



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 4

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Wednesday, 1 May 1985

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

000

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, before we go into Orders of the Day I would like to move, and I am sure the government members will join with the Opposition in this, that the House extend condolences to the family of the late Myles P. Murray, a former Member of this House of Assembly.

Mr. Murray had a long and distinguished public career in this Province as well as a very commendable war career from enlistment in the Royal Artillery in 1940 to attendance at the Royal Air Force Officers Training School and the School of Intelligence at Highgate. Mr. Murray was posted finally to the 125th Newfoundland squadron as an intelligence officer.

Following the war, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Murray became a member of the House of Assembly in 1951, became a minister of the Crown and served for fourteen years in Cabinet. He was the member for the district of Ferryland, which is presently held by the Minister for Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). I do not know if that title has been made legal yet or not, but anyway the present Minister for Career Development

and Advanced Studies now holds the seat for Ferryland which was formerly held by Mr. Murray. Mr. Murray was a Newfoundlander of whom we could all be proud and I believe that it is appropriate, Your Honour, if this House were to draft an appropriate letter of condolence to his family and express our condolences and our gratitude for having the tremendous contribution that Myles Murray made first as a private citizen, secondly as a distinguished member of the armed forces, as a Member of the House of Assembly, as a minister of the Crown and, more lately, as a Judge of the District Court of St. John's.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government side of the House I am delighted to concur with the motion as presented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). Yesterday in my remarks on the Throne Speech I mentioned the valuable contribution that Myles Murray had made to the district of Ferryland, to the Province, to the judicial system and certainly to all of Canada through his war veterans' experience. It is a pleasure to concur with this motion and I, on behalf of all government members and ministers, offer our condolences to the Murray family. We certainly concur with the motion.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for
Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before we go on, I would like to make a motion that this hon. House unanimously send its congratulations to the Corner Brook Royals, who will be playing their final game tonight, we hope, and making history for Newfoundland. They made a fine showing through contributions from many players from all over the Island, and I think they are going to put Newfoundland on the map in a sports minded manner. I think unanimous consent from the House would be a great thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we concur with having that motion go forward this afternoon to encourage them to get the finals over with tonight. I have already been in touch with them three or four times over the last two or three series that they have been involved with. When the finals began a few nights ago, the government did provide them with new uniforms to wear, and no doubt that contributed largely to their success to date -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- of now being ahead in the series three games to one. I am sure that with this telegram from the whole House today that we will copper-fasten them as the best amateur hockey team in all of

Canada. So we concur.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just so we make it unanimous on the part of all three parties in the House, I would like to concur in that motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I would like to recognize on behalf of all hon. members Mayor William Lewis from the Town of Paradise in the district of Conception Bay South.

Statements by Ministers

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in this statement is to comment on the judicial inquiry which took place following the death of Alonzo Corcoran on January 24, 1984, who, at the time of his death, was a resident of the Whitbourne Training School.

The Whitbourne Training School was established under the authority of the Welfare of Children Act (1944). The Act was retained as part of the Terms of Union with Canada in 1949 and the Province has operated under that Act up

until April 1, 1984. On that date, we became subject to the Young Offenders Act with the rest of the provinces of Canada.

The Whitbourne Training School operated within the authority and spirit of the Welfare of Children Act and, as the inquiry report indicates, operated as an open-custody institution. Section 28 of the Act clearly states that juveniles detained under the Act "shall be treated not as criminals but as a misdirected and misguided child and one needing help, guidance, training and encouragement". This approach to the treatment of young people has served the Province well and the record of the Department over the years in achieving rehabilitation of young people has been a good one. Indeed, the Province resisted the introduction of the Young Offenders Act to Newfoundland and indicated both publicly and privately on many occasions its desire to continue to operate under our own provincial statute. Establishing a closed custody institution with the necessary provision to prevent young people from running away would have been very difficult, if not impossible, within the spirit of the Welfare of Children Act and, in any event, contrary to the philosophy and approach to rehabilitation under which the Department has operated.

The policy established by the Department for searches when run-aways occurred was clear. The participation in the search by staff of the Training School was initiated immediately and the RCMP were notified so that the appropriate search activities could take place outside the Whitbourne area. Unfortunately on January 24, 1984, the search was

not successful, with tragic results. The Commissioner of the inquiry has indicated that reasonable efforts were made and did not fault the searchers.

Mr. Speaker, although this tragic incident occurred, the Judge is probably right in concluding that the chance of such an occurrence has always been there, and I think was a factor of the system under which we were operating at that time. That system, although having many positive attributes, provided the possibility for this kind of incident.

The Judge who carried out the inquiry indicated that the law with respect to young offenders has changed to such a degree that he saw no usefulness in making specific recommendations. His comments respecting record keeping at the institution and the involvement of social workers have been duly noted. The requirements of the Young Offenders Act are quite specific and a record system is presently being developed in co-operation with the Department of Justice. I would inform the House as well that a full-time social worker will be appointed immediately to the institution.

The Whitbourne Detention Center has been closed for the past year and has undergone a \$500,000 renovation programme to make it a "secure custody" institution in accordance with the new Young Offenders Act. It is just now being reopened. I have every confidence in the staff of the department to properly operate this facility and other programmes and services under this Legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, in making a few comments on this Ministerial Statement, first of all I should say that it looks like what is happening here is we are closing the door after the horse has gone. The minister noted that there will be a full-time social worker appointed immediately. Of course, the social worker who had been there for a long number of years was taken out of there three or four years ago. Obviously his services were required because, obviously, that is why one is being put back there again now. That was a mistake that was made in the department, taking that social worker away in the first instance.

The minister also refers to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that \$500,000 in renovations has been ongoing there and is nearly completed now and, of course, what we will have really is a new facility with a new set of guidelines, a minimum security system. What existed there in the past, Mr. Speaker, left much to be desired and the former minister is on record as saying that he was about to make some changes. Of course, these changes were long overdue, long overdue. The reason that this young gentleman ran away is known to the workers out there, and I know many of the workers personally, Mr. Speaker, and the circumstances surrounding his death are still mysterious, I think. But, anyway, it is all history, Mr. Speaker, and it seems as though this is what has to happen. We saw it happen with the Ocean Ranger. After the Ocean Ranger went down, then everybody knew what had to be done instead of doing it in the first instance. An ounce of prevention, Mr. Speaker, is worth a pound of

cure but sometimes it takes some people a long, long time to come to that conclusion.

But, tragically, somebody died there before something concrete and something necessary was done. We hope, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, that the new facility at Whitbourne - to call the old one a training school was a very loose use of the word "school", I can tell you that - that will soon be opened will serve its purpose well.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Before calling Oral Questions, I would like to welcome to the House Mayor Elliott and councillors Andrews, Thompson and Haggett from the district of Exploits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier following up on a response received from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) in yesterday's Question Period. The Minister of Fisheries indicated that the loss of the \$15 million which had been allocated for the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation was news to government. I would like to ask the Premier whether, in fact, this is the case, whether the Premier has any knowledge with respect to the fact that this \$15 million, which had been allocated by the Government of Canada, is no longer

available to the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) indicated yesterday, negotiations are ongoing on the establishment of the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation as is required under the restructuring agreement signed between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and it is yet a question of how much it is going to cost. It could be more than \$15 million. Both governments are aware that at least \$15 million have been available as was determined at that time when the negotiations were ongoing under the agreement. So it could be \$15 million, it could be \$16 million, it could be \$20 million; it depends on the nature of the corporation that is to be established. So there is every recognition by both the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland that a minimum of \$15 million will have to be provided to that corporation as was determined at that time. But the exact amount will be worked out between the two governments as we determine what the nature and structure of the corporation will be. We did at that time indicate that it looked like a \$15 million sum would be necessary for sure, but it is likely, Mr. Speaker, given that that was a year or a year and a half ago or more, that it may be more than that. It will all depend upon exactly what structure will be put in place at that time.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Is the Premier aware that the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) stated today to representatives of three regional development associations - the Development Associations for St. Barbe, the Strait of Belle Isle, and White Bay - that the federal government wishes to move as quickly as possible with setting up the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation and that the minister has had discussions with the Premier asking that this corporation and funding for it be made a priority under the ERDA package, but that in fact there was not a priority put on funding for this corporation by the application or the correspondence which passed from the Premier's office to the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am not aware of it. I have not had any discussions with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans on the matter. The regional fund under ERDA has been used up. The negotiations on the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation and the agreement that has been reached was that both governments would come to an agreement on the amount of money, determine, after that was done, whether it was \$15, \$16 or \$17 million, and that it was to be determined at that time where the funding would come from from the federal government; whether it was from a new allocation given to ERDA, whether it was an allocation from the federal treasury to Fisheries and Oceans, or through some other fund in the federal government.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Would the Premier confirm whether or not there was \$15 million allocated by the Government of Canada there ready for the taking, ready for the Province and the Government of Canada to put into a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation, which \$15 million has now lapsed and for which there is no longer any allocation under the federal budgetary process? And would the Premier agree with the statement by the federal minister, which I understand the federal minister has made to the representatives of these associations, that the reason this \$15 million has lapsed and is no longer available was because of the failure of the provincial government to supply a formula for a structure for the creation of that Northern Fisheries Development Corporation? In other words, is the federal minister correct when he states that it is the provincial government which has been dragging its feet in setting up this corporation?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I do not know what the hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Fraser) has said, Mr. Speaker, I am only going by what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has said. I will have to get the details of the negotiations. The negotiations have been ongoing long before this present government came into power and have continued ever since. As

I understand it, the negotiations are still ongoing and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is about to bring a proposal for the structure back to Cabinet. We have not been lax in our responsibilities. We have requested meetings, both with the former government and this government, to expedite the whole question of getting the corporation established. Both governments knew it was going to cost \$15 million or more and agreed that this sum of money would be made available at that point in time. It could be more, depending upon the structure. So there has been no lax attitude on our behalf. We sat down and negotiated and have continued to negotiate with the federal government for the establishment of that corporation. The fact that we did not apply under any existing programme was because we were waiting to find out what the final figure was and then we would determine jointly the avenues through which the money would flow. That is where it is. I can get for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) the meetings that we have held and so on. We have not shirked our duty in pushing this corporation as fast as we could. As a matter of fact, we wanted it established a long time ago, when the former government was in office, and we had pushed very, very hard. It was this government who insisted that that go in the restructuring agreement. At that time the former government did not want to go with that kind of a proposal, and it was over their objections that we got it, in the same way as we got the Burin Peninsula Development Fund and so on. I can demonstrate for the House in the next several days the meetings and the negotiations that have been

ongoing to get this corporation established. So there is no shirking our duty on this side of the House on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Would the Premier indicate whether or not funding for this corporation was contained in the priority list which was sent up to the federal government in the negotiations for a new ERDA package? Was this a priority in that application?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
There was no such application. There is a group of priority items that we have been involved in with the federal government for quite some time as it relates to ERDA for new money. There is already a commitment for the \$15 million, at least, for the Northern Fisheries Corporation. So what we are going after when we go back to ERDA for roads, fisheries, forestry, agriculture and all the other existing agreements, is more money for these agreements that had been ongoing, and it was never envisaged, up to the last set of negotiations that I was involved in, that it was necessarily money coming from ERDA for the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. It would be decided by the federal government where they would get their money to put into the Northern Fisheries Corporation. For example, it is not a DRIE subsidiary agreement like forestry or agriculture, or

tourism, or like Ocean Industries or like planning. It was a separate agreement in the same way as the \$75 million that was put in for Fishery Products International did not come under ERDA. It is separate and distinct from ERDA altogether and the ERDA envelope refers to all the subsidiary agreements that now we are involved in and are looking for more. The Northern Fisheries Development Corporation and the restructuring financing is separate from ERDA altogether and were always separate from ERDA, so we wanted to go ahead and get our forestry agreement and our agricultural agreement and our highways agreement and our ocean industries agreement. This kind of money is special and different and comes under whatever subhead that the federal government want to put it under. It does not make any difference to us where it comes from. But the commitment is there for the money and for the corporation.

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

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

MR. BARRY:
Is the Premier saying that the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) has not asked the Premier or the provincial government that funding for the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation be made a priority under the ERDA package?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I am not aware of it, Mr. Speaker, not aware of it at all, absolutely not. In all the talks that I have

had on the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation it was up to the federal government to determine where its money was going to come from. It did not make any difference to us where it came from at all, in the same way as the \$75 million did not come through ERDA when it went into the FPI. It did not come for ERDA at all. ERDA is an envelope of money which is in the Department of Regional and Industrial Expansion, as it is called now, to continue the job that was started by DREE years ago for subsidiary agreements on ongoing fishery related matters, forestry related matters, agriculture and roads. We have, for example, in other areas with the federal government, negotiated additional money that did not come out of ERDA. ERDA is not the only money coming into the Province. I guess I should table this in the House. Remember when we had the general development agreement years ago? That is what it was called then, the general development agreement, and it was DREE. Then when the federal government changed the structure and put Mr. Johnston in over Mr. Lumley, at the time, if you remember, they changed it to ERDA. If you see the terms of that general agreement, it was to cover these areas that I just talked about - fishery, infrastructure, facilities like ice-making and all the rest of it, forestry, agriculture, roads planning, all of these.

