



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 11

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

13 May 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask has the Premier now seen the labour force flash sheet from Statistics Canada for the month of April, 1985? In light of the fact that we see an increase in the unemployment rate from April 1984 to April 1985 of 4.5 per cent, 4 per cent adjusted; and in light of the fact that we see a decrease in the employed in the Province from April 1984 to April 1985, of 3 per cent; and in light of the fact that we see the number of unemployed - and this is a staggering figure - increase from 45,000 in April 1984 to 56,000 in April 1985, an increase of 24.4 per cent or 23.3 per cent adjusted; in light of these frightening figures, do we have any new initiatives contemplated by the present administration to deal with what seems to be a pretty threatening set of unemployment figures, and a frightening trend in the unemployment rate which is increasing at a point in time when it should be decreasing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have seen the figures that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) refers to. I have not had an

opportunity to go back to the various years to see how many years there were when we got to the end of April or early May we actually saw a significant or even a marginal decrease. I know by the end of May or early June we usually do. In many parts of Canada, of course, they pick up a little bit earlier because of their climate. And if you have been looking outside today with the snow still coming down here on May 13, we are into a different kind of circumstance. But we are very concerned about these figures that have just come out, Mr. Speaker. Obviously we are going to do all we can in the next several months to try to mitigate that kind of trend, to stop it all together and to see it move in the other direction. But, obviously, the Leader of the Opposition will have to wait for any additional initiatives that we might be contemplating or considering until the budget is brought down and the various programmes are announced by the appropriate ministers. But, obviously, we are very concerned about it. It has been the trend that has been ongoing through the Winter, as it is in most Winters. But right now the actual numbers and the actual percentages are very, very high and the government is extremely concerned about it. It is not easy to turn around a circumstance like that, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows. So it is difficult to contemplate new initiatives which will have more than just temporary relief to a lot of the people out there who are looking for jobs. And as we have found out from other initiatives that have been taken by other governments, both provincially and federally over the years, the temporary programmes that have been put in

place, whilst important for the temporary, have not done much to cure the structural problems that we face in the Province. That is one of the reasons, of course, as we saw this happen, that we appointed the Royal Commission to take a detailed look at this around the Province, to examine it strictly from a provincial point of view, and, even more than that, to study it from a regional point of view within the Province. Is the nature of the unemployment situation on the West Coast identical to the nature of the unemployment problem in Bay d'Espoir, and so on, or in Roddickton or in Labrador or in other regions of the Province, and what can we do to mitigate that kind of trend?

So a lot of it is rather structural and it is going to take some time to remedy it. We have tried to do what we could both in the fishery and in forestry, in just about every field that we are now involved in, but we still see that disturbing trend. Hopefully, over the next month or so as we start to move our own Public Works projects, and our fishery and our forestry start to pick up more than they have right now, we will see that stabilize and turn around. But any other new initiatives will have to wait, of course, until the budget is brought down.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would give the House a commitment that if we see a

continuation of this trend - as of the end of May - and I know to a certain extent it is hypothetical but it is the sort of thing that we have to start thinking about now; it is too late after the fact, I think, or hardship will be caused by the consequent delay - would the Premier give this House a commitment that if we see the same sort of trend in the unemployment rate, this will be treated as something other than business as usual by his administration and that there will be a look at some significantly different approaches, approaches that are not the same? I know the Premier said last week that they are aiming at certain long-term improvements, and you have certain long-term programmes underway which you hope will see an improvement in the unemployment situation in this Province, but if we see a continuation of this trend this Summer, would the Premier agree that there would have to be something done this year? Would the Premier be prepared to commitment himself to taking a look and changing from the business as usual approach if this should occur as of the end of May?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is never business as usual when you see figures like came out on Friday. Obviously the government is extremely concerned and many of the ministries are looking closely at those figures. You cannot change the way we now participate and work our forestry. You cannot suddenly look at new ways in which we can, if you will, harvest our fishery. There are certain new things that are now happening in fisheries

which are very important in the secondary processing field, and with some of the independent producers, and so on, there are certain things you can do there. But to drastically change and suddenly find 20,000 or 30,000 jobs over the next five or six months in the provincial economy is a very difficult piece of business to try and wrap your mind around.

MR. CALLAN:

You have had thirteen years.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, and there are a number of other parties who have had longer than that, Mr. Speaker. That is only a partisan quip. The long and the short of it is that we need to create significantly more job opportunities in this Province. As I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) the other day, we are working very hard on the whole question of the fishery and we are working very hard on the forestry and on tourism, even on agriculture, as we will see in the budget, and in all fields that have traditionally employed a lot of Newfoundlanders.

In the fishery, on secondary processing and so on, with all of that in we still see unemployment. All the West Coast, as I understand it, was about closed down the last couple of weeks because of ice, an act of God, and there is very little anybody can do about that. In addition to that, you have to try to provide more jobs for construction workers. Our development plan on the offshore will be in this year. Hopefully, we will be able to move in the direction which will give us the most jobs possible there, and

hydro developments will provide more, on top of the fish and the trees and the mining and the tourism and the other things. If the trends continue into the end of May and into June, then we will have to take a look at it. But what, in fact, specifically, Mr. Speaker, we will do at that point in time will be the subject of consideration by Cabinet at that time.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has occasionally said, "Well, there is a recession right across Canada, a recession in the Western world." As these figures indicate, the rest of Canada is seeing an increase in the numbers employed; the numbers employed across Canada have gone up 3.2 per cent, when they have gone down 3 per cent in this Province. Last year in April there were 166,000 employed in this Province, this year in April 161,000 were employed. So we see that the rest of Canada is moving out of the recession, the rest of Canada is seeing an improvement in the employment picture. I wonder if perhaps the Premier should take a look at what is happening in other provinces to bring this about. The Premier has indicated, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot change overnight and create 30,000 jobs, but the Premier has been told that this was happening and was continuing to happen, and that there was a need for a stimulation of the economy. Would the Premier now indicate to this House whether he is prepared to look at the policies put forth by the Liberal

Party in the last election having to do with stimulating the economy? This, granted, is a radical change in the approach of government up to now, but a change that these numbers, these unemployment figures may mean is now warranted. And I would like to point out to the Premier, in putting that question to him, that I am being approached by more and more private contractors. As a matter of fact, one mentioned to me on Friday that it is the first time in twenty-two years that that contractor has not had a project ongoing. This is not a small contractor but, we will say, a medium size contractor who would employ 50 or 60 or 100 people. Does the Premier have any idea of the extent to which the private sector is finding that it is not in a position to move ahead with construction projects this Summer, and to what extent is that part of the decline in the employment rate in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) took a long while to ask his question. The other day, when I got up to respond in some detail, I was involved into a point of order, so I hope I will be able to answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, number one, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said that most of the other parts of Canada are coming out of the recession, are starting to go in the other direction and we are not. Well, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, we were the last to come into the recession and we are going to be the last to come out of it and everybody knows that.

MR. BARRY:

No. We went into it with the rest of the country.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No? Everybody knows that. BC still has a problem on that score. If you look at the other provinces, the reason that they are coming out of the recession has nothing to do with stimulative measures that they took. It is just a matter of the marketplace, and that the recession is now over there and they are coming out of it in light of the United States economy, Ontario being close to it and so on, and Quebec the same way. They have taken no particular, new, enlightened measures to bring them out of the recession, they have come out of the recession as a normal evolution of the recession moving away and recovery coming. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that there is nothing in those provinces to indicate otherwise.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, is we have been doing stimulation for the last four years. We have been in a current account deficit for that reason. We have been the engine in Newfoundland for spending on public works when the private sector, because of the recession, were not putting their money forward. Our capital account budget this coming year, and our capital account budget over the last number of years, has been exceptionally high in historic terms primarily because we wanted to stimulate the economy in a time of recession. If that kind of money was not there, and if we had not gone ahead with the Fisheries College and got that deal, if we had not gone ahead with our hospital construction programme and our roads programmes

at a high level over the last number of years during the recession, a lot of people would have hurt a more than they have to now, Mr. Speaker.

We are coming in this year \$60 million or \$70 million down on current account and we cannot afford, if we want to continue to borrow money, to go another \$100 million or \$150 million on capital account as the Leader of the Opposition would suggest, or has suggested in the last three or four weeks, and still keep our credit rating. We would have to pay more for our money. Somewhere that has to stop. We are hopeful, because of the agreements that we have signed over the last twelve months amounting to \$400 million or \$500 million over the next four or five years, with the Offshore Accord, with our highways programme of \$181 million on which there will be tenders in road work this year, that we will be able to move ourselves out of that recession a bit faster. But it has been this government that has used public funds to increase our capital account to do the very thing that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is talking about. The issue is not that. The issue is the degree to which you can go and still be credit worthy within the financial markets of this world. That is the problem we have, Mr. Speaker. We have spent more on all our capital works and buildings. In schools this year, what did we do? We went from \$13 million a year to \$20 million a year, starting in this budget, an increase of \$7 million a year in school construction. So there will be \$20 million spent this year, \$20 million next year and \$20 million the year after. And in our roads programme the same

thing; we have been up around \$40 to \$60 million. Now with our highways agreement on the TCH and the Trans-Labrador Highway, \$181 million, somewhere around, I guess, \$20 million will be spent this year. So we are into a stimulation kind of circumstance and that is why we have a deficit on current account. If, however, Mr. Speaker, we were in a surplus situation on current account, then what the Leader of the Opposition is saying would have some merit. But we have progressively increased our deficit on current account, which we never, ever had before in our lives up to four or five years ago, primarily because we were in a recessionary situation and we understood that and therefore we put forward our best foot by encouraging more activity through the expending of a lot of public money.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and it concerns the recent agreement between Canada and Russia on the supply of offshore fish to the Russians in return for buying a certain amount of fish. As I understand it, the total commitment this year is 120,000 tons, an increase of 20,000 tons from last year. In return, the Soviets have promised to buy \$12 million worth of Canadian fish, in spite of the fact that they made the same commitment last year and bought, I think it was, \$885,600 worth or something of that nature, out of \$12 million committed. The question for the minister is

this. In view of the recent overfishing by the EEC countries, how does the minister feel about these allocations by the federal government to the Russians? And even without this over-fishing, what is the policy of the government regarding the allocation of offshore fish to foreign countries in any case?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that it is a very important question. The policy of this government has been clear for several years, as far as I know. That is that we do not, as a government, support the policy of fish for fish. We have, through previous ministers and the Premier, been opposed to that policy over the last several years and our position has not changed, nor do we intend to change our position in that regard. So this business of trading fish for fish is something that we adamantly opposed last year, when the original plan, I guess, was put in place, and we are doing the same thing, and have consistently done the same thing over the last several months. Now be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that last year and this year the federal government have gone ahead and negotiated such deals with the Soviet Union. But it has been done against our objection and we will continue to take the position that I am outlining here today, which has been outlined in past years by other ministers. I have requested that this item be put on the agenda for the ministers' meeting that is going to take place toward the end of the month. Because, while this agreement has been

negotiated and signed, it has not been negotiated with our blessing over the last several years, nor this year.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the minister is exactly right, it has been the position of the government. As the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) well knows, in 1982, when he telexed the then minister, and I believe the Premier telexed the Prime Minister, opposing those allocations, we on this side of the House agreed with him. But if the minister is opposed, let me ask him this: Has he made that position known to the federal minister (Mr. Fraser), his federal counterpart in Ottawa? Did he get a reply from the minister? And if he did, would he table that correspondence in whatever form it was?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there has been correspondence over the last several months between the provincial Department of Fisheries and the federal government on this matter. I will undertake to have a look at that over the next few days and, if there is no problem with it, provide it.

Those negotiations have been ongoing, as the member knows, I am sure, over the last several months, long before I became minister; and what correspondence there was between previous ministers and so on over the last

several months, I am not quite sure. I, as minister, have initiated a request to have this matter put on the agenda for the ministers' meetings which are to take place, I believe on the May 23. It is my understanding that the item will be an agenda item and, therefore, I can enunciate again, on behalf of this Province and this government, our objection and our pursuit of the objection to those kinds of deals. So I have done that and we will see how it goes during the course of negotiations in a couple of weeks time.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if I understand the minister correctly, what he has done here is not made an objection up to this point to the present allocation of some extra 20,000 tons of fish, and I think there is an extra amount of caplin built in there as well, which we all consider to be very important.

MR. W. CARTER:

More caplin than was there in 1982.

MR. TULK:

More caplin than was there in 1982. Now, the Minister of Fisheries at that time was very loud in his condemnation of the federal minister and now we see the present minister (Mr. Rideout) soft-peddling somewhat, quietly asking to have that put on the agenda.

