



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 79

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

11 February 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could bring up briefly a subject before we get into the business of the day, in the form of a suggestion. It frequently happens during Question Period, that the allotted time runs out while a member is in the process of asking a series of questions. I wonder if it is possible to change a regulation or institute a regulation whereby the House would agree that when an individual member is on a series of questions, he might be permitted to complete that particular series and Question Period would end when the final answer has been given. What frequently happens, Mr. Speaker, is the main point of a supplementary series is not able to be presented, and I think the people the questions relate to do not get the full benefit of them because the opportunity to present them at a follow-up time frequently is not there. I thought an agreement by both sides of the House would be of benefit in conducting the business of this House. We could have some kind of agreement that a current or active series of questions be permitted to be completed, with a possible time limit of five or ten minutes beyond the allotted time, if the House might agree to something like that.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, if that is on a point of order, I suppose that is the only way we could discuss this now. But it is a point that, if the hon. member wanted to bring it up, he should have brought up before strangers were led into the House, before Statements by Ministers was called. That is what that session is for, if members want to discuss something privately. I do not think that is something that would find favor with the House Leader (Mr. Marshall). He is not here today, as hon. members know, what the hon. member is asking is that we just extend the length of Question Period, which would mean a change in the Rules of the House, which is a serious matter, and is something which should be discussed between the two House Leaders.

MR. SPEAKER:
The only comment I would like to make to that is our Standing Orders allow one half hour and that can be changed on a particular occasion if there is leave to do so. Otherwise, a half hour is the time allotted for Oral Questions.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering if the other side of the House would care to join this side of the House in extending congratulations to the Liberal Party of New Brunswick on their very historic and distinguished

election victory in the district of Edmunston.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member is out of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition will also congratulate the Conservative member in the Yukon for winning in his constituency, I think we will all agree.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side have no problem with that. We just want the historic significance in the district of Edmunston to be noted.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, it is rather ironic that we had the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) up a few moments ago asking for more time so they could ask some legitimate questions as to what is going on in this House of Assembly, and now we have the member for St. Barbe up wasting the time of the House. If they have business to do, let us get down and do it. They were more concerned about Nova Scotia a few years ago when they wanted us to accept their offshore petroleum programme, now they are trying to rub it in with New Brunswick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

MR. FUREY:

He rose on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I rule there is no point of order.

MR. FUREY:

I think he would recognize that the Premier legitimized by his statement, my statement.

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce on behalf of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, the signing today of the Offshore Development Fund and the immediate release of \$34 million to be spent under the Offshore Development Fund; \$25 million for the Center for Earth Resources Research at Memorial University; \$3 million to be spent on special skill training in colleges and vocational schools throughout Newfoundland and Labrador plus, with that \$3 million, \$4 million from the Employment and Immigrations Department. The \$3 million will be capital and the \$4 million will be operating for special courses to be instituted by the various colleges for skills related to offshore development; \$1 million for a computer-aided design facility in engineering as part of the Faculty of Engineering and

Applied sciences at Memorial; and a \$5 million offshore survival center to increase our training in that area for offshore survival, both for the fishery and for the offshore, totalling \$34 million.

That is being announced at the present moment by both Ministers of Energy. I also wish to announce and to provide information to hon. members of a second series of announcements by the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Energy in Ottawa as it relates to a new \$7.5 million conservation and alternate energy programme for Newfoundland and Labrador to get under way this year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we thank the Premier for this information - a copy was supplied to us just a few minutes ago. I would say that the Premier should keep in mind that the University, which will be receiving some of these funds, is, in fact, badly in need, not just of funds in these specific areas.

I have to say we wholly support the concept of the \$25 million Center for Earth Resources Research. We have a Geology Department which is recognized worldwide, really, Mr. Speaker, because of the work being done by some of the professors at the university. We have our Engineering School which has been doing some very, very good work, but regrettably we have the administration permitting the university to exist in a financial squeeze, which sees the university having run out of its snow-clearing budget as of several

weeks ago. That just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, the haphazard approach that is being taken to higher education in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there has to be better planning than for the administration to try and aim for the high-profile vote-getting announcements, Mr. Speaker, while, at the same time, putting a very, very severe financial squeeze upon the University and other centers of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to expenditure on skills training, we say it is about time, when we see the way the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) and the Premier are now scurrying around trying to catch up when they have known for years that training was going to be needed. We see the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies talking about doing away with welding courses at vocational schools. Are there going to be jobs on the offshore? Are there going to be jobs that welders will be needed for?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. BARRY:

Then why are you doing away with the courses in vocational schools? This is just one example, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that while we wholeheartedly support the concept of putting money into an offshore

survival center, where is the money that was requested a year ago, or more, for the Province to motivate more work on a proper rig evacuation system? Mr. Speaker, where is the money for an improved air - sea rescue facility?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Oral Questions

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell), who is down there all alone in his corner. It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, our gas price to the consumer is in excess of \$3 a gallon and we are paying the highest electricity rates in Canada, which is being blamed on the cost of fuel. For the last five or six months, there has been a continuous decline in the price of oil per barrel, yet we have had no break for the consumer. Is it possible the Minister of Consumer Affairs could advise this House exactly why this is happening and what he intends to do about it?

MR. TULK:
A good question.

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated in this House on a number of occasions, this government, of which I am very proud to be a part, is subsidizing electrical rates in this Province to the tune of something over \$40 million. Consumers, unfortunately, have to pay high electrical bills, but under the given financial circumstances, I think this government is doing all it can to help the consumer.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
The question I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs had to do with the fact that we are paying in excess of \$3 a gallon for gasoline and we are paying one of the highest electricity rates in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:
The question I now ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs, due to the decrease and the continual decline in the world price of oil, why are we still paying these high costs?

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) answered that question yesterday or a couple of days ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RUSSELL:

If hon. members do not want the question answered, then I will just sit down. The hon. the Minister of Finance, I think, answered this question and said that within a month or two, when the existing oil is consumed, which was bought at the higher prices, and the companies get oil at lower prices, then maybe the consumer will see a decrease in these prices.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it has been quite obvious that the price of oil has been declining over the past several months. When the price of oil in the world market increases, it takes only a few hours or a few days for the consumer to pay the increased price at the pumps. Why is it taking so long for them to get the benefit of the decrease in the price of oil?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) does not understand or does not want to understand. I just answered that question for him.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Consumer Affairs does not know how to do his job properly. A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Mrs. Carney, the Energy Minister, is in town today, has the Minister of Consumer Affairs made preparations to have meetings with the Energy Minister to find out exactly when the consumers of this Province are going to benefit from the declining price of world oil, and are we going to get better prices at the pumps now, not in six months time, and better electricity rates now, not in six years time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the hon. member's question is no, I have not made arrangements to meet with Mrs. Carney. However, I am sure, from the announcements that have been made today, that Mrs. Carney is more of a friend to this Province than her predecessor and friend of the hon. member ever was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I have a question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he can explain to the House and to the consumers of Newfoundland why it is that in Halifax today heating oil is selling for twenty-five cents a gallon less than the same oil, processed by the same company, sold in St. John's, a spread of twenty-five cents per gallon?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, that is a fair question on behalf of the hon. the member for Twillingate. There does seem to be a discrepancy. I have written a letter to the company and I have asked my officials to check into it. As soon as I get the information, I will pass it on to the hon. House. But there does seem to be a discrepancy there.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am speechless! Mr. Speaker, my question was originally to the Minister of Fisheries but I would like to direct it, I think, to the Premier, who can answer on his behalf. Last Friday we heard from the federal Department of Fisheries, Friday evening I believe, that they have dropped the 25 per cent boat subsidy on boats built for our fishery. I have a number of questions, and the first one is: What is the position of the provincial government with respect to this particular subsidy and the dropping of the subsidy?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will have to get the detailed information for the hon. the member. On the surface it would seem that it would be injurious to some of the fishermen in this Province, if there is a subsidy that had been applied to boats in the Province. But I will have to get the detailed information for the hon. the member to see what group of fishermen it would apply to and what size boats it would apply to. If it applies right across the board, obviously it will have an impact upon the number of boats that would be built in the Province this year, and put an extra load on the Fisheries Loan Board in that regard. But I will check it out for the hon. member before six o'clock and give him a more detailed answer.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

In the information that has been available from the federal Department of Fisheries there is every indication that this was an action taken by the federal government in response to the attempt to put countervailing duties on fresh fish and then ultimately on other fish. Since we all know from the application that there is a long list of programmes, some of which are provincial some of which are federal, which have been indicted in the countervail action from the States, my question to the Premier is, is there any attempt on the part of the provincial government to look at its own programmes to see about eliminating those in response to this countervail and, secondly, of the federal programmes, is there any willingness on the part of the provincial government to see any of the federal subsidy programmes or support programmes for the fisheries altered as a result of the application of this countervailing duty?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are not, at this point in time, looking at any programmes that we have provincially from the point of view of eliminating them as a result of the countervail. We are studying the situation very carefully. We are hopeful, however, that through negotiations that hopefully will get underway later this year between Canada and the United States, that we can

deal with that around the Table government to government as opposed to ad hocly responding now to individual circumstances or decisions as they are made by the United States or made by Canada. I think we would be extremely concerned if the federal government now decided on somewhat of an ad hoc basis to start playing around with a programme here or a programme there, because I do not think that is the approach that should be taken.

The other point is, of course, that there is also a list of programmes in the United States, in various States as well as through the federal government, that are supplied to fishermen in the United States. So it would seem to me that the more appropriate way to tackle this issue is to get around the table as fast as we can as it relates to a more comprehensive trade agreement with the United States. But, at the present moment, the Province is not contemplating eliminating any programmes.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

As I hear the Premier talking there, he indicates that he believes that a comprehensive trade agreement will be an end to these countervailing duties. The indication we have is that these are apart, completely separate from the idea of free trade. Free trade in itself would not invalidate the joint commission in the States on it. My final question to the Premier is is he in the process of making

representation to Mr. Wilson and to the federal government to ensure that the budget we will see coming up in several weeks time will not dismantle more of these fisheries programmes that seem to be on the list to be eliminated?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We have looked carefully at it and where we think there is any potential for that happening, we will, obviously, make representation. But let me just say to the hon. member that I think he misunderstands what the Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement is, as do a lot of Canadians. It is not only a question of dealing with tariff barriers, it is a question of dealing with non-tariff barriers, like the countervail. The biggest threat that Canada faces today, and Newfoundland faces, is not with the tariff barriers themselves, it is with the non-tariff system that is established in the United States. And it is not only true of the United States, it is true of Japan, it is true of the EEC, and so on. The biggest problem in the whole free trade debate today is that the non-tariff area is just as significant, if not more significant, than the tariff area. And that is why it is called the Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement - I like to call it that as opposed to just talking free trade or some other terminology - for that reason. And the talks that we have had in the last couple of months with the federal government are along the lines that any comprehensive free trade agreement must deal just as significantly with non-tariff measures by countries as with tariff measures.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question which is related to the question asked by the member for Menihek. I wanted to ask the question of the Minister of Fisheries but, since he is not here, I will ask the Premier. Mr. Siddon, in making the announcement that the subsidy of 25 per cent was going to be cut, stated that one of the reasons he was doing this was that it was mentioned by the United States people as one of the reasons why they asked for a countervailing tariff.

Now, it seems to me that what is happening is the federal Minister of Fisheries is saying that the federal government is willing to remove some of the programmes we have in place for infrastructure for the fishery in this country in order that the United States will not put in countervailing tariffs. Now, I ask the Premier if he has made any representation to either the federal Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie), or the federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) or Mr. Clark, himself, the External Affairs Minister, to find out if that is the position of the federal government, that when the United States starts to ask for countervailing tariffs, they are all at once going to remove some programme that they have in place as an infrastructure programme for fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that question is

based upon an inaccuracy. It is the kind of thing that happens all the time in this House. You know, it is just a little bit of hyperbole which exaggerates the whole thing. I read the article and Mr. Siddon said it was not because of representation from the United States that he eliminated that subsidy. So, now, lets get it straight, lets be accurate in what we are saying here. There has been a subsidy programme eliminated. I am going to investigate and see why and what impact it could have on the Province, and I will do that before six o'clock. But from my reading of the article, it was not because of that countervail or other things that happened in the United States that the subsidy was removed, and that is what the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans said, but we will have to look very closely at it. We have indicated already to the federal government on many, many occasions, in the last few months, that the only way to approach this whole issue of countervail is not through going through this department or that department and looking at programmes, it is to move ahead expeditiously on starting the negotiations, so you look at the whole range of things rather than isolating one sector out from another sector. But it is of concern, obviously, and where it is injurious to Newfoundland, we will do everything we can to try to have it corrected.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

To the Premier again, Mr. Speaker. I have to advise him that the federal Minister of Fisheries did make that part of his original statement and he backed away from it yesterday, in the House of Commons, when he was questioned on it by some Liberal MPs from Newfoundland. The statement was made, and I would ask the Premier one other question:

MR. TOBIN:

Table the statement.

