ultimately will be saved

in interest payments by doing that.

Under Social Services there was approximately \$6 million involving four warrants. The first warrant was for an amount of \$3 million which gave additional funding for the community development programme. This has been a very successful programme whereby individuals who are receiving social assistance are assisted to get short-term employment, and then, when that short-term employment is up - and unfortunately it is short-term - they become eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. That programme has been very successful not only in doing that but also in giving these people work experience, and since many of these people have not had work experience for a long period of time. The whole idea is to try and get as many as possible back into the work force by giving them that work experience. The second warrant was for \$1.7 million. There was \$500,000 for social assistance, \$700,000 for regional administration and \$500,000 for community development projects included in that also. The next warrant was for \$1.25 million related to salary overruns at various institutions, at Exon House, Escasoni, Harbour Lodge and Hoyles Home. These institutions had salary overruns to some extent related to overtime but also to a considerable extent related to sick leave. In Health the requirement was for approximately \$3 million. This amount really did not cost the Province anything. Although we had to put in that \$3 million we got it back through reciprocal building arrangements with the federal government and with other provinces, so it was really a bookkeeping amount.

Then there was an amount of approximately \$3 million for

Labour and Manpower. There were two warrants there. One for \$1.5 million related to new employment expansion development. Hon. members will recall that there was put in place a so-called NEED programme and our cost under that programme was to be \$3 million. The total programme, I think, came to \$30 million, and our cost was \$3 million. In the budget we put in \$1.5 million, but as the year went along it was clear that the employment take-up of this programme was such that we would have to put in the remaining \$1.5 million that we were committed to. The second warrant was again for \$1.5 million and that was related to mobility assistance grants to employees who were affected by the closedowns in Labrador West. The outlines of that new mobility programme recommended by the task force that was put in place to deal with that unfortunate problem up there.

MR. WARREN:
Partially.

DR. COLLINS:
Well, to the extent we could anyway.

Then for Municipal Affairs there was approximately \$750,000. That was all, really, for disaster assistance in the towns of Bishop's Falls, Badger and Rushoon. It was given out under certain categories but the total amount came to about \$750,000.

Culture, Recreation and Youth required, after the budget had come down, additional funding of various amounts. The principal one was the 400th Anniversary and there was an amount there of \$427,000 required.

MR. WARREN:
Almost half a million dollars?

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, but a very large part of that was a federal contribution, which we gratefully acknowledge.

Then, there were smaller amounts. There was some capital expenditure on national park equipment and certain other smaller amounts.

The final one was Justice. We needed an additional \$6.5 million approximately for Justice.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas):
Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

DR. COLLINS:
Thank you very much for the leave just to finish this off.

There was approximately \$1 million required for the Royal Commission on Hospital and Nursing Care. There was \$120,000, approximately, required for the Electoral District Boundaries Commission, and the final amount - and this is the largest amount - was over \$5 million required for the RCMP Services contract. They changed their method of accounting -

MR. TULK:
The second one there.

DR. COLLINS:
The second one? The second one was \$120,000 for the Electoral District Boundaries Commission. And then, just over \$5 million was required for the RCMP contract. They changed their method of requiring payment from the Provinces. We used to have a delay of six months so that we did not expect this particular payment to come up until after the end of the 1983 - 1984 fiscal year. But

when they changed their method of accounting, they required us to be more expeditious in our payments so we had to put more into that fiscal year than we anticipated when we brought down the budget.

So those are the details. Hon. members, of course, will understand that all these warrants were tabled in the House quite a long while ago. This is a summation of the information already given to the House, and I move, therefore, that the resolution be adopted and that a bill be submitted to the full House of Assembly for adoption subsequent to the adoption of the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, again what we have here is some more housekeeping work that if the minister had been doing his work properly in preparing his initial estimates we would not be involved in \$134 million of supplementary supply. And we have seen, Mr. Chairman, in the past several years that the minister has shown himself to be incompetent as a Minister of Finance in the preparation of his budget. The Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, through many hundreds of years of very honourable tradition, is supposed to be a document upon which people can rely. Not just the voters, not just the members of the public of Newfoundland and Labrador, and they, of course, are the most important people, should be able to know that they are getting good, reliable information, but also, Mr. Chairman, the various lenders to the Province rely upon the minister's statements, the minister's estimate of what he is going to need for the various departments of government, what

the operating deficit is going to be during the year.

Mr. Chairman, you can understand the estimates being out 10 per cent, or 15 per cent, or 20 per cent with respect to the operating deficit, but when the deficit doubles and comes close to tripling? In certain years, I guess the first year, it did more than that, Mr. Chairman. The first year the minister started off estimating a small surplus and ended up with - what was it? - a \$10 million or \$12 million deficit by the time the exercise was over. And then we had subsequent years where the minister has had to admit at the beginning the year that he was unable to run his department, unable to keep control of government expenditures, and unable to raise the necessary revenue because he already had the people of this Province taxed to death. So we found that he had to start off at the beginning of the year admitting that there was going to be a deficit on current account.

