



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 15

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

21 May 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I inform the House that tomorrow, 22 May, in Argentia, I, in conjunction with the Hon. John Crosbie, on behalf of the Government of Canada, will announce jointly, with His Excellency, Ambassador Paul Robinson, the Ambassador to Canada of the United States of America, the successful conclusion of negotiations which will enable certain lands at the former US Naval Base at Argentia to be used for industrial and commercial development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The U.S. sublease, which contained an impediment to long term investment at Argentia, has been re-negotiated.

These lands, Mr. Speaker, were transferred to the U.S. in 1941 under a 99-year lease concluded as part of the war effort. Since the late 1960s the land has been substantially abandoned by the U.S. In 1978 the U.S. subleased part of these lands back to Canada. The administration and control of these lands was subsequently transferred from the federal government to the Province. Under the terms of the sub-lease, the U.S. retained the

right of immediate re-entry to any or all of the area.

The abandoned sites at Argentia have been identified in several studies as having significant potential for development in support of offshore activity related to petroleum development. However, under the terms of the 1978 sub-lease, major capital investments at the site could not be afforded any security of tenure.

The new agreement identifies two specific areas at Argentia: The airfield area and the management area. And the total area involved here is around 432 hectares or 1,080 acres.

The management area, includes most of the land between the former airfield and the harbour, including all the docks, which is a very important part to be in the management area. This area now, that is the management area from the Airfield to the harbour, including the docks, is now available for industrial development. Re-entry by the U.S. can only occur in the event of national emergency, and only then with the consent of Canada.

The airfield area includes the runways, adjacent hangars, control facilities, and the underground fuel tank farm. This area remains subject to immediate U.S. re-entry if necessary. So the area we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, out of the 1,080 acres is 500 acres which will come under the management area, and approximately 580 acres, which will remain under the airfield area. So what we are really doing is having released completely, from the sub-lease of 1978, 500 acres, which is the area which has been identified by the studies as being the crucial area

for industrial and commercial development, including the docks.

The management area, the area in which we have been successful in negotiating a modification of the 1978 sub-lease, is the prime area which has been identified for industrial and commercial developments.

Since tomorrow we will be concluding the agreement, I have personally been at it since 1979, I would like first of all to thank the member for Placentia, Mr. Patterson, who has been a dogged advocate for his area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I would like, here in the House, to acknowledge the high degree of co-operation and assistance we have received in this effort from His Excellency, Ambassador Paul Robinson.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just for the record, because I think I owe it to the hon. gentleman to say this and put it into the record of the House, since His Excellency, Mr. Robinson, became the Ambassador to Canada from the United States, he has become a very good friend of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland government, and it is through his efforts on the United States side that this matter has been expedited.

As we all know, as governments get bigger, so do bureaucracies. I can remember one occasion in the last year - it was a few months ago - after I had gotten on to the Ambassador again about this, that he actually arranged a meeting with the Secretary of the Navy and the people in the Pentagon, and

called me from the Pentagon on this matter, saying that the United States Government and the Pentagon had agreed. This is the degree to which this Ambassador has assisted the Newfoundland Government and, latterly, the Canadian Government.

I would also like to pay tribute to the hon. John Crosbie and to the hon. Joe Clark, both of whom, in the last two or three months, have seen that this matter was expedited so we could get on with making the lands available so that development can take place.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, just let me say that this is a very important day for the district of Placentia, for the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and for all the communities out there.

Several studies have been done. A lot of companies are extremely interested in establishing there and have come to the government through the Department of Development, and we look forward to speedy development in that area related to offshore development and the creation of hundreds, yea, thousands of jobs for the people of that area.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we are happy to see that this matter has finally been resolved. I must say it has to be

one of the longest, most difficult, most trying, most frustrating series of representations that I have seen.

I think if Hansard were checked, but definitely if the files of the Department of Mines and Energy were checked, you would see - the Premier mentioned representation since 1979 - that there was representation made between the years 1972 and 1975 on this point. I believe we even had debate in the House of Assembly and all-party support for the concept that every effort should be made, and that there was no real reason why the United States Government should not agree. I think what we have seen here, and what has amazed me in the process, is that we have had the agreement of Canadian and U.S. politicians - 'politicians' I underline - for a long period of time that this was a desirable thing to do. And I think it is an example of how a bureaucracy, and how, when you get a number of different departments of government, in this case, the U.S. Government, the Pentagon on the one hand and the U.S. Secretary of State, the people responsible for external affairs on the other hand -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Also External Affairs Canada.