The restructuring agreement is not an agreement attached to ERDA: It is a separate agreement between the Government of Canada, the Government of Newfoundland and the Bank of Nova Scotia. The \$75 million did not come out of ERDA. If the federal government want to take their share of the Fisheries

Development Corporation out of ERDA by putting more money into it, that is fine with us, it does not make any difference. The commitment is there to establish it and provide the money and it is up to them to decide where they want to get the money.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). As we all know, the time period when the budget is usually introduced has been long past. What I would like to ask today is is there any indication as to when the budget is expected to come down?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, we have always announced to the House at the earliest possible moment when a firm date has been set. The fact that it has not been announced at the moment means that a firm date has not been set. We will be making an announcement to that effect at the earliest possible moment.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
This is not an idle question because this morning a university student came into my office to complain that she had made application for some of the 1,000

jobs that your government provides this Summer and had gone to several government departments and had been told by one government department and an agency that there was no possibility of hiring her at this time because until the budget came down these departments did not know how much money they had available and as a result were not in a position to hire her. This, I think, is extremely tragic because we now have a situation where the government is promising these jobs and because of the delay in the budget they are not capable of hiring these people. My question is, can you give this person some idea of how long she is going to have to wait, unemployed now, before she can look for a job with the government?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, clearly I cannot be responsible for every word that comes from an official's mouth.

MR. FLIGHT:
I suppose you are not responsible for the deficit either.

DR. COLLINS:
Not personally responsible. All I can say is that the Summer programme for students comes from the provincial government itself, because the provincial government hires every year a sizeable number of university and post-secondary school children, that arrangement is not dependent on the date that the budget is going to be presented in this House.

Departments have already submitted their estimates in the budgetary process a long time ago. They have had responses back from Treasury Board in regard to those

estimates, so there is no excuse or validity to the statement that the Summer employment of students is related to the precise date on which the budget is brought down.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Menihek, a final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:
If that is the case then obviously some misinformation is coming out. Could you then instruct the government departments that this is not the case so that in future university students looking for jobs will not be told no because of this fictitious excuse?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, in any two-way communication there are two elements. There is on one side what is said and on the other side what is heard. Now I am not exactly certain what the hon. member heard but I do suspect that it is not necessarily true that what he heard was exactly what was said.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and pursue a question that I asked yesterday. The question was what was going to happen to the public service employees once they came out of

the wage freeze, whether or not full collective bargaining was going to be restored, and the minister and other members opposite sort of pooh-poohed the question, Mr. Speaker, saying that the information was all public. If Your Honour will allow me just a brief preamble, I went to the information to see what I was missing and this was what it says: "Confusion reigned Thursday as Finance Minister John Collins attempted to clarify the government's position on the wage freeze for public employees." Then the Premier clarified it by saying that each unit as it completed its two -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is going into a long preamble and the purpose of the Question Period is to ask questions. There is a certain preamble allowed but this is a very long preamble. The hon. gentleman is just using the preamble to try to indicate why he did not understand the answers given yesterday by the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard).

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) must be smarting under the truth that is coming from my colleague from

Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). I would suggest to him that the preamble was under a minute from the time that he rose, and I would also suggest to him that while he may want to take this House on his back it is the Speaker who gives rulings in this House and not the Government House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would ask the hon. the member for Bonavista North if he would ask his question.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said that as each unit came out of the wage freeze that they would go back to full collective bargaining. The Premier went on to say that as each unit came out of the wage freeze they would go into collective bargaining but, Mr. Speaker, would get a wage increase equal to the cost of living estimated at the time and would be free to negotiate for more than that. Now when I put the question to the minister, the minister answered, and I quote from Hansard, he said: "There has been a better announcement" - he is referring to other announcements - "than that made already, that there would be 4 per cent for the CPI granted and then free collective bargaining would take place." Now my question, Mr. Speaker, is where is this 4 per cent? I see no reference that the Premier mentioned 4 per cent, so is this the base level now at which these units will be allowed to start bargaining? Are we

saying that this is going to be a minimum of 4 per cent or is this in lieu of the CPI?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I should remind the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) that questions relating to what the level of increases are going to be is not within the purview of the Minister of Labour; in reality, it is a question for Treasury Board. However, I am not backing down from the answer that I gave to the hon. member yesterday when I said that there had been public announcements made on that matter and that there had been announcements made by the government previously that as each unit came out of the two year freeze period that they would go into free collective bargaining, but each unit could assume that they would receive a 4 per cent wage increase or the CPI whichever was the greater. Now I think if he has got further questions about it, I am supposed to be the neutral party in this, Mr. Speaker, I think he should address the questions to the Minister responsible for collective bargaining.

SOME HON MEMBERS:

Aha!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Aha! what? I have answered his question.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

This is a very important issue, Mr. Speaker, and we want to make sure that we are clear on it because the Premier may have to clarify this again. We want to make sure that we are clear. Now is the 4 per cent, as we understand it, in lieu of the CPI, or is that a guaranteed level? What is going to be the base? Is the CPI going to be used or is it going to be the 4 per cent?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times we are going to have to repeat this for the hon. member. Obviously the hon. member is not listening. We said there would be a minimum increase of 4 per cent. If the CPI at the time is higher than that, my understanding is that the President of Treasury Board of the day stated that it would be the CPI. Now that must be clear to everybody.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. BARRY:

'Tom' was not finished.

MR. TULK:

I will yield to my colleague from Bonavista North.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. member

for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

The point of order is that the Speaker is obligated to recognize the first person to stand up, and in your opinion it was the member for Fogo. You have no right whatsoever to pass your right over to another member of your caucus.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

We understand that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) has not been in the House as long as some members, such as the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) or a few others, but he has been here long enough to know the rules of this House. Mr. Speaker, Your Honour decides who is recognized in this House and it is highly improper for any member to question or challenge Your Speaker's ruling once Your Honour has recognized a member. Your Honour will, I know, as did your predecessor, bend over backwards to make sure that all members get a fair and equal opportunity to put their questions before this House. The member has no point of order. It is a spurious point that he is raising.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to

that point of order, I think this is rather important. We, on this side of the House, can see all the people on the opposite side and if I remember correctly the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) yielded to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) earlier in the Question Period on a supplementary. I have a certain sympathy with what the member for Menihek is saying. He is not really getting a chance to ask any questions and the Liberal Opposition are bamboozling the member for Menihek. Now the member for Menihek has just as much right to ask a question in this House as any other hon. member and he should be given some degree of courtesy, given that he is the only one member of a party represented in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! I have heard enough on that point of order. There is no point of order and the Chair will recognize as he sees fit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, again just pursuing this line of questioning, and knowing that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) has a lot of expertise in this area that we are pursuing, I am just wondering what he thinks of this idea of establishing limits, what the purpose of it is. He has told me that every bargaining unit in the Province now can be guaranteed 4 per cent, or if the CPI is higher than that they will be guaranteed the CPI. Is this, in the

minister's view free, full collective bargaining when we are establishing limits? What is the necessity of establishing limits? Why do we not open it up to free full and collective bargaining?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, once more I will clarify this. The hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has been the Labour critic in the House for some number of years and obviously he must know what he is talking about. We have said that there will be a guarantee of 4 per cent or the CPI for every unit. Now over the years certain units have negotiated for higher levels of wage increases than other units. What we are saying is you will go into a period of free, collective bargaining depending on the case, the situation of that unit. The union that bargains for that unit may negotiate a higher level than the CPI, a higher level than the 4 per cent. Some other units may be restricted to the 4 per cent depending on what the statistics relating to that unit may be.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). It pertains to the St. John's fish market which I understand has been asked by the City of St. John's to move from its present location in Bishop's Cove to some other location in the city. As a matter of fact, I do not believe it has been specified where they are suppose to move.

In 1977, the then Minister of

Fisheries, I believe it was the Member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) at the time, pointed out that he would prefer to see established in the city a proper facility for St. John's fishermen for a fish market. In view of the fact that those fishermen have been asked to move and they do not know at this point where they are going to be moving to, would the minister now undertake, of course, in co-operation with the City of St. John's, to see that they have a suitable location so that traditional way of selling fish in St. John's can be carried on?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the very important issues in the department that I have not been briefed on yet, but I will take the matter under advisement, as notice, and provide an answer as soon as I can.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I wonder if I could ask the minister, in view of the fact, that they have been asked to move today, which I think is May 1, is it not?

MR. BARRY:

They were given twenty-four hours.

MR. TULK:

They were given twenty-four hours yesterday, and they have been, therefore, asked to move today. Would the minister take immediate action on it today and see if

indeed there can be some contact made with the City of St. John's and those fishermen concerned to see that there is no unnecessary hardship or that that fish market is not destroyed. Would he undertake to take immediate action on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. After Question Period, I certainly will contact the officials in the department and have them investigate it. Like I said, I have not been aware up to this point in time that this was taking place. But we will investigate it and anything we can do, in co-operation with the city and whoever else, we will certainly try to do our best.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly infamous day for the South Coast and especially for the Tory Government in Ottawa because this is the day they cut the guts out of the South Coast coastal boat service.

Now the cutbacks that have been proposed today were first proposed by CN Marine four years ago, and again two years ago, and on both occasions the former Liberal Government refused them permission to go ahead, with some persuasion from me, and I may say some persuasion from the Provincial Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). My question is for him. I am aware of his answer to my

colleague for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) on Monday. Can he now assure the House that he is making some headway in his efforts to get Ottawa to reinstate the ports of English Harbour East and West and Hermitage and Pools Cove and Belleoram?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say we are continuing discussions on that matter as well as a number of others relating to CN Marine.

I would just like to, if I might for a point of clarification, indicate that there are a number of changes that have occurred on the South Coast service over the past number of years relative to the coastal boat service and ferryboat services. It is the Provincial Government that has introduced a couple of new services on the South Coast which have had implications and impact on the coastal service now being provided. It was this government that introduced the car ferry to the Ramea-Burgeo service. That is a much improved service that has created a higher demand in relationship to the provincially operated boat service than is now presently being handled in the same area by the CN Marine operated coastal ferry service.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, we have introduced a new service to Gaultois. A lot of the traffic and movement of people and goods that was previously carried by the CN Marine services are now being handled by the Provincial Government through its ferry operations, and the same applies to Grey River and a number of

other areas. So there have been structural changes in marine transportation on the South Coast and there are some structural changes as it relates to the ground transportation as well. All these combined require that both the federal government, and their mandate through CN Marine to provide a coastal service, and the Province's mandate in its marine services and ground transportation service indicate that we have to get together and talk about and try to rationalize changes that are occurring on the South Coast. I would like to assure the member that that process is ongoing and also to assure him that we are going to try to do our best to make sure that the collective services in transportation to the people of the South Coast of Newfoundland, as well as all around the Province, are met to the best of our ability.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I am aware of what the minister has said. I am aware of the Gaultois ferry, the ferry that was originally promised for Gaultois and McCallum, by the way. McCallum, I say to my friend for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), is still waiting for that commitment to be kept. When the original announcement was made it was for both those ports, but that is another issue. Now, the minister, when he talks about making representation, may well becoming close, Mr. Speaker, to misleading the House, dangerously close to misleading the House. I submit to him, and I ask him to

confirm whether it is true or not, that his so-called representation on this issue - and he as good as demonstrated this point in the last minute or so in his response when he tried to rationalize the changes away - I submit to him that his so-called representation has amounted to agreeing with the Tories in Ottawa to keep silent on this issue. Two years ago, when the same changes were being proposed, he was loud in his condemnation and now he is silent. Why is he silent? Because he has a deal with Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I think it is well known that in addressing supplementary questions there is to be no preamble. The hon. gentleman was, in fact, making a speech.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I ask the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) to ask his question right away.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I did not respond to the point of order because it was non-existent, it was 'Landslide Willy' stalling again.

Mr. Speaker, my question is: Is it true that the so-called representation by the minister has

amounted into entering into a secret deal with Ottawa to do something contrary to what he did two years ago when he was commendably loud in opposing the cutbacks? Now the same cutbacks are being implemented and he is being totally silent. Why?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that in Ottawa now we have a Tory administration as opposed to the administration which the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) used to belong to, is that the only avenue available to this government and to ministers and to other people who tried to make representation and try to bring about changes in policies that were detrimental to this Province was through the media in many cases, through Telex machines, through being very vocal publicly because we did not have an opportunity and never were provided with the courtesy of being able to sit down and discuss the issues relative to this Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, that has changed. Since the new administration in Ottawa we have been able to establish working committees in a number of areas particularly in the area of transportation where we have committees set up of public civil servants from the federal administration and from the provincial administration, we have regular ongoing meetings between the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) and myself discussing a wide range of areas. Mr. Speaker, we have our provincial commitment to these services in co-operation with the federal government's to the service. I am

glad there was a supplementary. It provides me with the opportunity to indicate to this hon. House, again, as was done publicly a number of weeks ago, that we are entering into an agreement with the Marystown Shipyard to build a new vessel, yet another ferryboat, a new ice-reinforced ferryboat for the Ramea-Burgeo service.