MR. TULK:

It is in his press release. You should read it. A few minutes ago the Premier was not aware of it, now he is aware of everything that goes on there.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier one other question: In yesterday's newspaper, The Evening Telegram I think it was, we saw a further effort by the New England fishermen to have a countervailing tariff placed on lobster from Canada. Now, this is the third fishery. It is fairly obvious that there has been no representation made, no effort made by the Premier to have those countervailing tariffs stopped, and very little effort, if any, made to have the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) keep the programmes in place that are now in place to benefit the Newfoundland fishery. I would ask the Premier if, indeed, he has made any effort to have this stopped before we get a tariff placed on lobster in this Province, which will affect our fishermen, will affect Nova Scotian fishermen, will affect fishermen in all of Atlantic Canada. I ask him if he has made any effort to see that that is stopped before it gets started, or is he just going to sit there and

wait to see what the federal minister does?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, once again, just inundated within inaccuracies. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) gets up and says I did not know and now I know everything. All I said in my second statement was, 'I had read an article.' I did not say I knew everything, or suddenly did not know anything and now know everything. That is totally inaccurate and an exaggeration of somebody's opinion. I said that I had read an article in which the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans said it was not the reason why he withdrew. That is what I read. Now, that is all I am saying. That is what I read the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans said. I mean, if we are going to ask questions, let us get accurate about it so I can give accurate responses.

We have a team working full time on the whole question of countervail and we have given a number of individuals from the Department of Fisheries, provincially, to the federal government and to the process because we had a number of individuals who were classified by the federal government as being experts in this field, and had not only to do with fresh fish, but frozen fish, lobsters, the whole kit and caboodle. We are on top of it and are working on it daily as it relates to actions in the United States which are injurious to our economic well-being here in Newfoundland and we will continue to do so. We have lawyers and Fisheries people on it

constantly. We are not waiting for something to happen, we are acting before it happens. We are very much on top of it and we have been recognized, as a matter of fact, by the other provinces as having some of the more specialized people necessary to respond to such actions by individual groups in the United States.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier did make the statement to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) that he had heard somewhere that the subsidy was removed but he was not certain; then all at once he was certain when I asked him a question about it. Now, let me ask him if he would table in this House any correspondence he has had with, I would assume the Prime Minister in this case, or the Minister of External Affairs. Would he table any correspondence he has had regarding efforts on the part of the provincial government to have those countervailing tariffs stopped? Is he as worried as many fishermen and many people in this Province are that indeed what we are seeing here is the United States put in place a set of tariffs before they sit down to the table to negotiate a free trade package with Canada? Are we going to indeed end up on the losing end of the stick when it comes to the Newfoundland fishery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. member does not even understand how the process works down in the United States. The US Government is made up of three branches, it just so happens, Congress, the Executive and the Judiciary, and the process that is now entrain happens to be a countervail process which is activated by individual groups around the United states, not by the Government of the United States. The whole issue of protectionism has arisen from some of these local groups, as well as from Congress, and not from the government. So for the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to allege that suddenly there is a design tactic by the executive branch of the United States, the government -

MR. BARRY:

They are politicians.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is what the hon. member said. So let us separate the Executive of the United States from the Congress part of the United States, because if you are talking about government you are talking about the Executive. The hon. member for Fogo mentioned the Government of the United States has a deliberate policy, before they sit down to the table, to organize a whole bunch of tariffs against Canada so that then they have taken that advanced position so that they could move back and still have a good position when they are finished. Well, that is complete balderdash, that just demonstrates an ignorance by the hon member on how the process works in the United States.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has

expressed it. We are in talks with the federal government now almost daily as it relates to the whole question of trade with the United States, and we are actively, with the industry and with the federal government, involved in trying to do our utmost to ensure that additional countervail duties do not apply to products out of Newfoundland, and we will leave no stone unturned to put our best case forward.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and myself had the privilege of going down to Washington and seeing the system work. While I was down there, I talked with Mr. Matthew J. Abraham, President of Camco, who wrote the Premier in January 1984, long before the fresh fish tariff ever came into existence, and long before talk of a tariff on frozen fish or lobster. Mr. Abraham wrote the Premier in 1984 suggesting that, because of the serious nature and the tone of Congress, and because of the system in particular, once the countervail did come into effect, the President had no jurisdiction whatsoever to override the countervail.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. HISCOCK:

The question to the Premier is, Mr. Abraham wrote the Premier on January 1984, what action did the Premier take to use his talents as a lobbyist in Washington, and what other actions did he take to

ensure the protection of the Newfoundland Fishery, for which America is our largest market?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware there is a countervail; it happened on the salt fish before it happened on the fresh fish. If it occurs, it is not overridden by the President. I am also aware that what we are involved in is negotiations between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada, and if those are successful and there is an agreement reached, then the President submits it to Congress. That is how that gets done and gets changed. So that is the route in which it goes. I am quite familiar with the way the situation works in the United States.

Now, the other thing that I am also quite familiar with, Mr. Speaker, is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the other thing I am familiar with is that the best way to approach this situation is not for Newfoundland to go down by itself to Washington and try to fight this, it is to do it through the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the other provinces and the industry. So what we have been trying to do as a country, with the various vested interests under the word

'country', is to co-ordinate our efforts so we would have the best expertise and make the most impact. That is the way we have proceeded through the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the other provinces and the industry. We have taken every step possible to try to protect our products that are exported into the United States market and we will continue to do so.

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

I will refresh the Premier's mind: He got the letter, he answered the letter, he referred the letter to the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) and nothing was ever done about it; the Premier did no further checking on it.

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, a little while ago, an hon. member opposite said that Question Period needed to be longer, he advocated it be longer. Well, now, the hon. member got up and he gave an extremely long preamble to his first question, such that Your Honour had to call him to order. Now he gets into a supplementary question. There is supposed to be no preamble, and he sets out on another preamble. I think the hon. member should be asked to

pose his supplementary question and let us get on with Question Period?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the point is well taken. Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. HISCOCK:

The question is to the Premier. Could the Premier table any correspondence he has had with Mr. Abraham with regard to countervailing duties? Also, with regard to the fact that the Premier delegated the Minister of Development at that time to follow this up, was this one of the reasons the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) was dropped from Cabinet and sent to Treasury Board?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, how foolish, Mr. Speaker. How foolish!

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, about a month or two ago, I had an exchange with the hon. member for Fortune about the free trade issue; it followed the Halifax meetings, the First Ministers' Meetings. At that time, we mentioned, or I think it was in the press, that there would be a two month period during which the detail of the input would be determined. I guess we are well passed or into that ninety days.

MR. DECKER:

Everything is ninety days.

MR. SIMMONS:

I wonder at this point is the Premier in a position to tell us what has been ironed out there in terms of the nature of the provincial input, particularly Newfoundland's input into the free trade negotiations and, specifically, does he now see the need for a veto by Newfoundland in certain instances, apropos the kinds of things we have been discussing the last few minutes in Question Period?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is a good question and I thank the hon. member for it.

As perhaps the hon. member knows from the media over the last number of weeks, there have been fairly extensive negotiations between all the provinces with Mr. Simon Reeseman in Ottawa, on the officials level, and then there have been meetings between the ministers of the provinces to try to iron out a provincial position, a co-ordinated, united provincial position and then to sit down with the federal government and see if there is agreement with us on what we had agreed to. I am not at liberty at this point in time to disclose how far along that is, just simply to say that I think we are fairly close to there being a provincial position. Then we will be sitting down with the federal government to see whether in fact that position can be accommodated by the federal government in their negotiations with the United

States.

I also want to say to the hon. member that I do not believe honestly, and I say this frankly and truthfully here today, that we will be able to achieve a comprehensive free trade agreement with the United States, which I think is absolutely critical to this country if any Province has an absolute veto. I really do not think that you are going to be able to achieve it. I would not hold out as a provincial Premier for an absolute veto in that. It might be parochially and provincially popular so to do, but in the best interests of the country and even of the Province, you just would not achieve it and we would back into a morass of more countervail without any agreement in place. I will not, as one provincial Premier, push for an absolute veto. But, Mr. Speaker, in the negotiations that are ongoing it will become clear as soon as the provincial position is known the kind of involvement that all of the provinces will want to see, which will be substantial.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
I have been trying for some time to be recognized, Mr. Speaker, on an important question, especially for members in St. John's, and I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition has not asked the question long before I have. I would like the Minister of Transportation to bring us up to date on the status of the proposed Ring Road that is going to

surround St. John's and tell us what stage this particular enterprise has reached.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. the member for St. John's North for his question. Of course the whole situation with regard to the proposed Outer Ring Road has created concern in, shall we say, both directions over the past number of years, and particularly in recent months, as it relates to the actual exact location of the road and so on. In a public meeting that was held a number of months ago, I guess about a year and a half ago, it was decided at that time, even though the original proposal and the concept for the Outer Ring Road was before the environmental assessment legislation, that we would in fact file that particular project with the Environment Department and put it fully within the context of the new environmental legislation as it now stands.

In addition, at that time Newfoundland Light and Power, or Hydro, who wish to put a transmission corridor through that particular park, joined with the Department of Transportation in making a joint proposal to the Environment Department, and the Environment Department subsequently ordered an environmental assessment be done.

We have been through a number of public sessions at this point and, in the next few days, there will be a second public forum established so that people with concerns about the proposed road can voice their concerns and have

a look at what the consultants have done to this point in time.

Certainly it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the importance of the Outer Ring Road, as the developments here on the Confederation Building Hill will attest to over the next number of months, is very important as it relates to transportation within the area. Certainly as development on the offshore heats up and other activities occur in the St. John's area, the importance from an industrial perspective of the Outer Ring Road becomes more important as days go by. But we are proceeding along to make sure that not only the industrial benefits associated with the Outer Ring Road but also the environmental concerns expressed by the residents not only in Pippy Park but in other parts of the city, are recognized as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I thank the minister for his answer. I wonder would he associate some numbers with his answer in terms of dates and ballpark figures for cost of the enterprise?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWÉ:

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to put exact dates in. As you know

and as the House is aware, the environmental process has not been completed yet and there is a format, through my colleague's department, as it relates to timing. Once the original assessment from the proponents, which is a department in Hydro, is submitted to the Environment Department, they have a committee process they go through to look at it and from their perspective, then, to ask for additional information, or that additional safeguards be put in place from the committee's point of view and so on. So there is a timing factor that is sort of up to the environmental assessment panel when they meet on it.

As it relates to the cost of the road, I think there are fairly significant numbers involved in that process. We have, to date, acquired some \$5 million or \$6 million worth of property that will accommodate the Outer Ring Road and auxiliary roads leading into it. We are in the process of acquiring additional property within the park and outside the park as it relates to the total infrastructure, and that will be in excess of some \$12 million. The road, itself, during construction or of the construction phase, is estimated to be some \$80 million to \$90 million. So it is a significant proposal, Mr. Speaker, and we will be going ahead with it in the time frames that are layed out under the environmental legislation.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier talked about knowing the American system. I wonder if he knows the Canadian system. Does he know, Mr. Speaker, that under the Canadian Constitution there are certain matters within the jurisdiction of the provincial government and one of the matters, Mr. Speaker, within the jurisdiction of the provincial government is the creation of jobs on land, the protection of industry that we have on land? I would like to ask the Premier how he can reconcile the protection of that provincial jurisdiction with this now whimperish concession to Mr. Mulroney to back off once again and refuse to look for a veto in those areas of provincial jurisdiction - not federal - in the free trade negotiations? He is whimpering out again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) would ask me that question because I had indicated to the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) that I thought no absolute veto would make for success. However, there will be, and this will become clear when the negotiations are completed with the federal government, a mechanism as it relates to provincial jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Orders of the Day

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain

Resolutions relating to the Advancing or Guaranteeing of Certain Loans made under the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957 (No. 2), Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):
Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, I cannot hear myself speak.

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

DR. COLLINS:
The Government House Leader -

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Minister of Finance is up and at least he is trying to make a half statement so will somebody keep the mouth for Burin - Placentia West quiet so that we can hear him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

I am about to say something about that. Would the hon. member take his seat? I have been calling order for the last three minutes and, with all due respect to the hon. member for Fogo, it is a toss up, it was going back and forth on both sides so, let us have order.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) last day indicated that we probably would be going into a Justice Bill but, the hon. Minister of Justice is not here. I did discuss this with the House Leader opposite and we decided to let this present resolution come to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution deals with the Bill that will come in after, that is Bill 35, the amendment to the Loan and Guarantee Act. This is something that we have to bring in just about every year because the government through the year gives guarantees, after careful study of the proposals put forth, to various companies, individuals, corporations and so on and so forth that should be carrying on activities in the Province for the benefit of the working population of the Province.