I say to the minister, putting it on an agenda for discussion at some future date is not good

enough. We need opposition to what is going on at the present time, and if the minister has received no correspondence, has made no attempt to oppose this to the federal minister, will he now, before he goes to any meeting, undertake to this House to make known his views, the views of this government and, indeed, the views of this House? I cannot speak for my friend from the N.D.P. Party but I can certainly speak for this side. Will he attempt to make, in the strongest possible terms, our opposition in this House known to those kinds of allocations, to not only the Soviets but to any foreign country?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, we have consistently, and we will consistently make our views known to the federal government in opposition to this kind of deal. It is nothing new, we have done it; we will continue to do it. I will be doing it again in another forum, in another way when we meet as a council of ministers in a couple of weeks time.

Let me also say to the hon. gentleman, I am sure he is aware that some of those catch areas, even though we have been against it in principle, are for species of fish that nobody else is taking. For example, silver hake is well over half of the allocation, and I am informed that there is nobody else, particularly no Canadian effort and hardly any foreign effort directed at that species except for the Soviet Union. So it is not all black and white. While we have been consistently against the thing in principle and will consistently be

against it still in principle and will use another forum in our meetings in a couple of weeks time to voice our objection and our displeasure again, there are some areas of it that, like I say, are not black and white, and we must consider these, as well.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of points about that. First of all, it is not quite good enough for the minister to sit down with his P.C. colleague behind closed doors and say, 'Mr. Fraser, I object to this.' Let us have it done, as it has always been done in this House, as was done by the former minister and, indeed, the Premier, let us have it done in a public forum.

In view of the overfishing that we suspect is now going on out there, let me ask him another question: Will he now contact the federal minister and ask him to have a hold or a stop put on fishing by foreign countries, including the Soviets, and EEC, until that whole mess that has been created out there over the past five or six years is cleared up and until we know indeed if the stocks, which are supposed to be out there and have been predicted to be building out there, are really there? Will he now do that, or is he going to risk the Newfoundland fishery?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Is he going to what, Mr. Speaker? I did not hear that.

MR. TULK:

Risk the Newfoundland fishery.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I think, again, we have made our position very clear on that. We will be consistent in our position, we will be determined in our position. There is a resolution coming up over the next little while that addresses, in a unanimous way, I think, some of the questions that the hon. gentleman is putting forward. We will be just as consistent, just as vocal today in our objection to a policy that we do not appreciate or support, as we were yesterday or as we were six months or twelve months ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, let me ask is the minister going to be just as vocal and going to put as much pressure on the federal minister as the former minister, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), did in 1982 on the then Liberal minister in Ottawa and as the Premier did on the Liberal Prime Minister in Ottawa? This afternoon, will he put together a Telex - he can do it himself, we will take a look at it and we will give him the unanimous consent of this House - to the federal minister? If the Premier wants to, he can put together one to the Prime Minister. Will they now put together a Telex, in the same form

as the former Minister of Fisheries in this Province did, opposing this allocation to the Soviet Union or is he just going to sit there?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have said our position is clear. We have opposed the policy, we will continue to oppose the policy, and we will take whatever initiatives we think are necessary to make sure that the federal government, the federal minister and anybody else know that our policy position has not changed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

You are going to do that this afternoon?

MR. RIDEOUT:

No.

MR. TULK:

No, you want to get behind closed doors.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Before recognizing the hon. the member for Menihek, who has been trying to catch my eye for a long time, I would like to welcome to the gallery Mayor Wilbert Rideout and Councillor Hedley Morgan of the Community Council of Lushes Bight - Beaumont - Beaumont North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was going to raise a point of personal privilege if you did not recognize me because the Liberals have put the biggest member they have right in front of me to make it more difficult to be recognized. However, I am pleased to see that your vision is as keen as it has always been.

My question is to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), who I believe about a year ago, or in early 1984, on behalf of the Premier in Labrador West released a statement in response to the severe economic times that we had gone through. One of the recommendations, one of the proposals that the Government House Leader put forward at that time was that all government departments and agencies in Labrador West would have a look at their staffing levels and see if some incremental improvements could be made there in order to help in whatever way it could in order to increase employment levels in the area. My question to the Government House Leader is, is this still the policy of your government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of this government to bring the services of the government into every area and region of this Province it is possible to, and, of course, that includes the Labrador City area. The Labrador City and Wabush area are particular concerns to us because we know that they are further away from the capital and they are a bit isolated. When we were up there we made that commitment and we have carried through with it as

far as we can and we hope, as the exigencies of the public purse allow in the future, we will be able to improve it even further.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am glad to hear that that is still the policy but, unfortunately, there is a decision that I have heard about, that seems to be accurate, and that is that the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation in its operation in Wabush is planning to close down the store, lay off two of the employees and transfer one to Labrador City. I would like to know, since it is obviously contrary to this policy, what the response of the government would be? In this case, if the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) does not wish to answer and he feels that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would be the more appropriate one, then I would be glad to accept the answer from him?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the full situation with respect to that. The Liquor Commission is one that operates under certain guidelines and its guidelines are to provide services as fully and as efficiently as they possibly can. The Liquor Commission is under the aegis of a board that is the responsibility of the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). The fact of the matter

is that they have operated very effectively and this is one of the actions, I assume, that they have taken in order to deliver services as efficiently and effectively as they possibly can.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I felt if there was no demand for it, that would be an appropriate reason for closing it down, but at the same time they have also advertised in the local area for individuals to bid on the setting up of an agency store in exactly that same space, which seems to me just a means of cutting down their employment while at the same time recognizing that there is a demand for the service.

My question, I guess, now to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is: Would you please review this with the Corporation to see indeed what is going on and come back to me with some sort of an answer on it?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that anyone spoke to the Minister of Finance in Budget Week. I thought that he was supposed to be sort of an invisible person who only resurrected himself in his new shoes on the appointed day. But, anyway, as the hon. member chooses to break so severely with honoured tradition, I will answer his question.

For some years the Liquor

Corporation has engaged in the opening of agency stores. They are supposed to be good managers, they are supposed to conduct the affairs of the Corporation in the best interest of the Province, and that usually means rendering to the Province a fair amount of money from their markup. And the only way that they can do that is if they have flexibility to carry out certain changes which provide service to the public, but nevertheless maximize their take which they can pass to the benefit of the citizens of the Province in the provision of government funds.

So I have no doubt that this has been gone into in some detail. Labrador City is a very short distance from Wabush, and I think that the people there will be adequately served by a liquor store in one situation and an agency store in another situation.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) tried unsuccessfully last week to pry some definite information about the proposed Federal Forestry Centre from this government. Since that attempt has been made, an announcement was made by the Federal Minister of Forestry (Mr. Merithew) that \$35 million has been made available for his riding towards the construction of a Maritime Forestry Research Centre in that Province, New Brunswick. My question to the Acting Minister of Forestry is this: Does this announcement mean that the idea of a Forestry Research Centre for

Newfoundland is abandon? Is the Provincial Government still committed to seeing a federal Forestry Research Centre in the City of Corner Brook?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are still committed. We understand that the project, from the economic statement last Fall, was deferred, not cancelled. As the hon. member might know, a lot of projects across Canada were cancelled at that time and not deferred. The Forestry Research Centre for Corner Brook was deferred. We have indicated in the strongest possible terms that we wish to see a Forestry Research Centre in Newfoundland and that it would be located in Corner Brook. That remains so. The Maritime Research Station that is going to be built will service the forest industry of the Maritimes, and will not service the forest industry of Newfoundland.

So we have every intention of holding the federal government to their commitment of establishing the Forestry Research Centre in Corner Brook and we believe that over the next couple of years we will see that project released and the building built.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by Standing
and Special Committees

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As minister responsible for the Office of the Legislative Counsel, pursuant to section 18 of the Statutes and Subordinate Legislation Act I am required to lay before the House a copy of subordinate legislation filed under that Act. Accordingly I hereby table the editions of The Newfoundland Gazette published between November 9, 1984 and May 3, 1985. These issues of The Newfoundland Gazette contain all subordinate legislation filed in the Registry of Subordinate legislation between those dates, November 9, 1984 and May 2, 1985.

Notices of Motion

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Board Act."

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means to consider the raising of Supply to be granted to Her Majesty; and I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Supply to Her Majesty.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
On behalf of and pursuant to the Committee that was struck on Friday, I give notice of the following resolution:
WHEREAS the fishery has historically formed the economic, social and cultural foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador; and

WHEREAS the preservation and proper management of the fishery resource of the Continental Shelf is essential to the development of the Newfoundland fishery; and

WHEREAS all members of the House of Assembly, irrespective of political affiliation, are united in their determination to protect and enhance this resource as essential to the future of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly recommends to the Government of Canada in the strongest terms that

1) it undertake to extend

jurisdiction to include the entire Continental Shelf, including the Flemish Cap; and

2) it take immediate and effective measures to terminate overfishing by foreign vessels; and

3) it agree to negotiate a fishery management regime whereby Newfoundland and Labrador would be entitled to exercise the appropriate level of jurisdiction and decision-making consistent with the importance of the resource to the Province; and

4) that there be a continuing process of Federal-Provincial consultation on all matters affecting the fishery.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. TULK:

I think the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is saying we have unanimous consent of the House. I understand that the minister in charge of this resolution met with the Leader of the NDP Party (Mr. Fenwick), and if it is satisfactory, by leave of the House I think we can pass this resolution without any debate at all and get it where it should go immediately, since we do have the complete, unanimous consent of this House.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

MR. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I agree wholeheartedly. The

quicker it gets to Ottawa, the better.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the question now be put.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is move and seconded that this question now be put. All those in favour 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Carried.

Petitions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here that I actually received some time before the election, and rather than delay having it attended to by government, I forwarded it to the Minister of Social Services at the time, the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett), who acknowledged receipt, indicated that it would be looked into and that we would hear further. To date we have not heard further. I am not sure -

MR. MORGAN:

He is not here.

MR. BARRY:

He is not here. Well, in any event, Mr. Speaker, I think that this petition should go forth and be tabled at this point in time.

There are a number of petitions. There are basically two different wordings but the essence is the same, I have not counted them exactly. There must be over 600 names to this petition from all over Bell Island. I have them from the Front, from Lance Cove, the Green, Quigley's Line, just about every part of the island, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with the changes in the policy of the Department of Social Services with respect to providing transportation for welfare recipients needing medical services. Apparently, what has happened is that the system was changed so that there was basically one set time at which medical transportation would be provided and this is fairly early in the morning. People are notified that they have to be available at that particular point in time to go and then the vehicle returns back from St. John's. The Health Sciences Centre is one main stop. I would assume it stops at other hospitals as well. In any event, late in the afternoon the transportation is set to return to St. John's. Now what this means is, in some cases, instances of diabetics who have to take their insulin at a particular time of day, have to have a certain regulated diet and so forth, and these individuals are battered around the city waiting. They are dropped off maybe nine o'clock in the morning, at the hospital, they have their doctor's appointment or their treatment, and then they are sitting around with basically no facilities available to them until late that afternoon when transportation is provided.

I understand that there is a need to economize and the department is obviously trying to make the service as economical as possible,

but it seems to me that they have gone too far in this instance, and that a bit more flexibility and sensitivity to the situation these people find themselves in would see some modification of this programme.

I have not mentioned here, for example, that there is concern on the part of parents that at times both parents and children have to spend all day in St. John's and there are no arrangements made for lunch for children in that situation. We have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where, as I have said, the provision of medication, if you have children who are going on this transportation, it may be difficult to see that children, or indeed other patients, get their medication at the correct time.

So the thrust of the petition is that an effort be made to improve the transportation services being provided for these individuals needing medical services in St. John's. I ask that this petition be tabled and forwarded to the department to which it relates, which in this case, I would assume, would be the Department of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word of support to the petition. I can certainly agree with some of the concerns expressed by the people of Bell Island. I would like to go back, Mr. Speaker, to the issue of transportation as addressed by the department when I was there. Hon. members may recall that last year a similar problem came to light in the area of Milltown - Bay d'Espoir area,

and at that time certain decisions were taken by the local managers of the office in that area, or some social workers, I believe, and approved by the managers.

I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that the policy on transportation - I do not know what it is now - to the best of my knowledge was to economize in terms of cost. I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) made reference to the reasonableness of economizing. There was a problem from a financial point of view. There was indeed some abuse in various parts of the Province. People in certain parts of the Province were using taxis under the aegis of medical attention while, in fact, going shopping. Something had to be done and something was done. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line was that for local transportation, to the nearest source of medical attention, people were expected to pay. But in emergency situations, where a special taxi for, say, one or two persons was required, the cost would be met by the persons themselves, if the cost was, say, \$5 or \$10, or whatever the case may be.