MR. BARRY:

- and External Affairs Canada - it is an example of how bureaucrats and red tape can delay something on which politicians on all sides of the House in both the Province and in Ottawa and the United States are in agreement, how bureaucrats can delay something that is good to have brought about.

So I have to join with the Premier in recognizing this as a

significant achievement. It is one in which I know the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has taken special interest, because I think I have written a number of letters as a result of his representations over the years, urging that this be done.

I do not want, in any way, to raise any unnecessary concerns, maybe the Premier could clarify - I did not get a copy of the statement before it was given - but one of the problems has been here that everybody was aware that a private investor would not move into Argentia to an industrial park, or indeed to an industrial park anywhere in Newfoundland, if there was a risk that on a decision of a government the investor could be dispossessed. Now we have a situation where there is only the remote contingency of the national emergency where a private investor could be put off the land that they may have invested hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars in. I am wondering if there is any provision made for compensation for investors if there has to be a displacement of them from the site in the event of a national emergency? I know that having the Government of Canada in a position of having to agree to this taking place before they are dispossessed will be helpful and will relieve the uncertainty or the anxiety, but, whenever you have a private investor about to make an investment decision, they want to be able to see that they are going to own the property and that they are not going to lose their investment by the whim or the arbitrary decision of government. I am concerned that unless there is some provision for compensation, or unless there is some commitment by the Government

of Canada and/or the Government of Newfoundland to see that individuals are put into another site if they do happen to be displaced in the case of a national emergency, that you will still have a defect or a flaw in title which individuals might obtain at Argentia which might deter investment. Perhaps at the appropriate time, whether now by leave of the House or subsequently, the Premier could give us some details on that because I fear that we will not see development at Argentia proceed as quickly as we would all like for it to proceed -

MR. PATTERSON:

You do not want to see it out there.

MR. BARRY:

I am trying to help the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and the people of the Placentia area. The member for Placentia should be aware that businesspeople are going to be looking at this agreement before they invest their money and the member should do well to listen to what I am saying and if there is a problem there get it corrected now when we have a momentum going and it will help the member in the long-term.

MR. PATTERSON:

You did not want development out there. You would not even come out there!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

The member for Placentia should show a little more sensitivity and courtesy and understanding here.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PATTERSON:

When the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was the Minister for Industrial Development I invited him to Placentia on three occasions, had a little lunch set up for him, and he failed to show. So you were certainly interested then.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

That is beneath the member for Placentia. He knows that I have been out there with him touring the facility on a number of occasions. The member is misleading this House. Now the member should listen to what I am saying because he is going to find that development will not proceed and it will be his fault, Mr. Speaker. I point a finger that if there is a flaw here that deters investment it will be that member's fault for this foolish approach that he is taking, for this childish display, the same type of childish display he took with the teachers of this Province.

I would like to join with the Premier in complimenting the Ambassador for the United States of America as well, Mr. Speaker, for his assistance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

member took the opportunity of explaining his position.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, if I could just finish my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I have to confess I do not always agree with statements made by the Ambassador of the U.S. for Canada. Mr. Robinson has not always shown himself as sensitive as he might be to the fact that there is a border and that the Canadian political or social or economic scene is different than that of the United States. But I have to give him full marks. And it may be an example of how a person with a business background is more quickly able to grasp the significance of having this sort of red tape cleared up. I think that the American Ambassador has to be complimented for the expeditious way in which he had dealt with this matter.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Before recognizing the hon. minister, I would like to welcome to the gallery a delegation from the Labrador Inuit Association from Rigolet to Nain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome a delegation from the Marystown Shipyard union, led by its President, Mr. Leo Walsh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, today I want to inform the House about the government's plans to combat a major infestation of the insect pest hemlock looper as well as a programme against remnants of the spruce budworm. This announcement is being made after a long period of deep consideration during which we examined all aspects of the hemlock looper threat and ways of dealing with it.

Before giving details of the method we plan to use to meet the danger to our forest being posed by the hemlock looper, I want to outline for hon. members some of the considerations that went into our decision.