These guarantees are then subject to ratification by the House and an amendment to the schedule of this act is the means whereby the House ultimately gives its ratification or consent. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment to the schedule is somewhat delayed in coming in. That is unfortunate I think. I would just like to remind hon. members that if we give a guarantee and the guarantee is not ratified by this House, strictly speaking we cannot pay out on that guarantee in the normal manner. We then have to go through another procedure. We have to bring in a Special Warrant to be able to deliver on the guarantee, whereas, if this amendment to the schedule goes through the House, then the House has given its okay, shall we

say, on the guarantee. If, unfortunately, it does come about that we have to pay out, well, we have the authority to do it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will just very briefly run over some of the major ones that are included in the amendment to the schedule of this act. The first one deals -

MR. BARRY:

Could the minister indicate whether there have been any payouts up to now that have gone through?

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, sure. There are notes attached to the bill itself which give some details but perhaps I will just add on a little.

The first one is Aqua Fisheries Limited. We had a guarantee in there. We are amending the schedule now to indicate that we have given an extension on that guarantee and increased that guarantee. We have increased it up to \$150,000 from \$90,000. That guarantee will be in place until the end of May. This is to allow this company to operate. It is situated in Aquaforte and there are a fairly large number of workers there, about sixty. It is an inshore operation. It has been working on a reduced scale because of the difficulty with the inshore fishery but nevertheless, it is still in operation. We have not had any payout on that particular one.

The next one is the Atlantic Ocean Farms Limited. I think this is a very interesting one because this is an aquaculture operation and it will be and is developing an operation to grow a particular type of mussel. I think they are called blue mussels. Anyway, they

are a particularly acceptable type of cultured mussel in the United States market in particular. This is the first project of this sort.

MR. BARRY:
Very tasty!

DR. COLLINS:
Very tasty! I think they are quite large too. This is the first attempt at this sort of thing in the Province and government was anxious to support it. We gave a guarantee of \$270,000 which will support the working capital requirements. They will begin to market their product lightly later on this year. That will only be the beginning. Their operation will build up over a number of years.

The third and fourth items deal with Baie Verte Mines Inc. and I am not sure I need to go into a great deal of detail on that. We all know that the Baie Verte asbestos mine out there is having difficulties mainly because of world markets. There is a bit of turndown in demand. I would not say a bit of a turndown, there is a very distinct turndown in the demand for asbestos in world markets. But it is a large employer out there. It is a very good product and we want to give the operation every possible chance before we say it cannot go on. The federal government is also supporting the operation very heavily but the federal government has decided that unless some new factor comes about, they feel that they cannot go any further than they have already gone.

We have not reached that decision. We feel that we still have to support the operation out there whilst detailed studies are going on and there are detailed

studies going on.

MR. SIMMONS:
On the previous item concerning the blue mussels, where is that development taking place?

DR. COLLINS:
That is a good question. I believe it was in Placentia Bay but I will have to get the -

MR. BARRY:
(Inaudible). They had a booth down at the last offshore show at the stadium and some of their mussels were exhibited.

DR. COLLINS:
Right. Yes. I think it is on the Burin side. We can find out.

The fifth one is Earle Proteins Limited and we have a guarantee in there to the extent of \$400,000. Earle Proteins Limited essentially deals with fish offal, making it into fish meal and of course it is a very, very important operation because otherwise you would have an awful lot of offal, and that is not a pun. You would have an awful lot of offal around the place unless you have operations like this in place.

Unfortunately, the fish meal market has had a decline - do you like that? - there has been a decline.

MR. BARRY:
The offal market is awful.

DR. COLLINS:
It is not only awful, it has gone off, and prices are down. Hopefully this is a temporary situation. For two reasons, because we think it will be a temporary situation and, secondly, because it is a very valuable means of dealing with a raw

resource that does not have too many other outlets, we felt that we should support this operation by a guarantee.

The sixth one has to do with Easteel Industries Ltd. and -

MR. FENWICK:

(Inaudible) did I hear you say the federal government has stopped funding it?

MR. PEACH:

You are not in your seat so you cannot ask questions.

DR. COLLINS:

What I meant was that the federal government has indicated that they are not interested in putting any further support there unless some new factor, some new process or something new is added on. They feel that as things stand at the present time they have put in a good deal of support there, I think it amounts to something like \$13 million, and they feel that that is as far as they can go in present circumstances.

MR. BARRY:

That was under the previous administration when they had a Liberal member speaking to a Liberal government.

MR. FENWICK:

I beg your pardon.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, it was some time ago but the present administration has been very supportative of the operation there but they feel that they have a responsibility for the public funds at their disposal. They feel they can only go so far and they have gone a long way.

MR. FLIGHT:

When did the federal government make their intentions definitely known? When did they say they were not prepared to continue to support it?

DR. COLLINS:

They have indicated that to us as we have found that the operation needs continued support and we have gone to them and asked them to join with us and continue supporting the operation. To date they felt that they have gone a very long way. Let us face it, they have gone further than the Province but, on the other hand, they have more means at their disposal than the Province. They feel that they cannot at this stage, unless there is something new, unless there is a new positive feature on the horizon, only then will they be willing to look at it again.

I mentioned Easteel Industries. It is a relatively old company as metal fabricators go I suppose although it started out under a different name, but they are in difficulties, as is the steel fabrication industry generally in the Province. They have come to us and we have acceded to their requests -

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible) offshore base that we have here.

DR. COLLINS:

Presumably, they will form part of our manufacturing effort in regard to the offshore when the offshore development gets underway quite smartly, and this is one of the reasons why we acceded to their request for assistance. We also feel that they have a fighting chance to make it and we have a guarantee in place there to the

extent of \$100,000.

MR. TULK:
Would the minister permit a question?

DR. COLLINS:
Surely.

MR. TULK:
It says an additional \$100,000, are you saying that you now guarantee \$600,000 for Easteel? I think the guaranteed \$500,000 to them already.

DR. COLLINS:
It was \$400,000 previously.

Now on this new guarantee they have in place certain solid contracts and we have arranged that the cash flow from those contracts will flow directly to the bank account in terms of which this \$100,000 guarantee is put in place. So we have a considerable amount of protection. In other words, we sort of isolated this particular item that they requested so that any cash flow they have coming in from solid contracts in place will not be dissipated elsewhere, it will go to reduce the bank loan to which this guarantee is related.

The seventh one is Fisheries Products Limited. That is essentially gone by the board now in this respect: we have very few guarantees now, because most of our guarantees that were in place in terms of Fishery Products were replaced by the equity injection which the federal government and ourselves have put in. I think the total federal equity in Fishery Products International now is about \$150 million, and ours is something in the order of \$60 million, I believe. But we have on our hands a very viable company

now, fortunately.

The eighth one, Fitz Ennis Cement Carriers, is again related to some extent to the offshore or the prospects of the offshore. This request for a guarantee was to enable the company to purchase and to refit a vessel that they will use to transport their cement from the West Coast to the East Coast here so that it will be available for the concrete platform. That guarantee that we did put in place was for bridge financing and in actual fact that guarantee is no longer applicable. The guarantee is now elapsed. It was only bridge financing. They got more permanent financing in place so our guarantee came off.

MR. BARRY:
We are not involved now?

DR. COLLINS:
No, we are not involved there at all now at this date.

The ninth one is Heritage Woodworks Limited. This is a small company and it is involved in the production of furniture using local timber. The guarantee is a fairly small amount, \$30,000. It will be in place until June of next year. Whether they will need to extend it beyond that time only time will tell. As far as I know, they seem to be putting out a good product and they seem to be going ahead satisfactorily.

MR. BARRY:
Where is it?

DR. COLLINS:
Again, I am not quite sure. I do not know if anybody in Committee knows where Heritage Woodwork is. I have just forgotten, but it is a small furniture operation anyway.

The tenth one is P. Janes and Sons which is a fish firm longstanding in the Province. We have in place there \$500,000 working capital guarantee which, as the note indicates, was up to the end of December, 1985. In actual fact, since that time it has been extended.

Number eleven is Marystown Shipyard. This is in regard to Hull 37 which was a supply vessel built more or less on spec. It was a very good vessel. In actual fact it had put into it firefighting capabilities. It is one of the few supply ships dealing with the offshore in this immediate area that has that capability. It has not yet been sold by Marystown Shipyard, but I think the probability is good that it will be. Until such time as it is, our guarantee will remain in place.

Number twelve is Ocean Harvesters Limited. Unfortunately that company did go bankrupt and we had to deliver on our guarantee. Fortunately, I guess, the operation itself will continue because new owners have taken over. It is one of those things.

We have in place at the present time something like \$18 million in direct loans and guarantees to fishing operations. Without that sort of assistance, and mainly to smaller inshore operations, if that type of programme was not in place, we would be in a lot of difficulty with our inshore fishery. Some of them are not going to make it. Some of them have done very well, and some of them continue to be marginal and require assistance. Unfortunately, Ocean Harvesters was one of the ones who just did not make it.

MR. FUREY:

Is that a dead loss, or is there some recovery?

DR. COLLINS:

There is recovery and as a matter of fact the bottom line is not reached yet. There are things to be disposed of. We may have to deliver on something of the order of \$1.5 or \$2 million, that type of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

The hon. minister's time is up.

DR. COLLINS:

I have a few more points, if members of the committee would like me to finish off. There are only a few more points I would like to make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

By leave.

DR. COLLINS:

I might add that we have taken possession of the Harvest Star which was the trawler. That was their obligation or part of the guarantee, that trawler. The Province has taken possession of the trawler and it is being used. We leased it out and I am sure it will be used continually so that is not a loss. We do not want to be shipowners, but we have taken it over on a temporary basis and it ultimately will go back to the fishing industry.

MR. SIMMONS:

This \$2.1 million, was all of it outstanding on the Harvest Star?

DR. COLLINS:

No, it was not all outstanding on

the Harvest Star.

MR. TULK:

Who did you lease it to?

DR. COLLINS:

It was leased on a temporary basis to National Sea.

MR. TULK:

Did National Sea also get the quota that was left on it or part of the quota?

DR. COLLINS:

No. It was actually used down in Burgeo for a period of time and the quota was related to Burgeo. They did not take the quota from Harbour Grace when we leased it to National Sea. That quota remains with Harbour Grace.

MR. TULK:

Did they take the quota that was left from last year? There was some of that quota left.

DR. COLLINS:

Not the quota that was related to Harbour Grace.

MR. TULK:

They did not take that?

DR. COLLINS:

No.

MR. TULK:

Where is that?

DR. COLLINS:

Well, I guess if it was not caught, it was not caught. The concern itself went out of operation.

MR. EFFORD:

Would the minister permit one question?

DR. COLLINS:

Sure.

MR. EFFORD:

Concerning the Harvest Star, you say it is still being used but I do not think National Sea has been using it any more. The question I would like to ask is, it was brought to my attention that there is a problem presently with the Harvest Star, it is not seaworthy and the insurance company who hold the insurance will not insure it. Is that correct or am I being misled?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

The information I had is that it was used by National Sea but there were problems with it. I believe it went into Marystown to deal with these problems. Whether it is still there or not, I am not quite sure. I will have to get that information for the hon. member. There were problems with it and I think they did relate to the ballast but it has to be taken care of.

MR. FENWICK:

What was the total debt picture of the the Harvest Star? Where does that \$2.1 million come in, from the second, third or fourth quarter? Does that include the plant?

DR. COLLINS:

No, we had the total guarantee in regards to Harvest Star but we had other obligations in regard to the Harbour Grace plant. We gave total guarantee for the Harvest Star.

MR. TULK:

Was that \$2.1 million?

DR. COLLINS:

It may have been. I think it was a bit over that because some of it

was paid down. I am not sure what it is, I think it was something like \$2.5 million in the beginning.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible)

DR. COLLINS:

No, we are not going to lose anything in regard to the guarantee we have with the Harvest Star unless, of course, we have to sell it at less than its value. I do not know if that is going to be so or not but I trust it is not going to be so. At the present time we have not had to pay out on the guarantee we have had in place in regard to the Harvest Star except that when the company was in difficulties it could not keep up its monthly payments so we took over those monthly payments for a period of time. I think we paid out something in the order of \$700,000 in monthly payments so that, I think it was Chemical Bank, would not actually take possession of the Harvest Star.

MR. FENWICK:

What price would you have to get for the Harvest Star in order to recoup our total costs?

DR. COLLINS:

Well, I presume we would have to get what we paid out, the residual amount of the guarantee. It would be something over \$2 million and I think the vessel is well worth that. To build a trawler now it cost \$6, \$8 or \$10 million and to buy a second hand one is probably \$4 or \$5 million.

MR. TULK:

What is the condition of this one?

DR. COLLINS:

As far as I know the Harvest Star is a good vessel but, as the

hon. member brought up, there was a difficulty with the ballast. I think at one time it had a collision and there was a bit of trouble with its crankshaft or whatever but, I mean these things happen to trawlers all the time. The vessel itself is a good vessel, obviously, it is a state of the art deep sea fishing trawler.

MR. FENWICK:

Did I hear you say we are likely to get a \$1.5 or \$2 million bath on this whole situation, that we are going to lose at that level?