At that time, the whole issue of transportation was placed in the hands of the district manager. He or she, knowing the area so very well, would be in a position to adopt a policy which was reasonable, which was economical, or having some emphasis on economy, but never, Mr. Speaker, at the expense of deteriorating the level or quality of medical attention. And that was the situation.

With regards to the situation on Bell Island, let me address it more definitively, Mr. Speaker.

There is at least one doctor on Bell Island. Indeed, the policy at the time was put in place specifically to address a place like Bell Island where, for maybe \$3 or \$5 somebody could get to the doctor or, for that matter, get there under their own steam as opposed to hiring taxis.

When one leaves the Island to come to St. John's for medical attention, Mr. Speaker, that is a different situation altogether and I am amazed to find that people are being relegated into groups to come to St. John's and have to stay all day. I certainly would not support that, Mr. Speaker. I think the petition is a reasonable one and I would certainly want to add my support and simply say that the intent of policy change with regards to transportation for medical purposes, at least to the best of my knowledge while I had something to do with the Department of Social Services, was never meant to create undue hardship or in any way deteriorate the level or quality of medical attention. With that in mind, I certainly support the prayer of the petition.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 120 residents of the community of Pinware in Southern Labrador. The prayer of the petition reads: "We, the residents of Southern Labrador from L'Anse-au-Clair to Paradise River, hereby petition the federal government and Canada Post to upgrade its mail delivery

to Southern Labrador. At present mail can take as much as eleven days before it is received in a community on the Coast after being mailed from St. John's. We realize that there are problems with the weather, but not to an extent to cause the poor mail delivery we are receiving. We ask the federal government and Canada Post to reinstate the forty-hour week for rural post offices in Southern Labrador because in the Winter we receive mail only three times a week - Monday, Wednesday and Friday - in the South. If there is bad weather, then you have to wait another three to six days before the mail comes in or goes out. We, the residents of Southern Labrador, ask that an inquiry be done into the poor mail service on the Labrador Coast during the Spring, Winter, Summer and Fall. We are only asking for our basic rights on mail delivery, whereas in larger centres you have mail hand-delivered five times a week."

Mr. Speaker, the federal government cut down mail delivery from forty hours to thirty hours a week. Mail is the lifeline of the Labrador Coast and other areas of rural Newfoundland, but particularly Labrador because you have to fly in and fly out, whereas in other areas you can drive, like on the Northern Peninsula or the South Coast of Newfoundland. With the cutback to thirty hours, Mr. Speaker, if mail came in, for example, on Friday afternoon at 5:30 p.m., at one time Canada Post would pay time and a half on Saturday to have the mail opened and that in itself straightened out a lot of the problem, but they cut back that time and a half, cutting total hours back by eight hours. So what you have now is, if mail

comes into a community on Friday at 5:30 p.m., they close at 6:00 p.m. and they do not reopen until Monday, so people have to wait until Monday to get their mail. As soon as the mail is delivered, the mail goes out. So if you are answering your mail, Mr. Speaker, then you have to wait until Wednesday before you can mail it. If there is bad weather Wednesday, then, of course, it is Friday before it goes out. Mr. Speaker, when you talk about savings and restraint that government has to practice, surely in cutting off \$4.5 billion, the amount of money Canada Post would be saving could be used for by this time and a half to return to the forty hour week.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that I got a telegram today from John Andersen, Vice-President of the Combined Council of Northern Labrador, asking that Labrador Airways have flights into Southern and Northern Labrador five times a week and asking that the provincial government help subsidize that. If we had mail delivery in the communities five days a week, the end result, of course, would be that we would not have the problem. But the petition here, Mr. Speaker, asks that the federal government have an inquiry. In the Fall, when you are filling out UIC forms, and bills, you have to wait, particularly with UIC, if you do it in November - and perhaps the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) will agree with me - it is sometime in January before things are straightened out. I hope, now that we have co-operation between this government and the federal government, that when we ask about mail delivery that that extra eight hours can be allocated to rural areas of Labrador and that

the time and a half, Saturday be paid overtime. Then, at least, they can have more flexibility for the Coast. I also hope that the provincial government will continue to help subsidize Labrador Airways. Meanwhile, I hope an inquiry be done, because what the post office says is, 'It is not our responsibility.' Labrador Airways say that they are getting the mail through and then, of course, they always comes back with, 'It is an act of God, it is the weather', when they do not. But the basic facts, Mr. Speaker, are that there are times on the Labrador when you do not get mail for up to as much as two weeks - a week is quite common. And now, for example, with the CN Marine cutback this Summer, there will be places like Henley Harbour and other areas along the Coast that are going to have mail delivery probably once every two weeks. There is another community along the Southern Coast called George's Cove. We just got notice today, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to cut out that post office.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, Canada Post, in trying to balance its books, are trying to do it on the backs of the people who the least can afford it, people in rural Canada who depend on postal deliverly. Here, in St. John's, you can have your own courier, you can phone up a private company, but in Southern and Northern Labrador, Mr. Speaker, you are entirely at the mercy of Canada Post. The end result, Mr. Speaker, is they have a monopoly and, because of that, people of Southern and Northern Labrador have to put up with the service that Canada Post gives. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, think they cannot continue to try to to make their corporation viable by doing

it on the backs of rural areas of Canada, like the North West Territories and Labrador. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have support from this government in petitioning Canada Post and petitioning the federal government to have a review and to reinstate the forty hours.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). I believe that what the hon. member said is indeed factual. In fact, when I go to my office tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I will give the member copies of some correspondence that I have written to Canada Post objecting to the cutting down of the hours per week in the small, remote, post offices throughout Labrador and also throughout Southeast Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to advise the hon. member that, as regards to Labrador Airways and not getting mail in on schedule, it is only today I received a letter from a teacher in Makkovik who waited fourteen days for his pay cheque. Again, during that time, there were four occasions when there were planes other than the mail flight into the community. So, I agree with the hon. gentleman in that I think there can be a much better service provided along the Labrador Coast. I would also like to say to the hon. member, with reference to his telegram, of which I also received a copy, that we are looking forward to Labrador Airways or some other airline

providing a five-day-a-week service to the coast. I think the coast needs a five-day-a-week service. In fact, I had the unique opportunity on Friday night of addressing a graduating class in the hon. member's district at Red Bay and the first thing one of the students there brought up to me was how they had not seen a mail plane for the last two or three days. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we need to assure the people in Labrador that Canada Post is making a mistake and doing a grave injustice to the people in the remote areas of the Province by cutting down the operating hours per week because the people in the post office up there know the local people cannot depend on a thirty-two hour week because one does not know when the mail plane will arrive and when it will leave the community.

I support the petition the hon. member presented. I am satisfied to go to bat and fight on behalf of his constituents as well as mine.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I, too, stand to support the petition. I can sympathize with the people in Pinware, Mr. Speaker. Their expectations are not all that high, I am sure you will agree, Sir. I should venture to say that over the years the people of Pinware have not requested very much from this hon. House or from government. And the people of Pinware are only a symbol of so many other people in our small communities who seem to be totally neglected when it comes to mail delivery. I believe, Sir, that if

it is possible to take the hon. member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) into Red Bay by helicopter to speak at a graduation, then, surely, it must be possible to take mail in by helicopter when the time comes to get mail in there. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, we have here a larger question, and the question as I see it is this: Why do we have post offices and mail delivery in the first place? It seems to me that there are people who think that the delivery of mail and the establishment of post offices are somehow meant to provide a job for someone, or to give a contract to some carrier, be it an airline carrier, be it coastal boats, or what have you. But surely, Mr. Speaker, it is not too much for us to expect that the delivery of mail is a service for people and whether those people live in Pinware or whether they live in Ottawa, they are entitled to have their mail delivered.

The hon. member referred to cases where mail arrives in those smaller communities on a Friday afternoon and because of some bureaucratic organization, the mail is not delivered until Monday. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that person, who is not called back to work on Saturday, probably spent all day Thursday in the post office doing nothing. It is a lack of organization. We are only concerned with organization, we are not concerned with the people we are supposed to be serving in the first place. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see that the people of Pinware finally have spoken out. Let us listen to them. Let them speak loud and clear because it is their right. It is the responsibility of government to see that mail is

delivered to the people of Pinware and all the other rural communities around this Province at a time which is convenient to the people who are receiving the mail.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Orders of the Day.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I may speak with leave before we get into Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to draw the attention of the House to an accomplishment of one of the members of the House, namely, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), who has gotten an entire page in Time Magazine this week as being the recipient of the Time Magazine Quality Dealer Award for Newfoundland. Now, there are only thirteen of these given across Canada and the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, as a successful automotive dealer has been given the recognition of his peers. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be remiss of me if we permit this to go without notice by this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker.

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

Committee of Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I think the Opposition would like to discuss this in Committee for another three or four minutes, but before they do I just thought I would respond to a few remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) last day. I wrote them down unfortunately I am not sure I can read all my own writing here but I think I can read most of it.

One of the points that the Leader of the Opposition made was that the projections in the budget were very wrong in recent years. I do not intend to go into that in any great detail but just mention that I have answered that question a number of times in this House, and indeed in the media. If one looks back over the last few years, our revenue projections have been off and our expenditure projections have been off, but they have been off in the order of 1 per cent to 2 per cent. In other words, our revenues approximate \$2 billion a year, so if we are off by even \$50 million it is a very small percentage of that total amount. I think one also has to take into consideration the fact that we do not ourselves make all the projections, the federal

government makes about 50 per cent of the projections, so we are relying on a third party for some of the projections. Even considering that, the projections are off in the order of 1 per cent to 2 per cent. Well, it is not humanly possible to have any better projections than that, I submit.

Now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) also said that the budget in the last couple of years is meaningless because we bring in review statements on a periodic basis. The reason why we bring them in is that the figures change and on that basis you are saying the original figures are meaningless. Of course, that is not supportable either. We bring in review statements because we think it is in the best interests of the House of Assembly, and indeed the Province, to be updated in volatile times on what is going on with government accounts. I think if we did not bring it in we would be remiss. In former years it was not a practice, so it is a new practice, but in former years there was not that same volatility in the economy and we did not feel the need to do it. I might point out that some jurisdictions have been doing it for quite a considerable period of time, so we are really not breaking new ground; although I would like to break new grounds, it is always fun to break new ground, I have to admit that we have not been breaking new ground, we have just been doing something that certain jurisdictions have done for a certain period of time and I think it is a good practice.

On another point, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) it is on the note here, said something about 'goodies' in the upcoming

budget. I do not know what will be in the upcoming budget, no-one knows until 2:59 p.m. on Thursday, but anyway I am sure that they will not be put in the form of 'goodies', they will be put in the form of benefits. 'Goodies' has a sort of pejorative type of ring to it and we bring in things that are beneficial not just for the sake of bringing them in.

Two final points, the Leader of the Opposition commented on the size of the Interim Supply Bill this time, and it is sizeable, there is no doubt about it. The figure is just under \$650 million, but I would point out that last year we brought in a three month Interim Supply Bill and was just over \$600 million, so it is not that great a difference. The difference this year is very largely due to the capital expenditures, that we are permitted to put into the Interim Supply Bill if we inform the House about them, are rather higher this year than last year. So it is a sizeable amount but it is not out of keeping with the amounts that have been in Interim Supply Bills in recent years.

The final point I would just like to make is that we have to bring in an Interim Supply Bill because we have run out of authority to spend. Now, we are presently working under Lieutenant-Governor's Warrants and those Special Warrants run out on May 15, the day after tomorrow. If the warrants run out, government cannot pay its bills and one group that government cannot pay will be its public servants, the employees of government. Indeed, we usually like to get the cheques out before the due date - the due date is May 15 - because otherwise it is an

inconvenience to employees, many of whom rely on the timely receipt of their cheques to meet their ongoing daily expenses. So I just bring that to the attention of the Committee, knowing what a soft-hearted and generous type of people are involved in Committee considerations. With those few remarks, I again move the adoption.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In the discussion on the Interim Supply Bill, I would just like to bring into it the meeting I attended over the weekend involving the people who are running the West Coast of the Province. The Western Regional Economic Conference was held in Corner Brook. I thought it was quite a good conference involving many municipalities, councillors, people working in government, people working in business, etc. We were trying to address the problems of the running of the West Coast and improvement of the West Coast of the Province. It was a good conference; a lot of good discussion and a lot of good things came out of it. There was a number of hon. members of this House there, and I hope that they take heed of some of the good suggestions that were made. I certainly did. I will be bringing forth some of them forward to the other side in the near future if they are not taken into account. I must say it was a very good conference and I hope there are more in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What has it got to do with Interim Supply?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The Interim Supply Bill is involved in the running of the Province, payments and so on, involves the setting up of infrastructure, etc., as I link it up. The Stephenville district, I believe, is one that has been, taken for granted for a little while on the part of a lot of people. I see the improvement of Stephenville district being in procession of an industrial park for Stephenville, which we presently do not have. I think a misunderstanding that exists amongst many. The industrial park that was left to us over twenty years ago was an air base and it is presently falling apart, falling down.