The Eastern Hemlock Looper is a native insect pest that is capable of killing a tree in one or two years, depending on its population level. The insect causes major damage in a very short time because what it is known as a "wasteful feeder", consuming only parts of the needles on the branches of coniferous trees, especially balsam fir. Upon first hatching, the looper starts eating the current year's needles on the tops of the branches. As it develops, it feeds indiscriminately on older needles, literally taking a bite or two out of one needle and then moving on to the next. This is why the hemlock looper is so much more destructive than the spruce budworm, which takes between five and seven years to kill a tree. There have been six outbreaks of hemlock looper in Newfoundland during this century, Mr. Speaker,

the last between 1966 and 1972. During the six years of the last outbreak, the looper killed 8.6 million cubic meters of wood, enough to keep our three paper mills supplied for approximately five years.

The loss, Mr. Speaker, would have been much more expensive if the government had not carried out an aerial spray programme in 1968 and 1969. In 1968, the chemical insecticides Fenitrothion and Phosphamidon were used to treat 431,000 acres. The following year a total of 2,054,000 acres were sprayed, with Fenitrothion being used on practically all areas.

Populations of hemlock looper have been increasing again during the past several years. In 1984, because of warm, dry weather conditions in July, that favoured looper development, the population thrived. The result was that 234,000 acres suffered defoliation, including 130,000 acres in the moderate to severe category. This was a dramatic increase over 1983 when defoliation was detected on only 23,000 acres on the Avalon and only 494 acres around Bay d'Espoir.

Mr. Speaker, the outlook for 1985 is very, very grim. The forecast is for a total of 1,754,000 acres of defoliation in several areas across the Island portion of the Province. Of this total, 674,000 will be in the moderate to severe category. In simple terms, moderate to severe defoliation means the trees will die this year, or in 1986, unless the looper is stopped. In addition, another 1,079,827 acres will receive light defoliation. Meanwhile, there is no indication that any looper damage will occur in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, this forecast, made by scientists with the Canadian Forestry Service, cannot be ignored. There is no doubt about the size of the infestation - it is based on actual egg surveys by federal scientists.

We cannot risk further loss of trees in this Province, especially in view of the 28 million cubic meters of wood left dead and dying by the spruce budworm throughout the 1970's, approximately, by the way, enough to support our mills for twelve years.

We have spent more than \$115 million during the last decade to protect and improve our forest resource, including more than \$30 million for such silvicultural activities as the raising and planting of seedlings, thinning of overstocked stands of young trees, as well as construction of 2,000 kilometers of access roads. We have to protect this investment of taxpayer's money. We must protect the livelihood of not only the people who depend on jobs in the forest products industry, but others who also love the outdoors.

We must not allow another insect pest, especially one as destructive as the hemlock looper, to cause further damage to our vital forest resource.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, government has decided to undertake an aerial spray programme in areas that are at greatest risk - this is, those forecast to experience moderate to severe defoliation as well as areas where we have invested money and effort in silviculture. This covers a total of 516,402 acres. Most of the spraying against the looper will be carried out between early July and early August.

A detailed plan of the spray programme, including precautions to be taken, was referred to the Pesticides Advisory Board. That board includes representatives from the Departments of Environment; Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development; Health, Labour and Manpower; the Wildlife Division; the federal government's Environmental Protection Service and five individuals representing various interests. These include three representatives of the public - Dr. June Winter of Memorial University, Mr. John Tremblett of Milltown, Bay d'Espoir, and Mrs. Janice Sweetland of Corner Brook. The other two persons are Mr. Eric Cumby, representing industry, and Dr. Des Colohan of the Newfoundland Medical Association. The board has recommended approval of the programme for both the looper and the budworm. The Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) has accepted the recommendation of the board and has given his approval, which enables us to proceed with the programme.

We will be using Fenitrothion on 507,123 acres and *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) on another 9,000 acres. The Bt spray, a much more expensive product - which, in fact, costs four times as much as fenitrothion - will be used for the more sensitive areas.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that Fenitrothion is the only insecticide registered by Agriculture Canada for use against the hemlock looper in 1985. In addition, the Royal Commission on Forest Protection and Management in 1981 had recommended the use of Fenitrothion after carrying out a very comprehensive review of this and other insecticides. Furthermore, as I said previously,

we have in fact used Fenitrothion before, as recently as 1977 when 80,000 acres were sprayed as part of a number of experiments that were carried out. In 1969, as I mentioned, it was used on an area nearly four times as large as the area to be done this year.