DR. COLLINS:

That is on the whole bankruptcy of Ocean Harvesters, owners of the plant in Harbour Grace, the plant in Port de Grave and the plant in Old Perlican. On that whole operation, when it all works out, we will probably end up with something in the order of \$1.5 million or \$2 million on the short end.

MR. FLIGHT:

Would the minister permit a question that might be relevant to what we are talking about?

We were expecting the Auditor General's Report to be tabled today or yesterday. It must be tabled by Thursday. It is possible that some of that report might be very relevant to some of the guarantees he is talking about here. Is the minister tabling the report today or when does he propose to table the report, bearing in mind that he only has until Thursday anyway?

DR. COLLINS:

I have received the Public Accounts from the Comptroller General and when the Public Accounts are tabled, the Auditor

General's Report, related to those Public Accounts for that particular year, are traditionally tabled with them. After I have received the Public Accounts, the Act permits me to have a period of time before I have to table them in the House. I will table them within the period of time.

MR. FLIGHT:

So we will get them by Thursday.

DR. COLLINS:

I do not know if it will be Thursday but within the period of time that I am required to table them, the hon. member can be assured that they will be tabled.

MR. FLIGHT:

Why have we not gotten it before this?

DR. COLLINS:

Because I have not finished looking at it myself.

The next one is number 13, Port Enterprises Limited. This is another fish company situated in Southern Harbour and the guarantee is for \$150,000. They have troubles similar to many of the other smaller fishing operations. They have had difficulty with raw material in recent times.

The fourteenth is Vanguard Paper Box Limited. This is an operation that produces various paper products. One of the principle ones that it produces are cardboard boxes for the fishing industry and it is an operation that got into difficulties when we had the fisheries strike. Then it got into continuing difficulties when the bottom went out of the fishing industry a little bit. So they were secondarily, shall we say, put into difficulties by what happened in the fishing industry.

We have got in place here a \$200,000 guarantee. They are still struggling. I trust they will survive. We think it is something that we would like to have in this Province, that we would make these cardboard containers for our own fishery. If we do have this in the province, we will have to import them. That is not something that we would look at happily. Also, we feel that it has a reasonably good chance and it will come out of its present difficulties.

The other ones in the schedule are mainly changes in the extensions, smaller changes in the amounts and even things like a change in the name of the company involved. They are of lesser importance I suppose, although they are listed there in the schedule and Clause (2), (3), (4) and (5). I have other information here. I hope I have information the Committee members might like.

Unfortunately the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has had to tend to business outside the Province. Many of the guarantees relate to the fishing industry. I am sure he would have been able to add a lot if he had been here but we will just have to do the best we can.

With that, I move the resolution.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I was absent from the House the day it reopened last Thursday so what I am about to say may have been said but it is good

to see the Clerk back at the Table again. We missed her during her absence and welcome her back.

Mr. Chairman, the minister's penchant for amiability and coaxiness is both engaging and disarming. I have always admired him for that. But I would ask him, as a friend, not to use it, as he clearly has today, to gloss over his lack of knowledge of the items that he wants the House to give approbation for. He does not know where Heritage Woodworks are. He does not know where Atlantic Ocean Farms Limited are.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, that in the place of his admirable candor he might substitute a few officials. We are, after all, in Committee and we are looking for information so that we, as the elected representatives of the people of Newfoundland whose money we are dealing with here, so that these people could have some forthright answers and, more to the point, some information. I recognize that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), with the multitude of responsibilities that he carries, does not have or should not be expected to have in his head all the details pertaining to these loan guarantees. That is not my point.

My point is that I would hope he would come better armed, better prepared, either with a good set of notes to tell him where Heritage Woodworks is located; to tell him where Atlantic Ocean Farms is located or, if he cannot get it on paper, and I am sure that should not be difficult, to bring with him an official or two. I think it has been done before in this Committee, to have an official sitting beside him who

would have command of those details, particularly in view of the absence, I assume the understandable absence, of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). We will give him the benefit of the doubt that he is on the business of the Province and he cannot be in two places at one time. But in his absence, perhaps we could have had the Deputy Minister of Fisheries sit and hold the hand of the Minister of Finance at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, the minister, in opening his remarks, made the point that if the House did not ratify this bill at an appropriate time, then the government, the administration of the day, would have to use another route, the Special Warrants route. Surely he can deduce from his own remark that the smart thing and the responsible thing to have done was to have given this bill more urgency. We have been here essentially since last Spring and somewhere between then and now we should have had this bill and had it dealt with so that the minister did not have to mutter out loud about the ramifications of his not having House ratification for the bill in time.

I mention that, Mr. Speaker, in tandem with the earlier point that I made about his lack of facility in providing the Committee with details because the two together, that lack of facility in providing details and the lateness in time at which this bill comes to us, I mention those two in tandem to make a point. The point is that continually this administration takes this House for granted, much to much for granted. The administration knows that with or without my vote or the votes of other persons on this side of the

House, they will get ratification. The administration will get House ratification for this bill. But surely what I have just stated is by no means novel or unique. That is always the case that pertains when you have the majority party in government, whether in Mrs. Thatcher's administration in Great Britain or Mr. Mulroney's in Ottawa, or those in office in Australia or New Zealand.

In any parliamentary government, unless you have a minority situation, the government can assume that it will get its bills through, unless it has a stormy backbench or unruly backbench, which this government does not have, I must say. This government has done a marvelous job of keeping its backbench in line. It does it in various ways, Mr. Chairman, as you will know. It keeps its backbench in line marvelously well, keeps them happy, keeps them smiling anyway, whether they are happy or not, they are smiling. I love to see my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) smiling. He has a beautiful smile.

To the point though, Mr. Speaker, surely it is not enough for the party in government to have a majority. That alone will guarantee that its legislative programme gets approbation by the House. But surely part of the faith, part of the trust mandated to a government in majority by the people is the assumption by the electorate that that mandate will be used responsibly and that that mandate will be used within parliamentary traditions. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that here we see the minister again taking for granted -

MR. TULK:

Do you know what the member for Harbour Main (Mr. Doyle) is happy? He is getting out, he is going to Ottawa and to the Senate.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

More power to the gentleman. I would put in a word for him but it would do no good at all in the present circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, my first point I believe has been made. I make an appeal through the gentleman who is Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), a gentleman if there ever was one, I make an appeal through him to the administration that they not take the House so much for granted as they do every day that we sit here.

My friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) raised -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

All right, we will take our time. The gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) has to cosy up to the administration every chance he gets. When he is through I will put some questions to the Minister of Finance. One was put a moment ago by the gentleman from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

You can have him.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

I am checking out the view from here to decide whether I will move over or not.

MR. SIMMONS:

I thought your ambitions were more lofty than that actually.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from Windsor-Buchans alluded to a point that I want to raise and it relates to the report of the Auditor General. We are aware of the statutory parameters within which the minister must operate. Surely that, I say to him, is not good enough. If he has the report, unless there is some particular reason why he is harbouring it, why does he not give it to the House at the earliest opportunity so that we can have a look at it?

MR. BARRY:

We cannot let this bill go through until we get it.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is understood that we are on a money bill, and this is one of the few times where the Opposition does have a little bargaining power. We would like to see what is in the Report of the Auditor General. I say to the minister that he cannot change one dot, one stroke of it anyway, so whether he releases it today or tomorrow cannot change the report. But, Mr. Chairman, I tell you what it can do, and this too relates to the first point I was making about managing the House or perhaps the less kind term is manipulating the House.

You see, Mr. Chairman, Ms. Carney is in town. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if there is not a bit of

management going on here. I wonder if the word is not gone out that nothing should subtract from the circus that is taking place in another part of town right now; nothing at all should in any way compete with the main event. Maybe that is the reason why the minister is sitting on the report of the Auditor General.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my friend for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) that I have a couple of questions I want to put to the minister, and as able as he is -

MR. J. CARTER:

Sit down, and send him a note.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Two quick questions I want to put to the minister. He might want to respond on the issue of the Auditor General's report, because I think he ought to do the right thing and table it today. But two other questions, would he now undertake either today or within the next few days to update the House on the current financial position of the Province? He will know, he might not want to be reminded, but it is public knowledge after all, that he has done this on occasion before. He has given us a blow by blow account of where the Province stands financially, and after a passage of time he has had to give us an update substantially different from his earlier forecast. I wonder could he undertake to give us a fairly current update of the financial position?

In concert with that, I wonder would he undertake to give us his views on the issue of our current

rating in the bond markets? He will know that there was some slippage fairly recently. Would he give the Committee what he understands to be the reasons for that and whether he anticipates there might be any further erosion of our rating on the bond market?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, just to respond to the hon. member. He is very anxious to hear where Heritage Woodwork is, and I have got news for him. I know now where Heritage Woodwork is. If the hon. member will pay close attention I will tell him where Heritage Woodwork is.

MR. SIMMONS:

The same man who was bothering me was bothering you Sir.

MR. FENWICK:

I bother everybody.

DR. COLLINS:

Heritage Woodwork, I understand, is in Eastport. Perhaps the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) even buys his furniture from Heritage Woodwork. It is a small operation, but that is a very industrious part of the country. I mean no slur on any other part of the Province, but certainly Eastport has very industrious people down there. I think we all remember when they got into things like greenhouses and so on and so forth.

I think they had a lot of assistance with their local industrial endeavours through the Extension Service of Memorial University. I think it was one of the better efforts by the Extension Service of Memorial University. So they are an industrious group of people down there and this is one of the industries that they are now pursuing.

The hon. member also pilloried me, he really struck out at me, and he wounded me, savagely mauled me, because I did not bring this bill in earlier. I would just like to remind the hon. member that the last time we brought in a Loan and Guarantee Act or a resolution in regard to a Loan and Guarantee Act we debated it, I think, for something like eight weeks. It was just a simple little resolution, almost a routine type of thing, and we went on forever and ever. It was enough to put anyone off ever bringing in a similar resolution again, but unfortunately we have to.

Of course, I do not have to remind the hon. member and other members of the Committee too that when the House last sat we got into other matters that went on forever and ever and ever and ever. The business of the House just did not go at the pace that it should have gone. I think we are seeing a rather better pace in the House now, and I think both sides can take satisfaction from that. I do not think this government takes the House for granted. I think we have been very scrupulous in the way we have discharged our responsibilities towards the House of Assembly. We have been as frank as we possibly can be in regard to the business before the House. We have not tried to do

things some other administrations before us did, such as skirting around what should be brought before the House. We have entered fully into Question Period; ministers of this administration are in attendance at Question Period whenever they are in the Province, and so on and so forth.

I think we pay a lot of attention to the House, certainly to the extent we are required to as an administration. I have no apologies whatever to make for not tabling the Auditor General's Report today, none whatever. The Auditor General's Report is the Public Accounts, which is the responsibility of the Comptroller General, and the Public Accounts are then audited by the Auditor General who then makes a report on the result of his audit.

These are very important documents and the Financial Administration Act gives the Minister of Finance a period of time before which he has to table them. He is obligated to table them in the House. Now, I presume that period of time is allowed to allow the government and, I suppose, in particular the Minister of Finance, because he is the one on whose shoulders this obligation is laid, to at least familiarize himself, and government to familiarize itself, with what is in the final accounting of the finances of the Province, i.e. the Public Accounts, and also the comments of the Auditor General. I might also add, that I just received the Public Accounts yesterday. I received the Public Accounts for 1984/1985 for the first time yesterday, and on the same date I received the Auditor General's Report. I have had it in my possession now for approximately twenty-four hours,

so I have no apologies to make that I am not tabling it today. But I can assure members of the Committee that I will table it within the statutory period.

Now, the hon. member asked me about the finances of the Province. Obviously, he did not intend that I go into that. The budget is coming up fairly soon. We expect to bring the budget in before the end of this fiscal year, and the year ends on March 31. So we will expect, barring unforeseen circumstances, to bring the budget in before the end of the fiscal year. Hon. members of the Committee know that the federal government has given the date on which they will bring down the federal budget, and it is earlier than usual; it is going to be brought down on February 26 and that is going to be very helpful to us in completing our budgetary processes. That date is coming up soon and I will go into the finances of that Province at that time.

However, I will comment on the credit rating. The hon. member is correct in saying that there was a bit of slippage in our credit rating with one of the agencies. We did not drop out of a category. We were an "A" category and now we are an "A minus". So we did not drop from one category to another, we slipped within the category. It is important that you do not drop down from one category to another, because that does have implications for your borrowing ability and for what you pay in borrowing funds. Fortunately, that did not impact very negatively on us. Nevertheless, it is not something we want to see. We would hope that as the economy of the Province improves, after the

recession is over, we will be able to go back to the credit rating agencies and at least go back to our former rating.