The Harmon Corporation which was set up is doing a very credible job of maintaining what is left there, but there have been no new monies put in there in the recent past - I mean the really recent past. And if we do not do something soon the Stephenville area is going to suffer neglect and it is going to show by business starting to move out. It has happened in the very recent past also. If you go up there on the base, as we call it, or the Harmon Corporation, our industrial park has lots of old buildings with signs saying, 'Closed up. Had to move out.' One of the reasons for that was high electric rates and a combination of other factors. So I want tell to this House that I will be presenting a proposal for monies for the development or improvement of an industrial park for Stephenville because right now there is no new business going to come into the town because there is nowhere to go, there is nowhere to set up. I think there has been a misunderstanding for many a year

on the beautiful industrial park that we have there. They are planning a fair next year to bring back everybody who left in 1966. I was talking to a couple of gentlemen the other day who said they are going to run out of town because they do not want anybody to see the place when they come back. So I am hoping that between now and next year this House will see fit - I will make sure they will, anyhow I will try - that some monies are put towards the improvement of a nice, good, at least, decent industrial park which can invite business in. This was one of the main things that came out of the conference on the weekend in Corner Brook, inviting business in and making it presentable for them to come in and do good work, and to set up and create employment.

So I bring this to the House and I am sure that you will get much, much representation from me on that in the very near future. I hope that you will be receptive to the proposals that will be brought forward. I would like, as a matter of fact, to invite anybody who wants to come out in the near future - I will be approaching the minister - to have a look at the industrial park that is there. I do not like to call it that. It would like to call it an old air force base because that is pretty well what is left out there. I want somebody to come out and have a look at it and see if we can get something done about it. I think it will improve the whole Bay St. George area.

Concerning the Interim Supply Bill again, I hope that as soon as the budget is brought down we can get things rolling. I do not know if we will or not, but I sincerely hope so. I am sure that the next

budget will contain monies for an industrial park for Stephenville. I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman, we in the Opposition are asked to support an Interim Supply Bill, but we find it a little strange that we be asked to support something when we do not know, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said on Friday, what the deficit is going to be. The budgeted deficit was somewhere in the \$28 million range or something like that, but we know it has gone much over that. We think it is wrong that this government should ask for the support of this House for interim supply when we are not aware of what the deficit on the operating and capital cost accounts are.

In the Interim Supply Bill there is an amount of \$18,690,000 for forestry. During Question Period today there was a question raised about a Federal Forestry Centre for Corner Brook. Right now we have a strange situation that seems to be to show a little bit of mismanagement of forestry in this Province. We have a Provincial Forestry Centre which has moved to Corner Brook. We have a federal one that is in St. John's which we were promised would be moved to Corner Brook. It has not gone there. So it seems to me that they cannot work closely together if they are so far about. This was one of the arguments that was raised by the hon. the Premier when he came out and supported Corner Brook in October of 1982 to have this forestry centre established

there. So we feel that the Forestry Department in Newfoundland is not working at full efficiency, and it cannot unless they get their act together and settle down and find out exactly what the federal government is going to do towards building a new Forestry Centre in Newfoundland. Are we going to be once again passed over? They have one in New Brunswick now. Because the Federal Minister of Forestry (Mr. Merithew) is from there, he has announced that they are going to have a forestry centre there. Is that going to be enlarged and carried on so they will be able to say, 'We are going to centralize again and operate the forestry centre for the Maritimes from New Brunswick? Well Newfoundland once again be sloughed over? Will they say that we do not have the pulpwood in Newfoundland now, and, 'We have a forestry centre in New Brunswick which can adequately service the Maritime Provinces'? I do not think this is good enough. I think we in Newfoundland have been promised one. The Prime Minister in his election campaign this year came out and supported Corner Brook for a forestry centre, and now we find that it is on hold maybe for this year, maybe next year, maybe forever. So I think that the members opposite should wake up. Right now there seems to be some doubt as to whether there is an acting Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. When I asked a question in Question Period today, nobody seemed to know who is filling in and acting in that job. I think somebody should appoint an acting Minister of Forestry until we have the minister sitting in the House.

MR. CALLAN:

The Premier is now the boss.

MR. GILBERT:

Good I will ask him a question. I feel that there is problems in the forest industry in Newfoundland that have not been addressed. My colleague for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) brought one up last week which was sort of passed over rather quickly, but I think it is a very important point and should be looked into, particularly in view of the fact that forestry can be one of the major sources of employment in this Province if it is handled properly and managed properly. I do not think that this government has done it. I will give you a little example right now. We know there was a fire on the Bonavista Peninsula twenty years ago, but since that time that forest has grown up again unmanaged and the present growth that is there it is not going to be commercially of any value unless there is some reforestation done there with respect to thinning out and replanting. It is a well-known fact that a forest that is managed grows in about twenty years. One that is left to grow on its own without management takes fifty years and you still do not get a good growth.

If a Summer reforestation programme were to be carried out on the Bonavista Peninsula, as required, it would provide thousands of Summer jobs for the youth of Newfoundland. The government has been remiss in not doing this. The Bonavista Peninsula was one of the chief sources of forestry products for this Province down through the years until the unfortunate fire in 1961 and since then, nothing has been done with the Bonavista Peninsula. Consequently, there is no employment now in forestry in what was one of the most

prosperous areas in the Province with respect to the forest industry. The area from Gambo to Hare Bay was always looked upon as a very, very productive forestry area.

One of the members opposite talked the other day about private woodlots and he suggested that individuals get into forestry. Well, that is very good, but his government have given no indication that they are even thinking that way because, in the agreement that Kruger signed with this Province - no doubt it was a good agreement and it put Newfoundlanders back to work in Corner Brook - but it also gave Kruger all the timber rights and all the land in the Bonavista Peninsula area and in the Glenwood area. They are not using it and I do not know if they intend to. I think that government should seriously look at what has happened with the Kruger agreement on the Bonavista Peninsula and in the Glenwood area, and possibly take back the timber rights and give them to people who will use them to put Newfoundlanders to work.

Mr. Chairman, we have another industry that is forced upon us due to the high energy costs in Newfoundland. People have gone back to wood as a prime source of energy. I feel that the Forestry Department has been remiss in the management of this vital resource for private users and I think they should look into it, because if it is not managed properly, the people who are now dependent on wood as their source of heat are going to have to go further and further to get it because our forests are not being managed properly. Forestry should be managed so that the people of

Newfoundland can reap the benefits from this resource.

In the Bay d'Espoir area we have every year a log-cutting project which is provincially and federally funded. I understand that this agreement is in its last year. In the project this year, there is supposed to be \$800,000 to \$900,000 spent. The problem is that the 75 per cent of the people of Bay d'Espoir who are unemployed, are wondering what time this year the project will commence. There seems to be some vagueness when the Department of Forestry are approached about it: 'Well, we have to wait for the provincial budget', 'We have to wait until somebody gets back', but that is not much help to the 120 people in Bay d'Espoir whose very livelihood is dependent on this federal/provincial forestry agreement.

I again ask the government: What are they going to do about it? Have they arranged to sign a new federal/provincial forestry agreement to take care of some of the misery that is caused by unemployment in Bay d'Espoir? The 120 unemployed people down there have not been able to ascertain from the Forestry Department whether or not the project is going ahead this year. We know there is \$800,000 to \$900,000 there for the project. We know jobs are badly needed in the Bay d'Espoir area. And yet, the Department of Forestry is sitting back and saying, 'We have to wait.' I would like for the government to address that and give those people their answer, 'Yes, there are jobs and we intend to implement the programme this year.'

Now, we have, in conjunction with

that, the forestry project that has been ongoing in the Bay d'Espoir area for the last four years. It has been a cutting project, but nothing else has been done there. They harvest what they can to be sold and there has been no reforestation. Again, where we have an unemployment figure that is three times the provincial average, I think, in all seriousness, in the new forestry agreement there should be provision made to do a reforestation programme in the Bay d'Espoir area.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, there are 3,400 miles of gravel roads left in this Province.

MR. W. CARTER:
Kilometers.

MR. DECKER:

Kilometers? There are 3,400 kilometers of gravel roads in this Province. If all that gravel road were joined together, it would be about three times the distance from here to Port aux Basques. And the administration's attempt to pave this gravel road shows neither rhyme nor reason. There does not seem to be any planning.

To my mind, Mr. Chairman, what we have is crisis management. If a road is washed out, they send in some equipment and try to patch it up and do a little bit of paving. If there is a picket line or a road block somewhere in Newfoundland, they send somebody

there saying, 'Yes, next year we will come in' - crisis management. If there happened to be a by-election here or an election there, they pave some roads - crisis management. This is the way road paving has been handled by this administration over the past number of years.

There must be, I believe, some orderly way in which government can get its act together and do something about that 3,400 kilometers of gravel road and about the other hundreds of kilometers of distance between places where there is yet no road, not even a gravel road, not even a cow path. For example, the only way into Great Harbour Deep is by airplane or boat, or by Ski-doo in Winter. Crisis management will never get a road into Great Harbour Deep.

There must be some orderly way to cope with this problem. Mr. Chairman, when I talk about an orderly way, I am reminded of the orderly way of the Moores administration. The Moores administration had a Five Year Plan to pave the roads in Newfoundland. I was at a meeting of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities when the hon. the Premier told us that there was indeed a Five Year Plan. No longer would there be haphazard paving of roads in Newfoundland. 'Now there is going to be a Five Year Plan. You can come in and look at this plan and see exactly where and when your particular town is going to be paved.'

Mr. Chairman, I went to visit the Deputy Minister of Highways, who at that time was Mr. MacDonald. I asked him could I see the five year plan. "No," he said, "you cannot see that, that is an

internal document it is not for the public." I explained to him that the Premier had told the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities that the five year plan existed and that you could come and look at it and see just where you were. So the Deputy Minister said to me, "Now, which five year plan are you talking about?" I said, "The government has only been in power three years, there can be only one five year plan." "No," he said, "there has already been two five year plans in the space of three years." Now that did confuse me mathematically but when I am talking about a planned approach to paving the roads in this Province, I am not talking about a five year plan where you can bring down two of those five year plans in the space of three years.

MR. TULK:

No, what they do now is they keep moving it up a year.

MR. DECKER:

Oh that is how it is done. Well being new at this job, Mr. Chairman, I am not just sure how things are done.

MR. TULK:

You have to understand, Sir, a five year plan with this administration is just a gimmick.

MR. DECKER:

Oh, thank you, Sir. First I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we must recognize that we do have a problem here. We must recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there is a problem with gravel roads in this Province. I just returned from my district where I went to spend the weekend, the real problem is in the towns, that is where there is a concentration of traffic, Mr. Chairman. Now I see the Minister

of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) -

MR. FLIGHT:

Leaving.

MR. DAWE:

I will not go out of ear shot.

MR. DECKER:

When I say towns he probably feels that he is left off the hook, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DAWE:

The hon. member just reminded me of something I have to do.

MR. DECKER:

He probably thinks, Mr. Chairman, that when I talk about the towns that takes the responsibility away from him. But, Mr. Chairman, it does not take the responsibility from the Minister of Transportation. It puts it right back into his lap because every town in this Province has a section of road that is a government road, owned by the Department of Transportation. Usually this particular piece of road is the road from the entrance to the town to the government wharf. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I do not have to explain to you that this would not apply to Badger or some of our inland communities, but the vast number of towns and communities in Newfoundland are located along the ocean, near the sea, and normally the road through those towns which goes to the government wharf belongs to the Department of Transportation.