I had the honour of sitting in Cabinet, Mr. Chairman, for a number of years. I do not believe it is any Cabinet secret - I was in there from 1971 to 1975, and again from 1979 to 1981 - Mr. Chairman, that in every one of those years the emphasis was on the terrible, terrible importance of making sure that we did not have a deficit on current account and now this was taken as gospel, as the Bible. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who is walking in now, is a minister who made his early name in politics, Mr. Chairman, before he became infamous by the various assaults he subsequently made upon the voters of this Province, the President of the Executive Council made his name on one plank, fiscal responsibility. It is time, Mr.

Chairman, he said, 'To bring fiscal responsibility in to government.' I agreed with him. I agreed with him, Mr. Chairman, it was time to bring fiscal responsibility in to government. And for a number of years this fiscal responsibility was shown, but, Mr. Chairman, not in recent years. And that is why I think that the minister opposite has more and more of a handdog look about him, the more he sits in this hon. House, the harder it is for him to get up with enthusiasm and support what is happening about him. I think members opposite have noticed that, particularly in the few days he has been in this session that the heart has gone completely out of the President of the Executive Council (Mr. Marshall) because the entire basis of his getting into politics has disappeared, Mr. Chairman. I suspect we will see the minister himself disappear in the next election. The minister may not even have the heart to run for the nomination. But, Mr. Chairman, we do know that this basic premise, this basic principle for which he fought so strongly and for so long has now gone out of the window. He has lost the battle and we see yet another government fall into that very trap that the minister opposite spent so many years declaring had to be avoided, the trap of letting expenditures get out of control, not paying your way as a government, Mr. Chairman. The mortal sin of government, according to the minister opposite, the mortal sin to condemn any government to eternal damnation is for a government, according to the minister, to spend more than it can afford. And what do we see, Mr. Chairman, for these past several years? Is it three years already or is it four years that they have been into deficits on

current account? I think it is the fourth year, Mr. Chairman, but maybe it is only three.

But, Mr. Chairman, the first year it happened they were able to say we predicted that there would be a surplus on current account but the federal government was not nice to us, they had to cut back some of their payments, and collections from sales tax were not as great as we expected. That was because we have torn the bottom out of the economy in this Province and people cannot afford to get out and buy things anymore, therefore the sales tax does not get into government. So at first they were able to use these various explanations. But, Mr. Chairman, they have now given up all pretence and they now come in at the beginning of the year predicting that they will see a deficit on current account. Now that is bad enough, but then, Mr. Chairman, within three months that sacred document, the Budget Speech, recently laid before the people of this Province, and people who loan money to this government, is totally useless and you can throw it out the window. It bears no more relevance to anything that is happening in government than an exercise book of a Grade III student in one of our schools, Mr. Chairman. The Budget Speech bears no more relationship to what is actually going on than that Grade III exercise book. And what do members opposite, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the President of the Executive Council (Mr. Marshall), the Premier and other members of Cabinet say? They say, 'Oh, it is out of our control. We cannot do anything until we get our offshore oil agreement.' Mr. Chairman, the inference there is that everything is going to be alright. Well, we are going to find out a little bit about how

alright things are going to be when we get that offshore oil agreement signed. We are going to have a little information, I am sure, provided in the course of this Session. We are going to find out really why it was that Mobil was asked to delay that development plan and that environmental impact statement. I suspect what we are going to find, Mr. Chairman, is lo and behold, once the development was paid for, once Mobil had recovered its cost of development -

MR. TULK:

There is nothing left.

MR. BARRY:

I do not know if nothing will be left, Mr. Chairman, but there will not be very much left, I suspect. We will be very interested in hearing what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can tell us about the revenue.

I do not know why we have this sudden silence. What has happened, Mr. Chairman?

MR. NEARY:

You are giving such an outstanding speech.

MR. BARRY:

They have even turned off the fans and the air conditioning so that they can hear me better, is that it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

We are going to be very interested in finding out from the Minister of Finance or the President of the Executive Council (Mr. Marshall), the Minister responsible for certain aspects of Energy - not all, but certain - how much money there is going to be from this first plan that was filed, this

first environmental impact statement. Granted, we will not accept that one, we will tell the company to go back to the drawing board. Mr. Chairman, I think the real reason we have seen the filing of that environmental impact statement delayed is because the international price of oil has fallen so much, coupled with the delay on the part of government opposite, has meant that the sweet years have been missed, the years when the oil prices were high. The international price for oil has fallen so much and the cost development has risen so much that there is not very much there any more. And, Mr. Chairman, we want to know, and we want the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to tell us, is this Province in a position where every year in the foreseeable future we are going to have to see this deficit on current account in the budget speech? And, Mr. Chairman, are we every year then, within three months after the budget speech, to expect that the minister will come out with a revision and say, 'My prediction three months ago was a little out.' A little out? Close to 100 per cent out! Mr. Chairman, it has close to doubled in the first three months of this year. Now we would also like to know from the Minister of Finance or the President of the Executive Council (Mr. Marshall), whoever would like to tell us, what is the present estimate of the deficit, what increase has there been in that deficit since the statement by the Minister of Finance? What has the second quarter of the fiscal year shown? Are we into that second quarter yet?