MR. FLIGHT:

Answer the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to indicate, if hon. members are upset and have to shout and yell back and forth across the House, the kind of statesmanship evident in the first paragraph of Hansard from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), about how statesman-like they are going to be in their questions and how they are going to treat the decorum of this House, is fast fading. When you get members opposite who try to shout their question over the Speaker, shout their questions or their arguments over the objections of our Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), it is an indication that they are failing fast. I would have thought they would have gone into next week at least, Mr. Speaker, before they got into this kind of a hoopla. Mr. Speaker, since the member asked the question, 'Why is it different now?', I am trying to explain what is different about it. There are very obvious differences. Before, you did not have an opportunity to sit down and talk with people in Ottawa and now we do. We are being involved with trying to discuss issues relative to the marine service, in

building new boats ourselves, in acknowledging the fact that the people on the islands around this Province have a legitimate requirement for adequate transportation services and we are providing that at great cost to the Province, sometimes in co-operation with the federal government and other times on our own, but we are doing that. So we have this mechanism of consultation and discussion. And we will, over the next number of weeks, and the next number of months, and the next number of years, have an opportunity to sit down and continue to rationalize the transportation service on the South Coast of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Petitions

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present a petition from some several hundred people in my district.

I will read the prayer of the petition. It concerns, of course, the matter of electric rates. The prayer reads: "We, the concerned citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador, do hereby protest against the high and increasing electricity rates in our Province."

Now, as I alluded in my speech on the Address in Reply yesterday, I am extremely concerned about the cost of electricity rates. I realize it is one of the greatest potential contributors to inflation in the Newfoundland economy today and unless we can get a handle on it, unless we can control the increase in these rates, we are going to be severely affected when trying to do anything for our economy.

I believe, however, that our solutions are long-term. I do not think there are any workable short-term solutions, and I think that unfortunately, our solutions are very technical and, in fact, a great deal of study is going to have to go into trying to understand all the complexities of electric generation and supply. There may be something that can be done in the short run; perhaps we may be able to play with the rate structure and perhaps there can be off-peak period use. There could be some adjustment there, but that is going to require a great deal of study and I would just like to pledge my serious effort, my best efforts in trying to get a handle on these electricity rates.

I would like to add while I am on my feet that it is patently obvious to me that the Opposition are trying to use this issue as a political football, and I say, shame on them, double shame on them. This is far too serious an issue for people to play politics with and I think that for people who do not know the difference between an amp and a volt and could not care less, it would be much better for them to keep silent, I really do. So I will not be at all offended if no one from the other side -

MR. MARSHALL:

They know how to re-volt though.

MR. J. CARTER:

They know how to re-volt, someone said.

I will not be at all offended if no one from the other side gets up in support of this petition because I know they are not serious. I know they do not care. At least, as far as I can know anything, I know that. So I suggest that they just sit still. As a matter of fact, when I think of electricity, I keep looking over at the Opposition and I keep thinking of electrocution. I wonder if there is a connection there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Anyway, there it is, Mr. Speaker. I would like to lay this petition on the table of the House to be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in supporting the petition so ably presented by the hon. member. But, Mr. Speaker, if the people on whose behalf he was presenting the petition had been here to listen to it, the last few lines show how insincere he is in presenting the petition. He had done a good job of pointing out to his government that they have bungled electric rates in this Province for the past ten years. We would have

believed, Mr. Speaker, for a minute, that he was indeed going to sincerely present the petition, but in the last few lines he could not resist getting political. Mr. Speaker, I have, however, to commend him for his courage, because it was very embarrassing for me yesterday, and it is going to be very embarrassing for the next week or so, when I have to stand in this House, not because I want to do it, but because it has to be done, stand in this House and present petitions on behalf of backbenchers and ministers sitting on the government side. So I have to commend him for his courage. But I have to wonder about his influence, Mr. Speaker, in that government because he is in a position where he can have the concerns that he talked about addressed. He is a member on the government side. Where is the whole message in the election? Remember the election? 'Let us elect somebody on the government side.' The subtle threat was do not elect somebody on the government side and you will have no influence. Elect somebody on the government side and you will have influence. Well, the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, who just presented that petition, shows us how ineffective and how useless a member on the government side can be to his constituents when they really need him. Because he is right. Newfoundlanders are being devastated. Mortgages are being foreclosed.

MR. HODDER:

Who signed the Upper Churchill contract?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Five minutes, Mr. Speaker, is not

long enough for me to deal with the hon. the member for Port au Port. We will wait for the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest humbly and sincerely that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), who just presented that petition, would use what should be his considerable influence with the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) and have the government look at the problem. As a matter of fact, there was a commitment made in this election that there would be short-term relief and the Premier would be announcing long-term relief in the near future. It has not come yet. I am hoping it will come.

Mr. Speaker, the member talked about there being no short-term solution. Well, maybe he should have the Premier talk to the Public Utilities Board. There was legislation brought into this House in 1977 that very effectively took away the right of the Public Utilities Board to set electrical rates.

The member indicated in the petition that they were talking long-term. Newfoundland cannot afford to wait for long-term relief. The people who are living in darkness, the people who are losing their homes, the people who cannot pay their bills cannot afford to await long-term relief. So what is he going to do about this? He is going to wait for the Upper Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, I looking forward to hearing from another member on the other side. I am sure there is somebody over there; I am sure the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) will have the courage to present a petition on behalf of

his constituents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I support sincerely and genuinely the prayer of the petition.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition as well because I am, as well as all members of this hon. House are, concerned about electrical rates. One thing that has not been known about electrical rates, though, Mr. Speaker, very often when we start talking about this issue, which is of such concern to a lot of people in the Province for a whole range of reasons, I direct hon. members' attention to Page 81 in the Budget for 1984. It seems as if it has not become a well-known fact that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is presently subsidizing electrical rates. If one looks on Page 81, 'Electrical Energy, 01 and 02, you will find that we are subsidizing electrical power rates to industries in the Province this past year to the tune of \$20 million and to the ordinary citizen of Newfoundland to the tune of \$21,500,000, for a grand total of \$41,500,000 this past year. Now, that could have gone up somewhat.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is for diesel plants.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no. It is for some diesel plants. So the total subsidy right now to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro is \$41 million. That is the present subsidy. And we are now facing, as everybody knows, this year, a deficit on current account somewhere around \$70 million. So the question has to be asked. And I agree with the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and others who have spoken on this issue over the last while, it is not a simple matter. Whilst the Opposition may try to make it one, it is not just a simple matter. There has to be return to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to cover their cost. They cannot go in the hole. We have to make up the difference in order for them to be able to borrow money and the short-term solutions are not there.

The other point that has to be made is that I think this year, I forget the exact number but I am sure that I can get it, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro has lost a whole bunch of money, if you will, or had to go into oil. This has been the worst year on record for about thirty-six years. It has been thirty-six years since we have had such a dry Summer, Fall and Winter which has given rise to this higher consumption of oil generated electricity. So if this were a normal year the amount our electrical bills would have been a lot less. But it is not a simple matter. We are presently subsidizing Hydro to the tune of \$41 million of taxpayers' money. There has to be at least a 1 to 1.5 per cent return to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

It is not as simple as it may seem. It is a difficult problem and one that we have to overcome, one that we are going to work on very diligently over the next while, but it is no simple matter because then you will have to take money from somewhere else - there would be less for roads, there would be less for hospitals, there would be less for education, and everybody wants their share of the pie. I think it is fair to say that we do recognize the problem and we hope that in the not too distant future that we will be able to do something constructive about it for the consumers of electricity in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

This is Private Members' Day.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

I think this is the appropriate time to bring this point of order as a result of the way the motions appear on the Order Paper today. Motions 6 to 11 inclusive contain motions from the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). Standing Order 38 (c), which relates to Private Members' Motions, says: "No private member shall have more than one notice of motion at a time on the Order Paper." Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that you are probably going to want to take

this matter under advisement, and I believe that probably the hon. the member for Menihek and other members may wish to speak on it, but the Standing Order is very clear with respect to it. The reason for it is to give every private member an opportunity to bring his or her individual concerns to the House for debate. As I say, the Standing Order is very clear.

Now there may have been some research done by the hon. gentleman with respect to the practices in this House. I can recall an instance back in 1970 when a member introduced a number of bills in the House at the time under a Private Member's Motion. First of all I would point out, Your Honour, when you are researching this that since 1970 the rules of this House have been substantially altered and changed, particularly with respect to private members' motions. Secondly, if you research the Hansards of the time, and I am quite certain of this, you will find that at the time the then government, which was uncharacteristically certain of it, must have all been sleeping, they did not rise to make any objection to the four or five bills that were brought in by that private member at the particular time. So it was done with acquiescence. I remember that the then Deputy Speaker who was in the Chair told me that he wished he had drawn it to the attention of the House at the time just in case it established a precedent, but he did not think it did establish a precedent. As a matter of fact, Your Honour, if you look further on in the Hansards of the House at that time you will find that subsequently the Deputy Speaker or the Speaker made a note to that

effect, that it was not a precedent. Now, I do not know how the House will deal with it. If it is in order, I would suggest the net result of that would be that all of them would be off the Order Paper but that would not be the intention as far as raising the objection is concerned. The hon. gentleman gets up and he is entitled to be heard in his turn with respect to a motion which will consume two days under the Standing Order. I would suggest that he might either select one of the bills himself for debate at that period of time or, by leave of the House, as we would grant leave of the House, he can select some type of wording to give him the opportunity to debate various aspects of it. Certainly I think the point is crystal clear that a private member cannot have more than one private member's motion on the Order Paper at any time. I think we have to adhere to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Speaking to that point of order, Mr. Speaker, the actual date of the previous time these were introduced was March 22, 1971, and the motions were introduced by the hon. the member for St. John's East at the time, who is currently the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). So I think he is quite familiar with what the procedure was. I would argue at this time that that is entered as one motion for the purposes of getting it through first reading and, since no objection was raised on the day on which this was done, which was

last Thursday, that we have the same situation we had back in 1971. But I await the Speaker's ruling on the legitimacy of these motions and, once you have ruled on that, then we will be in a position to make a further decision if indeed they are out of order.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House find ourselves in complete agreement with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) because, as he so rightly pointed out, Private Members' Day is a day that is set aside in this House for private members to get their own grievances on or to redress certain situations which they see. If we are going to allow Motions 6 through 11 to stand at the present time, then we will probably use up the whole sitting of the House. Now we would agree with the Government House Leader, that the motion of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) should maintain its position on the Order Paper, take one position on the Order Paper, perhaps the one it is in, and we would also give leave that he can introduce a private members' motion according to his own wishes. But we certainly have to agree with the Government House Leader in this case that we cannot see where one person can be allowed to put what is really six private members' motions on. It is against the Standing Orders of this House and we have to uphold the Standing Orders first rather than any precedent. I think

Standing Orders come first and precedent second.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, because it is an important point of order -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

- something arising out of what the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) stated. He said it was not raised when it was brought in. Now it happens to be a tradition in this House that on opening day one does not get up on points of order in the House. Opening day is a traditional type of day where you do not do that kind of thing. But in any event I would say, Your Honour, that I am bringing this up now at the earliest possible opportunity. It is the first time Orders of the Day on Private Members' Day have been called and that is when I have done it. The hon. gentleman obviously has done his research, something I wanted to find out, since he could identify that precedent. I think I should perhaps also note, for historical perspective as well, that of the two bills brought in at that time one was a Public Tender Act and the other a Public Service Commission Act, which were very quickly voted down and heehawed by the Liberal members of the House, the government at the time, but subsequently saw their reincarnation in a Progressive Conservative Government.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair was aware of this problem and has looked into the matter, and is also aware of this

1971 precedent and that no objection was raised at that time. However, our Standing Orders are perfectly clear in this matter, that 'No private member shall have more than one notice of motion at a time on the Order Paper,' and I must rule that five of these motions are out of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a further point of order, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a further point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I think the position of the government and the Opposition as well is that it is not a case that the hon. the member for Menihek's (Mr. Fenwick) motions are out of order, they are fine. Certainly the government side and I think all members of the House would grant leave for him to select one of them to go in so he would come in the same order and not be at the bottom of the Order Paper, or if he so wishes he can formulate another resolution.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, we were going by the precedent and hoping that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) would live up to his own precedent, but since he will not we will have to modify our objectives. I note with pleasure that at least two of the bills that he put down at that time did get through when he formed the government and I am hoping that that precedent will continue.