As well, before making the decision to go ahead with Fenitrothion, we asked the Forest Pest Management Institute in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, to conduct tests to show the effects of Matacil on the hemlock looper. The institute is a branch of the Canadian Forestry Service that specializes in finding ways of handling insect pests. Interim results from the institute show that Matacil is four times less effective than Fenitrothion in killing the looper. In other words, we were advised by the institute that we would have to use more than the maximum allowable dosage of Matacil on the looper in order for it to be effective. The maximum dosage by the way is 1.28 ounces per acre for each of two applications. So, in fact, Mr. Speaker, we are left with no choice but to decide on Fenitrothion as a definite means of bringing the looper under control.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Environment is requiring us to undertake three studies in connection with the Fenitrothion spraying. Two of these studies will determine whether there are any side effects on birds and pollinators. The third study involves analyzing soil, vegetation and water samples to check for traces of Fenitrothion.

At the same time, I want to add that we will be carrying out a

much smaller spray program against the spruce budworm, using Matacil and BT over a total of 34,000 acres. BT will be used on 17,000 and two applications of Matacil on 9,000. The overall total includes the use of Matacil on 7,000 acres of blocks that have been set aside by the Environment Department as part of a continuing study on the effects of the insecticide Matacil. These environmental blocks are in the Central Newfoundland area.

This small scale program, by the way, illustrates the decrease in the budworm infestation, a decrease that was speeded up by the use of Matacil. I do not think there is any real doubt that if we had not sprayed, the budworm infestation would have lasted longer and caused more damage. In fact, I believe we can take some satisfaction in knowing that we indeed did the right thing.

Maps, Mr. Speaker, being distributed with this statement show the areas where the hemlock looper and the budworm spray will be carried out. I want to add also that two companies have been awarded contracts for spraying - Conair Limited of Abbotsford, British Columbia, for large aircraft, and Kanata Aviation of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, for smaller planes.

A DC-6 owned by Conair will be used for hemlock looper spraying over 406,257 acres and Kanata's Ag-Cats, small agricultural spray planes, will be used for 110,000 acres of looper spraying and for all of the budworm spraying.

We have used both these companies before, Mr. Speaker, and in each case we have been satisfied with their performance. Conair has a

worldwide reputation for difficult operations, such as fire fighting, spraying and oil spill dispersal. The company carried out spray work for us in 1977, 1978 and again in 1983. Kanata, which specializes in agricultural and forest spraying, did our budworm spraying during the last three years.

As in the past, Mr. Speaker, the public will be advised ahead of time of each area to be sprayed. This will be done through messages to the media, supplemented by a telephone hotline for answering public inquiries. Maps and information brochures will be made available at all of our forestry unit offices in the Province.

In conclusion then, Mr. Speaker, faced with the possibility of a major loss of wood in Western and Central Newfoundland, and on the Avalon, the government believes it has little choice but to go ahead with the spray program, while taking every possible safeguard. As I have said so often in the past, the bottom line is that we have to protect our forest resource from all threats. If we do not stop the hemlock looper, we are going to run into problems of wood supply at a time when we are trying to repair the damage caused in the past by the budworm. Let no one believe for a minute, Mr. Speaker, that we can afford to take any risks with out supply of wood. We have to protect employment in the forest industry, and we are already spending millions of taxpayers' dollars to make sure that existing jobs are preserved and new ones are created. Even putting aside the purely commercial aspects of the forests, we also have to think of the thousands of people who love being in the woods to hunt, fish, hike, ski, or just to relax.

I think we have to accept, Mr. Speaker, that the presence of mankind has certainly changed the character of our forest. No longer can we trust to nature alone to keep insect pests under control. If we want to keep our forest in a healthy state, then we have to help do the job ourselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Before recognizing another hon. member, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the House a delegation from the community of Herring Neck.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the minister on one thing. We must protect our forest. There is no doubt about that. But I do not agree with the content of the document he has there. There are some things which have to be considered in it. I believe we need to work continuously to protect our forests rather than using haphazard spray programmes. Every once in a while it seems we get a spray programme as a crisis thing instead of spending money on silviculture, as should be done.