MR. TULK:

We are past it.

MR. BARRY:

We are past that second quarter.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether this Supplementary Supply should go through until we get that statement from the Minister of Finance with respect to the deficit that can be expected on current account as of the end of the first six months. We have heard that for the first three months it has gone from \$34 million up to \$57 million, almost doubled.

MR. NEARY:

From \$32 million to \$57 million.

MR. BARRY:

From \$32 million to \$57 million. Now, Mr. Chairman, what has taken place in the second three months of the fiscal year? How much has it increased? Mr. Chairman, we have a serious situation facing this Province and the members opposite and the government opposite are not going to be able to pass the blame any longer onto the fact that there is a government of another political persuasion in Ottawa. They will now have to take the responsibility for these deficits on current account. They will now have to take the responsibility, Mr. Chairman, when the estimates contained in their budgets are thrown out the window within three months. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have seen a situation over the past several years where members opposite have thrown up their hands, have given up the ghost and said, 'It is out of our control. We cannot control our expenditures.' They said they were not going to raise taxes. Ask the Council of Jersey side whether or not they are going to raise taxes. What this government has been doing, Mr. Chairman, is forcing the municipalities around this Province to do their dirty work for them because they have not had the guts to do it

themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Leave is not granted.

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman will get an opportunity afterwards.

Now, Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to reply to - I will not say the misrepresentation of the hon. gentleman because I do not think he can read the supply bills sufficiently. The total supplementary supply looked for by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this bill is \$134,651,000. But, Mr. Chairman, included in that is some \$90.5 million related to the assumption of the debt owed by the school boards and it was just merely a transfer from indirect to direct debt. So to all intents and purposes all this bill relates to is an extra expenditure of money of \$44,151,000.

Now we heard the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) scorning that and talking about budgetary responsibility and aiming to balance the budget and what have you, but, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman wants to look at the total budget, the total expenditure for the year ending March 31, 1984, it is \$2,144,000,000. In other words, we set out estimates of expenditures in excess of \$2 billion, and at the end of the year the Minister of Finance (Dr.

Collins) comes in, Mr. Chairman, with a mere \$44 million divergence. Now that is a lot of money, Mr. Chairman, but it represents approximately 2 per cent of the total budget. Mr. Chairman, any Minister of Finance who in these uncertain times can project a \$2 billion budget within \$44 million, within just merely 2 per cent, particularly when you are dealing with the depressed economy that we have dealt with - and the gentleman opposite had to deal with in his tenure in Cabinet in this Province - and with all the international economic upheaval, that Minister of Finance, I say, has done a splendid job and is due for and entitled to the commendation of everybody in this House and in Newfoundland and not the kind of innuendo that the hon. gentlemen there opposite tried to heap on him.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentlemen there opposite make a great deal about his quarterly statement where he showed that projected to the end of the year, we were going to need about \$30 million, that was less than 2 per cent, Mr. Chairman. So once again this year the minister is on target in very, very difficult times. Any person in this day and age who can estimate their own personal budget within 2 per cent I would say is doing a great job, let alone make that estimate and have it stick consistently year after year as the Minister of Finance has done.

And on that very point, Mr. Chairman, it was this government and this Minister of Finance who first brought in the general reports to the public quarterly as to where we were going. Before that one never knew where we were in this Province until the end of the year itself. But the Minister

of Finance every quarter comes out with a statement and gives an indication of the state of the finances of this Province. And he has done a monumental job, an excellent job, and if you need any indication of that, Mr. Chairman, all you have to do is look at the assessment of the financial position of this Province. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Quebec Hydro within the past couple of years have all suffered a downgrading of their credit rating. Now these are provinces with a much greater base than this Province has. They have bigger populations and a stronger based economy. And one would think, particularly with what we have had to face over the past four or five years, that the credit rating of this Province would come down. But what have we heard, Mr. Chairman? When the hon. gentlemen were on the air crowing about the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and in their own uninformed way scoring him because he indicated there was going to be a certain amount extra spent at the end of this year, at the very same time Moody's and Standard and Poor down in New York City were confirming our credit rating. And they confirmed the credit rating, Mr. Chairman, at the same time they were downgrading others.

So let there be no doubt about this, first of all, Mr. Chairman: we are talking about a supplementary supply bill not of \$130 millions but \$44 millions, a mere 2 per cent of the total budget, and it represents as far as I am concerned a ringing endorsement of the Minister of Finance and the government of this Province in the handling of its financial affairs.