Does the Minister of Transportation, and this government, recognize the hardship and recognize how demoralizing it is to the people who live in those muddy towns day after day, 365 days a year? For some of our citizens 85 and 90 years of age,

can you imagine how demoralizing it is? And at this particular time of the year, Mr. Chairman, when the frost is coming out of the ground, the snow has just melted, we have nothing but mud gutters and no words of mine are bad enough to describe the misery, the discomfort, the agony that our people are going through by living in the midst of this mud. Mr. Chairman, if we continue at the rate that we have been going for the past number of years we will never, if this world goes on for an eternity, we will never see all the gravel roads paved in this Province because as soon as we get some paved they will be ready to be paved again. We will never get all the roads paved. But let us put some order into it, Mr. Chairman, let us recognize it, let us get in there with our Department of Transportation and do the roads in the towns first, the government portion. This will allow the town councils, where there are town councils, to take advantage of the paving equipment while it is in the area, and get a reduced rate to do the towns. That is the priority that I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should go with. I would like to see all the roads paved but being a rational person I know it is impossible for us to pave all the roads with our finances at the present time. But let us show the people of this Province that someone is concerned about them, that the government does care because they live in mud gutters, because their life is so miserable, because they dread to see the Spring come. They hate to see the month of October with its rains come, they hate to see a rainy day. Mr. Chairman, we have to do something about that and it is the responsibility of the government I maintain, Sir, to put

the priorities right, come up with a planned approach and do something and show that we care for the people of this Province who are suffering the misery of muddy roads. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Shall the resolution carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Chairman, asking for over \$600 million for interim supply with the budget being brought down Thursday, basically prompts one to ask the question, 'Why does the government need all the money when the budget itself is going to be brought in in a few days?' We all know, Mr. Chairman, that the reason we had the past election instead of having the budget which would normally come down at this time, was, of course, to have the election out of the way before the unemployment figures came out. We found out last Friday that youth unemployment is up now to 43 per cent or 45 per cent, and the Province's unemployment as a whole went up 2 per cent or 3 per cent.

With regard to the budget, we will find out, Mr. Chairman, in the next few days what is in the budget. I would go as far as to say with regard to taxes that I cannot see in actual fact the government getting away with not having to increase them. The interesting thing about this government is that since 1979 they have said, no, they have not raised taxes, but they go about it

an indirect way, raising licence fees for vehicles, for chopping wood, for marriages and birth certificates fees went up. One time, as I said before, you could get a laminated birth certificate for \$5, and now it is \$10 for just a piece of paper. I think back in 1978 it was \$2.

Mr. Chairman, the government asks for \$648 million. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) points out that our total revenue - and a majority of that, of course, is from the federal government in equalization payments, is \$2 billion. When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was speaking today about 43 per cent or 45 per cent unemployment among our youth, the Minister of Finance said, "Well, \$50 million over and above current supply is not really that much considering the state of the economy." But of the \$2 billion, Mr. Chairman, that this government brings in as our total budget, only \$2 million was set aside by this government for youth employment. Those are Summer jobs, Mr. Chairman, not permanent jobs. These are not jobs for the young people who are out of school, out in the work force trying to find jobs. I think the Leader of the Opposition said 56,000 young people are unemployed and that will not include the ones from the Trade School, the Fisheries College, the university and Grenfell College on the West Coast. So \$2 million is being allocated towards solving the problem of youth employment when we have a budget of \$2 billion and we have, as I said, over 56,000 or more young people. It goes to show that obviously the priority of this government is not on job creation. 'I want a mandate in order to create jobs' said the Premier. But the ones that are

affected most, Mr. Chairman, in this Province are our youth. Are we turning around and saying to them, 'Okay, if you want to set up a company we will give you less red tape and we will give you a grant'? Are we saying to the Grade XII students coming into Trade School or University, 'Your first year of tuition will be paid so that in the long term you will be paying more taxes back into the economy'? Are we coming up with innovative ideas to help our young people who have to create jobs for themselves, Mr. Chairman? And this is one of the messages, I think, that has to go out to the youth of our Province. If the youth of this Province continually sit and wait for this government to do something for them, then a lot of them, Mr. Chairman, will have arthritis and grow gray while they are waiting for this government to do something. So what has to be done, Mr. Chairman, is the youth of our Province have to also bear part of the responsibility in this way, and say, 'How can I create a job for myself? How can I try to create a job for somebody else?' And once these ideas come forward to the government, then the government has the responsibility to help in this way.

Two friends of mine last year ended up working for College Construction - I think that was the name of the company - which employs young students doing painting and other work on houses. Well, they worked with that company last year and this year they set up their own company and now they are in the process of bidding on a couple of houses. Those are the things, Mr. Chairman, that need to be done. But when they had to be incorporated, it cost almost

\$800. Now, would it not be much better for the government to turn around and say, 'Okay. You are setting up a company, you are unemployed youth, so we will give you a grant to help get this on the go.' And, the answer, of course, is there is no help whatsoever for the youth of our Province to help them become more innovative entrepreneurs and get them into free enterprise. The NDP member of the House will end up saying, 'Okay, just throw money at the problem,' but somebody has to foot the bill in the long run. And as I said, Mr. Chairman, when you have \$2 billion in this economy, in this budget, and we are only spending \$2 million on temporary Summer jobs, then there a lot of the hopes and aspirations of our younger people will be crushed.

The Premier's Office, the Executive Council, has approximately \$2 million spent on it in this bill, Mr. Chairman, \$2 million basically on the Premier's Office, and that is not counting other things that are hidden that they do not have to report. But approximately \$2 million is being spent on the Premier's Office and \$2 million is being spent on the youth unemployment in this Province, Mr. Chairman.

One of the things that we have in our Province is the relationship between the press and the House of Assembly. The press have their responsibility to cover news events in the House, outside the House, and in the Province as a whole, and to show the people the positive side of news, the negative side of news, and the reality of how things are. When a government starts cozying up to the press and throwing banquets and throwing cocktail parties and

that, one has to be a little bit cynical and ask the question, 'What is the government doing? Why is the government having dinners for the press media?' The press secretary to the Premier says it is because there are six new ministers and four changes in the Cabinet. That is the main reason for that broiled salmon luncheon at Holiday Inn on Friday. Then it lists the five people who did not attend including the new Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell), and the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power). So, Mr. Chairman, when you say that we had this dinner thrown for the press corps so that they could familiarize themselves with the new ministers and the changes, and the ministers do not even turn up, then obviously that is not the answer. The answer is, of course, that the media of the Province, as far as I am concerned, do do their job. I believe that the media have a responsibility to our Province and it is quite different from ours as elected people. I do not agree with the familiarization of calling somebody in the media by their first name and I also do not agree that the media should end up calling members of the House by their first name. I think there should be a professional distance.

MR. BAIRD:

What would you like them to call you?

MR. HISCOCK:

The member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) with the few votes that he ended up winning by should have a little bit of humility for a while, at least five or six weeks, in the House. But the end result is, Mr. Chairman, that he has no

humility.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make my maiden speech in the Fortieth General Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why we are here looking for interim supply - over \$600 million - is that this government, number one, has a certain fix with Spring elections, especially April elections. In this Province, Mr. Chairman, it is fast becoming the most popular pass time in the Province, far ahead of bingo and Another World. If you go back and count the number of elections in this Province since 1979, I think there have been about eight or nine. It is becoming more than an annual event when you count the federal and the provincial elections. That is, Mr. Chairman, the obvious reason why this Province does not have a budget almost up into the middle of May. Of course it is also another reason why, Mr. Chairman, we have the deficit that we have - \$1 million dollars wasted on an unnecessary election.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I thought you were going to talk

about Bas.

MR. CALLAN:

I will talk about Bas and Bellevue some other time when I have more time, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, speaking about Bas, I do not know why he did not win the election. It was not because he did not spend enough money out there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) road work (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

Well, that is a profound answer.

Mr. Chairman, I was in the Department of Municipal Affairs a few days ago talking to some civil servants and I saw a list there of the promises that were made, \$25,000 for Thornlea, which is in my district, and I mentioned here one day about the \$4,000 for the artesian well to repair it or something, perhaps to fill it up with water in Blaketown. I am told that these two are in the district of Bellevue. These are only a small portion of the many, many promises that were made during the election, the taxpayers, Mr. Chairman, being tantalized and being bought with their own money. Why Bas did not win the district, Mr. Chairman, I do not know. It is not because the PC party did not spend any money and, of course, it is not because government money was not promised. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that these commitments will be lived up to. There is a special order in Cabinet to look after these political promises during the election campaign, water and sewer projects. Of course, Bas was down in Southwest Arm, Mr. Chairman, and he promised that he was going to get some pavement for Southwest Arm,

Hodge's Cove and that area. He said he had a \$350,000 commitment then. I hope that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), who is now consulting with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will make sure that the good people in Hodge's Cove - 195 Tories and 38 Liberals - I hope that they are rewarded, Mr. Chairman, for their voting patterns because I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that unless they are paid for doing what they have been doing, and that is consistently voting PC, that after this last effort, I am sure that they will give up and say, 'We are sick and tired of being blackmailed with our own tax dollars.' The next time the vote will probably be just the opposite of what it was this last time, Mr. Chairman. I can see it happening for several reasons. Mr. Chairman, 52 per cent of the people in this Province in the last election voted against the Premier and his government and I would say, in another two and a half years or three years - it will not be any more than three for sure when we have the next election because the Premier cannot go over three years - Mr. Chairman, I would say the next time the Premier is gone.

I have found a couple of interesting things, Mr. Chairman, in the Throne Speech, number one, the Premier always ends off his Throne Speeches with a quote from his favourite Grade X literature book author, Alfred Lord Tennyson. He quoted him again this time and he did it last Spring, as he does practically every year. I have a little poem I would like to read for the Premier, Mr. Chairman. This poem was not written by Alfred Lord Tennyson. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the author of this

poem is anonymous, first cousin of unknown. Mr. Chairman, I think the poem suits the Premier because he is on the way out, there is no question about that. Even though he has erected a monument to his ego next door here and all over the Province the Premier is trying to erect monuments to his ego. But the people of the Province are beginning to see, Mr. Chairman, 52 per cent of them saw it a month or two ago and voted against the Premier. In another three years of do-nothing government, which is what we have seen for the past fourteen years of Torism, the people will finally get the message. This poem here, Mr. Chairman, says : "Sometime when you are feeling important" - as the Premier does all the time - "Sometime when you are feeling important/Sometime when your ego is in bloom/Sometime when you take it for granted that you are the best qualified in the room/Sometime when you feel you are going would leave an unfillable hole/Just follow these simple instructions and see how they humble your soul/Take a bucket and fill it with water/Put your hand in it up to your wrist/Pull it out and the hole that is remaining is a measure of how you will be missed" - directed at the Premier of course - "You can splash all you wish" - and the Premier does a lot of splashing during election time in particular - "You can splash all you wish when you enter/You may stir up the water galore/But stop and you will find that in no time it looks quite the same as before." So, Mr. Chairman, the moral in this quaint example is do the best that you can - and I think the Premier is doing the best, nothing, but that is his best - 'be proud of yourself but remember there is no indispensable man.' Mr. Chairman,

it is about time, and the people across the Province are beginning to realize it that this gentleman, who thinks he is indispensable, will be replaced one of these times. I would say, Mr. Chairman, it will happen in three or four years hence, or whatever it takes. We will replace him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:

We have the leader here, Mr. Chairman, who is ready to take over the Premier's job. This is the leader, Mr. Chairman, who cured the ills.

MR. TOBIN:

Is it true you wanted to come over here just before the election?

MR. CALLAN:

Never, never, never. It was a Tory lie that was spread through the district of Bellevue.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, now.

MR. CALLAN:

It is not the first Tory lie that was told in the district of Bellevue. They tried it every time, Mr. Chairman.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the minute or so that I have left - perhaps it is not even that long, is it? - this is the leader, Mr. Chairman, who cured the ills of the ERCO contract. He did not do as the hon. John Crosbie did when he was Minister of Finance here and represented the district of St. John's West here in the city. Mr. Chairman, John Crosbie's answer to the problems with the ERCO plant in Long Harbour was, 'Lay them all off, put them all on welfare and the Province would be better off.'

But this gentleman here, the next Premier of the Province, Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman who went out and sat down with ERCO officials, renegotiated the contract and saved the taxpayers of this Province \$168 million over the life of that ERCO contract. That, you see, Mr. Chairman, is action.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, I will get back to it some other time. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, in looking at the amount of money for Interim Supply, \$648,919,500, one of the main amounts of money is for Social Services \$38 million, almost \$39 million. When you look at the four departments that you would consider, Mr. Chairman, in this Province as the ones to cure our economic problems, to create jobs for our youth as well as for our general population, the Department of Development, \$12 million; the Department of Fisheries, \$6 million; Forestry, \$18 million; Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, \$10 million - there is more but I just rounded it out you have these four Departments - Development, Fisheries, Forestry, and Agriculture and they add up, Mr. Chairman, to \$38 million, and for

the total Social Services Department \$38 million. So, Mr. Chairman, it only goes to point the reality of the condition of our economy that the main source of employment is not the Department of Development, not the Department of Fisheries, not the Department of Agriculture or Forestry, the main department of development and job creation is Social Services. That is the stark reality, Mr. Chairman, of our Province. And yet, Mr. Chairman, the Province still feels that the Premier is the great white hope, is the one who is going to solve all of our economic ills.