Some of this legislation is excellent and it is something that is desirable.

At this point we have drafted Motion 6, the bill, "An Act To Amend The Conveyancing Act." (Bill No. 100). I think it is probably most straightforward to go with Motion 6 and we will withdraw Nos. 7 through 11. We will wait to reintroduce those at the earliest opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Is that agreeable to the House? That is Order No. 6.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

This being Private Members' Day, we will go to motion No. 2 by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush).

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great privilege to speak to this resolution today.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I submit, with respect, that the hon. member's motion is entirely out of order. It is out of order for a number of reasons and I will discuss the least of them first. One is that it is argumentative and provocative and, I think, patronizing. I think the language is unfortunate, to say the least, because, Mr. Speaker, the language of the resolution, if allowed, can quite

properly be referred to at any time during the debate. And whereas this particular motion could be allowed under that circumstance, there are further motions on the Order Paper that would curl your hair. I detect the fine Italian hand of the Leader of the Opposition. Not satisfied with trying to curl his own hair, is trying to curl ours. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker - these are side issues that we could perhaps overlook - the last part of his resolution, "AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the reduction of the tax level start by a reduction of the retail sales tax from 12 per cent to 10 per cent."

Now, each 1 per cent of the sales tax brings in \$30 million to \$35 million, so 2 per cent -

MR. BARRY:
\$28 million.

MR. J. CARTER:
All right, I will not argue. I will accept \$28 million but only for the sake of argument, just so there will not be any undue delay in this. The 2 per cent would be something like between \$50 million and \$60 million. Now it is a well established precedent, Mr. Speaker, that a private member's motion cannot direct the government to spend money. Now, what else is this but directing the government to disburse between \$50 million and \$60 million? Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit it is totally out of order.

Now, I am prepared to add my voice to the rest of the members and allow, for instance, if there is a slight recess, the member to reword his resolution. I do not wish him ill, I do not wish him to miss his speaking slot, but I

think if the member would stand up and humbly apologize and then reword his motion, take out the offending passage, we could -

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, are you going to allow him to go on like this?

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, they are provoking me. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is totally out of order, totally improper. There is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). You know, already he is tacitly agreeing with me that this motion would direct the government to redirect nearly \$60 million. It is quite repugnant, Mr. Speaker, and I submit totally out of order, and if the member will not rephrase it, then I would invite him to sit down.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
To that point of order the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me say to the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) that the motion is not out of order, he is just trying to waste the time of the member from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). Let me say to him that he is out of touch. Because while you are not allowed to introduce a money bill in this House, you are certainly allowed to introduce a bill, as a private member, which gives direction to the government. The member for Bonavista North has done that and, God knows, this government needs direction. That is exactly what he has done. It is similar to a bill that was introduced in this House some time ago which I believe reduced a minister's salary to \$1. Mr. Speaker, Private Members' Day is an important day and without wasting

any more time, as the member for St. John's North is trying to do, I would suggest to Your Honour that there is no point of order, it is just that the member for St. John's North is out of touch.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the Chair has read the motion and it is in order.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

It just occurred to me, as I was reading this through, that this particular motion appears to be a private member's motion that would indicate and require the expenditure of public money because the last part of the resolution says that the reduction of the tax level start by a reduction of the retail sales tax from 12 per cent. to 10 per cent. So that is the burden, and I really mean burden, of the hon. gentleman's resolution, which would seem to require an expenditure of money.

MR. BARRY:

The Speaker has given his ruling.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, this is a different point of order.

MR. BARRY:

The Speaker has given a ruling. It is the same point, the same wording.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, he said it was argumentative.

MR. BARRY:

Are you going to make a farce of this House already?

MR. MARSHALL:

My understanding, Mr. Speaker, was the hon. gentleman was getting up on the point of view that the motion was argumentative.

MR. BARRY:

No, he definitely stated that it was a money bill.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Just take your tranquilizers. All I heard was the hon. gentleman indicate that he was of the opinion it was argumentative. Now, if he was making his motion and there was a ruling on the point of view, for example, that it was an expenditure of money, and Your Honour has said it was an expenditure of money, of course it is acceptable. But that is not my understanding of Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The Chair has ruled that the motion is in order.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a resolution, probably one of the most serious resolutions, probably one of the most significant resolutions that will be debated in this House in this session, probably one of the most serious resolutions to be debated in any government, Mr. Speaker, because the pith and the substance and the essence of this resolution is about creating jobs, creating jobs for the thousands of unemployed people in this Province, and, I am sure, that is a point with which all hon. members will agree. I am sure that no hon. member can agree

that creating jobs has to be the most important job of any government, and that is what this resolution is all about. So, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no hon. member will find that point a disagreeable point.

Looking at the resolution and discussing some of the whereases, Mr. Speaker, the first one says, "WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest unemployment rate in Canada:" I am sure no hon. member can find that difficult to agree with. We all acknowledge the fact that we have the highest unemployment rate in Canada, and, Mr. Speaker, just let me give a few statistics to demonstrate, to prove that particular point and not only to prove it, Mr. Speaker, but to point out the gravity of the situation.

In 1979, when the present Premier took over this Province, we had an unemployment rate of 15.1 per cent and that in itself is a disgracefully high rate of unemployment. That was the annual average for that year, Mr. Speaker, 15.1 per cent in 1979, whereas the annual average for Canada was 7.4 per cent. So we had double the national average in 1979. In 1980, this was after the Premier launched us into a new era, in 1980, a year later, with the promise of 40,000 jobs, the Premier was successful in reducing the unemployment rate to 13.3. He reduced it by 1.9 percentage points from 1979 to 1980 and the Canadian average was 7.5 per cent. In 1981 it was 13.9 per cent and, again, the Canadian average was hanging in there at around 7.4 per cent or 7.5 per cent. In 1982 we started the rise, Mr. Speaker, that is when the unemployment rate really

became critical. In 1982 it went to 16.8 per cent and, I might point out of course, that the national average increased as well, it was 11 per cent. In 1983 it rose a further 2 percentage points, to 18.8 per cent; in 1984 it went to 20.5, that was the annual average 20.5 per cent, and today, 1985, for the month of March, the unemployment rate was the incredible figure, Mr. Speaker, the disgracefully high figure of 24.6 per cent. So certainly no hon. member can disagree with these statistics, can disagree with the gravity of the situation, 24.6 per cent, while the unemployment rate for Canada during the month of March was 12.5 per cent. So we have been just about doubled all the way through.

And looking at the rest of Atlantic Canada for the month of March, in PEI the unemployment rate is 17.6 per cent, Nova Scotia 17.3 per cent, New Brunswick 19.9, and Quebec 19.9 percent. So, Mr. Speaker, we are practically 5 per cent higher than the second highest province in Canada, New Brunswick, which has 19.9 per cent. Mr. Speaker, these statistics certainly indicate the enormity of the unemployment problem that we are experiencing in this Province at this particular time.

But, Mr. Speaker, these statistics do not tell all of the facts. They do not demonstrate all of the human misery and the frustration that is associated with unemployment, they do not demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, the deprivation, the hardship that is being experienced by the thousands of jobless people in this Province, they do not show the loss of pride and the lost of

dignity which results from being unemployed, but, Mr. Speaker, they do indicate the enormity of the problem and they do show the comparative level that we are in all of Canada. So they are very, very serious. It is a travesty, Mr. Speaker, the level of unemployment in this Province at this particular time. And what this resolution is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to call upon this Provincial Government, along with the federal government. We realize the Provincial Government cannot solve the unemployment problem in this Province, we realize this, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to be rancorous in this debate, I am very sincere about it. I am sure all hon. members are. I am just simply showing a concern, getting this resolution on the floor, in the hope that the Provincial Government, along with the federal government, will develop a strategy to try and relieve us of this cancerous problem that we now have in this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, certainly we cannot doubt, we cannot dismiss the enormity of the rate of unemployment in this Province at this particular time.

The second Whereas: "WHEREAS the present administration has failed in the past to execute effective plans and policies to help our unemployed." Again, Mr. Speaker, I do not think hon. members will find that difficulty to deal with. I mean, if they were successful, then our unemployment rate would not be 24 per cent. If they had been successful, if they had just held the line from the time in 1979 when this government assumed office, when this government took office, and held it at 15.1 per cent, which is still unspeakable in terms of an unemployment rate, Mr. Speaker, it

is incredibly high, then we could at least say that this government was partially successful even though it did not decrease the level of unemployment in this Province. If it did not decrease the rate or the numbers of people unemployed, at least it would have maintained the status quo, it would have held the line, they would have held their own. But, Mr. Speaker, they did not do that. It ran away on them. It ran from 15.1 per cent to 24.6 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of all of the plans, in spite of the blueprints for development, in spite of the five year plans, these plans were not effective, they did not improve the level of unemployment in this Province.

The third Whereas says: "Whereas the provincial economy is now stagnant." I think, Mr. Speaker, that is rather self-evident.

Number four: "Whereas the people of this Province are paying the highest level of taxes in Canada", and I will deal with that a little later. Again, Mr. Speaker, it is an indisputable, an irrefutable fact that we do pay the highest level of taxes in Canada. Whether we are talking about the personal income tax, or whether we are talking about the retail sales tax, whether we are talking about different business taxes, which I will get into a little later, if I have the time. I am certainly sorry that the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) tried to use up my time, tried to take away the time that I was going to use to point out, certainly, the seriousness and the graveness of the problem we are dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, the fifth Whereas:

"WHEREAS the Provincial General Election was called to give the present administration a mandate to create jobs." Mr. Speaker, again an irrefutable fact, an indisputable fact. I mean, the Premier said he was asking for a mandate to create jobs. We on this side are trying to assist the Premier. We know he has the mandate. He has received a mandate from the people of Newfoundland and it is to create jobs. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are not willing to wait for any more five year programmes, the people out there who are finding it difficult to put bread on the table, the people out there who are finding it difficult to clothe their children, the people out there who are finding it difficult to provide proper and adequate shelter for their children, they want the jobs now. They want them now, immediately. Mr. Speaker, what we have suggested here, and it is only a suggestion, a small point that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the House Leader wanted removed, this is just a quick measure to help stimulate the economy, hopefully to get something going now. It is the quickest and the most practical measure that we could think of at this particular point in time. We know it is difficult to create the numbers of jobs that the people of Newfoundland now need, and we are just, in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, advancing a suggestion. But I have the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) think that this level of taxation is not causing any burden to the people of Newfoundland, is not causing them any hardship. You would almost think that they

would not care about putting another percentage point on whenever the government gets into a situation where they want more money. These hon. members, I believe, would not hesitate in terms of putting the retail sales tax up to 13 per cent. What does 1 percentage point matter? Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say it matters a lot to the people of this Province who are unemployed. And not only to the people who are unemployed, Mr. Speaker, but to the people on fixed incomes and the people on salaries, who are not making very much. It matters to these people. It matters! So, Mr. Speaker, this is not a frivolous matter. This is not a matter to be just dispensed with, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter to be taken seriously.

Mr. Speaker, this was the mandate. Up until now every Whereas is factual and, I am sure, a point with which every member can agree.

The next Whereas: "Whereas we now have finally arrived at that supposedly, blissful, euphoric, and Utopian state of having a Provincial Government and a Federal Government practicing the same political philosophy." That might be considered to be a little bit frivolous, Mr. Speaker, I will admit, and I certainly would not want that 'Whereas', and particularly any undesirable adjective, to take away from the seriousness of this debate or the seriousness of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will realize that again it was they not the people on this side who were using that argument all during the election campaign. Did hon. members here find that when they were going through their

districts? - 'Elect a PC member because we have a PC Government in Ottawa.' They wanted to get to that situation for a long, long time. It is not unique, it is not a new situation, that has existed in this Province before. But hon. gentlemen opposite never had that opportunity and they wanted to get it. Now they have it, Mr. Speaker, and they have built up the expectations of the people of this Province to a level they have never been built up to before, because no other government in the history of Newfoundland made it such a point. No other government, Mr. Speaker, emphasized that particular point of view as much as this particular government.