The hon. gentleman made all sorts of allegations. The hon. gentleman, I would point out,

unfortunately or maybe fortunately, has left the Assembly. We are debating the financial affairs of the Province for the period when he was over on this side of the House supporting the government. It is for the period of time when the hon. gentleman was elected as a Progressive Conservative for Mount Scio and now he is over on the other side. He was supporting it then and he is criticizing the situation now. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman referred to the deferral of the development plan and I want to deal with that for a moment. The hon. gentleman should not cast again innuendos and make such statements that the price of oil had caused this to happen and now there was going to be no money. I think the hon. gentleman would love that situation to pertain because he is a member now of a party that feeds off disasters in this Province. If he could see this Province in a bad financial position, or in a worse position than it is, he would see, perhaps, a chance for him to gain a few seats, although he is operating in a false premise when he does that.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the development plan has not been delayed because of a lack of money that we anticipate to flow from the development. In effect the development plan will not be delayed in its filing and the development of Hibernia will not be delayed. The fact is the unfortunate problems that we had in reaching an offshore accord over the past two years has not delayed in any aspect at all the ultimate development of Hibernia. What that delay does is assure an opportunity for the government of this Province in the co-operative framework that now exists that the optimum number of jobs are going to be provided for the people of

this Province and the optimum benefit for Canada as a whole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

And the hon. gentleman can try all he likes to put in this business again - you know, he has a mind fix - that the delay has stopped or delayed development, so therefore we should have had an agreement before. We cannot let the opportunity go by to remind the hon. gentleman that this philosophy, had we bent to that in the past, would see us operating now under a development of Hibernia that would be worst than the Upper Churchill Development. But that is what the hon. gentlemen there opposite were trying to push us towards at all times and the hon. gentleman cannot get it out of his mind set at the present time. He still makes the statement that, because we did not sign an agreement, development has been delayed. Mr. Chairman, that just does not happen to be the fact. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the development of Hibernia will now be proceeding in a co-operative manner with joint management. We have seen an instance of the operation of that last week when there was an agreement between both orders of government to delay the development plan. That development plan has been delayed slowly and purely to assure that the optimum benefit can be secured to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Chairman, back to the general supply bill. Before sitting down I want to emphasize once again that this is not a supply bill of \$130 million, it is a supply bill for \$44 million. It is a bare 2 per cent of the total

budget of over \$2 billion of this Province. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) need not subject himself in this House - we obviously have to take criticism - to criticism that is most unwarranted and unjustified. If the hon. gentlemen were being fair minded people they would be getting up and congratulating the Minister of Finance, they would be supporting him and they would be congratulating him on being able to budget, as he has year after year in this Province, within a mere 1 per cent or 2 per cent of the total budgetary requirements. They should be congratulating him for saving the credit rating of this Province as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):
Order, please!

The hon. the member's times has elapsed.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for having the face of a robber's horse to bring in a supply bill of this magnitude.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I presume all members of the House, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), the member for Harbour Grace, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) are all familiar with supplementary supply, they know what we are doing here. Mr. Chairman, I suppose in one sense they are probably saying to themselves, 'Why is the Opposition arguing about this? The money is spent.

It is for the fiscal year ended 31 March, 1984 so why do they not just rubber stamp it? Why do they not just give it their approval since the money is spent and there is nothing we can do about it? We cannot roll back the hands of time, the money is gone, spent, so why do they not just rubber stamp it and let it go?' Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a money bill and it gives members on this side of the House a good opportunity to talk about fiscal management, to talk about budgeting, to talk about deficits, Mr. Chairman, and that is precisely what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did. Instead of the hon. gentleman scolding my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, he should have answered some of the questions that were raised by him in his fifteen minute speech there a short while ago. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) cannot budget. He may as well in his estimates flip a coin in the air, he may as well count on his fingers. In this day and age when you have the expertise and the computers and the calculators and you have all the latest technology, there is no reason in this world why the Minister of Finance should be out \$130-odd million in his estimates. He should have been able to foresee that these things were going to take place. So really what it is, Mr. Chairman, is an admission of failure on the part of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Now, Mr. Chairman, the debate seems to have developed into a sort of a general discussion. In case my colleague from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) wants to join - and again he might get up and say, 'Well, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was correct' - this can be developed into a wide ranging debate and I am sure that my colleague will

want to ask some questions about that item in there about helping the people in Labrador City. But anyway, it seems to have developed into that kind of a debate. We will have ten minutes back and forth, by the way: Ten minutes this side, ten minutes for that side. If it can last long enough we may grind them into the ground. But what we have been talking about in the main in this debate so far is the offshore. Now, Mr. Chairman, the members there opposite now are using a different strategy than they have used previously. Their strategy now is this, that we are getting co-operation now from Mr. Mulroney's government, we are going to have an agreement and prosperity is just around the corner. Now that will be the issue. That will be the issue in the next election, that is the election issue they are going to use. The Premier will go around this Province shortly waving the offshore agreement and he will say, 'Look, I have carried it this far, I have done the job so far, I have delivered the agreement, I have fulfilled my mandate of April 6, 1982, now give me an opportunity to finish the job because prosperity is just around the corner. Put me in again and let me finish the job.' That will be what the next election will be fought on, I predict now.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I will deal with that in due course, but I want to deal with the point of why Mobil was forced by two levels of government to delay the environmental impact study. And you know you would want to be deaf, dumb, blind, or all three, if you could not see why this administration wanted the environmental impact study kept under wraps for another six months. The election will take place in that length of time, we