Of course, we are certainly not the only ones who have, in recent times, suffered at the hands of the credit rating agencies. Ontario has had a slip, Saskatchewan has had a slip and certain other Provinces have had slips, again related to the recession. So with improvement coming along and with the excellent management that this government gives the finances of this Province, I have every confidence that our credit rating will not go down any further but that, indeed, it will improve. With that I move the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, the minister's closing statement was by far the most enlightening that he has made in Committee today. The weapon he relies most on is hope: he hopes with the excellent management - in his words or to paraphrase what he said - that things are going to be all right. That is the frightful thing about this administration, Mr. Chairman, the amount of faith that is exercised without an appropriate amount of deeds to justify that faith. I suppose it will come as no shock to him that while he has that kind of hope, he has that kind of view of how the government manages the economy, that there are those on this side of the House and those in the Province generally who have a very different view.

MR. J. CARTER:

No one in the Province would have

a point of view like you.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

It is all right, Mr. Chairman. The member for St. John's North must be given a chance to vent his considerable frustration whenever the opportunity arises. Is he finished?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I want only to make one other point now in response to what the minister said. In his opening statements in his latest contribution to this Committee, he mentioned that when we dealt with a similar bill a little while ago it was before the House for a considerable time. He is right. This bill may well be before the House a considerable time, too. But it is the admission, Mr. Chairman, in the minister's opening statements that gives me cause for some concern and that re-enforced the points I made earlier about the government's attempt to manipulate the House. Now, we have from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) an admission that the public agenda, as it relates in this particular case to approval for expenditure of public funds, is being decided not by the statutory requirements, not by the need of the people to responsibly know what is being done with their money but, by the minister's own admission, the public agenda, the agenda of this House, is being determined in a cat and mouse game with the Opposition.

I say to him and to his absent House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that the kind of new millennium that he

has discovered the past two or three days here might have been in existence last Fall, and it might be the order of the day for some months to come. His House Leader should stop giving the Opposition childish ultimatums as he did on Friday in relation to whether this House would sit today and spend more time doing what House Leaders do in Ontario and Nova Scotia and Ottawa and Westminster, calling their counterparts - in this case the gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) - behind the curtain or having a meeting beforehand. This after all is the public's business here. It is not a partisan thing. It gets partisan at times - that is fair ball. We do represent different philosophies and different parties. It is going to get partisan. But the public agenda ought to be decided with a little less rancour than has been the case. I have to put much of the blame on the gentleman from St. John's East and his lieutenant, and I do not say that condescendingly but in the sense that the gentleman who has the Finance portfolio often pinch-hits for the Government House Leader, as he has been doing today in the absence of the Government House Leader.

If these gentlemen want the kind of atmosphere of co-operation which the Minister of Finance clearly wished for a few moments ago, they can have it, no difficulty. They can have it, Mr. Chairman, if they would do the honourable and decent thing which is being done elsewhere. My friend from Fogo spends half his time trying to track down the Government House Leader, trying to find him. We do not know, Mr. Chairman, from one day to the next what is on the agenda in this House. So I say to the Minister

of Finance (Dr. Collins), if you want some co-operation, it is a two-way street. We have said before what our price for co-operation is. It is not a very high price. But I take umbrance, I take exception to the minister's

MR. J. CARTER:
Umbrage.

MR. SIMMONS:
You want 'umbrage'. Is that what you want, 'umbrage'? I thank my literary editor from St. John's North. 'Umbrage' is the word. I take umbrage at the suggestion, the dastardly suggestion from the gentleman from St. John's South, the Minister of Finance, that this bill's timing before the Committee was not determined by statutory requirements or by any responsible attempt to get on with the business of the House, but rather, was predicated upon trying to find the opportune time to get it through in the least possible time. I give him, on behalf of the Opposition, an undertaking that we will not tie this bill up in Committee for an undue period of time, but if we get the impression that he is sitting on the Auditor General's Report unduly, if we get the impression that the Minister of Finance cannot give the Committee the kind of detail that one would expect to have before casting a vote for these staggering amounts of money in some cases, \$2 million, \$2.1 million and so on, if we get that impression, we may be here, we may have to wait until the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) gets back in the Province so that he can give us some of the answers. So we give him no guarantee that this thing is going to go through conveyor belt style here today. We do give him an undertaking,

though, that we will be expeditious if he and his seat mate once removed, from St. John's East, is fairly forthcoming with the House Leader in terms of what kind of business is coming before this House. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):
The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to speak to this bill today, especially since it is a money bill where you can talk about a variety of subjects that pertain to issues in this Province, to the economy of this Province and the well-being of this Province. I have been working diligently to get grants or loans for certain small businesses in this Province and I have had a tremendous problem in trying to obtain money. I want to impress that fact upon the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) so that we may see more bills come in to improve small business in this Province.

Before I go on, since we are talking about a money bill that involves financing and different things in Newfoundland and Labrador, I want to say I have had discussions with my counterpart, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) over the year on the Arts cultural policy in Newfoundland. I am a bit jealous, to tell you the truth, because there are certain productions that have just come out in this Province and I only got a bucket

of water thrown over my head. Now, I am the 'Culture' of Culture, Recreation and Youth and, as far as I am concerned, I think I deserved a lot more than that. I also think that the minister deserved it himself. I say that in a comical way but also I believe that Arts policy has been debated in this Province over the last eight months and coming up in March is a major conference to discuss how funding is allotted in this Province. I think it is a serious matter when you get right down to it. If Arts in the community are supposed to distribute ideas and promote culture in Newfoundland, if politics is going to enter into that, I think it is important that we take a good look at exactly how the money is allotted. I am looking forward to this upcoming March conference. I think a release which just came out in the Globe and Mail is very indicative of and kind of sums up the problems that we have had over the year. It is a review of the Revue '85, and I think it gets right to the problem. It talks about how the relationship with governments can affect the performance of arts in this Province. I just say that because that is the danger of direct funding. We have been talking about it. We have four new directors on the Arts Council. As a matter of fact, some of them were opposed to the Arts Council at one time, and now they are on it. So that is a good move, and I am very happy to see it.

MR. DECKER:
They were opponents?

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Yes, a couple of them were opponents at first. But they have now been appointed to it, and I am

sure they are going to make some changes.

MR. TULK:

Are the changes going to be for the better?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Well, we hope they are going to be for the better. We are hoping that with this conference coming up in March we will see a compromise so that Arts policy and funding for the Arts will be done in a manner which will not leave people open to any type of suspicion, abuse, or whatever, which I think is exactly what should be done. People should be protected in that sense. That is why I believe that funding for the Arts should be done in a manner which is fair to all people in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I am sure the hon. member is going to connect his Arts to the -

MR. TULK:

This is a very wide-ranging debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I am aware of that.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Because this is a money bill and I think this is a topic which will be coming up very shortly, I just want to make these points to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who is responsible for finance in the Province, and to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), because these things have to be taken into account. They have been brought out very well, as I have said, by this article and also by people who have been in contact with me. If we are going to have a good,

sound Arts policy in the Province, I think it should be done with the blessings of everybody involved in the Arts community in Newfoundland and Labrador. I must commend the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth for finally putting this conference together, which has been promised for quite some time. I am looking forward to it because I think the problems that may arise as to arms-length funding may be cleared up. If the Arts Council has the full support of the Arts community, we will not see problems arise because of politics and Arts getting involved. With those few words, I would just like to sum up my comments on the Arts Council and Arts policy.

To get back to the Loan and Guarantee Bill, as I was saying earlier, the business community in this Province, and I refer to my district of Stephenville, specifically, there are a number of businessmen there right now in that area trying to get their businesses going and so on, but they have been having a hard time getting guaranteed loans or financing. I think the Province should look very carefully right now at providing proper funding to small businesses to help them out. The Rural Development Fund is pretty well down to nil and I think they should make some waves and get more money from somewhere, because these grants of \$25,000, or up to \$25,000, and loans of up to \$25,000 are very good and they have been very effective. They have helped some businesses get going, and I think it is time we put a little bit more into this. This is one of the most effective programmes in the provincial government's scheme of things to get jobs created and I think they should put more money into it.

Because right now we have businesses which are on the edge, waiting, and I would ask the provincial government to try to do something about that as soon as they can.

A guaranteed loan is like money in the bank. I think they should try and put as much money as possible up front so that these applications which are now backlogged will be able to be processed and we can get more jobs created in this Province, which we desperately need, especially on the West Coast of Newfoundland, in Stephenville, on the Port au Port Peninsula, up the Coast to St. Barbe, and so on, and in Corner Brook. People always talk about government's wasting money. I believe this is the most effective manner in which money can be used. If you invest in a business person, you also invest in Newfoundland people and they are then able to promote this island and create a few jobs, which we are in dire need of.

On that note, Mr. Chairman, I would like to end my comments. Thank you very much.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Chairman, I just want to have a few comments in relation to what the member for Stephenville (Mr. Aylward) was saying and, of course, I would like to return to the bill itself. Specifically, in my own district, as I have pointed out to government a number of times, there are a number of companies in trouble and we have asked for loan guarantees.

I would just like to draw to the attention of the hon. the member for Stephenville's that in the review in The Globe And Mail - he quoted Revue '85 as being reviewed - the writer says, 'This is presenting probably its most trifling production of the season.' Mr. Chairman, I have not had occasion to go to this kind of theatre before in the last number of years, because I have been working for Newfoundland in Ottawa. But I did go to Revue '85 a couple of weeks ago because I was given free tickets, thank God. I just want to confirm what the writer is saying. It was very interesting for me. The Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) was there at the same time. In fact, he and I saw each other a few times.

MR. HEARN:
I enjoyed it.

MR. FUREY:
He says, he enjoyed it. I guess you did enjoy it.

MR. BAIRD:
It was good. Great!

MR. FUREY:
How can you not but enjoy a review from a theatre company directly funded by your administration who stand back half frightened to criticize that very administration because they do not want to lose their money?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:
Now, that is a valid point not brought up by us, brought up by the national newspaper The Globe And Mail, and other reviewers, CBC included, and Memorial University as well.

MR. SIMMS:
This is not true.

MR. FUREY:
You guys can sit back and say this not true because you know it is true. They get direct funding and it is very tough to have a crack at the Premier -

MR. MATTHEWS:
You would not say that when the director was in the gallery.

MR. FUREY:
- when that particular group itself is being funded by the Premier and by logical extension are in the Premier's pocket.

MR. MATTHEWS:
You waited until she left the gallery before you brought it up.

MR. TULK:
Do you notice how they always protest when you hit the truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
The Review goes on, Mr. Chairman, to say that 'The director is convinced there is a potential market for theatre in this Province and says she can build if the government is willing to write off Rising Tides losses for another five years.'

Now, is that the price we have to pay for theatre in this Province?

MR. BAKER:
A Tory propaganda machine.

MR. FUREY:
My, God, how ridiculous!

Now, I want to make a suggestion to Rising Tide: Next year, perhaps they could call their

Review, Review 86, Free Of Politics. Perhaps that might be a good suggestion for them to look at. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the comments -

MR. TULK:
You saw it, did you?

MR. FUREY:
Yes, I saw it. There were some very funny moments, and there was some very good acting, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FLIGHT:
You see that every day in the House.

MR. FUREY:
What I heard from people as I walked around during intermission was, why are they letting Bill Marshall off the hook so easily? Why are they letting Brian Peckford off the hook so easily?

MR. BAKER:
Do you know why.

MR. FUREY:
Why are they letting the Minister of Soccer Balls off the hook so easily? That is what I kept hearing, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK:
Yes, why I wonder?

MR. FUREY:
It was absolutely incredulous to see this theatre group with so much political red meat bleeding that they could get their teeth into and chew up, bypass the major stories, Mr. Chairman. That was the saddest part of Revue '85.

MR. TULK:
Why was that?

MR. FUREY:
Why? Why? They were frightened

to death they might lose their money.

MR. BARRY:

Surely not, surely it is independent funding.

MR. FUREY:

Independent funding? You have not heard of the clash system in funding for the Arts, tier one and tier two.

MR. BARRY:

What?

MR. FUREY:

Oh, you have not heard about that.

MR. SIMMONS:

What is tier one?

MR. FUREY:

Tier one, is the block of money passed to the Arts Council to distribute fairly amongst the artists, and tier two is called direct funding. Now, direct funding comes into play for Rising Tide Theatre. They fall into tier two, direct funding. That is called the Premier's pocket funding. "Let me put you in my pocket, then I will fund you."

MR. TULK:

They are special.

MR. FUREY:

Oh, ridiculously special. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to detract from the seriousness of this bill, but I do feel compelled to align myself with the comments of the member for Stephenville (Mr. Aylward) who is a very honourable and honest individual and who speaks the truth about funding in the arts and the incredible shemozzle that is going on, the Mugg's game, the shell game being played by the Peckford Administration with dollars for

our artists in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me talk for a minute about -

MR. MITCHELL:

(Inaudible).

MR. FUREY:

I am sorry? The member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) wanted to align himself with that statement, did he?

Let me get back, Mr. Chairman, to the Loan and Guarantee Act. I want to talk specifically about the Great Northern Peninsula, represented by myself from the district of St. Barbe and the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), and the businesses that have come forward asking for - the hon. member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) points to his chest. Yes, there is a portion of the Great Northern Peninsula in his district, too. There are a great number of businesses up there, Mr. Chairman, in an area of extremely high unemployment and I am sure the hon. member for Humber Valley would agree with me that this is a chronic problem in the North, all the way up and down the Northern Peninsula.