Mr. Speaker, they wanted to get into that situation and now they are there. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland have some great and high expectations and well they may, because hon. gentlemen told them, Once we get into this situation - let them have a federal government and a provincial government of the same political stripe - things will happen. Now the people of Newfoundland are out there waiting for this to happen, waiting for the jobs to be created. They are waiting for this, Mr. Speaker. We have arrived at that state. At one point during the election one person, obviously he was not a supporter of mine, said that he would like to see all levels of government Tory - the federal, provincial and municipalities -

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave. By leave.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, that is the extent to which hon. members opposite were willing to drive that insidious argument. Those were the levels to which they were willing to drive that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, certainly the first resolve is one with which all hon. members must agree. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, all hon. members will agree -

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

There is no leave for the hon. gentleman to continue. Make him sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has given him some extra time in order to clue up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. J. CARTER:

All of us have given him time. No, Mr. Speaker, he has to sit down.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

If the previous member for LaPoile were only here now.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not mean to interject here but I would hope that we would follow the tradition of back and forth and since there has been a speaker for the other side of the House and I know we were sort of shouting, perhaps Your Honour did not catch everything that was happening. I would like for us to try to follow the tradition of back and forth and if the Opposition would agree I am prepared to carry on with the debate.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, it is a tradition in this House that we move back and forth across the House. I would remind hon. members on the other side that instead of engaging in cat calls and that kind of thing that they have to be faster on their feet.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. gentleman remembers that the rule is twenty minutes on Private Member's Day.

MR. LUSH:

I think the hon. gentleman concedes that I lost at least half my time to the frivolity of the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

MR. J. CARTER:

What frivolity?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am struggling here. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he was speaking and I would hope that I could do the same.

MR. LUSH:

I seldom get worked up.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I agree. The eloquence was flowing out of the hon. gentleman.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks that, of course, from a political perspective I am not delighted to see the hon. gentleman back in the House. I would rather see my former colleague. But on a person-to-person basis, as a gentleman to a gentleman, I am delighted to see him back in the Legislature again. He is a fine member, a fine debater. I get carried away with his eloquence myself almost as much as he does.

I really enjoy his resolutions. Having said that I will carry on.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman who put this resolution on the Order Paper would have only tried to put on paper, to put into debate, to put into a concept, the sincerity that he says he put this resolution down for then I do not think you would find too much disagreement on this side of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, words cannot be denied, particularly, the written word. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this resolution, put down by the hon. gentleman, is nothing more and perhaps nothing less than a regurgitation of Liberal campaign policy that the people of this Province shut the door on five or six weeks ago. The same kind of abusive political language that the Party platform contained four, five or six weeks ago is now contained in the essence of this resolution. The hon. gentleman wants to say to us, in his own sincerity, 'you ladies and gentlemen on this side should now support.' So if he had done that, if he his sincerity had carried over to the written word, then I would think the hon. gentleman would have had a better chance of getting some support from this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I do not normally interrupt other people when they are trying to say a few words so perhaps the gentleman for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) might like to do the same thing. I want to say to him as well the Liberal Party and himself and any other political party in this Province does not have a monopoly on feelings. The Liberal Party and himself does not have a monopoly on the cancer and the misery of unemployment that we find throughout every riding in every district in this Province.

You would almost gather from listening to the hon. gentleman that anybody who represents a party and sits on this side of the House - or perhaps the other gentleman down in the corner - that anybody else but Liberals are the only people who can feel hardship, the only people who can imagine misery, the only people who can see the cancer of unemployment on society is a Liberal. That is the kind of impression that the hon. gentleman left in the remarks that he made in this House. And I would say to him, Mr. Speaker, that he and his party do not have a monopoly on feelings. We on this side as well know the family disruption, we know the misery, we know what is in our own constituencies as well, what the feelings of people are who are suffering by the problems and the cancer of unemployment throughout our Province. The hon. gentleman goes on with a whole bunch of statistics. In his opening remarks he goes on with a whole bunch of statistics, and you can look at statistics. The hon. gentleman brings them right up to 1982 and then he drops them like a hot potato. He does not give any credence, he does not try to analyse, he does not try to intellectualize what took place not only in Newfoundland and Labrador but in all of Canada, in the United States, in the Western industrial world. What happened to the economy of this planet Earth that most of us are used to in the Western industrial world? He does not ask himself those kind of questions. Again, the Liberal monopoly that somehow or another, because it is a Tory government, because it is a Tory Party in power, that somehow or another, if that was not the case, none of those unemployment problems would exist. None of the statistics

would be there, none of the problems would have been created. Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman not realize that politicians, whether they be supporting a party that forms the government or a party that is in opposition, would dearly love to be popular all the time? Does the hon. gentleman think that those of us in this party sit down around a caucus table or the Cabinet table scratching our head about how we can destroy another job in Newfoundland? That is the mentality of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. That is why, Mr. Speaker, this resolution cannot be in its essence, cannot be in the way it is worded here on this paper, be endorsed by anybody on this side of the House. This resolution cannot be supported by anybody except somebody in some party that feels that somehow or another they have a monopoly on everything, that somehow or another the only people in the world that can see the misery of unemployment is the Liberal, that somehow or another the only people in the world that can find an extra job is a Liberal. Well, let me say to the House, Mr. Speaker, and through the House, to the people of this Province, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of jobs provided in this Province but there has also been a tremendous increase in the number of people looking for the jobs. The member who just took his seat and introduced a resolution never said anything. You would not know but we had zero growth rate in this Province over the last number of decades. The fact of the matter is there has been a population increase. There are more people looking for the jobs that are out there. He never made any reference to that. So you take one side of the argument and

you try to intellectualize it and you say nothing about the other side. The hon. gentleman never made any mention about the new jobs that have been created because of the steadfastness and the determination of this administration when it comes to offshore and the local preference policy. There was no mention of that. It is all negative, negative, negative. There is no mention about the jobs that we create in roads, that we create in fisheries, in water and sewer, and in tourism. There is no mention of Kruger, the jobs we saved as a result of pulling off the Kruger deal on the West Coast. Who has a heart, Mr. Speaker? Who has the monopoly on all that misery that the hon. gentleman spent twenty minutes talking about?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There are 200 new jobs in White Bay with the logging industry because of Kruger - additional jobs.

MR. RIDEOUT:

And you will find the environmentalists, some of whom, I am sure, will be on the other side of the House saying, do not do it because of the river problem, or do not do it because of some other environmental problem. You can look at Baie Verte Mines in my own constituency, you know, not out of the woods, not stable, but providing 365 jobs that was lost, closed down and gone. So this administration, Mr. Speaker, has suffered along with every other administration and every other jurisdiction. In the Western world we have suffered economic lumps. But I would say to the opposition and to the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution, we have not sat on our hunches and did nothing. We have

attempted, as best we can, whether it is providing funding for loan guarantees in fisheries, or helping to attract Kruger to the West Coast or Baie Verte Asbestos to Baie Verte, or helping out in the iron ore industry in Labrador. Every conceivable means at our disposal, every ounce of energy at our disposal has been directed at trying to hold on to what we have in some very, very difficult economic times. And the fact of the matter is, as I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is nothing more than a regurgitation of the Liberal pamphlets that were distributed around this Province five or six weeks ago. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador would love to have the sales tax reduced from 12 per cent to 10 per cent. We would like to get like Alberta and have zero. But there is wisdom in the crowds. The people know that at this particular point in our economic life we cannot do it and they said, no, to the party that promised to do it. For two elections the party that is on the other side of the House went before the people and promised to freeze electricity rates. That party promised it in 1979 and they promised it again the other day, the 2 April election, and twice the people said, no.

So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman who introduced this resolution in all his sincerity, is that he should look at the reality of what the people of Newfoundland and Labrador have really said, what the people of Newfoundland and Labrador have really dictated, they said, 'Do not go try fooling me, 'boy'. We have had a look at this and we know the times are difficult. The government is doing what they can, all governments are doing what

they can. But do not try to fool me with this political carbage.' And the result that we see around here today speaks louder than perhaps you can put into words.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one whereas in this resolution that I think says it all. And that one is simply this, the first one. Whoever penned this resolution started off correctly but it was after the political jargon and the politics got involved that the resolution went down hill. The first resolution, "Whereas the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest unemployment rate in Canada." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. There is nobody who can dispute that. We recognized it and I talked about it. It would be higher still except for the policies and the programmes that this government have worked so hard to put in place over the last several years. Everything else becomes politics. "Whereas the present administration has failed to execute effective plans and policies to help our unemployed." Well, I mentioned the offshore and the local preference. I mentioned roads and fisheries and tourism. I mentioned Kruger, I mentioned Baie Verte Mines. What about all those things? Are there no jobs provided with all that?

MR. FLIGHT:

Where are the new jobs?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Do not be so stunned, boy! Go out there and have a look. Go down to Baie Verte and find 365 jobs that were not there in 1981.

MR. FLIGHT:

Where are the new jobs?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not normally interrupt the hon. gentleman when he is speaking and I hope he will not interrupt me.

The fact of the matter is that it is foolishness. And then it says, 'Whereas the provincial economy is stagnant; and Whereas the people of this Province are paying the highest levels of taxes in Canada'. In most cases, we recognize that. The provincial election was called to give the present administration a mandate to create jobs. That has already been decided, the people have worked on that. And 'We have finally arrived at the blissful state of having a Provincial Government and a Federal Government practising the same philosophy.' Politics, politics! And the hon. gentleman was arguing in his speech that he wanted all of us on this side of the House to support this sincere resolution because it was about jobs. There was nothing else in this resolution only sincerity and jobs! Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman must be crazy. All that is in this resolution is a Liberal Party platform that the people of this Province threw out on the night of April 2.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
All this resolution is doing is trying to use the rules of this Legislature to somehow or other implement, bring before the public once again, something that the people of this Province have already passed judgement on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to propose an amendment to the resolution. I think the hon. gentleman is sincere in his talk

about jobs. I, and this side of the House, would somehow or other like to be able to support him in his sincerity, to support and articulate and debate unemployment without the politician partisanship with which the hon. gentleman just about scuttled his own resolution.

I am going to propose, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), that all the words after 'Canada' in the first 'Whereas' be deleted and be replaced with the following: 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House urge both the Federal and Provincial Governments to initiate strategies and programs to reduce the number of unemployed in this Province on a priority basis.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty well the gentleman's own words with the politics taken out and the guts of the issue put forth. And I would say to Your Honour before you make a decision on the resolution, I am doing that based on page 153 of Beauséne, Section 425, which says: "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition". I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will make this very important resolution more acceptable to more members of the House and, as per Section 428 (1) "A motion may be amended by: (a) leaving out certain words; (b) leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; (c) inserting or adding other words." In both cases, I have done that, Sir. I propose the amendment for your consideration and I will be prepared to carry on and finish up my time if Your Honour decides that the amendment is in order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The amendment is that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), seconded by the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has moved that all the words after 'Canada' in the first 'Whereas' be deleted to be replaced with the following: 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House urge both the Federal and Provincial Governments to initiate strategies and programs to reduce the number of unemployed in this Province on a priority basis.' That amendment is in order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we have something that we can talk about. Every time we would have gotten up in this debate this and next Wednesday, we would have had to talk about this administration that, or some other administration that. We would have had to at least try to answer - and it is not very difficult to answer - the political innuendo that was taking the heart and soul out of what the hon. gentleman was trying to say in his second 'Be it therefore resolved'. Now, what we have before the House for debate is an amended resolution that urges this government and the federal government -

MR. LUSH:

Why not 'directs'?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, 'urges', 'directs', I am not high on either word. The hon.

gentleman can call it what he likes - 'to initiate strategies and programs to reduce the number of unemployed in this Province on a priority basis.' Now, we can all have our two cents worth into how we might go about doing that. Is it possible, for example, in the department that I am responsible for, to initiate new programs and to try to get new jobs in the fishery? There are those out there who will say no. There are those out there who say that you have reached the apex, that in fact with advancing technology there are going to be less jobs. Well, is that so? Can we look at new areas of fishery development like aquaculture, for example, where we are now doing experimental work on the South Coast of the Province? Which has a lot of potential, by the way, Mr. Speaker. The House might like to know in salmon alone in another four or five years, the expert information is that Norway will sell more salmon from an aquaculture program than they will from their commercial salmon fishery. If you want to talk about being able to do other things, if you want to talk about being able to initiate new programs, if you want to talk about being able to initiate new strategies with all the political piffle behind you, that is perhaps the kind of thing that we can look at. I would think that every member in this House, members on both sides, will have, hopefully, some sincere and objective ideas where government programs can be tailored to create more jobs.

As I lambasted the Opposition in the beginning for indicating that it was only Liberals who had a monopoly on things, I would say also that we are big men and women on this side. We do not propose

that we have all the answers yesterday for all the problems that are going to come up tomorrow. We have never suggested that. We are open-minded. If you have a program, if you have a strategy, if you have something to propose, propose it. Let us have a look at it, let us analyze it, let us send it off to the appropriate department of the federal government so that they, too, can have a look at the initiatives and the ideas that might flow from this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I just concentrated on a few things in my own department, but I am sure there are other ministers and members on both sides of the House who will have their own pet peeves that they might want to zero in on. So the new strategies and programs that the hon. gentleman talked about can perhaps be taken from the conceptual stage, taken from the thought stage as a result of some debate here in this House over this Wednesday and next Wednesday and looked at with some flesh around the idea. What about rural development in Newfoundland and Labrador? Have we reached a position where it is not possible to create any more employment in rural Newfoundland through the rural development movement? Personally, I do not think we have. Personally, I think there are all kinds of growth areas in all parts of Newfoundland and Labrador that, given the right initiatives and the right directions can be addressed very, very well through the rural development movement. Have we reached the stage in Newfoundland and Labrador where it is impossible to get any more jobs out of the tourism industry? I do not believe there is anybody who would say that we have.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, why do you not get them?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor - Buchans, I assume, will speak in the debate. I assume that, for example, with the problems in Buchans, perhaps the member for Windsor - Buchans will have all kinds of new ideas. It might be penitentiaries or it might be the Hinds Lake development that he opposed before. There could be all kinds of new ideas now that the member for Windsor - Buchans had three or three and one-half years of self-reconciliation, imposed by the people, of course, but he had three or three and one-half years to rejuvenate his thoughts. He had three and one-half years to get new ideas put into his mind.