are going to have an election before the Spring of next year. This crowd do not relish the idea of bringing down a budget. But, Mr. Chairman, what they wanted to cover up more than anything else is the fact that Mobil and their partners Chevron - and you can take this as gospel - wanted to use semi-submersible platforms, they wanted to use steel structures instead of concrete platforms. That is the big reason for the delay in the environmental impact study, because Chevron, a partner of Mobil in the Hibernia field, wanted to do it as cheap as they could, wanted to keep the cost down because as my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said, there is a glut of oil in the world and the price of oil has dropped substantially. You can buy oil now on the open market bootlegged for \$20 a barrel, I suppose, if you wanted to. Twenty-five to twenty six dollars is the official price, but you could probably buy it for \$20. So the sense of urgency is not there anymore and the dollars, the profit, the big money is not there anymore, so Mobil and Chevron want to use semi-submersible platforms, they want to use the steel structures. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier and the gentlemen there opposite wanted that to surface, to come out for public scrutiny during an election or immediately prior to an election? Certainly they did not! Because the Premier has been banking his hopes on concrete platforms. He has told the people of this Province that the money, the jobs, are in the mode of the production, mode of operation, and Mobil was just about ready to drop the bomb in their laps. They saw it coming and they went to Ottawa to Ms. Carney, and between them they managed to force Mobil and Chevron to keep the information under wraps, just the same as they

kept the layoffs of the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the Bowater situation under wraps.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would not mind, in the six month period, if they would spend their time trying to persuade Mobil and their partners to use the concrete platforms to create a lot of jobs in this Province and buy a lot of material in this Province. But that is not what they will do, Mr. Chairman, they will call an election. The Premier will call an election and he will try to hide the fact that there is a row on. The Premier will try to conceal the fact, hide it, that there is a row on between the Province and Mobil and Chevron over the kind of a platform they are going to use to produce oil. And, let us face it, no oil is going to be brought ashore no matter what kind of a platform they use. The tankers will come in and load the oil, take it away, bring it down to Maine and feed it into the pipeline and the average Newfoundlander will never know there is oil here. There will be a few dollars go into Consolidated Revenue from the offshore, Mr. Chairman. The briefing session we had three or four years ago, I believe my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), was the one who conducted it when he was Minister of Energy, do you know we were told at that time what the number of jobs will be when they start producing oil offshore, Mr. Chairman? Does the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) know? We were told that at the production stage, once the construction period is over - and they were basing their hopes at that time on concrete platforms - there would be 1,500 jobs offshore.

MR. TOBIN:
Per well.

MR. NEARY:

Per well, but there is only one well yet - 1,500 jobs per well. We only have one well.

MR. TOBIN:

We have more wells than that.

MR. NEARY:

Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman has information that the oil companies do not have yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

Now, Mr. Chairman, occasionally in the House of Assembly we get the opportunity to have a wide-ranging debate and many of us take advantage of that. And, in doing so, one cannot avoid having a feeling of history. You have to be able to recall certain things and to live through or recount the living through of a certain period.

The period that I would like to just briefly review is the period from 1979 to 1984 and where hon. gentlemen opposite have stood during those five and a half years. They heard in August of 1979 the worst news that the Opposition ever heard, the news that oil was discovered offshore. Oil discovered offshore! Oh my God, what is going to happen? Those Tories are going to be able to manipulate that and get re-elected! That was their fear. Their fear was that prosperity would come to this Province. They feared it and you know what, ladies and gentlemen They have reason to fear it. They have

reason to fear prosperity. They have seen what the people of Newfoundland will do in adverse times when you have a Tory Government here in Newfoundland. They saw what the people of the Province did in the worst Winter in fifty years, March and April of 1982. There were no gimmicks about that, no gimmicks whatsoever. Hon. gentlemen were given the framework of the agreement, the January 1982 proposal for settlement on which the election was called and on which the election was fought successfully, and hon. gentlemen opposite never did read the agreement. It was presented to them publicly, we ran an election on the basis of it, and where this government stood. At that stage there were 33 of us, I believe it was, on this side of the House at that time. Members opposite, led by the intrepid Mr. Stirling at the time, believed that by saying the PCs on this side of the House and the PCs in the Province were separatists, that the people of Newfoundland would throw them out. Well, they found out in no uncertain terms that the people of the Province believed that the real patriots, the real Newfoundlanders, the people who stand for the great traditions of Newfoundlanders, and who stand for the future for this Province, are over here on this side of the House, and they keep getting elected and re-elected in mounting numbers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

Now that is the reality of it. There are no gimmicks. The truth is not a gimmick. There is nothing gimmicky about it. So the reality of political life in this Province is that the people of the Province support the principles

which have some 43 of us on this side. There should be 44 of us, by the way, because the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) should be a Tory, but that is one of those political problems, one of those things that happen in political life.