Mr. Chairman, \$38 million for Social Services. If the truth were known, if we did not have \$17 million of the total in the Department of Social Services job creation to take the people off Social Services, where the Province is paying fifty cents of each dollar, on on to UIC after ten weeks or the twenty weeks, where they are entirely, 100 per cent, the responsibility of the federal government, if that programme of \$17 million for job creation was not there, then I would go so far as to say, Mr. Chairman, that Social Services would have to pay out would be close to the amount paid out by the Department of Health and the Department of Education.

It is a sad state for the Tory Administration of the past thirteen years to be in. For the past thirteen years they have said the Province was being bankrupted in the Smallwood years, when the unemployment was around 9 per cent and the debt of the Province over \$650 million. After thirteen years of the Tories we have 45 per cent unemployment among our youth,

28 per cent in our general population and, Mr. Chairman, looking at the other realities, no hope on down the line. The other part, Mr. Chairman, moreso than anything else, is with the state of the economy, and the 56,000 youth of our Province who are unemployed, plus unemployment in the general population, the reality is if you want a job you have to know a Cabinet minister, number one; if you do not know a Cabinet minister then you have to at least know a member of the government side, and your political affiliation is questioned, Mr. Chairman. If you worked on a campaign and were a Tory, then you could maybe end up qualifying for a job. If you want a job offshore, you have to be a Tory, you have to be from St. John's.

MR. DAWE:

Do not be so silly.

MR. HISCOCK:

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has the arrogance to say 'Do not be so silly.' Who turns around and gets on T.V. in this Province, saying, 'Of course, we give money to PC districts. Of course we work and co-operate with our friends, Mr. Chairman?' And he has the arrogance, Mr. Chairman, to say that people who want a job do not have to have PC affiliation. And I would go so far as to say, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to jobs in this Province and the number of jobs that he has gotten for people in his district, I can darn well assure you, Mr. Chairman, that they were PCs. It is the same thing with all the other ministers, Mr. Chairman, in this government, whether it is to do with the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Rural,

Agricultural and Northern Development or any other. The PC candidate who ran against me in the last election - and more power to him for offering himself - I do not even know if he resigned from his position.

MR. TULK:

Who was that?

MR. HISCOCK:

It is not advisable to mention people's names in the House.

MR. TULK:

What was his position?

MR. HISCOCK:

He was a Rural Development specialist in the district of Eagle River. He ended up running in the district, and more credit to him, he is a decent man. But the end result, Mr. Chairman, was when the election was over he was back at his job two days later and I do not even know if there was any advertising for that position, if the person has been on leave or whatever.

MR. TULK:

Did he lose any pay?

MR. HISCOCK:

Or lose any pay. Again, an Executive Assistant to the former Minister of Fisheries ran in the campaign and then went back into his job. And another candidate who ran for the PC nomination then went back again into a PC job, Mr. Chairman. All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is if people want jobs in this Province, then you have to know a Cabinet Minister or you have to know a person of a PC stripe.

The Department of Education created, Mr. Chairman, the position of Attendance Officer, to

keep track of the number of students who were not attending school. Who gets that position? Was that position advertised?

MR. TULK:

No.

MR. HISCOCK:

Was that position advertised in the general media? No. One of the personal friends of the Premier got the position. If you go and check on other jobs, the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board is a former Cabinet Minister, and you can go on down the line. We are only waiting now for the defeated PC candidates wondering when their heads are going to rise and we find out that they are put on some board or made chairman of some committee. So the dark reality is, Mr. Chairman, we have one of the highest rates of unemployment in all of Canada, we have the highest form of taxation, we have an expenditure of \$2 billion and in order to get at that \$2 billion you have to be a Tory. Mr. Chairman, the people on this side, and the people of the represented districts on this side, ended up saying, 'We are not going to be bought with our own money. We are going to stand tall. We are not going to be intimidated.' They did not take this blarney that the members for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) were talking, that in order to get anything you have to be on the government side. So they go on their hands and knees and prostrate themselves in front of the Premier and say, 'Could I have \$500,000 for a road? Could I have \$200,000 for the school in Nain?' Mr. Chairman, the nineteen districts on this side ended up saying no to that. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, that idea has

been cracked. If this government and the ministers continue to practice their arrogance on funding only PC areas, Mr. Chairman, then the full population of the Province will get on to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. HISCOCK:

Could I have silence, Mr. Chairman, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province expect better leadership from elected officials and they expect hard work and determination and they expect new ideas. Unfortunately, with the government being re-elected after thirteen or fourteen years in power, there are no new ideas. The Cabinet Ministers are tired almost into semi-retirement.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like a little notice next time, Mr. Chairman, probably one minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, it gives me great a privilege today to rise again and put forward some of the views that the people of Bonavista North so overwhelmingly elected me to do.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, there is some question about the legality of what we are doing today. It has come up on several occasions, and I understand that there are officials within the Department of Finance who object to the kind of procedure that we are going through today. That is an issue that has to be addressed. If we are going to function properly, if we are going to do the people's business properly, then certainly we must do what is legal, what is constitutionally legal, what is legislatively legal. There is some question about the way the government of the day is now dealing with this particular issue, there is some question as to the legality of this procedure. Mr. Chairman, this has to be addressed and has to be answered unequivocally, that what we are doing is, indeed, legal, when we are talking about such large sums of money. Mr. Chairman, that is an issue that certainly should be addressed, and cleared up, so that this House does not find itself in that situation of playing around with the people's money.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be the first to give approval to this Interim Supply Bill if I knew what was happening to the money, if I knew that the hon. gentlemen opposite were spending the money fairly and equally, that they were dispersing this money in a fair and equal way to all areas of the Province. Past experience tells me that that is not the way it has been done, but, again, we can only

give the benefit of the doubt and hope that government have changed their ways, that they see this as a method that will surely backfire, one that started to backfire in this past election. I believe that if hon. gentlemen opposite learned anything it was that the people of this Province want to see the money spent fairly. In addition to it being spent efficiently, they want to see it spent fairly and equally in all regions of this Province. I certainly will be watching this and will be a person who will speak out if I see any indication at all that the people's money, the taxpayers' money of this Province is spent equally and fairly in all parts of this Province. That is what has to be done, Mr. Chairman. Our people are beginning to wise up, they are beginning to become very astute, and they are beginning to watch the expenditures of government. And if there is one thing that I pick up in my travels throughout my district and other districts, it is that the people want to see the money spent fairly and equally throughout all areas of the Province. They want to get the benefit of government grants and government job creation programmes. They want to get the benefit of all of these things equally. If we are giving out money for roads, they want to see that the money is spent fairly, they want to see that they are getting their fair share. I am sure you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that that is only reasonable. It is right and proper, it is a just demand, that everybody in every area can expect to get back a proportion of their tax dollars to be spent on services such as roads and water and sewer. All taxpayers of this Province expect that kind of just, fair and equal

treatment. We certainly hope that that will be the procedure that this government will follow in the next few years, and that they will take the high road, Mr. Chairman. I should not be telling them this, Mr. Chairman, because that will only ensure their re-election. I should not tell them that, because if they are going to spend the moneys equally and justly, it is likely to ensure their re-election. What is going to ensure their defeat is doing it the other way.

MR. CALLAN:

That is right.

MR. LUSH:

We on this side should be advocating that procedure, because we know that the people are so fed up with that kind of treatment that they will not accept that procedure again, they will not accept this partisan way of divvying out the moneys in this Province. They will not accept it, Sir! So, we on this side should not be advocating that, because we know if this government carry on their past practices, they are going to be self-destructive. These practices will be self-destructive. But again, Mr. Chairman, when they become inebriated and intoxicated with power, you can give all the advice you want and neither the Premier nor any of the Cabinet ministers will follow it. That is what happens when one becomes inebriated and intoxicated with power. One loses all sense of fair play, all sense of justice, Mr. Chairman, and all sense of equality. So I guess whatever we say, they are not going to listen to that. If there was one lesson driven home to a government, one lesson that hon. members opposite should have learned, it was that

the people of this Province want their money spent and distributed fairly and equally through all regions of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. J. CARTER:

Do you mean give it to all Liberal districts first?

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman can only think in a partisan way. Equal distribution does not mean giving it to Liberal districts or P.C. districts or N.D.P. districts, it means giving it out equally regardless of political affiliation, regardless of how people voted, Mr. Chairman. That is what we believe in as a democracy. We do not believe in punitive measures, we believe in distributing the money equally. Mr. Chairman, that is the type of government that I want to belong to, a government that believes in distributing our moneys fairly and equally. And, if hon. members opposite want me to cross the floor, that is one way that I will cross the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

If I find the government I am a part of is not distributing the moneys fairly and equally, then I will take my walk and I will take it quickly, Mr. Chairman. Because I will stand up for rights of the people of this Province at any time on any day. And when I see the moneys of this Province not being spent properly, not being spent equally, not being spent fairly by any government I am part of, then, Mr. Chairman, I will take the walk!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:

How about if the member is no damn good (inaudible)?

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, that is a policy that the hon. gentleman should not raise. That is a statement that he should not want me to get into and, Mr. Chairman, I will ignore it. Because if I begin dealing with it, I will have to make some statements that are not characteristic of this member and I am not about to do it. But if there is one word of advice, Mr. Chairman, that I will leave to the government to ensure their re-election, if they will listen, it is to spend their moneys fairly, equally and justly through all regions of this Province. I hope when we get into the Estimates committees to have more to say on that, and by that time we may be having some indication as to just how this government is operating, when we see the moneys, capital funding, for water and sewer projects and roads.

I see that Mr. Chairman is looking at the clock. I am glad he is not looking at the calendar.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for bearing with me.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, during the recent election, we saw, for the first time, I suppose, since the early 1970s, the N.T.A. and the provincial unions becoming very heavily involved in election proceedings. Students of our Province who have studied the process of democracy have probably, for the first time, had a good look at the political process. They saw a Premier and a government taking the people for granted, Mr. Chairman. Rather than the normal four-year term governments usually serve, they have seen the third election in six years.

MR. CALLAN:

Constitutionally it is five.

MR. HISCOCK:

It may be five, but traditionally it is four years.

Students of democracy are also taught that the Premier and his Cabinet are responsible for government policy and for maintaining an 'open' government. Did the young people of this Province see openness on the part of this government? Was the Premier, at the beginning, willing to enter into public debate? Was he willing to make himself accessible to the people? Did we see the Premier of this Province meeting with labour groups prior to the election? The answer is no, Mr. Chairman.

Because they thought they were ruling by Divine Right and because of the fact there was a P.C. government in Ottawa, they thought they would be returned with forty-eight or forty-nine seats, but they ended up getting their wings clipped!

Mr. Chairman, the Premier should not have called an election so quickly. If he had had any decency, he would have extended the election call beyond twenty-one days.

As a result of all of this, Mr. Chairman, we are now having dinners for the press, entertaining them, and saying, Come on side, we may be able to tuck you away in one of the departments, get you a job which pays \$10,000 or \$15,000 more. Maybe we are going to see the role of the media in this Province the same as that in BC and Ontario, and maybe a couple of the other provinces.

With regard to the teachers and the unions exercising their right, we had the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), a couple of days after the election, accusing the leaders of the unions of hypocrisy, of having no courage. He also said that if they wanted to criticize and chastise government, then they should have come out as candidates in the election. The hon. minister made those statements because the union leaders were standing up for their workers, and because the President of the NTA said, "No, we do not accept the conditions of our schools, we do not accept the roll-backs and the reduction of teachers and the classroom size, we do not accept all these things."

And it was the same thing with the Fishermen's Union and NAPE. Because they wanted to exercise their rights, they, too, were told that they should have been out on the campaign trail running as candidates.

Mr. Chairman, speaking of democracy and fairness, after

members opposite were elected, were some of the members who had a close fight in their campaign gracious men who said to their constituents, "Thank you for re-electing me, thank you for voting for me"? Did they do that? No. The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) got up and talked about the teachers in his constituency who fought against him, and named them. And the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) did the same thing. In his acceptance speech, instead of being gracious and thanking the people of Placentia for re-electing him - I think probably for the fifth time now - he got up and lambasted the teachers, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, I would you request my colleagues to be quiet?.