MR. DOYLE:

He had three and one-half years to go out and create new jobs in Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I did, too.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I think my time is pretty well up. What I wanted to do here was to try to put a resolution before the House in such a form that all of us, once the political foolishness is out of the way, can somehow or other try to use the collective wisdom of the House to try to put on the record of the House some ideas that will flow from this debate and can perhaps be analyzed and looked at, not only by departments of this government but by any government agency of the federal government, as well as ourselves. That, I believe, was the gist of what the hon. gentleman wanted to say. It was just the way that he

went about saying it of course made it very difficult for us over here to be able to support that kind of resolution. So, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
On a point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just wondering what the rules and regulations are regarding an amendment of this type, I am wondering if I have the right to speak to that amendment and if I do whether I do not have the right to speak last in the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
It is a point of order, I mean all the hon. gentleman has to do is read the rules of the House and the rules are quite clear on it. A member opens the debate. When an amendment is introduced, you do not speak to the amendment, you speak to it when you wind up. At the end of next week, all questions are put to dispose of the motion. It is contained in the thing on private members.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Do you not take your Standing Orders book home and read it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, members on each side have twenty minutes to speak to the amendment.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is, I suppose you could say, my first address to the House. I would like to offer congratulations to yourself and to the Deputy Speaker, on your election. I am sure you will do quite well. Also, I offer congratulations to all elected members on both sides of the House.

Before I start, just a response. I have a different prospective, I think, than a lot of members in this House because I have just gone through the educational system just a little while ago and through the problems that you experience. I was unemployed just recently, as a matter of fact, a very little while ago and I know what it is like to be in situations where you think you do not want to get up the next day. When we talk about mentality, on this side of the House or on that side of the House, I do not think it is that. What we are trying to do over here is to give you a conscience over there which I am sure you have. I have proof positive of that. But I have seen many a friend of mine leaving this wonderful Island, leaving my wonderful municipality of Stephenville and going away. To tell you the truth I am totally tired of it and I decided I am going to try and do something about it.

I know there is no simple solution. I am trying to be constructive. I want to be constructive. I cannot do

something concrete about it at the present time. I will offer my suggestions, as our Party will, but I want you to be aware fully of the situation that exists and to me it is unreal. It is just unreal.

I am not going to keep going on unreality or on how bad it is, but it is really ridiculous. I am trying to get you to make some type of movements to fix that up or try to improve it. Okay?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I look at it and this administration that we have here now, and again I am going to try to suggest a number of things in my tenure here, has been in power fourteen years. It is now time to stop saying blame it on this or blame it on that. I just want to see that something is going to improve or get better. I have not seen that. When I went to university in '77 my student loan was \$450 a term. When I left it was \$900 a term, a 100 per cent increase. I know that we have a fine student loan programme -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The best in Canada.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Wonderful. Wonderful. Wonderful. Going through that system, as I just did in the recent past, provided me with many wonderful experiences. Well, not just wonderful. There were ones I would not want to repeat again. It is getting more difficult to get higher education. It is getting way more difficult than it was six, seven or eight years ago. It is becoming an extreme problem that we have got to start

looking at.

I think this motion has a great bearing. It is not something that is useless or whatever. I think that we should look at the youth unemployment problem which I have a special interest in. It is unreal. Again I use that word. In my district in Stephenville the population has decreased since the last election. There is no increase in the population. The teacher/student ratio is falling. People are leaving, especially young people and I have talked to hundreds of them, and they do not know what to do or where to go. They are reaching out and I am hoping that that administration over there is going to give them something to reach out to. And I am going to do my best, as the Liberal Party here will, to give you something and help you do it, if you will answer our suggestions or take them or incorporate them, whatever. You do not have to. You can turn them around and use them. That does not matter. As long as you do something out there for those people.

The Province's youth unemployment rate for sixteen to twenty-four is 40 point something per cent which is unreal again. It is amazing. It is a generation that we are going to lose. It is a generation that will never probably see full-time work if we do not do something. We just cannot wait four or five years down the road. Try something out. What is the problem of trying out something? I am asking you to come up with something that will answer the problem in the very near future before we do not have anybody to work on with the problem. There will not be any problems, there will be nobody left. So we have to get people to stick around this

wonderful Island. My priority is to try to do that or create that atmosphere.

The attitude out there is a wicked problem. The Summer in my job hunting as I was and so on, this past Summer way back, I did a proposal up. I was trying to be constructive as a young individual. I did a proposal for a youth employment counselling centre, that is a mouthful I know, but a youth employment counselling centre. The centre is established in Gander and it is established in Corner Brook under a federally funded, wonderful programme. It is there to counsel people from sixteen to twenty-four who are experiencing difficulty entering the job market. I went around to everybody I knew and I did all the research, put up all the statistics, prepared it and so on. I got many doors just slammed in my face and it was a constructive try - trying to do something. Very constructive, as a matter of fact I am going to be put back on the board again in trying to solve or at least help get the problem alleviated somewhat.

The problem that we are having face us now is an attitude problem with the youth unemployment.

MR. HODDER:

Ninety per cent in Port au Port.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Well in my district is way up over 50 per cent.

Now the problem is, if you have not worked for any length of time or you have not had that first job, as you get a bit older it is a very hard tendency, when you try it, when you get in there it is a very difficult tiff. How are you

going to work, if you do not know how to work? How are you going to get up in the morning, if you have not been getting up in the morning? If we do not soon do something, I think it is a travesty, I think, as many people have described it. I think we have described it as that. I think it is. We all have to face that fact. We all have to try and do something about it. I am saying it in a constructive manner. Again that little thing that I propose the Summer would just be something where you can improve the attitude. That is a start. I am too tired of people saying, the attitude of the youth is this or that and there is no work ethic, well that is not the truth. If there were work there would be a work ethic. We just do not have it existing. We have to do that, we have create that. That is the problem that we have. The youth out there will work as hard as anybody, as far as I am concerned. The problem is getting them to at least look and see if they can get a glimmer of hope. And the problem is they have not had that glimmer of hope.

I am hoping that this administration, with the federal government co-operating fully, will try to solve that youth unemployment problem. To that effect I am preparing a brief that will go to the Senate Committee that will be travelling to St. John's here on June 6. I will be presenting a brief to them on youth unemployment trying to offer some viable suggestions. I am going to try and do my best to try and do something about that.

MR. WARREN:

Think positive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I emphasis to you to have a representative from the other side to do the same or at least get talking to them about it, and not just youth unemployment. So let us get some constructiveness going. I do not want to lambaste or anything like that. You know what the statistics are as well as I do. The problem is we have to look at starting to solve it. Turn that rate down this way instead of going up all of the time. We should not be arguing about excuses. Let us get some work done and get something done about it so that we can say to them, 'yes, we are caring about youth, we are going to try and do something about it' or 'we have a programme that we might bring in place' or 'we are looking into your problem' or 'we are going to debate it in the House of Assembly,' or 'we will all be interested' and so on. I mean it is time to start waking up. We have to start doing something. It is becoming a major problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The proposal was made by my leader over here - an apprenticeship programme. While it may cost so many dollars -

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is an investment in youth.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, my colleague. It is an investment in youth. I support it. I am aware of many things, but I am not aware of the philosophy on the other side. I am sure they would want to do the same. I would like to see them come up with something that is not maybe the same thing or maybe it

will cost less, but maybe it will go a long way to solving the problem, something similar. It has been tried in other places. We have a unique problem here. I would hope that the other side, with all the many resources that you now have, the many members that you now have at your disposal, you can come up with something that will give us a little bit of hope out there in that age group, get us going a bit and get our attitude improving and saying, 'yes, I am going to say in Newfoundland, I am going to give it another shot. I am going to stay here and try to build a decent life which we cannot do right now.'

MR. BARRY:

We cannot drive them away.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We have to keep them here. That is our biggest resource. I think everybody will agree with that on both sides. That age group is our future leaders. I want to make sure that they stick around here instead of going off and being future leaders for somebody else or for some other place.

So I would only hope that the hon. gentlemen on both sides, especially on that side, where you have the power to do something, will do something about it.

It is also the International Year of the Youth, which is also a good reason to - maybe it should always be the International Year of the Youth as a matter of fact - start doing something about it.

I want to thank the hon. members on both sides for listening to me and taking my comments into account. You will be hearing a lot more from me in the very near

future. I look forward to hearing from you also, Sir. I will not bother you when you are talking, and I hope you will not do the same with me. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Let us hear it from the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) on his maiden speech. I thought it was a good one. I feel, Mr. Speaker, his heart is in the right place, and I believe that he has a genuine commitment to combat unemployment. I believe that as a youth he sees, perhaps, more clearly than the rest of us in this House, the problems that youth face, particularly, the unemployed youth of which there are a great number in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, in 1975, when I was elected, a study was done at that particular time in my district and in that district at that time - it was known as a LIP project at that time, there were statistics done and every family was visited - and the statistics showed that throughout the Summertime somewhere between 40 per cent and 50 per cent of the people were unemployed. In the Wintertime between 60 per cent and 70 per

cent of the people of the district were unemployed. This figure, by the way, had not changed appreciably since 1966, which was the time when the base in the hon. member's district had closed and had thrown a great number of people out of work. Recently a survey was done by the Port au Port Development Association on youth unemployment in the district which showed that there was an 89.6 per cent, I believe, unemployment rate amongst the youth of the district. I feel, as the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) said, very strongly about this problem. As a matter of fact, this particular problem is one of the most serious problems that we are facing today. It is one that I think we should deal with in whatever way we can.

I liked the amendment by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). The amendment does nothing more than take the partisanship out of the resolution. The resolution remains basically the same. But it is a problem which faces every member in every district and every member that sits in this House of Assembly. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, this particular conference I did not attend the conference, but I did take the trouble to write a brief. For the first time I had to focus my mind on the problems of youth unemployment. I had to try to think of solutions to the problem. Mr. Speaker, as all members of this House know, I did not sit on this side of the House then, I sat on that side of the House. But I wrote the brief not in a partisan sort of way. I wrote the brief to genuinely try to be helpful. And when one sits down and spends a couple of days

trying to put his thoughts together on how you are going to combat the problem of unemployment, the magnitude of the problem becomes -

MR. TULK:
(Inaudible).

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, I should say to the House Leader (Mr. Tulk) opposite that I am probably the oldest sitting Liberal in this House of Assembly. I look at all the members over there including the hon. member, I think the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is a few years short of me.

MR. FLIGHT:
No, no, the same time as you. I dropped you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MS VERGE:
What about the member for Twillingate (Mr. Carter)?

MR. HODDER:
The member for Twillingate (Mr. Carter) sat on this side of the House but as a Liberal, I believe. Even at this moment, while I stand here, I am the oldest sitting Liberal in this House or who sat there and, I suppose, I know more about the Liberal Party than anybody in the House because I have been the longest Liberal in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, I had thought that, I could, I suppose, during the Throne Speech and the Budget Speech, entertain the Province on stories on the Liberal Party but I

am saving all of that, Mr. Speaker, for the book that I am writing, The History of the Liberal Party from 1975 to 1985, and I think this is a very good perspective to write it from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not being very relevant to the amendment that I believe was somewhat put on the spur of the moment by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) but we will be interested in reading his book because there are a number of us on this side who are not even sure he can write.

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

there is no point of order. He is just trying to interfere. He does not like what he is hearing and he is trying to muzzle me. I only have a short twenty minutes, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is just trying to waste the time of the House and try to keep me from speaking, to muzzle me.