As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty we ran into in Menihek was that there was a concerted effort to conceal from the people of that district what the situation was and very cleverly and adroitly it used. I do not know if it was done by the hon. member or not, it was not attributed to him, but I know on election day over in Stephenville I heard it on the radio the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) - I think that he is the fifth Leader of the Opposition since 1972 - saying that the government was concealing this and as a result, of course, the government lost a seat in Menihek in 1984. The Menihek by-election is an aberration. I will not say the hon. member is an aberration, but there are those who would say that he is an aberration in the political life of this Province. But there is nothing to draw from that. That was a situation in which people who are afraid of their jobs were mobilized very cleverly by forces that oppose the government, and the member was elected. I have no doubt that the member from Port-au-Port who represents Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) will acquit himself honourably in the House nevertheless. But he was the recipient of quite a boost which was one of the aberrations in political life.

But to get back to the new House Leader (Mr. Tulk) on the opposite side, I say that the member for Fogo is in his one and only executive capacity in the House of Assembly. This is it. Because I

am predicting, and you can say you heard it here first, that whenever the next election is held - I think it is going to be held sometime within the next two and a half years because constitutionally we must do so, so I am not letting out any great secrets there - we will take forty-eight of the fifty-two seats in the House of Assembly. You heard it here first, forty-eight to four, so the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) as I said, had better enjoy his temporary place in the sun in an executive capacity in the House of Assembly. So as far as hon. members opposite are concerned, they are going to have to live with the reality that there are going to be people like myself around who are going to point out in no uncertain terms where they stood since 1979, and they stood squarely on the side of Mr. Trudeau. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Trudeau is going to bring you down just as he brought Mr. Turner down. All of the Liberals in the country who got on his bandwagon, who pointed that Mr. Trudeau was an honourable man, you can believe Mr. Trudeau's words, and all this sort of things, these people will reap what they have sown, and hon. members opposite have been sowing for five years. The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is going to attempt to rejoin his profession, but whether or not his school board will accept him I do not know, because he has been out in the wilderness now for five years and his opinions have been warped. The hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) was involved with an upgrading process in education, so maybe the hon. member for Fogo could go in for a refresher course after the next election. I expect the hon. member for Menihek will be back on the staff of that institution at that time, too. I

was certainly hoping, by the way, Mr. Chairman, that when I did drag myself to my feet here in this debate, that the member for Fogo would not leave the House. We went through a period of time in the House when the member for Fogo and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) would act as my jousting partners. But having gotten the better of them for several years, they decided every time I would get up that the best way to handle me, since I had the microphone and they could not compete with me because right is on my side - you do not have to be particularly bright, when right is on your side and you are standing for what is right and honourable and patriotic, and that leaves hon. members opposite at a considerable disadvantage - so they used to leave the Chamber. For a couple of years, when I got up to speak they used to leave, that was their ploy. Of course, there is nobody over there with very much spunk anyway. I have finished dealing with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). He and I for some reason have a friendly relationship and cannot work up a good dispute at all. But hon. members opposite were supporters of Mr. Trudeau and his predatory, malevolent government. There are all kinds of adjectives you can use to describe that particular government; predatory and malevolent are but two. They are supporters of Mr. Chretien, the man who -

MR. MORGAN:

He barely won his own seat.

MR. STAGG:

He barely won his own seat, yes. The people of Quebec obviously were not great supporters of his, but members opposite were supporters of Mr. Chretien, the man who came down here and I say lied to the general public of

Newfoundland. There was framework for an agreement, one similar to what Miss Carney and Mr. Crosbie and Premier Peckford and Mr. Mulroney later worked out, a year and a half or two years ago, and what happened? What happened is that hon. members opposite, when Mr. Chretien backtracked, instead of saying that he was -

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. STAGG:

By leave, Mr. Chairman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No leave for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Leave is not granted.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to deal with the hon. clone that just took his seat. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, he is trying to worm his way into the Cabinet. He has gone back into ancient history, into the past. It is a wonder he did not go back to Squire's time. Mr. Chairman, has anybody told the hon. gentleman that the people to whom he referred are all gone? The real question that the lackeys over there should ask themselves, the lapdogs, the handmaidens of Ottawa, is this: Could Newfoundland have gotten a better deal? That is the question they should be asking themselves because, Mr. Chairman, the letter between Mr. Mulroney, the federal Minister of Energy (Ms Carney) and the Premier of this Province is a

compromise on principles they would not agree to with the Liberals. They agreed with the Tories, were prepared to compromise the shop, give the shop away to the Tories but, Mr. Chairman, they would not deal with the Liberals on these matters and that is the truth of it. Joint management was there on the table for the last three years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Wrong.

MR. NEARY:

Treating the resource the same as if it were on land was announced over at the university by Mr. Trudeau when he was Prime Minister. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at what has happened to the offshore and get back to where I left off ten minutes ago about the steel structures versus the concrete platforms. How often has this administration shifted their ground in the last four or five years! The Premier started out by saying he would talk to nobody, would deal with nobody until that somebody, or whoever he was dealing with, agreed that Newfoundland owned the resource. That was their position: Newfoundland had to own the resource or they would talk to nobody. Now, Mr. Chairman, where have we come since then? We have come to a position which I consider to be a bit of a sell-out, because in that letter the most important point is an override clause. The Government of Canada can overrule this Province any time they want to, can declare the resource to be in the national interest and they can overrule the Province on the mode and pace of development or anything else involving the offshore. They would not agree with Mr. Chretien on that when he wanted to put it in. They would not agree. They said, 'No, we demand joint