The Premier talked about how wonderful the unemployment statistics were, they have dropped way down to 21 per cent, all the way down to 21 per cent. Well, let me tell him that in Western Newfoundland, in Northern Newfoundland and in Labrador, the unemployment numbers went from 19 per cent in November to 21 per cent in December, to 24 per cent

in January, and that is ridiculous. And those do not include the hidden unemployed and the seasonal variations, including fishermen and part-time plant workers. So to stand here after his trip from China, Mr. Chairman, pound his chest and say, "Down to 21 per cent" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

- how ridiculous! Now, the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) wants to get up and dribble and drabble for a minute.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

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

MR. MITCHELL:

It is very interesting to listen to the rhetoric from the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) talking about the high rate of unemployment in his district. I would like to say that there is a contingent from his district down in the LaPoile district right now. If, for instance, they would do their traditional work, which is go fishing, instead of squabbling, the unemployment rate may not be as high as what it is up in his area.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

This is incredible. What the member for LaPoile just said, in not so many words, is that basically the people in my

district, and the people generally around Newfoundland who are unemployed, are lazy. He stood there and said if they would go fishing there would be no unemployment problems. Now this is the same Tory turkey who said before Christmas that the young people in this Province were lazy. "Ask one of them to go paint the house," he said, "you try to get a young person to paint the house," the implication and the inference being, Mr. Chairman, that young people are lazy.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is a relatively new member in the House and I am sure his emotions sometimes get the better of him. But I have to point out that you are not permitted to use unparliamentary language and I believe that if not the actual word, the implication of a word he used in regard to the hon. member was unparliamentary. He referred to him by a very derogatory term and I think it is unparliamentary and he should withdraw the remark.

MR. DECKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

I understand quite well what the hon. Minister of Finance is saying. We have heard a very narrow, vicious slur cast upon my

fellow Newfoundlanders. In effect, he was saying they are too lazy to go to work.

MR. MITCHELL:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DECKER:

I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! There is a point of order on the floor. I would ask the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle to make his point of order.

MR. DECKER:

I am speaking to a point of order, Mr. Chairman, which was raised by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I am speaking to the same point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the hon. member will wish to withdraw his remark because I can hardly believe that anyone who is elected to this Chamber would have the audacity to refer to Newfoundlanders as a bunch of lazy bums which, in effect, is what he is doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. the Minister of Finance checked Beauchesne. I think turkey is perfectly permissible with or without feathers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to this bill and to talk about the the Great Northern Peninsula, as I tried to do before I was so rudely interrupted, and before the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr.

Mitchell) expressed that implication that Newfoundlanders are lazy. Can you imagine! The hon. the member for Fogo, are your people lazy?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I wish to remind the hon. the member that his time is up.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. MITCHELL:

I would like to speak to the point of order that was raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. member for LaPoile that I have ruled on that point of order. There was no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, the member was making such a good speech here, I think we should let him have another go at it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe. I did not recognize the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke, but the hon. the member for St. Barbe South.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, could I just correct the district. It is changed to

St. Barbe, 'South' has been removed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The correction is noted.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, I was saying that I do not think any of the people from LaPoile that I know, or from Port aux Basques that I know, or from any of the areas that he represents in that district are lazy. Are they lazy in Naskaupi? Are they lazy in the Strait of Belle Isle? Are they lazy in Bellevue, Mr. Chairman? Are they lazy on Bell Island? Are they lazy in Fogo? Are they lazy in St. George's?

MR. MITCHELL:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, what we have here is a member misinterpreting what another member in this House is actually saying. Before the House adjourned at Christmas, the Opposition accused me of saying that the young people of this Province were lazy. One of the things I want to do as a member in this hon. House is to be able to defend the young people of this Province. No way am I going to sit in this hon. House and allow a member from another area in this Province to get up and take the case of what one young person says as being gospel for all young people in this Province. That is exactly what that gentleman did. I got up and I said, "That is not the case. The young people of this Province are not lazy. They

have a great opportunity in this Province to make something of themselves." Now, that has been interpreted wrongly.

Today I rose on another point of order in relationship to the fishery, Mr. Chairman. We have the hon. the member for St. Barbe talking about the high rate of unemployment. Well, let me tell him that there are somewhere around 120 to 130 outer trawl boats on the Southwest Coast at this particular time, and they have been there all Fall. If you would take the amount of fish that those boats are going to catch and the amount of people that are going to be employed in the Winter fishery on the Southwest Coast, you are talking approximately 3,000 people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird):

Order, please!

If the member has a point of order, I would ask him to make it.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, the point of order that I am trying to make is that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) actually is misinterpreting what I first raised when I got on my feet and I would like to clarify that situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, there is clearly a difference of opinion between two hon. members. The member for St. Barbe.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Does the member for Fortune - Hermitage have a point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:

Can I have your place for a minute? Let me go. I will get up and you get up after me.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield for a second to my hon. colleague.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The member for Fortune - Hermitage now has the floor.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Just so we do not get confused in the thing. It may well be that the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage has to go or something, and we have no problem with that, but just so we do not get our procedures mixed up here, I am not aware that a member can rise and then delegate his speaking time to another member. Somebody can ask a member if he can sit down to permit a question or that kind of thing, but I do not think it is within our rules to have a member say, "I have been recognized by the Chairman, it is my turn to speak, but now I am going to pass my right over to another member." It is not transferable. On the other hand, if the hon. member wishes to make a brief remark for some good reason, we have no problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I thank the Minister of Finance for his comments. The Chair did recognize the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, my good friend for

St. John's South is right again. He amazes us sometimes, that one small head could carry all he knows. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not the gentleman for St. John's South I wish to make the subject of my oration, but my good friend for Lapoile. You see, it seems to me, and he and I have known each other for some time, under different banners we have fought, and I really am surprised what the change of allegiance has done to him. He was such a gentleman, a remarkable person, a man who drew on his considerable experience whether running a business in Baie Verte, or studying in Peterborough, or running a business in Petites, and yet he is reduced it seems to me, and I say this more in sadness than in anger or accusation, to casting aspersions on the gentleman for St. Barbe - and it is St. Barbe not St. Barbés - whose youth and whose people generally are every bit as hardworking as the people in Lapoile, which people he and I know quite well. Indeed, I may say to him in passing that I am getting several calls these days from the people down there because they have not heard from the gentleman on what the federal government is doing to the fishermen in terms of subsidies. If he wants to know why the boats are tied up, it has nothing to do with the alleged laziness of the people, it has rather, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MITCHELL:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a ruling on my point of order,

because we have heard on it from the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FLIGHT:

What point of order?

MR. MITCHELL:

Just a moment. Let me speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. MITCHELL:

This is a new point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is the member rising on a new point of order?

MR. MITCHELL:

A new point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

We have heard from the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) that I called his people lazy. Now we are hearing it again from the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), the same scenario, that I called the people in LaPoile and other areas of Newfoundland lazy. I would like to have a ruling on that point or order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the Chair has already ruled there is clearly a difference of opinion between two hon. members. Before recognizing the member for Fortune - Hermitage again, and realizing we are in Committee of the Whole on a money bill, I would say that I think members on both sides certainly have not commented on the bill at all. Now, a fair bit of latitude has been allowed so I would ask all hon. members to remember that we are discussing

Bill 35.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I thank you, Sir, for the considerable display of your indulgence. I seem to recall, and it was this point that I was addressing very specifically, that we were being asked to shell out \$2.1 million in one case for fisheries related items. Surely, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be asked in this House to be spending all kinds of money, ratifying, after the fact mind you - rubber-stamping is a better term, more to the point - all kinds of money for fisheries related activities, we ought to get to know what is the mind of this administration and the weighty backbench that supports this administration. If the mind of that administration and its considerable backbench is that the people out there are lazy, well, I would be less prone, less moved to dump more millions of dollars to get some boats moving that are tied up because the people are allegedly lazy. Surely, Mr. Chairman, that is the nub of the matter.

Perhaps the problem is not money. Perhaps the gentleman for LaPoile today has done us all a favour. Perhaps with his undeniable penchant for getting to the point so quickly, he has pointed to what is the guts of the problem. Perhaps the problem, Mr. Chairman, is not the lack of funding to underwrite capital ventures and operating costs out there in the fishery, perhaps the problem is not even the alleged laziness of people in St. Barbe and elsewhere in this Province, perhaps the problem, Mr. Chairman, is the

attitude of an administration that thinks that to be the case. And with that weighty backbench over there giving every day the benefit of its considerable wisdom to the administration, I suppose you ought to have some compassion for this administration, this lowly band of twenty-two. It is only the largest Cabinet since Confederation mind you, but this lowly, worthy band of twenty-two being pilloried and pounded by this backbench all the time, how can they, those poor twenty-two, those courageous few, this Daniel's band, as it were, how can they, Mr. Chairman, come to grips with the financial problems of this country, this Province? - a country if the gentleman from St. John's South had his way, but that is another story. How can that lowly, unprotected band survive the intellectual pillaging, the mental vandalizing by the gentleman from LaPoile?

Mr. Chairman, we ought to salute the gentleman from LaPoile. I suppose we should give some credit to the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) because he was the person who had the audacity to trick the truth out of them. The truth has been laid on the Table now, Mr. Chairman, the truth has clearly been laid on the table. It is not the alleged laziness, he may think that, and I do not put words in his mouth. If he has gotten up and apologized for saying it or saying he did say it, well that is fair ball, I accept the man's words because surely that is not the issue. The issue, Mr. Chairman, is that there is this mind-set over there, this patronizing, condescending mind-set which sees the electorate of this Province -

MR. J. CARTER:

That is not true.

MR. SIMMONS:

Some of us do not see at all. This diabolical mind-set sees the people of this Province as plebes, as subservient people who make nice Xs every four years.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You should retract that.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I would quite agree, and urge him to take note of that parameter as well.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I have said enough, perhaps the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) would now want to set the record straight. He will realize that sometimes in the heat of debate his entirely honourable utterances are taken out of context and get misconstrued. But I would ask him to set the record straight and tell us whether he really thinks what my friend for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) heard him to say -

MR. CALLAN:

And I heard him myself.

MR. SIMMONS:

Then while he is at it, would he please - it is not that I mind hearing from the people of Rose Blanche and Isle aux Morts and Burnt Island and Port aux Basques and Cape Ray, and so on, it is not that I mind hearing from these people, but I would ask him to tell the public what he has done to send a clear signal to the administration in Ottawa that it cannot go on dismantling fisheries programmes. Because if it does, every boat along the Southwest Coast and elsewhere in this

Province is going to be tied up not because of any laziness on the part of the crew but because they will not have the money to make ends meet, thanks to this Tory Administration in Ottawa that he is in bed with, that he aids and abets by his silence.

So perhaps, Mr. Chairman, during the course of Committee, since he has interjected himself into this debate, he might tell us what he is doing to support our urgings to Ottawa. But they are not listening to us a lot. The Tories in Ottawa, for some reason, are not listening to us very much -

MR. GILBERT:
Shame!

MR. SIMMONS:
- when we go to bat for the fishermen on the Southwest Coast. But we have to, Mr. Chairman, do it in all conscience because the other voices have been stilled, the other voices that should be speaking up for the fishermen of this Province are caught in a diabolical trade-off, they are caught in a Catch 22, they are caught in a situation where they must paint continually what a rosy picture things are despite the fact we are having \$2 billion in cutbacks in family allowances across this country by 1990. This was the government that was going to do things for Newfoundland. We have seen cutbacks in one subsidy programme after the other for fishermen. We have seen a job creation programme that is not worthy of the name any more, and here we are in February trying to crank up programmes that under the former administration were going full tilt in October.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
That is right.

MR. TULK:
Now, what does the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) think about that?

MR. SIMMONS:
And still they brag. They are living in a fool's paradise, Mr. Chairman, an absolute, unadulterated fool's paradise. Because, you see, the real danger here is that they are beginning to believe their own rhetoric.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. SIMMONS:
I will be back a little later. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, one of the delightful things about the House of Assembly and, I suppose, any parliament, is that you can start off on one line and seemingly logically end up on a totally different line altogether. You know, a word will lead to another word, will lead to another word, will lead to another word and you find you are on a new subject altogether, nothing to do with the subject at issue. I must say that many members do it beautifully. For instance, the hon. member who just sat down is a very good speaker. I complimented the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) the other day on his speaking. I said that he is a very good speaker but one problem with his

speeches is that there is no content to them but, nevertheless that does not denigrate from the fact that he is a very, very good speaker. He puts his whole heart and soul into it.

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is also an extremely attractive speaker to watch because he develops arguments in a very innovative way but, many of comments when he was just speaking now had nothing to do with what we started out with. Just let me give you an example.

I, in introducing the resolution, said that there are certain consequences if we do not get through this resolution and the Bill through. The hon. member turned that around to say that I did not want to bring this in. He jumped to the conclusion or he said that I had come to the conclusion that just because I said there is difficulty if we do not pass this thing, that I did not want to bring this thing in.