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

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, I will try to say

this is an important subject but it seems that members opposite, for some reason or other, I cannot think why, seem to be a bit chippy over there. Since I started to speak they have -

MR. TOBIN:

Ask the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) his majority compared to yours.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into that. We are talking about a very serious matter here. Mr. Speaker, when you look at the solutions to the problems it is very easy, and I have done it, to sit and point the finger. But, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the solutions to the problems, before the little interchange, I was talking about the writing of a brief concerning, I suppose, the highest youth unemployment area in the Province and I was very serious about what I was doing there and I am very serious about what I am saying here. Mr. Speaker, you can talk about short-term solutions. Yes, there are things that can be done in the short-term, there are things being done in the short-term by both the federal and the provincial government at the present time. Such things as a short-term Canada Works project for youth, that was on of the suggestions that came out of one of those conferences. Let us try to get youth employed through community development projects, are suggestions that I have had. But these are short-term solutions and in order to reach long-term solutions, whether it be youth unemployment or unemployment in general, to combat unemployment then -

MR. TULK:

My old buddy.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for silence. I am having trouble with the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). He is muttering away over there. Obviously, he is highly agitated.

MR. TULK:

I know how excited you get Jim. You can have silence, my old buddy.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious problem and I am sure that the member for Fogo will have a prominent place in my book, *The History of the Liberal Party from 1975 to 1985*.

MR. TULK:

Do not tell all the stuff we did.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, in order to combat unemployment there has to be, first of all, an improvement of the infrastructure -

MR. CALLAN:

There has to be a will and there is no will over there.

MR. HODDER:

Yes, there has to be a will. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a responsible government. I saw in the resolution put forward by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) that we reduce the sales tax from 12 per cent to 10 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would love to see the sales tax reduced from 12 per cent to 10 per cent, I would like to see that happen, but not for the reasons given by the member for Bonavista North. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see it reduced, as anyone, to take the burden of taxation from the people of Newfoundland. But, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Bonavista North feels that by reducing the sales tax from 12 per

cent to 10 per cent in this Province will combat unemployment, I do not think that the figures warrant that.

There are economists in the United States, there are economists in Canada who have said, 'Reduce the sales tax and you will stimulate the economy.' That is the idea behind reducing sales tax or income tax. There are people who have said, 'Reduce income tax and you will stimulate the economy.' But, Mr. Speaker, that may have some validity or it may not, it has not been tried to my knowledge, not that I know of. That would be on a national level if you want to get the national economy going. But the nature of this Province, with a population of somewhere over 500,000 and the amount of the budget of this Province, to reduce the sales tax in order to create employment, Mr. Speaker, just will not work. Mr. Speaker, such things as a local preference policy that was a move which was made by this government which has born fruit. Those are the types of things that government can do.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I see as a bright spot in the economy of this Province is the will of this government, who have made it known over and over again that they prefer concrete platforms over semi-submersible platforms. That type of move can be taken by government but, Mr. Speaker, other things can be done as well. I have always been amazed that we do not, in our schools, have anything which teaches our children to be entrepreneurs. In many communities there is no history of business or of business mentality. Sometimes you find in communities, if someone wants to

start a business, or they want to do something or in some way use the natural resources which we have to create more jobs, very often they look to government. Of course that is not a bad thing in many ways, but if you look only to government, then it is counterproductive. Mr. Speaker, the government does give grants and loans through rural development, through DRIE and all of the federal government agencies that we have. Mr. Speaker, I have often thought - and this has been done in some countries, particularly in the areas of high unemployment - but I have often thought that a course in the schools where students are encouraged to take part in business and encouraged to be entrepreneurs would not be a bad thing. Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to criticize but it is a very, very difficult problem to tackle. I listened to the most disappointing speech by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). I have trouble calling him the member for Bonavista North, Mr. Speaker, because I always knew him as the member for Terra Nova but he is now the member for Bonavista North. It was a disappointing speech because basically the member gave no new ideas whatsoever, except in his resolution where he suggested a reduction in the sales tax from 12 to 10 per cent. His speech was merely to castigate the government for what they have not done and I would suggest to members of the Opposition -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Let us hear your ideas.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have given some ideas. If the hon. member had been listening I have thrown out

four or five which perhaps, when Hansard comes out, he could take home and read very slowly and then he will realize that some of the things I have said here today makes sense.

MR. FLIGHT:

Newfoundland's concrete platforms means you can start your business.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I hope the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) stands next to speak and I will listen very carefully to his ideas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the members of this government as well will listen very carefully to the ideas of the member for Windsor - Buchans and if there is anything there that is worthwhile I am quite sure that the administration of the Province will take his ideas, any radical and new ideas which can combat unemployment in this Province, we will take them to heart and certainly implement them.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is a serious one. I certainly can support the resolution. I could not have supported the resolution as it was worded mainly because of the petty partisan way in which it had been put forward. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which was put forward by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is a good one and it is almost identical to the resolution by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and I feel that it is very easy to support. I would say that it is a problem that we will have with us for a long, long time to come. Each and every one of us, as we are all members of the House of Assembly - we each represent a district where we can show leadership in that district - I

think it is incumbent upon all of us to tackle this problem. Certainly the spirit of the resolution is a good one. It is one that I can support and one that, as amended, will support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support the motion so ably presented by my seat mate and colleague here from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). I must say, if the words of wisdom that has come from the other side today, from the ministers and from the other members, if that is the extent of their imagination or their ability to cope with the problems facing the Newfoundland people today, then I do not think the unemployed in Newfoundland will sleep that much easier this evening, or indeed any evening, while the present administration is in power. We heard some very flowing and flowery comments from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) about some of the things that could happen. He talked about some of the things that could happen maybe in fisheries and in tourism. Of course, the question that must be asked the hon. minister is what has been happening in the past five or six years. If all of this potential exists in the fishing industry, why has it not been developed since the present administration took power, under the present Premier, in 1979. I am not going to start quoting the statistics. My colleague here has put on

record the rather frightening and shattering statistics with respect to unemployment. Talking about fisheries, Mr. Speaker, which, in my view, is one of the great areas where potential employment can be created. I would remind the Minister of Fisheries - I am sorry he is not here to hear this - but the question that I raised in this House yesterday with respect to the salt fish industry, an industry that is responsible for injecting maybe \$30 million or \$40 million a year into the Newfoundland economy, the hon. minister's reply to my question proves one of two things, Mr. Speaker, that either he is getting some bad advice, and I presume from the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, or he does not know what he is talking about. Maybe it is a combination of both because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad the hon. gentleman is back in his seat, in reply to my question and my recommendation that certain steps be taken to help alleviate the very serious and very frustrating problem of the fish glut, the hon. minister, in his reply, rejected my proposal about the government use of its position, its licencing power, to force processing companies to provide a capability for salting and splitting fish. His answer, of course, was that there are no markets, or at least the market is not good, and I think that was concurred by the Premier. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the market for salt fish is good. There is a very substantial market and a very healthy market for salt fish in this world today. Let me quote a few statistics. There is a market today for approximately 250,000 tons of salt fish. Portugal, one of our oldest trading partners, a

country with which we have had a long and historic relationship, has a market for 60,000 tons of salt codfish a year. Newfoundland supplies that country with 8,000 tons of fish per year. We have a potential for increasing that amount to 25,000 tons a year. Italy has a market of 40,000 tons. We supply that country 200 tons. We have a potential of supplying them an additional 2,000 tons and on it goes, Mr. Speaker. There are 250,000 tons consumed in the world. In codfish, we, Newfoundland, which at least should be one of the prime salt fish producing countries in the world, we supply that market roughly 8 per cent. Eight per cent of the total world's consumption of salt fish comes from this Province. There is a potential, Mr. Speaker - and I have checked this out, I have talked to people in the private sector and others - a potential to increase that market to at least 20 per cent, thereby eliminating, to a large extent, the very serious problem facing Newfoundland fishermen today with respect to the glut problem. Mr. Speaker, the question that must arise then is, if we are only able to capture 8 per cent of the world market for salt fish, wherein lies the problem? In this Province we have the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. This is a federal agency set up by the federal government with the concurrence of the Province and operating in the Province of Newfoundland, by leave and by license, of the provincial government. A saltfish corporation can only establish itself in a province if the province concerned opts for that corporation. It is a monopoly on the export of salt fish. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation is

getting flabby. They are getting careless. They are obviously not working as hard as they should and could, with respect to securing more markets for salt fish.

I would strongly recommend to the members opposite - in fact, I intended today to put a question to the Premier to that effect, but I could not get recognized - that the Premier and his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and his government give some very serious thought to appointing a select committee of this House and call before it the directors, the president, and the chairman - the officials of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation - to find out from them, to get an explanation as to why we are unable to get more than 8 per cent of the total world potential market for salt fish. If you talk about creating jobs, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) went to great length today talking about what can happen in fisheries, tourism and rural development, and rightly so, but this might be a good start. Those of us who have fishing districts will have to face the problem soon, in a few months, of fishermen out during the harvest period - the great fish harvest - unable to get a market for their fish. In fact, in my own district last year, I am told, fishermen were on a quota. During the harvest period they were given a quota of something like 300 pounds per person. And today, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, fishermen who are engaged solely in the groundfish industry are finding it difficult enough as it is to survive without having to be restricted in the amount of fish they can sell. So there, Mr. Speaker, is an area where a lot of employment can be provided. There are adequate facilities around the

Province. I am sure most of us who represent rural parts of the Province know that in the communities there are large community stages, built at considerable government expense, a lot of which are not being used. These facilities could be used as a means where fishermen can, in fact, split fish during the glut period, salt it, cure it, and hopefully get it into the market. Another suggestion I made to the minister that, obviously, is not going to be accepted, is the one with respect to existing fish plants being required, as a condition of their license, to provide, like I said, fish salting and fish splitting capabilities on their premises. If that were in effect, Mr. Speaker, then I think the problem of the glut would, to a large extent, be solved.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things we can talk about. We can talk about, for example, the importance of small business in the economy of our Province, as, indeed, it is important to the economy of most countries in the world, I suppose, most cities in the world. In fact, during election periods we hear politicians, both federal and provincial politicians, talking about the importance of small business. I believe I have heard the figure of 65 per cent of the work force being dependent on small business for their existence. I do not know if it is 65 per cent but certainly, I think, we all realize that it is a pretty hefty and a pretty important sector of the economy - small business.

What is happening today, Mr. Speaker, is that the so-called goose that lays the golden egg, as far as employment is concerned, is

rapidly being killed off by governments at all levels. Today, talk to any small businessman who employs five or six, eight or ten people, and he will tell you or she will tell you that it is just about impossible to carry on a business because of government regulations. We have a bureaucracy, I believe, stay awake at night trying to find ways and means of blocking small businesses and making it difficult for people who own these small businesses to operate. I can speak with some little authority in that field, Mr. Speaker, because I had an interest sometime back in a small business in downtown St. John's, one that my son really owned but I had some financial interest in it. We figured out one day that we had to deal with eleven different levels of bureaucracy in order to exist in that small business, eleven different levels of bureaucracy on the municipal, provincial and federal levels. We had a sales tax department that required an employer, for example, or a store owner to collect taxes - to do their dirty work for them. There was a time when the government, I think, paid small business people a small stipend for collecting their tax, and well they should. Why should a small businessman today, who is limited - who cannot afford to have on a battery of accountants or bookkeepers or lawyers - why should he or she be required to collect taxes for the government without getting some compensation? At least enough to compensate that person-

MR. LUSH:

To pay his postage.

MR. W. CARTER:

That is right - for what they are out off pocket or for the bit of

time it takes to fill in the forms that are constantly being sent out. So, if the government, Mr. Speaker, is serious in trying to eliminate unemployment, then I would suggest there are a lot of areas that can be looked into and one area is in trying to abolish some of these regulations that are having the effect of actually strangling, putting a strangle hold on, small businesses in this Province today.

I want to congratulate, by the way, my young colleague from Stephenville (K. Aylward) on what I thought was a very good speech, a very fine and a very constructive speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

A speech by a young man who obviously shares the concern of young people his age, a lot of whom today are finding life pretty hectic and finding it pretty rough to carry on. I have a large family and I know the problems today facing young people trying to get employment. I have personal experience in my own family with unemployment and I know the frustrations, the torment, the agony, the misery, the embarrassment, and all that goes with unemployment. It is a very, very, serious matter and I think it is one that has to be addressed by government. Now let us look at the record of the present administration with respect to job creation and matters pertaining thereto. In my view a lot of the problems facing this Province today are a direct result of the attitudes and the actions of the present administration. In the past five or six years we have seen a

Premier has been more interested, more willing to be stripped to the waist, brawling and fighting than in getting things done. We have seen the government hide behind the old federal government syndrome, blaming everything on the Liberal Government in Ottawa. We have seen that happen. We have seen the so-called Atlantic Accord delayed for four or five years strictly for political reasons and then we hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) today condemning my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) for introducing a motion that he says is political. Well, I think he has had lots of chance to witness politicians in action and I think today, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Newfoundland, especially the young people, are paying the price for what has been happening with respect to the present government in the past five or six years.

There has been very little happen. We have seen unemployment pretty well doubled. We have seen the unemployment figures in Newfoundland, at least twice as high as the national average, higher than every other province in Canada, especially higher than the Atlantic Provinces. Mr. Speaker, there has got to be a reason for it. Of course the reason is that all that can be done has not been done in the past four or five years. All that could have been done was not done.