ownership.' But now the most important clause in that letter is an override clause. The Government of Canada can overrule the Province any time they want to. So they have come from demanding ownership to giving the authority for the mode and pace of development, and everything else in connection with the offshore resource they have given to Ms Carney and Mr. Mulroney. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I started to say a few moments ago before I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), the big issue now, the big dispute, the row, the fuss is about what kind of platform will be used in the production of oil offshore. That is where the row is taking place and that is why they wanted the lid kept on the environmental impact study. They did not want the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to find out that there was a dispute on, that Mobil and Chevron and their partners were going to use steel structures that would not be constructed in this Province but brought in from outside, and there would be no concrete platforms. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Premier of this Province - he is not in his seat today and I wish he were - that if he is honest and sincere, if he is not trying to pull a gigantic bluff, if he is not trying to play partisan politics and arouse people's emotions, that before he calls an election let him indicate to the people of this Province what kind of platforms are going to be used, not just go to the electorate with a piece of paper and say, 'Look, we have an agreement,' when the people do not know what kind of platforms are going to be used, whether they will be concrete platforms or semi-submersible steel structures.

MR. BAIRD:

You will find out all about

platforms when the election is called.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should remember that the first oil rig ever to sail into Newfoundland waters came in under a Liberal administration back in 1967, the SEDCO I. It was a Liberal administration that brought the first oil rig into this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, people must realize that it is going to be steel structures for the first five years, and probably even after that, and that crowd over there will be able to do nothing about it. Because Mr. Moores and Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Conrad Black and Walter Wolfe - the same Walter Wolfe who financed Joe Clark's downfall and put Mulroney in - are the boys who will call the shots, and the oil companies, of course. When Brian Mulroney and Walter Wolfe, and Frank Moores and his cronies are finished with that crowd over there they will think a steamroller went over them. Do you hear them standing up to Ottawa now or standing up to the oil companies? No! They are over there now like milquetoast, agreeing with everything Ottawa does. Mr. Chairman, the Premier and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) should come across the House and join with the Opposition in fighting that crowd up there in Ottawa who already got Canada on a disaster course and they have only been there since September 4. So, Mr. Chairman, we will never know whether or not we could have gotten a better oil deal on the offshore. We will never know

because the hon. gentleman refused to negotiate with the Liberals, refused to negotiate with Mr. Turner. How will we know? Will we ever know? No, Mr. Chairman. They are panic-stricken now because the world price of oil is dropping. There is a glut of oil in the world and there is no urgency to develop the offshore. So they are panic-stricken now and they will take anything that Walter Wolfe and Frank Moores and Brian Mulroney and their cronies pass on to them.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who is Walter Wolfe?

MR. NEARY:

Walter Wolfe is the guy who sent in the offshore money from Bermuda and from Switzerland to defeat Joe Clark and to get Brian Mulroney elected. The hon. gentleman must not read the Globe and Mail. Practically every day in the Globe and Mail there is an item demanding that Mulroney declare where he got the money to bring the delegates from Quebec to Winnipeg. Mr. Walter Wolfe owns several offshore service vessels here. He sailed into Newfoundland waters when Mr. Moores was Premier here, and that may be a subject of investigation and an embarrassment before too long. These are the boys who will call the shot, Mr. Chairman. And when you read that letter that they have been promoting and boasting and gloating about, you will see that there is nothing new in it, not one item that was not on the table previously. They wasted four precious years and now they will take anything they can get, Mr. Chairman, in the hope the people in the next election will fall for it. They will hail this as the Magna Carta, they will say this is the greatest agreement since Confederation, the greatest thing that has happened to Newfoundland since Confederation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I was tempted to forego this, but after the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) mentioned such kind words I felt that it was important to at least get up and make a few comments. I do have some comments, actually, about the bill itself, and I know that is going to be somewhat surprising given the tenor of the debate that has occurred here, but I want to make some comments about that as I get on.

I am not sure how I should introduce myself, as the 'abberation from Menihek' or the 'abberation for Menihek', I really was not up to the subtleties that were being involved there, but I can assure you that if it is an abberation then I intend to lead a lot more abberations into this House after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

I would also like to mention, since it was raised, the way in which the by-election went in Menihek about a month ago. I mention it, not because I would particularly like to, to tell you the truth, but because of the way in which the Premier went on and on and on after the by-election first saying that the unions up there were obviously responsible for the victory. Quite frankly I was proud of that because there is a very strong and long-lasting connection between my party and the union movement and one that we certainly cherish and hope to strengthen in the future. Now, I did not object to those comments.

But then the Premier took the poll results, went through them poll by poll and analyzed them by looking at particular areas where he perceived the management people in Labrador City lived, and - surprise, surprise! - he actually found out that the management people voted for a New Democrat. This was quite surprising to him, so his interpretation, reached in some misguided series of logic in my opinion, was there must have been some grand conspiracy between the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the New Democratic Party, which is about as farfetched an assumption as I can possibly imagine! We have consistently been the only party in this Provinces to demand that the mining companies pay their fair share of taxes on a continuing basis, and I could not see, really, where it would be to the Iron Ore Company of Canada's interests, or any mining company in this Province, to see new Democrats in the House.