Of course I would have liked to have brought this resolution and the Bill in a year ago because it is a routine thing. It should be disposed of fairly quickly, after adequate debate and then should be over and done with but, the hon. member turns my raising the question that if we do not do this with a fair bit of speed, there could be unfortunate circumstances, he turns that back on me, saying that I do not want to do it. That is the sort of logic that if we are not careful in this House, we will waste all our time on. I might add that if I did not want to bring it in there is any number of orders on the paper that I could have called today but, I did not because I did want to get this one through.

Now, just let me get to the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). He raised a few points that I think deserve an answer. I think he mentioned briefly there that he has some difficulty in getting government assistance for businesses in his area. I am sure that is quite true. I can assure him though that we try to look at any proposals coming before us in as dispassionate a fashion as possible. We do not arbitrarily say, "This area is not going to get any assistance. This area is going to get assistance. That type of activity is."

We have put in place groups of officials and they are usually drawn from various departments. For instance, over the fishing industry guarantee programme we have officials from Finance, from Fisheries and from Development. These officials will get each proposal that comes in. They will give it their best shot. They will then give a combined opinion to the various ministers to which they report and then it goes to Cabinet. So, if the hon. member has difficulty in getting some assistance, I can assure him that that is mainly because either there are greater needs, or we just do not have sufficient funds to approve everything that is presented to us.

Now let me just get back to the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) for a moment. The reason I do this is because he has again tried to turn some quite sensible remarks by the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Mitchell) back on himself. He tried in there to say that he is against the workers of this Province, that the hon. member for Lapoile feels that the workers of the Province are not worthy of

assistance and so on and so forth. That is quite the opposite, certainly the opposite of the philosophy of this administration.

The philosophy of this administration every since he came into power is to create job opportunities and we do that because we know that the people of this Province want to work. On television last night, for instance, there were a group of workers in Ferryland, I think it was, down on the Southern Shore who were insisting that they do not want welfare, they want the plant to open up. They want new owners to come in. They want new vessels to be attached to the fish plant so that they can get back to work. That is only an example of the vast majority of people in this Province. I am sure there are a few people who try to beat the system and so on and so forth and that is only natural but, the vast, vast majority of people in this Province want to go to work, they want to come off assistance, they want to come off unemployment insurance, they want to come off charity or whatever, they want to earn their own way and we, as an administration, and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) is fully supportive of this and right behind this, want to create opportunities so that the people of this Province who want to work are given the opportunity to do so. It is very regrettable that for the last number of years we have had such a high unemployment rate in this Province. It has nothing to do with a disinclination to work. It is just to do with -

MR. SIMMONS:

The policies of your government.

DR. COLLINS:

- the tradition that has been in place so long in this Province. There has not been adequate development. There has not been much push into using our resources to their best advantage. The whole thrust of this administration is to say that we are going to use our opportunities and we are going to make them produce the work and produce the livelihood that they are capable of doing. I do not have to defend the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell). He is quite capable of defending himself, but to say that he is in any way looking down on the workers of this Province is a travesty of the truth.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

When I recognized the hon. minister, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) was standing. I recognized the hon. minister because I assumed that he was going to respond to some questions raised. As far as I am concerned, the hon. member for LaPoile is next.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, it is tradition to alternate back and forth across the floor of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It is also tradition, as far as the Chair is concerned, to recognize a minister who proposes a measure, proposes a bill or proposes a resolution and it was in that context that I recognized

the minister.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

Does this now mean that we are going to see a minister stand up and then, whoever was standing up behind him or whoever was standing up near him then be recognized? If the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) stands now when this member stands, does that mean that we are going to move to him or do we go back and forth across this House as has been the usual practice?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

I think the hon. member is interpreting my decision to recognize the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) incorrectly. The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) had invited, in fact, the hon. member for LaPoile to stand in his place and to clarify certain statements or certain things. The hon. member for LaPoile stood to do that and the Chair recognized the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with a view that he was going to respond to some questions that were raised. I do not accept the fact that I would recognize the Minister of Finance as the next speaker per se if you are considering both sides.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I would move that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) be now heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MITCHELL:

To that point of order, I will yield.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Question. Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Would the hon. member take his seat? Order, please!

I can only interpret the comments by the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) under the heading of a point of order. If I am going to recognize the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), it would be to that point of order.

MR. FLIGHT:

What about the motion the member moved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question. Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. MITCHELL:

Is this on a point of order?

MR CHAIRMAN:

Do I interpret the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage to have moved a motion?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes. .

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Would the hon. member for

Fortune-Hermitage clarify the situation?

MR. SIMMONS:

I move, Mr. Chairman, that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Fury) be now heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you ready for the question? All those in favor -

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, no Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The Chair is having some difficulty understanding or hearing what is going on here. Is the hon. member now rising on a point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:

No, to speak to the motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I called the question. The hon. member cannot speak to the motion.

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, Mr. Chairman, except the Chair had not invited any opportunity for debate -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Would the hon. gentleman take his seat for a second until I explain. I asked the hon. member to clarify his position and he stood up and moved a motion. I then said, "Are you ready for the question?"

MR. SIMMONS:

I said no.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There was an answer, 'yes', by

majority as I interpreted it. I put the question and then the hon. gentleman stood.

I will call again, Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, yes!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I interpret it to mean that we are ready for the question.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

All those in favour 'Aye'. All those against 'Nay'. I take it that the 'Ayes' have it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order. I did not intend to dwell at any length on the motion but I did want to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that at the moment my motion was put down there was a clear majority in the House who would like to have heard the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Fury). By the appropriate stalling the government was able to use its majority again to institutionalize another dispicable practice where two or three members on the same side of the House are going to be allowed to speak. That is a further erosion, Mr. Chairman, I say to you, of the practices and the traditions of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):
Order, please!

Would the hon. member take his seat for a moment. The Chairman wishes to make it explicitly clear it was not my intent to stray from the tradition of recognizing both sides of the House. I have explained that in recognizing the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I recognize him as such, having moved a resolution, as responding to certain points that were raised in terms of answering questions. That, to my mind, in the twenty years that I have sat in this House, is also tradition.

Further to that, consequently, as a result of recognizing the Minister of Finance, the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) was also standing when I recognized the minister.

MR. SIMMONS:
And the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Fury).

MR. CHAIRMAN:
As a consequence, in recognizing the member for LaPoile, in my opinion, I was not straying from tradition. I was going from this side to that side and I would then recognize a member from the other side.

Because I believe that my decision was made in good faith and I also believe that my decision was fair, the only thing I can do was put the question whether the decision by the Chair be upheld or whether, by leave, the hon. the member for St. Barbe is to be heard. Otherwise, we will recognize the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, I did not even suggest that I was questioning your ruling at all. The House decides the rules and the Chairman interprets. I have no argument with the manner in which Mr. Chairman interpreted the rules. That was not the issue. The comment that I made was related to the vote of the House, that the government majority had decided to do something, not that the Chair had decided to do something.

Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you would rule that the "Aye's" have it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Yes, the "Aye's."

MR. SIMMONS:
The "Aye's" have it. So that the gentleman for St. Barbe should now be heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Would the hon. gentleman take his seat. The Chair is confused now. I put the question and the motion was, as I understand it, that the hon. the member for St. Barbe be heard. I said all those in favour "Aye," all those against "Nay." It obviously is my mistake if I said the "Aye's" have it. Obviously it is the "Nay's" that have it on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it the wish of the House that the hon. the member for LaPoile be heard?

All those in favour "Aye." All those against "Nay". Carried.

I take it the "Aye's" have it.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If the hon. the member for St. Barbe has anything constructive to say in this House, I will certainly yield to him and let him have this opportunity. I will follow.

MR. FUREY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

That was absolutely brilliant.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand now more realistically why the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) does not want the cameras in here, to see that kind of display and to hear the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for this Province talking about, "Yes, we want to make it better. Oh, we would love to make it better. If only we could make it better." Well the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the

Conservative Government has been in power in this Province for fifteen years. Can you imagine now, in their fifteenth year standing there, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for this Province saying, "If only we could make it better."

MR. KELLAND:

The people will make it better in a couple of years.

MR. FUREY:

There is another fact that came to light when he was talking. In 1972 when the Liberals passed power to Premier Moores, unemployment in this Province stood at 8 per cent, and when Mr. Moores passed power to Premier Peckford, unemployment was at 15 per cent. In the last election when this Premier went to the people it had jumped to 24 per cent, so you do not deserve to govern after fifteen years like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

I am being kind, Mr. Chairman, when I say 24 per cent, because if we look at the research assistant for the Royal Commission on Unemployment, his numbers it is not 44,000 unemployed. The hon. minister of trees can sit there with his perm disappeared and shout back and forth across here, but these are the facts. Forty-four thousand is not the real number. You have to add 12,000 discouraged. Do you know why they are discouraged? They are discouraged because of fifteen years of massive depressive policy by this silly crowd over there. You add to that, Mr. Chairman, 22,000 for seasonal variations and the true number escalates to

80,000 unemployed Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who cannot find work because of these tired Tory policies.

I want to come back to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) and his statement saying that the boats are tied up in Port aux Basques from my riding, and it is true. They come down from the Northern Peninsula to the Winter fishery and, "They are tied up," he said, "and if they would quit squabbling and go back to work, there would not be unemployment."

Why are they squabbling, Mr. Chairman? Why were they squabbling? They were squabbling because they could get 24 cents a pound round for their fish, they were offered 27 cents a pound gutted, bled, and washed for their fish and we know by volume they are going to get less money for their fish. Why are they complaining? Let me give you a little history lesson dating back to the Kirby days.

When Mr. Kirby introduced the quality incentive bonus and the Liberal Government accepted it, the Tories in Ottawa came to power and threw it out. What did they throw out? They threw out 6 cents a pound above and beyond the negotiated price for fish, negotiated by the unions and the processors, 6 cents above that for the first year, 4 cents above the negotiated price for the second year, and 2 cents above the negotiated price for the third year. We were offering them a motivation to gut, bleed, wash and ice the fish at sea for quality. That programme, Mr. Chairman, as we moved away and weaned fishermen away from that, the marketplace would have reflected in a true payment for that quality of fish

naturally and of its own and onto itself. The marketplace would have given fishermen a decent return for their fish.

So when they squabble, they have a right to squabble and when they shout, they have a right to shout because it is tough up North, it is tough up there because the unemployment figures are staggering, shocking, despicable and a reflection upon your policy.

MR. TULK:

And they are not lazy.

MR. FUREY:

And they are not lazy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the Loan Guarantee as it reflects in my riding and some of the businesses that I have asked for help from this government for. Let me tell you about one of them - Gould's Fisheries.

Mr. Gould has run his fish operation up there in River of Ponds for the last twenty-five years and all of a sudden this year, because of depressed prices, because of cash flow problems, he is having trouble keeping his company above water. We have asked this government months ago, I have telexed the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Fisheries, I have telexed everybody I thought would listen, to protect these one hundred jobs in a small community that has a tremendously high unemployment rate. I want the jobs protected and if you want the jobs protected, you should come forward instead of playing bureaucratic games, the great paper chase, shoving it from Fisheries over to Tourism, back to Fisheries over to Finance, and giving him the runaround. Instead of doing that,

if you would put up a loan guarantee, he would put those people to work this Spring and possibly next week from product he can get from the Winter fishery. So that is 100 jobs.

Parsons Pond Seafoods is another case in point. We have asked and requested time and time again for an amendment to their loan guarantee to protect those sixty jobs in Parson's Pond. Do you think we can get an answer? Do you think there is an answer anywhere from anyone on that side of the government? That is 100 plus 60, 160 jobs.

James Doyle and Son in New Ferolle. They want to do secondary processing. The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) should know this. They want to do secondary processing. They want to hire over 100 people in their processing facility in New Ferolle. They will hire from Shoal Cove West. They will hire from Bartletts Harbour. They will hire from Reefs Harbour. They will reach out in a circle to bring the unemployed to their fish plant if they can get a loan guarantee. There is another example in my riding.

Another company there, New Ferolle Fisheries, run by Mr. Ambrose Hynes. Mr. Hynes has created hundreds of jobs in the last twenty years and now the squeeze is on him because he had some bad deals from Nova Scotia buyers. They are not paying him what he is duly owed. He had to throw it into the courts. It has tied up his cash. It has his plant flat. We ask for help and do we get help? We get the great paper chase. Shove it from Fisheries over to Tourism, down to Finance, to this committee, that committee,

the other committee, everywhere where there is no money until the final shuffle ends up on the MHA's desk or on the businessman's desk. Here is the final shuffle or shove. There is nothing for you.

The Stornoway Lodge, I noticed the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in here the other day, the hon. the minister of gloom and doom, who took the Bonne Bay ferry, ripped it out of that community, took it from the North and South, that shuttle of tourists going back and forth between Bonne Bay. One hundred and thirty thousand measly lousy dollars is all we needed for a subsidy. But instead of that, what does he do?