Getting back to the fishing industry today, we have the potential in the fishing industry to provide many thousands of jobs, but I am afraid that if the attitude on the other side does not change, if they are not willing to take a few chances and to be a little more imaginative,

then I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the opportunities in that particular industry will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go on any longer. I support the motion presented by my hon. colleague and I think that the government opposite have a very serious responsibility. They were given a mandate by the Newfoundland people. They asked for a mandate to create jobs, they have been given that mandate and now I think every Newfoundlander, certainly every unemployed Newfoundlander, will expect them to perform.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to get up to speak to this amended motion. I must say my first words have to be ones of congratulations to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) because I think that he has done this House, indeed he has done this Province, a great service by amending this motion. He took a motion that could have been debated here for a couple of days, at least a couple of afternoons - and it would have rife with partisan comments and there would have been jeering back and forth across the House, and there would have been very little result at the end of it - and he has turned the motion into something to which now there can be given serious consideration. People can say, "Look, yes this is a very serious problem." We have a proposition before us that is put in a serious framework and now

we can give it some serious discussion. Previously, there was a serious issue taken and phrased in such a way that it was bound to make people lose the point the motion was supposed to make and get off into all sorts of tangents and up all sorts of blind allies and get into all sorts of non-productive controversy. I think the Minister of Fisheries has done this House a tremendous service in that regard. And I was glad to see that the speaker who followed him - I was out of the House for a little bit on something else - but I think I am right in saying the next speaker who followed the Minister of Fisheries took up the challenge and he did make quite a number of good points in his remarks. He treated the subject in a clear and intelligent way. He did not get into these other avenues that I am sure, despite all his good intentions, he would have gotten into if the wording had not been changed and I compliment him, I think he was the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Alyward). Stephenville must give rise to good members because his predecessor was an extremely good member also. Mr. Fred Stagg was the previous member for that district and he made tremendous contributions to this House. He was a very good speaker, a very amusing speaker. He made his points in a good fashion, and this is not to take anything away from the present member, but I must say, in many respects, it is too bad that a good member, as he seems to be shaping up, had to take the place of an even better member. The fact that he was on this side of the House I do not think takes away from the comment that Mr. Stagg was an extremely good member.

Getting back to the motion, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there was a bit of slippage after the member for Stephenville spoke. I am sad to say that the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) started off pretty good, as far as I understand, but at the end he got back into areas of, I suppose he had to do it, almost pro forma, of saying that all our problems can be laid at the door of the personality of the Premier and these types of things. I do not think that was quite worthy either of the subject, of the member from Stephenville who took up the challenge thrown down by the Minister of Fisheries, or indeed of the member for Twillingate himself. I think that he probably has not got yet the new attitude that I think the people of this Province want this House to have. I think that this House, up to now anyway, has been able to show that we are willing to debate the issues, to try to keep the partisan remarks to a minimum. I suppose there is no harm in throwing in the odd one and a little bit of jarring and jibing across the House, so we will not all go to sleep on occasion, but I think that this should not be the total way that this House works and especially on serious subjects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a serious subject and I do not think that the seriousness of the subject can be addressed by glib statements. Unfortunately, there were in the original motion a certain number of glib statements. I will go into them a little bit later, but I just want to say now that the retail sales tax issue, in my view, is a very glib statement in terms of curing unemployment. I am going to go into that a little bit later.

I think also it is a bit glib to just say that the fact that this party on this side of the House, the government was fighting for other desirable achievements - that is the rights of this Province - I think it is a very glib statement to say that that is a cause of the troubles we are in. I think that we can fight on many battles and there were many issues that the government has to face, and we would be derelict in our duty if we did not face all the issues that we felt were serious for this Province. The fact that we had to fight for our place in the sun in Canada, which we were not getting previously, I think it is glib to say that in fighting for that we caused the unemployment problem in this Province. Not only is it glib, it is totally inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we are going to deal with this in any really serious and substantive way we have to be sure what the basic issue is. The basic issue is not retail sales tax, the basic issue is not the Premier's personality. The basic issue goes much deeper than that, and if we do not face the basic issue, we are not going to come up with real remedies. I am not saying the remedies are going to be easy, even if you identify them, but you are not going to get anywhere unless you do identify them.

Now, just let us go back to the early part of this decade, in other words, to 1980. What happened in 1980? We all know that a recession struck. I do not think it is understood to the level it probably should be the effect of the recession on this Province. The recession hit this Province earlier, more severely, in a more lasting, more

fundamental way than any other province in Canada and almost any other jurisdiction than I can think of anywhere in the world. Certainly, it did hit this Province harder than most of the Canadian provinces and there are reasons for that. The main reason is that the recession coincided in this Province with the high interest rate policy and the tight money policy that was practiced in Ottawa. Now, I am not being partisan, I am being factual in saying that. There was a move in Ottawa at that time to concentrate on inflation fighting. No one likes inflation, and we suffered from inflation as much in this Province as did any other part of Canada. But the big issue in the more populous parts of Canada was inflation, almost to the exclusion of everything else. It was not the big issue here to the exclusion of everything else. We had a high unemployment rate at that time. We had a very fragile, narrowly-based economy at that time. Inflation was worrisome to us, but there were many other problems that were also very worrisome to us. That was not the same level of concern in the more populous parts of Canada where inflation loomed large. It was the big issue, it was what everyone talked about, it was what the federal government was supposed to be dealing with almost to the exclusion of everything else. And indeed they did deal with it almost to the exclusion of everything else. They brought in inflation-fighting mechanisms which did get the thing under control but at enormous cost, an enormous cost that could be borne reasonably well by the more wealthy and populous parts of this country, but which took the wind totally out of the sails of the poorer parts of this country and

the parts which already had a very precarious economic base, such as Newfoundland. It was a heartless, uncaring type of concentration on the good of one section of the country while totally ignoring the legitimate requirements of other parts of the country. Unfortunately, it could be gotten away with, because the parts of the country that were hard hit were small and had great difficulty in making their voice heard in the halls of power that could do something about it, that could reverse this policy. And, of course, you all know what I am referring to is the tight-money monetary policy that the federal government practiced to the exclusion of everything else, without any adequate off-setting policies to help the areas of the country which were particularly wounded by this tight-money monetary policy.

Now, that is why in this Province the recession visited us early, hit us hard and stayed with us. The facts are there to see. We had our last significant increase in our provincial domestic product in 1979. In 1980 our domestic product went down, in 1981 and 1982 it remained about the same, in 1983 we had not yet shown any improvement. It was only in 1984 that we began to show some improvement and we are still not back to the gross domestic output that we had been able to achieve in this Province in 1979. We are still behind the level we were at in 1979.

Now, if you will look at the national figures, it varies a bit from province to province, granted, but on an average, 1980 was not a recessionary area for the rest of Canada. The recession started in 1982, by 1983 it was

already beginning a recovery and in 1984, in most areas, the recovery had been well established. So it was a relatively short, relatively deep, granted, but nevertheless brief recession for the rest of Canada compared to the prolonged recession that we had in this Province. And that was totally related to the fact that the monetary policy the federal government was pursuing hurt the areas of narrowly-based economic effort, an economic effort mainly related to exports. Almost all our goods-producing industries export. Our paper, our forestry products, our mining, our fishery and so on, these are all related to exports and to world markets. And the monetary policy and the high interest policy the federal government pursued took the wind totally out of those goods-producing industries and the sectors of the economy in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that inevitably led to an exacerbation of our already high unemployment rate in this Province. We have had an unemployment problem going back for generations, and it is not going to be easily turned around, but that type of thing was certainly not going to help and it did the obvious, it ballooned our unemployment rate to almost impossible and startling figures. If any other part of Canada had our unemployment rate, there would be such an uproar you would never hear the end of it. Words thrown around would definitely not be words like 'recession' but 'depression'. People would say, 'Canada must be in a depression if they have a 20 per cent unemployment rate.' How can it otherwise be anything but a depression when there is an

unemployment rate of 20 per cent? When Newfoundland is in that position you hardly hear anyone even mention it. You never see much in the national papers about it. There should be screams about conditions in Newfoundland. But we are far away and we are small.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what were the consequences of that early and prolonged and deep recession in this Province? The most startling result was that private investment collapsed. We had a turnabout in private investment from a slowly-growing situation to a very sharp reversal. And we know what was the consequence of that, there was a tremendous amount of unemployment in the private sector. Now that was compensated to some extent by increased public investment. So this is what this government did: We increased our capital works and we increased our other aspects of capital expenditure to a very sharp degree. As a matter of fact, it went up by about 66 per cent over that four year period. That is how much we increased our public investment. To some extent that reversed, or at least slowed down or ameliorated the trend towards unemployment, but it could not do it sufficiently, it could not do it all on its own. And it had this consequence, that our public involvement in our economy did increase percentage wise, not, in my view, a terribly healthy thing. We have to now begin to reverse that arrangement. We have to encourage, in particular, private investment again so that we can have a better mix. We have too big a mix now of public activity and not enough private activity. It is not a healthy economy to have things like that and we now have to try to turn this around.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to try to get private investment going is not going to be easy. And, as I mentioned earlier on, it is just too glib to say that all you have to do is reduce the retail sales tax. That is not going to do anything of a substantive nature. For one thing, our goods-producing industries, the real wealth producers in this Province are, by and large, now exempt from retail sales tax. So if we reduce our retail sales tax down to zero it is not really going to do much for the fishing industry, the fishing industry does not pay retail sales tax, by and large. It is not going to do anything for the saw log industry. They, by and large, do not pay retail sales tax, and so on and so forth. So the real wealth-producing parts of our economic are not going to be helped by any change in our retail sales tax policy.

But what will it do? It will do this: Firstly, there will be an immediate negative effect on our government revenues, and our government, as I just mentioned, is one of the underpinnings of the economy in this Province. If we diminish the revenues that the government takes in, clearly government is not going to be able to underpin the economy to the extent it can. We employ a very high percentage of the work force in this Province. If our revenues go down and we are forced to limit public employment, clearly we are going to be in bigger trouble than we are now. So that is the first effect of a retail sales tax cut. I am not against cutting retail sales tax. I wish I could do it, and this government wishes it could do it. But we have to be realistic about things. That would be the first effect, our revenues would decrease and we

would have difficulties helping out the fragile and heavily publicly orientated Newfoundland economy to the extent we are doing at the present time.

What would be the second thing? The second thing would be that there would be help to certain manufacturers, because retail sales tax is mainly on consumer goods. So the manufacturing aspect of the economy would be helped. But which manufacturing sector? Our manufacturing sector, which is largely things like fish plants and so on? Certainly not. The manufacturing industries in Quebec, in Ontario, and, to some extent, in the other Atlantic Provinces, because that is where our manufacturers come from. Now granted we may get a little bit of extra activity in the trade sector of our economy, in the retail trade or whatever, but that is only one sector that we are concerned about and it is, to some extent, a sector that is already receiving enough stimulus. The stimulus we want to give is to the wealth-producing part of our economy, not so much to the service part of our economy, especially the service part of our economy that is typified by the retail trade.

So the fact that we have a high RST is unfortunate. But to say that it is the cause of our troubles and that by doing something about it we are going to have the millennium come is just too glib, it is untrue. We have to remember that Alberta has no retail sales tax. As far as I know, it has never had a retail sales tax. Certainly it has not had one since the 1930s. Anyway, Alberta has had its economic troubles. If retail sales tax was the end all and be all of

everything, Alberta should be home to the races. But we all know that the Albertans, in relative terms anyway, have also had their recessionary problems, and the fact that they do not have any retail sales tax is not something that prevented that.

Now, the other thing I would just like to mention, if I have the time, is that we do have a large tax burden in this Province, but it would be wrong to say that it is an increasing burden. I did some figures a short time ago, when I had to address one of the organizations in the Province, and we carried out some investigations. We went through the statistics, and these statistics on a factual basis, on a purely dispassionate basis, shall we say, show that even though taxation has changed over the years, perhaps there has been a bit more on the personal income tax, or retail sales tax, or whatever, but in other areas it has diminished, and the total burden now is no different than it was five or six years ago. If you relate the tax burden to total personal income in this Province you will find that the same percentages apply. There have been changes, variations along the way, but the total burden - it is a very high burden, I am not saying it is not a high burden - has not been increasing. As a matter of fact, there is a marginal decrease in the total burden related to personal income. In other words, personal income has been going up over the years, taxation levels have also changed over the years, but there has not been a relationship between the two such that taxes are taking more out of the personal income aggregate than it did a number of years ago.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has elapsed.

DR. COLLINS:

Just in finishing up, Mr. Speaker, may I say I support the amendment to the motion, and I think and hope that over the next while this debate will continue in a very constructive fashion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

This debate will continue this day week, Wednesday.

It being six o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 2, at 3:00.