One of the things we as a society cannot afford to tamper with is attitude. Students of this Province look to the House of Assembly for leadership, they look to their teachers for leadership, and they look to their communities for leadership. But because their teachers exercised their democratic right, you have members, and ministers, and parliamentary assistants getting up and criticizing that professional group while our young people are listening. Mr. Chairman, for this government to turn around and punish the union people of this Province, whether they be the NTA, the Fishermens Union, or NAPE, is nothing but an act of vengeance.

Also, I am absolutely amazed that a former teacher who crossed the

floor, a former Liberal, now a parliamentary assistant who is supposed to give leadership to all of Labrador, would get up and attack the teachers. There are 10,000 teachers in this Province, and because one or two were rather zealous during the campaign, what is happening, Mr. Chairman? The whole teaching profession is being tarred with the one brush.

MR. PATTERSON:

The teachers tarred themselves with their own brush.

MR. HISCOCK:

That is the attitude, that is the vengeance of the member for Placentia, The teachers tarred themselves with their own brush. Mr. Chairman, if the teachers tarred themselves with their own brush, then I would say that this government is going to make sure that conditions for the proper education of our younger people are going to be withheld from them. I think that that attitude has to change. If it does not, we are going to see nothing but hatred and vengeance. And I truly believe that is the attitude over on the other side.

And speaking about hatred, there is probably no member in this House of Assembly more hateful than the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) when it comes to the former, former Premier of this Province, other than the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

Mr. Chairman, education and democracy and the right to exercise one's franchise is something sacred. Within the past couple of days we celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the victory over the hatred, violence, and inhumanity to man by the

Nazis. But because Canada has the Charter of Rights, we are supposed to live in a society that is much better. Yet, when our unions and other people exercise their rights, we get a parliamentary assistant, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), and the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) accusing them of hatred. And, I am sure that when the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), comes back, he is going to continue in the same manner.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this government will not exercise vengeance towards the students, and that we will get proper funding for education. And I am not talking about salaries, I am not talking about education. There was an article in the paper about the school in St. Genevieve's, Mr. Chairman, which mentioned the fact that \$100,000 was needed to repair the roof, to replace faulty fluorescent lights, and also tiles. The member for Placentia, when he states the teachers tarred themselves with their own brush, is not necessarily concerned about those school conditions, is he?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Chairman, there is \$106 million for education, just for interim supply. I would not blink an eyelash, Mr. Chairman, if I knew that that money was going to be taken and spent wisely, if that

money was going to be spent as wisely as the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) would spend his own personal money. But when I see the way that the Education budget has been spent in this Province throughout the years I am convinced, Sir, that this money is going to be taken and it is going to be wasted. It is not going to be spent wisely, it is not going to do anything for the benefit of education in this Province. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it could well set back the cause of education in this Province. That is the unfortunate thing. That is what has been happening to education in this province, \$106 million is taken to make education worse than it was before the \$106 million was given.

MR. TOBIN:
Why do you say that?

MR. DECKER:
This is why I say that, take bussing: There seems to be a belief that in some supreme edict, that bussing is good. Therefore, if bussing is good every student in this Province has got to be bussed. Mr. Chairman, bussing in many cases is actually a hinderance to education. There are places in this Province where students are being bussed as much as fifty kilometers in the morning and bussed back another fifty kilometers in the afternoon. We are bussing students one hundred kilometers a day.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That was a Liberal concept.

MR. DECKER:
Whether it is a Liberal concept, Mr. Speaker, or a NDP concept is irrelevant. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we are taking children five years of

age and, like cattle, we are loading them on buses which are little better than trucks to begin with, and they are not even required to wear seat belts on those buses.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is true.

MR. DECKER:

Five-year-old children, in the name of education, are being bussed over gravel roads. Is this the way we are going to spend our education budget, Mr. Chairman? Why should you ask us to authorize the spending of another \$106 million, to take our little children and treat them like animals and bus them over the worst roads in our Province, Mr. Chairman? What about the student/teacher ratio in this Province, Mr. Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Twenty-three to one.

MR. DECKER:

Twenty-three to one, the teacher/pupil ratio, Mr. Chairman. This is what the teachers were talking about in addition to their salary. And yet the whole issue was blurred and all we saw was a bunch of greedy, selfish people trying to get an increase in wages. They were talking about the teacher/student ratio. And because of the teacher/student ratio, Mr. Chairman, children in the Strait of Belle Isle cannot get the opportunity to study biology in the schools, cannot get the opportunity to study chemistry in the schools. Yet, Mr. Chairman, I will admit that the amount of money that is being spent on education in this Province is as high or higher than it is in any other Province of this nation. We

are taking money and we are wasting it in our education budget. This is what we are doing, Mr. Chairman. We are asking now for \$106 million to waste, to blow, to throw out of the window in exactly the same way that we have been throwing it out over the years into education. The teacher/pupil ratio is a curse. It is a hinderance to education in this Province. It is time for some one to have the courage -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is the way you got yours.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

- to get in there and do something about the teacher/student ratio. Is this why you are asking for \$106 million? No, it is being asked for to be wasted and to be blown like the education budget has been doing for the last thirteen years. Mr. Chairman, is this \$106 million going to be used so that teachers can come into university and qualify with a degree in history, or a degree in mathematics, or a degree in what have you, and end up teaching in schools out of their discipline? Is this what they are going to do with this money, to take a man and give him a Masters Degree in History, a Grade XI in French, and put him out in the schools teaching French for which he is not qualified? Is this what the money is going to be spent for, this kind of waste?

I see surprise on the faces of the members opposite. I believe they are surprised, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe they know that this has been going on, but they should have known because it is their

place to know. Teachers qualified in history, Grade XI in French or Grade IX in French, and perhaps no French at all, are out teaching French. Is this what we are going to do with our \$106 million, Mr. Chairman?

My friend and colleague referred to the leaky roof. I know about that leaky roof because I happened to have been the Chairman of the School Board in that very district where that leaky roof existed. And I can tell you the struggle that we have had to try to get \$100,000, not \$1 million, not \$2 million, not \$106 million, one measly \$100,000 to fix a leaky roof so the tiles would not fall down on the students. This is what we were trying to get. But to get at that money, Mr. Chairman, was impossible. You see, this \$106 million is going to be wasted, tied up, wasted on things which are relevant, and not applied to leaky roofs.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been made about the amount of money that is allocated for education this year. Let me ask how many schools are being built under the Integrated Education Council in this coming year? Would you believe that there is not a single new structure going up this year by the IEC.

MR. WARREN:

It is not true.

MR. DECKER:

I asked you would you believe it?

MR. WARREN:

It is not true.

MR. DECKER:

And the reason is, Mr. Chairman, is because there is not enough money -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

Check it. - for the IEC to meet its maintenance and to meet the regulations of the Fire Department. This is what has been happening to the spending of money by this Department of Education. Not a single new structure, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TOBIN:

What is your solution?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, be quiet!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, we have to have a wise approach, a sensible approach.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, borrow it.

MR. DECKER:

The money is being spent, Mr. Chairman, but the money is being wasted. I believe men of goodwill, men of common sense - who I would hope and pray are on both sides of this hon. House - I would hope that we can find a sensible, reasonable way so that the child in the Strait of Belle Isle who is being bussed one hundred kilometers a day will have seen something done with teacher/student ratio, so that we can keep these little children in their own little communities.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It cannot be done.

MR. DECKER:

It can be done, stick a couple of extra teachers in. But, no, the approach is to take the money and waste it on bussing contracts. The amount of money wasted on bussing contracts could well put

teachers in these classrooms so that we would not have to be bussing our children a hundred kilometers a day, Mr. Chairman, and then this government has the audacity to say, we want \$106 million for interim supply for the Department of Education to which I say, you want \$106 million that you throw down the drain. You are misspending the money. The money is being misspent.

I see nothing wrong with taking our money and spending it on Education, Transportation, Social Services or spending it on any other department of this government, but it has to be spent prudently, wisely and sensibly, as if we personally were spending our own money. That is the approach that I would like to see, Mr. Chairman. When we talk about spending money on Education, when we ask for \$106 million, I have seen no evidence that this has been spent prudently in the past. All I see is people spending money as if the old adage was true that money does grow on trees, that nobody has to account for it, it is just a matter of throwing it out there regardless of the value we get for our money. Mr. Chairman, if you or I were going into a store to buy something personally we would be very careful and we would examine that product that we are buying and we would possibly try to negotiate a lower price. This is not happening with this government. We are taking the money and we are spending a lot of it, God knows we are spending a lot of it, but, Mr. Chairman, it is not being spent wisely, it is not being spent prudently, it is money wasted and \$106 million, I would assume - if we are to assume that the money has been spent in the past is any example - that \$106 million for

interim supply for the Education portfolio alone is \$106 million of the people's money which is going to be taken again and thrown away in the same silly way that it has been thrown away by the Department of Education for the past thirteen years, teachers teaching outside their discipline, students not able to take advantage of the sciences in 1985. In 1985 there are students in Newfoundland who are not able to study Biology, students in Newfoundland who are not able to study Chemistry, students in Newfoundland who are not able to study Physics. Mr. Chairman, this is an utter waste, this is a disgrace to the Twentieth Century. We cannot afford to see this waste any longer. That interim of \$106 million should be more like \$50 million if we were prudent, if we were wise and if we spent this money as we would spend our own money.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, just as a change of pace, you know whatever is said in this House goes into a document that is published called Hansard. Fortunately, no one reads it because I think that if they ever read it, and read the garbage that is spoken in this House, it would be a disaster for the Province.

I did have to rise to my feet because the hon. member who sat down - incidentally I like to respond to the Opposition back to front because that seems to be to appropriate with the remarks that come from there, you need to respond from back to front to be in tune with them - the hon. member who sat down is a new member. There is a certain amount of latitude given to new members in the House, but I must admit I am finding that new member very tiresome in his remarks. He makes wild, unsubstantiated statements that are, one, totally inconsistent with the other. He makes wild statements like, 'Money is wasted,' and not a shred of evidence that there is any waste, not an example, not a comment, and then, on the other hand he will turn around and say, 'Not enough money.' So on the one hand it is waste, and on the other hand it is not enough, and it is all garbagely, wild-eyed, unsupported statements. I must admit, sometimes hon. members opposite will make remarks like that and they are rather amusing, but I find his diatribes tiresome. I have heard him for a number of days now and I really find him tiresome. I hope that he will change his approach in the near future.

Now, let us go out a little bit more back to front. One of the members, at least the bottom remark I have here, says that we are giving too much money to the Department of Social Services, I think it was the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). He expounded at some length that we were giving too much money to the Department of Social Services.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

A point of order the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) get his quotes straight, unlike his budget where there are revised editions all of the time. If he is going to quote me, at least he should be quoting me right. I did not criticize any amount of money that is being paid out for the Department of Social Services. It is a stark reality. But I did say that there is more money being spent on that than there is for the Development Department. So if he is quoting me in saying that I do not agree with the money being spent there, that is not correct, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

What the hon. member has just said has substantiated my remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) says we are spending too much money on social services. He reiterated it a number of times. As a matter of fact, he compared what we are spending there with certain other departments to underline that we are spending too much money on social services. Now, I do not know if he is reflecting the

policy decisions of the opposite side, I do not believe he is. I think that those statements were so foolish that they could not even have come from the Liberal Party, so I believe he is on his own in making that remark.

On another point that was brought up, I should, in actual fact, give the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) his just due. The hon. the member for Eagle River is learning. He has been in the House a certain number of years now and I can detect a very definite upward learning curve because, if you listen very carefully to what he said today, he moved off the traditional Liberal approach to employment encouragement which always has been 'Just throw the money out, have it totally unaccounted for, it does not matter what it is thrown on, you can spend it on anything as long as you put it out there, you do not have to plan it, you do not have to try to get any return on it, just put it out there and hope that you will get some benefit in the regard of the electorate.' But the hon. the member for Eagle River sort of said that to some extent today, but, then he did get into saying people have to use their own initiative too. He did mention that. So I found the first glimmer of sense I have detected in any Liberal member in terms of the use of public money for the benefit of unemployed people. It is only a small little chink, it is only a small little glimmer, but any learning effort on the other side is something that we should encourage, so I think that the hon. member is to be complimented for that.

Someone else was saying that we do no road paving in this Province,

on the other hand, we are continually getting lambasted for doing too much road paving. This is the usual inconsistency we get from the other side. On the one hand, there is thousands and thousands of kilometers of unpaved in the Province and we have not done anything about it, we have been in for six years and there has been no improvement - we get that - and then, on the other hand, we hear members standing up saying there is too much paving going on in this Province, district after district you see nothing but tractors and paving machines in them.