MR. DAWE:

We will ask the insects to give us a schedule.

MR. GILBERT:

It would be better to do that than do what you are doing now.

All you have to do is say there

will be a hemlock looper infestation this year, so, all right, fine, 'we spray'. When you look at the area outlined in the minister's statement, a lot of people would be concerned about his spraying in very heavily populated areas, like the Avalon Peninsula and the Central Newfoundland area. There are a lot of people in those areas. I think the people the minister referred to, who are going to be out enjoying the woods and the outdoors, should be given a little bit of consideration and we should make sure that what we are doing is safe and is checked out very carefully. Because we so not want to see some sort of a major catastrophe as a result of dumping these chemicals in populated areas.

We need a silviculture programme in place continuously in Newfoundland. We all realize forestry is one of the major employers in our Province, and, yet, I understand that the budget for the minister's department has been reduced percentagewise this year. I do not know if that is in the forestry end or not, but I think more money should be put in it because that is -

MR. SIMMS:

There is more money in it. There is an increase.

MR. GILBERT:

Percentagewise.

MR. SIMMS:

You are talking about silviculture.

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, but percentagewise, this is where we want it.

The other thing is, where you are dumping this chemical in the major water supplies, in the Exploits

River area and down in the Bay d'Espoir area, and you are dumping over other rivers, I think that should be looked at and considered.

As I said, forestry is a major employer. I feel that more money should be devoted to it, and a better programme developed, because it can create some jobs in areas which are badly depressed, as far as jobs are concerned. I think it would be interesting to compare the minister's statement with the Royal Commission that was set up on forestry. I think that would be worth looking at. I agree that we have to protect our forest. I am not sure that I agree with the way you are doing it.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I had delivered to me the Quebec draft agreement on the Constitution which I understand was also delivered to the Premier on Friday. I wonder if the Government of Newfoundland has yet formulated a position with respect to the Quebec proposal?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I read the proposal over the weekend and again early this morning and there has not been an opportunity from Friday until today for the Minister of

Justice (Ms Verge), the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and myself to present anything to Cabinet for consideration as it relates to what our position will be on the Quebec document. It is now being studied by these departments. As I said, I read it myself over the weekend and this morning but we will be considering it in due course, the various departments will, and then we will be putting recommendations to Cabinet for Cabinet's consideration. So, as soon as that process is done, we will be able to inform the House and the people of Newfoundland what our position is.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, on another point, I have had some calls from some widows in St. Lawrence who are becoming concerned about the fact that the arrangements for the miners' widows allowance expires I think it is the end of June this year. I wonder if the Premier would indicate to the House whether the Province will be extending that agreement and whether, if so, an announcement could be made as soon as possible to alleviate the concerns of these widows?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice, get the information for the hon. gentleman, and get back to him as soon as I can.

MR. BARRY:

Another short snapper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the Premier is aware that members of the House of Assembly have not each been supplied with a full copy of the Mobil Environmental Impact Statement? I wonder if he has any views with respect to the appropriateness of this attitude that seems to be shown by the Environmental Impact Panel, maybe by Mobil Oil and perhaps by government, in terms of the position of the MHAs on both sides of the House, government members as well as Opposition members, in the process of debate which is now commencing? I would submit to the Premier that every member of this House of Assembly should have had a full copy of that Mobil Environmental Impact Statement delivered the day it was released. It is an insult to this House and to members of this House that we are now told that there are insufficient copies to go around for all MHAs.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is saying and we will take action on it immediately. The first new copies that come off the press, if there are none there now, we will make sure that every member gets a copy. I regret that this has happened and I was not aware that it had happened. It has nothing to do with government. I just assumed, perhaps naively, that members of

the Legislature would be the first to get copies it. I, on behalf of those responsible, express my regrets and ensure I will undertake, since the question has come up from the Opposition, in the next number of minutes to have my office get on to the appropriate authorities and ensure that copies are provided at the earliest opportunity to every member of the House and to indicate to them that the members of the House are not at all amused by the way they have been treated by not getting copies before now.