He takes the subsidy with the right hand, puts in the left hand and gives it to the defeated Tory MHAs, calling it jobs. Pure, blatant, shocking, political, vulgar patronage and our people are supposed to survive! The Stornoway Lodge, which hires twenty people seasonally, is supposed to survive when the ferry was taken away. He asks for a loan guarantee and they tell him, 'No, boy, we cannot help you.'

MR. TULK:

And he tells you your people are lazy.

MR. FUREY:

And my people are lazy. My people should stop squabbling and shouting and complaining and get in their boats and then unemployment would be fine, the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) says, that Crosbie clone back there on the backbench.

Mr. Chairman, let me finish by saying that I have got a lot of

problems in the district of St. Barbe and they were there when they had a Tory member for three and a half years. Nothing changed. But, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that in three years time, when we reduce you to a runt, things will change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

I will be able to go back and stand proudly in Bonne Bay putting back that ferry where it belongs and say that a Liberal government will make things better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, let me close by reflecting back to the hon. member for Stephenville's (Mr. K. Alyward) comments about the arts community, the way artists are funded in this Province and his particular comments which are very, very honest and very honourable. We do not mind Revue '85. We welcome it. We love the good fun, the good nature. There was some tremendous acting. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a line, and Newfoundlanders understand this, that cuts clearly between that of an artist and that of a mouthpiece, a propagandist. Newfoundlanders know that and so we feel comfortable knowing that they know that because our Youth Critic let them know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

The hon. the member for Lapoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. KELLAND:

Would you clarify for me, Mr. Chairman, your earlier ruling recognizing the member for Lapoile (Mr. Mitchell)? When he did stand on his feet, he deferred to my colleague for St. Barbe (Mr. Fury) and, therefore, gave up his turn. Is that the way you understand it, Mr. Chairman? My reading of it was that in deferring to the member for St. Barbe, my colleague, he thereby gave up his right to speak next. If I am not mistaken the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) was next on his feet.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, I could not accept that as a matter of fact. The fact that an hon. member would yield to another hon. member does not mean that that hon. member cannot rise again and take his turn to speak. It so happens that on this side that the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Lapoile stood again and the hon. Minister of Finance yielded to the hon. member for Lapoile so, I recognize him as such. There is nothing sacrosanct in any event on the fact that it is this side and that side. It is not unusual and it is not unprecedented in this House for the Chair to recognize two hon. members on the same side. In the last number of years it has been that way but, what I am saying is, there is nothing written in the rules. It is a matter for the

Chair to decide.

MR. KELLAND:

May I make another comment?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I was not really questioning anything about the alternating traditions or anything like that but, my understanding was that the member for Lapoile was saying that if the member for St. Barbe has something meaningful to contribute, and I think that has been quite obviously displayed here in the House, that he would yield to him and that, therefore, terminated the member for Lapoile's contribution to this afternoon's activities. The next on his feet was the member for Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

I am sure that none of us here mind the member for Lapoile getting up and speaking because every time he does so he puts at least two or three feet in his mouth and I am very anxious to hear what he has to say this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

To that point of order, for clarification again, let me say to the hon. member for Naskaupi, the fact that the hon. member yielded to the hon. member for St. Barbe does not mean anything other than a good gesture on the part of the hon. member. As the hon. member for Naskaupi will realize, hon. members have been speaking this

afternoon several times, the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage, the hon. Minister of Finance and so on. That is it.

The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Probably the hon. member for Gander would think that I had three feet in my mouth when I wrote a letter to Mr. Mazankowski supporting the cause to save Gander and the airport there. Is that what you call having three feet in your mouth?

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BAKER:

If the hon. member did that, I thank him for it but, he has not gotten up in the House to speak on that particular issue yet and I am certain that he would not be allowed to by the members opposite anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, that shows the narrow-mindedness of the members on the other side of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to rise today to clarify some of the issues and the accusations that has been cast in this hon. House. One of things that I would like to say to start off on this money bill concerns unemployment in this province and what this government has been doing to try and correct the situation. We have brought in

good policies. As far as the unemployment rate in the district of St. Barbe is concerned, probably I should suggest that it may be the member's fault, probably I should suggest that it is the member in that particular riding that is lazy and that is the reason why they have such a high youth unemployment rate. That is probably the reason why the unemployment rate amongst the adults in that particular riding is so high. It is because they have a member who is not diligent enough to fight for the people in that district. Mr. Chairman, -

MR. FUREY:

Why are you picking on Alfie? He is not here to defend himself.

MR. MITCHELL:

I am not pick on Osmond, I am trying to defend -

MR. FUREY:

No, no.

MR. MITCHELL:

- the people of this Province because no way are the people in this Province lazy. They are very industrious people. One of the things that we saw in this Fall session, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

Order, please! The hon. the member for St. Barbe on a point of order.

MR. FUREY:

I do not mean to interrupt your speech, it is such a wonderful example of a large lexicon at work over there. But I do want to ask, using your logic of laziness equaling high unemployment, surely you are not saying the member for

Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) is super lazy with 90 per cent unemployment in Port au Port?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

I would declare there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, it is all right for member on the opposite side to get up and to dish it out, but they do not like to take it. They do not like to hear it when it comes from members of this side of the House. We saw in the Fall session, Mr. Chairman, members from the opposite side of the House waste eighteen days in this House of Assembly debating a money bill. That is what we saw, a total waste of time. What did we see when we introduced legislation in this House to support the fishermen of this Province and when we brought in legislation on factory freezer trawlers? No, Mr. Chairman, they sat there and they would not even get up and debate it in this House. They never argued then for a turn to get on their feet and to be able to speak for the Newfoundlanders of this Province. We saw another total waste of time when we brought in legislation to deal with unemployment regulations for fishermen. Again, Mr. Chairman, they took no side. They sat there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. MITCHELL:

Talking about the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), I am sorry he is not in his seat. I sat in my seat when he wanted to ridicule me. I remember being in the district when he was the minister in Ottawa. What happened? Where was the voice? Did he fight for the fishermen on the Southwest Coast, the people who put him in office when the Liberal Government in Ottawa decided to take away the salmon licences from fishermen? No, we never heard from that member, but yet he will get up in the House today and he will talk about how he fought for fishermen in that particular area.

I am not ashamed to say that I fight for fishermen and I fight for employment and job opportunities in the district of LaPoile.

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. FUREY:

I do again apologize for interrupting your speech but you are saying some provocative things there. I want to ask him because he does not get a chance to speak very often because he is on the backbench, way back there amongst the Cabinet ministers, I do want to ask him this question, and perhaps he will be good enough to answer it: where do you stand as the member for LaPoile with respect to the current possible dismantling of the railway by both the Tory Federal Government and the Tory Provincial Government? Where do you stand on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! There is no point of order. The hon. member is asking a question. He should wait until tomorrow's question period.

MR. FUREY:

He would love to answer that, I am sure he does.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to policy that is going to adversely affect the constituents of LaPoile, the member for that particular riding will stand up and be counted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

But where do you stand on the railway?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Chairman, I have to support the government today on this money bill, Bill 35 because since I became the member for LaPoile I have brought a request to this government to have a loan guarantee to put 1,200 people to work in the fishery in LaPoile. I can get up here and say today, because of my efforts, because of my hard work, and because of my influence in dealing -

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, a point of order I take it?

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do wish that the hon. member could clarify the position. I am the critic for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in this Province and any light that can be thrown on their position, on the abandonment, the devastation, the sellout of the railway, I would like to have it clarified. If extra time is needed, I would like for the member to take it to explain his position on the railway.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

DR. COLLINS:

I have sat here now and I have seen four members opposite rise on a point of order which from the very first word they uttered clearly was not a point of order. I do not know if hon. members opposite know what a point of order is.

A point of order is where the procedures of the House are being violated. Points of order are not where you have your chance to have a few remarks, especially those that have nothing to do with the procedures in the House. The members opposite are violating the rules of the House by interfering on four separate occasions. The hon. member is trying to exercise his rights in this House by making some points and he is being obstructed in his rights by people rising on something like that they know themselves are not points of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Hickey):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I can assure the hon. Minister of Finance that that is not the case, that we are not trying to obstruct or harass the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), but it is an important issue and we will, as a matter of fact, give the hon. gentleman extra time, he can have from now until six o'clock, indeed tomorrow, if he wants to, or when this bill is called again, if he will indeed tell the Opposition spokesman on transportation (Mr. Decker) and the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), indeed this side of this House, because it is very important where he stands on this whole issue of abandonment of the railway in Newfoundland. So we will give him all the time in the world. We are not trying to obstruct him at all. We just want to see where the hon. gentleman stands on this important issue. Is he going to kowtow to his Tory buddies in Ottawa or is he going to stand up for the people of LaPoile.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, I would rule that there is no point of order. May I say in relation to the comments by the hon. minister that I would welcome the day that hon. members abided strictly by the rules in relation to points of order because since time immemorial the rule pertaining to points of order have been abused in the House and used and all the rest.

I must admit that there has been a number of interruptions. I cannot say that I am prepared to make a precedent ruling by ruling them

out of order or denying them the right to stand on a point of order. There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try and answer the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) before I -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! I would ask the hon. member to wind up his remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

By leave, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Before my time is up I would like to go back to the trend of thought that I was talking about just before I conclude and that is in relationship to loan guarantees, which are in Bill 35. I am proud to say that we can see in my district 1,200 people employed today with one company because this government had a social conscience and loaned that company, or put up a loan guarantee so that company would not go bankrupt. Mr. Chairman, that is performance.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to the question that was raised by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) about the railway, and its abandonment. I do not know where he is getting that idea but if, for instance, there is policy that comes down from Ottawa that the railway will be abandoned, then certainly you will know what my stand is on that particular issue.

In relation to other things that is coming down from Ottawa, I heard through the grapevine just the other day that the information service was going to be moved out of Port aux Basques and there were going to be jobs transferred into St. John's. What did I do? Before it was ever brought up in this House by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle, I had a telegram off to the Minister of Transportation in Ottawa (Mr. Mazankowski) objecting to this move, totally objecting to it. The same thing will happen, Mr. Chairman, if, for instance, I disagree with any policy that is going to be brought down by the federal government, that is going to drastically affect the residents of my district or that is not the well-being of the citizens of my area, Mr. Chairman. It is a privilege for me to be able to stand here in this House today and to give praise to the government, and to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on Bill 35. You talk about the hon. member, the seven day wonder I suppose he has been referred to, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), talking about being on the government side.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ten day wonder.

MR. MITCHELL:

Ten day wonder, is it? Being on the government side, you know, towing the line, that type of thing, not speaking out, playing partisan politics. Well, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to talk about partisan politics probably I can give him a lesson in partisan politics from when he was the member for Burin - St. George's.

Probably I can give him a good

lesson when I was called into his office when I was President of the Southwest Coast Development Association and my executive was called into his office and he said, "Unless you tow the line, unless you do what I say, as long as I am a member in the Government of Canada, not another cent will go to the Southwest Coast Development Association."

Mr. Chairman, if he wants to cast aspersions, if he wants to talk about partisan politics, I can talk about partisan politics. But I can also say because of that statement I am in this House today representing the same people and he is not because he got defeated in that election.

One of the things I believe that we should always pay attention to is we should always be kind to those on the way up because you never know when you are going to have to meet them on the way down.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should realize something that he is doing and perhaps he does not realize it. Perhaps he is again putting his foot in his mouth as he has done on several occasions in the last couple of weeks, just before Christmas and today. He should realize something, that at least he should wait until the

person who he is casting aspersions at, which he is doing - he is saying that the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage tried to blackmail him, that is what he is inferring, tried to blackmail certain actions out of of him or otherwise -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
He is inferring that, Mr. Chairman. He should perhaps wait because the hon. gentleman for Fortune - Hermitage had to leave early this afternoon on business. He should wait until the hon. gentleman is back in his seat before he makes those kinds of aspersions. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, he would not have the courage to do it if he was here.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

There is no point of order. I would suggest that the word 'blackmail' not be used by any hon. member. That is unparliamentary.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make some comments on some specific items in this particular bill. However, I see, Mr. Chairman, it is six o'clock so I would request the Committee rise.

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, just a point of information, if I may. The hon. member wishes to make some points on this particular resolution. That may present some difficulty because tomorrow we will not be back on this resolution, unless, by leave, we give up Private Members' Day. I suspect we will be back on the Atlantic Accord legislation on Thursday and I know that hon. members will want to give that deep consideration. That may go on for quite a number of days.

I would remind our members it is not too long in the future now where the Easter recess will come up and I would suspect that the House will prorogue in the not too distant future. So, whether we will get back on this resolution is problematical in my view and if the hon. member wishes to speak to it, he may now have burned his boats.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

To that point, I think it simply points out something that has been mentioned a number of times here today, that if we had any prior or advanced knowledge of what is going on in this House from day to day and if we had proper communication with members opposite, then this problem would not arise.

DR. COLLINS:

I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

On motion, the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to

sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has directed me to report that it has made no progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, and that this House do now adjourn.

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