There is one other comment the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) made that I must really latch on to. If I got it correctly, when he was talking about his own limited intelligence, he said something like when you are right you do not have to be bright. I thought of that for a second and I said, I understand what he means, he is obviously talking about right in terms of the political spectrum, and it has been my experience that when you are right you are not particularly bright. So that I fully accept that comment now that I understand the way in which it should be understood.

The other comment I would like to make about it is that quite frankly I was very disappointed in the Premier and wondered why his reaction was so extreme. As members have pointed out

frequently, there is a surplus of blue Tories over on the other side here, and we do not really need a heck of a lot more in this House in order to make the debate better than it is. And I just recalled something which can be pointed to, that since the Premier became Premier in 1979, this is the very first time that he has lost a seat that has been held previously by the Tories

MR. STEWART:

No.

MR. FENWICK:

It is the first time he has lost one. I agree in Bellevue he won -

MR. RIDEOUT:

Not true.

AN HON. MEMBER:

St. Mary's he lost.

MR. FENWICK:

St. Mary's. I am sorry.

MR. DAWE:

And the other thing is he became Premier in 1978, not 1979.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, it was in 1979 the last time I checked. As a matter of fact I am absolutely sure he did become Premier in 1979. So the minister is incorrect in saying it was 1978 and if he wants to check it up he can. The convention I believe was in February of 1979, I am not sure, I was not there but I am sure some of you were.

But the other thing I wanted to mention was that that is probably the reason that he took the loss so badly. I really feel sorry about that because we intend to bring a lot more New Democrats into the House, and if that is the way he reacts to just one, I am surprised. I think there were actually some comments made before

about our replacing the Liberals. I want to correct that right now. We have no intentions whatsoever of replacing the Liberal Party in this House. We have every intention in the world of replacing the Progressive Conservative Party in this House and that is our objective.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Pigs might fly but they are very unlikely birds.

MR. FENWICK:

I just wonder if I should duck the ice cubes now. Anyway those were the comments I wanted to make on the member for Stephenville's (Mr. Stagg) comments on that. The other thing I would like to raise, and this is in a much more serious tone, is that when I looked at the supplementary supply I noticed in Social Services \$3 million was spent for the Community Development Programme. The Community Development Programme was put forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Collins) when he made the motion as a sort of great programme to alleviate unemployment and to get people off social assistance and in a position where they are in the work force. Of course, if that were the case I would totally endorse the programme. But, as most members who have seen the programme in operation know, it is the most cynical buck-passing that I have ever seen in my entire life. What it in fact does is hire people on for the period of time they need in order to qualify for unemployment insurance and then they pass responsibility for these poor individuals from the Social Services department to the federal unemployment insurance programme. In a sense, there may be some way in which they are better off, since they are not subject to all the strictures of the Social Services department and

all the regulations and so on and so forth, and they are back, to a small degree, in control of their own lives. But I have talked to a number of people who have been involved in this programme and they are beginning to get the impression that they are ping-pong balls between the provincial and the federal levels of government and that they are being batted back and forth on a continuing basis, and they are wondering what is the point of this whole exercise. A large number of the people whom I have talked to were people who were involved in homemakers' services, they were involved in day-care operations that operated for a short period of time, all of which were desirable social programmes, that is the point of the whole thing. And it seemed to me that these were desirable programmes that should have continued on an ongoing basis. Admittedly, we would not have been able to dump as many of our social services recipients on to unemployment insurance as we have with this programme, but it seemed to me that these kinds of day-care programmes and child-care programmes and so on were desirable and necessary and the kinds of things that as a civilized society we should have had. But it is to me extremely disheartening to see these things put in place for a short period of time, then jerked away once these people qualify for their unemployment insurance and then being dumped on that. And the amount of confusion that is put in people's minds when their lives are played with this way, I think is an enormous disservice to them. So quite frankly, the money has been spent and there is no way, as has been pointed out, that it is not going to be spent again. But I really think that that cynicism that underlies that

kind of programme, I think other people call it desperation, but the desperation and cynicism that is there is not becoming of a government that should have a more intelligent long-term approach to what we want to do in terms of providing employment for the people of this country or the people of this Province. And I really would strongly urge the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) if he were here, to really look seriously at that kind of a programme. If you are going to do it, and we need those services, let us offer them on a continuing basis so that the people of the Province will have those services. Let us not just use it as a little game that we are playing with the unemployment insurance people, which, quite frankly, I think, if they strictly enforced the regulations, could charge this provincial government with fraud under the Unemployment Insurance Act, but I am not entirely sure whether that would work or not. I do think it is a cynical programme and I would strongly recommend that it be dropped in the future and something else put in its place.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Chairman, since it is close to 6:00 p.m., I do not know if I should start now and finish up tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Is it agreed to call it 6:00 p.m.?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:
The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred, report having made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the President of the Council.

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 14, 1984 at 3:00 p.m.