Another point was that I should be laying out the deficit at this point in time, giving details on the deficit in our last year's budget during the Interim Supply Bill. I just take that as a bit of debating, a little bit of rhetoric, because the hon. members who have been in here for any length of time know that the accounts of the Province are laid out in detail in the Budget Speech. They have to be laid out so the proper context is set. It is pointless to come out with a single figure and say such and such. That does not give any information. It would only be used in the most argumentative way in any case. That sort of information has to be presented logically and with all of the other backup information with it. Of course, that is what we will be doing in the Budget Speech shortly.

So, Mr. Speaker, just as a change of pace, to try to get back to some sense of reality, rather than hearing the continual wild emotions from the other side, I thought I would just try to bring the Committee back to the Interim Supply Bill, which we are suppose

to be debating and hope that we can get this bill passed. I think that all the items that need to be discussed will be discussed at considerable length when the main estimates come down very shortly. Hopefully, we can get this resolution passed and the bill in so that the members of the public service, who need to be paid very shortly - I think there is already some delay in them getting their cheques - but the members of the public service who will need to be paid can be paid very shortly so that there will not be any delay in our paying the suppliers, the small businessmen of this Province, the people who supply goods and services in good faith to this Province, that they will not be unduly and unnecessarily held up in receiving payment.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had no intention of speaking in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but the minister dragged me in. We have been asked for a great amount of money in Interim Supply, Mr. Chairman, one third of the budget. When I sought election in the first instance in 1975, I could have, had I wanted to, and I could have got away with it, as I went door to door in my district, I could have wrote down the names of young people in my district who were looking for work. And by the time the three week campaign was over, it may have been realistic to believe that I could have dealt with the number that were unemployed. I may have had 100 names from my old district and I could have used my influence maybe with service stations, the Sobey's of the world, the Dominion's of

the world, or the parks and probably placed forty or fifty young people, which would not have been bad. Any member campaigning in this last election, 1985, would have been mad, he would have been laughed out of town, if he ever indicated that he was prepared to list the names of the young people in his district who were unemployed and indicate that he would try to help them get work. In the town of Windsor today, Mr. Chairman, probably nine out of ten houses have got anywhere from one to three, from twenty-five to seventeen, not working today and have not worked for two years. It is a national disgrace, Mr. Chairman, it is a provincial disgrace, it is a disaster. And, Mr. Chairman, I watched money being spent in this Province and I wondered about priorities. There is a seminar going on in Houston right now and I wonder what it is costing to have the Newfoundland contingency in Houston, and I wonder who these people are. They can be named, Mr. Chairman. I wonder how many short-term jobs could be created with some of the money that we would have saved if these people had not gone to Houston? For what purpose are some of the civil servants down there? How will the Newfoundland treasury or the Province of Newfoundland benefit?

Mr. Chairman, I attended the function, not by invitation but, because I had the gall to walk into it, myself and another member sitting on this side of the House, walked into Holiday Inn a couple of nights after the Atlantic Accord was signed. And I wonder, Mr. Chairman, how many short-term jobs could have been created with the money that was spent for the booze party? And that is what it was, Mr. Chairman, there was booze

flowing on the floor, refreshments we call it. I wonder if that was a priority. Did the Premier make it a priority or the Minister of Energy (Mr. Dinn) make it a priority to authorize a booze party at Holiday Inns to celebrate the Atlantic Accord? I wonder how much it cost, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to have a guest list. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was not there because he was not allowed there then. He had not taken the walk. He had not named his price. If he was there he was probably ashamed to be seen, Mr. Chairman, he was probably standing off in the corner by himself.

Mr. Chairman, the minister wants specific questions. When the minister gets up, let him tell us what it cost to finance that party at Holiday Inns. It is a good thing it did not happen before the beer strike, Mr. Chairman. There was still plenty of beer around this Province. So let the minister tell us why it was necessary in these times of restraint to charter the Holiday Inns and all the salons over there, Mr. Chairman? Bars were set up in every outlet in the place. How much did it cost and how much of this Interim Supply is going to pay that bill? Let the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) tell us about the trips that have been authorized by this administration. The former Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and the former Minister of Mines (Mr. Dawe) went to the Far East. Can anyone in this Province, Mr. Chairman, point to one thing that has been accomplished by the trips that these minister have been making around this world?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, Oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

The Minister of Development will get into the debate now in a few minutes or the ex-Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR:

No, I am not going to react to that kind of small-mindedness.

MR. FLIGHT:

He tried to react in the press after he came back and did not do a very good job. It was not very credible, Mr. Chairman. The truth of the matter is that the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) took advantage of the fact that he was the Minister of Development for Newfoundland and, at public expense, took a trip around the world. That is the basic truth, Mr. Chairman. That trip could have put three or four young people in this Province to work.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Have you ever had a trip around the world?

MR. FLIGHT:

The ex-Minister of Forestry, the now Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) back in 1980, I think, spent three weeks in the Scandinavian countries and the reason being he was telling them he was going to maximize the benefits from the forest industry. Can anyone in Newfoundland point to one change in the forest industry, one job created, or one industry started?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Silviculture.

MR. TULK:
Who said that?

MR. FLIGHT:
Silviculture! On the day the Throne Speech was read, Mr. Chairman, somebody said that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) made a great speech. It was his first and it was his last. I will yield the floor right now for the member for LaPoile if he would stand up in this debate and allude to some of the things I am talking about.

So we are talking waste here, Mr. Chairman, unbelievable waste. It is wasteful to have twenty-two Cabinet Ministers in this Province. It is wasteful. It is the worst kind of political patronage. The Premier wishes to stand up and tell us how many people on that side of the House are not getting extra pay, Mr. Chairman. And if that money was pooled how many short-term jobs could that create for some students?

MR. WINDSOR:
Perhaps we should (inaudible) the district of Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Perhaps you should not. We did not have a member for three years and we have not had a government there so we might do ourselves some good. We have not had a government as it relates to Windsor - Buchans.

So, Mr. Chairman, I may get into this again. I am not going to get into whether or not we are spending too much money on welfare. I know how much money is needed in my district. We have a welfare district because it was created by this government. The reason we are spending so much

money on welfare in the last thirteen years is because this government has not been able to look at anything else but welfare.

MR. TOBIN:
How about the Employment Opportunities program of the Department of Social Services?

MR. FLIGHT:
What about it?

MR. TOBIN:
It created 8,000 jobs.

MR. FLIGHT:
What about it - 8,000 jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

MR. FLIGHT:
You know, the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier should have a bit more sense than interrupting in debate. Normally that particular office is served by some other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
Why does not the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier take his money and sit quietly like every other Parliamentary Assistant has done. He is probably next to Cabinet. He might make it to the Cabinet if he stays there long enough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman, I want to hear the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) address himself to some of the sources of waste, pure, blatant waste, that we have seen in this Province for the past three years - the trips, the booze parties and now we have another one today. How many dollars of the Interim Supply Bill is going to fund that kind of thing?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Cocktail parties.

MR. FLIGHT:
Cocktail parties. There was some cocktail party at the Holiday Inn. They can close up for the next year and still live on the profit they made that night.

MR. TULK:
The Premier is going to take the media down again now. 'Graham', the Premier is going to take the media down again now.

MR. FLIGHT:
Yes, he is going to bring the media down.

So the former Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Windsor) is going to stand up in a minute and tell us how Newfoundland benefitted by his trip down to the Far East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Chairman, why does not the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) stand up and tell us about the millions and millions of dollars that is wasted in Newfoundland Hydro? Tell us what happened to Cat Arm and why it doubled? That is our money, that came out of Interim Supply. We are going to have to sign a loan

bill now shortly for Newfoundland Hydro for the millions they wasted at Cat Arm. The Minister of Mines and Energy will stand up the once and tell us why that is. How much of the Interim Supply Bill is that going to cover?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Chairman, the minister will get up shortly and tell us what happened and he will justify the waste we are seeing at Newfoundland Hydro.

Mr. Chairman, I will give one of my colleagues a chance. I will come back into this debate again. As a matter of fact, some of the points that I raised need to be dealt with by that minister.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to take part in the Interim Supply Bill debate. I am very pleased for a couple of reasons, first of all, it gives me an opportunity to express an opinion about something that concerns me very deep. And also, Mr. Chairman, it gives me a chance to find out that the backbenchers on the other side are in fact alive. They actually move and talk and so on. It is good to know that things are well on the backbenches.

I have enjoyed the speakers this afternoon, with the exception of the second last speaker. I think that this particular debate serves a very valuable purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk about taxation, and, specifically, as it applies to the municipalities of this Province. I am very pleased to see that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is in his chair. I would like to talk about the fact that we have been told a number of times in this Province in election campaigns, and we were told it again very recently, that there was going to be no increase in taxation in this Province. Yet, Mr. Chairman, we have seen increase after increase after increase, specifically with for municipalities. There has been a reduction in the per capita grant that has been given to municipalities, albeit, Mr. Chairman, a temporary reduction. When it was done the indications were that this -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The increase was less with the new Municipalities Act, over what we would have gotten if the act had not been brought in.

MR. BAKER:

And I suppose, Mr. Chairman, if I could respond to the Premier's comment, if we go back to the Dark Ages, it is an astronomical increase. I am talking about the Premier of this Province saying there will be no tax increase and then immediately taking away money from municipalities. That is what I am talking about.

The municipalities of this Province were told that this was a temporary measure over three years ago, a very temporary measure and year after year they have been told that it was a temporary measure, until eventually it will become the accepted fact and will no longer be a temporary measure but something that everybody

eventually has grown used to. And when I say has grown used to, Mr. Chairman, I mean that the municipalities have reached the point where they then had to go to the taxpayers of the towns and raise their taxes to compensate for the money that is no longer coming in from the provincial government. So, in fact, indirectly and really directly if you look at it, there has been a tax increase on taxpayers of this Province as a result of the reduction of the per capita grant to the municipalities. There has been a tax increase, a very real and very direct tax increase.

Another area where there have been some very real tax increases is from the point of view of the assessment costs that the municipalities have had to pay. Not very long ago there was a system in operation whereby municipalities, every five years - supposedly every five years, but then it got to be six years, and seven years and so on because there were not enough people to do the assessments - but every five years a municipality would get an assessment done and would be charged on a particular basis. Municipalities, Mr. Chairman, had grown used to this and each year, in making up budgets, there is a certain amount, an allocation made in budgets to compensate or to get this assessment done.

This government, within the last two years, has all of a sudden increased the assessment cost to many municipalities in this Province by 1,000 per cent. Where the assessment cost to a municipality would be \$35,000 every five years, now the assessment costs are \$350,000 every five years - a stupendous increase in taxation. An increase

in taxation to the municipalities and they, in turn, Mr. Chairman, would have to raise it from the people in their communities. So there have in fact been tax increases, very real tax increases, passed on to municipalities for them to pass on to their taxpayers.

What makes it worse, Mr. Chairman, if this had been done through a consultative process, perhaps that would be not as bad. However, it was done in such a way that municipalities were advised that they had to pay this increase in assessment costs after they made up their budgets for that year. And we all know that municipalities cannot run deficits. They had already set their mill rate for the year and so on, when, all of a sudden they were slapped with an extra cost. And, Mr. Chairman, I have contacted at least twelve of the larger municipalities in this Province and got the figures on the extra cost that it is to them, in terms of the reduction in per capita grants and the assessment costs, and believe you me, it is extremely significant. So municipalities have had increased costs in the last few years that they have had to pass along as tax increases to their taxpayers.

Over the last few years as well, Mr. Chairman, municipalities of this Province have grown used to using the grant structure for a student Summer employment to develop recreation programmes. What they have done is seen what the needs are in their municipalities, then they have gone and applied for federal grants to run their recreational programmes. And some municipalities have built up rather amazing, wonderful

recreation programmes for the young people in their communities. They have hundreds upon hundreds in Gander, for instance, of children all Summer in a guided and a very, very positive programme.

Now then, that has been the case for the last couple of years. A side affect of all this - and it is has been a good kind of thing - a side affect of all of this has been to employ a lot of students each Summer. However, Mr. Chairman, all that has changed.

MR. MARSHALL:

Would the hon. member like to move the adjournment of the debate?

MR. BAKER:

Yes, Sir, I move the adjournment.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please.

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred, and have directed me to report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on Supply reports that it has considered the matters to it referred, reports progress, and asks leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the
Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House
at its rising do adjourn until
tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.

On motion, the House adjourned
until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00
P.M.