If I may be able to answer a previous question to the Leader of the Opposition, it took me a minute and a half or two minutes to get the information, the St. Lawrence situation will be extended and the widows will be protected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). For the past number of weeks this Province's economy has been drastically effected by the brewery strike. Would the hon. minister inform this House as to what is the government's present status on this labour problem?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that the

strike is being monitored on a daily basis. There have been no actual meetings of the parties over the last several days. The acting deputy minister will be today contacting the unions concerned. This dispute, I would like to inform the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, has more than usual complications attached to it. In addition to the ordinary labour/management dispute, there has been some change of affiliation in unions here and there are difficulties between locals representing two of the breweries and one of the other ones. So I can assure the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the situation is being monitored very carefully and we are aware of the seriousness of the situation.

MR. FENWICK

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, this is a question for the Premier. On two separate occasions last Fall I asked the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) questions about the breakdown of staffing on the offshore oil industry, specifically how many were from the St. John's area and how many were from outside St. John's. Since that time I have managed to get a copy of the Premier's speech of 21 February, to Rotary I believe, where he indicates in one passage that in just one eleven man shift there are residents from Port aux Basques, Wesleyville, Burin, Fortune, Fogo, English Harbour in Trinity Bay, Dildo, Coley's Point and Frenchman's Cove all still living in these communities, nine out of an eleven

man crew. My question to the Premier, since I have not received a response from the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, is is this number, that is nine out of an eleven-man crew, indicative of the breakdown of people in the offshore oil industry or not?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would not say it is indicative. It was an example that was used to demonstrate that obviously there were people from all over the Province who were getting jobs related to offshore activity. It was not meant to indicate that that was the average, that there were more people from of the Avalon or outside the St. John's area than inside the St. John's area getting jobs. But there is a high level of representation from all around the Province as it relates to jobs on the rigs themselves, on the supply boats, and related industry. Obviously it is not nine out of eleven in every case from outside St. John's, but there is a fair representation from all over the Province as it relates to that. Obviously it is always difficult to ensure that if something happens on the East Coast, that everybody in Central and Western Newfoundland and Labrador get an equal opportunity at it. It is the same way, I guess, if something happens in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, it would be very difficult for people in St. John's who are unemployed to have an equal chance for the jobs in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, in Labrador City or whatever. But we have been trying, because this is a burgeoning, infant kind of industry, to ensure that as many

people from outside St. John's and laterally off the Avalon, are afforded the opportunity for the jobs there as well.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary. The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
If nine out of eleven is not the ratio, can the Premier give me any rough indication of what kind of ratio does exist out there today?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know off the top of my head, but I think those statistics are readily available from the departments concerned. They issue statements on it fairly regularly. I think this year, for example, there were 2,300 Newfoundlanders working relative to the offshore. It would be easy to get some kind of a breakdown on it and we will see if we can get the numbers for the hon. member over the next couple days.

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

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

MR. FENWICK:
The question was raised twice last Fall and I did not get an answer from the minister responsible, so I assumed that it was privileged information. As a matter of fact, that was really the answer I got.

In Volume IV of the Environmental Impact study - and I am pleased

to say, by the way, that some members of the House did get a chance to go get the supplementary volumes - in Volume IV, Page 200, of the Environmental Impact study, they say, and I quote, "Surveys indicate that approximately 75 per cent of Newfoundland rig workers reside in the St. John's area." Would the Premier care to comment whether this is an accurate indication of the representation? And, if it is an accurate representation, considering that the St. John's area has about one quarter of the population, would he not then agree that residents of St. John's have a six times greater opportunity of being employed in the offshore oil industry than do people not in the St. John's area?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Well, Mr. Speaker, that is rig workers. As I indicated to the hon. member in a previous answer, one has to take into consideration all the jobs relative to offshore, that is, those people actually on the rigs, plus those people on the supply boats, for example. You cannot just suddenly isolate the rig workers and not talk about the people on the supply boats, because you will find, for example, that there will be a fair number of people from outside the St. John's area on the supply boats, many of whom have their captain's ticket or mate's ticket, people who have gone to the College of Fisheries over the years from rural Newfoundland, as opposed to those who have a more technical background and who might come from St. John's. I do not what the total figure is. The hon. member is taking one figure out of an Environmental Impact

statement and asking me to comment on his accuracy or lack thereof. Well, just on that point alone, how can I? I do not know the process they use to accumulate that data and, therefore, how can I say, any more than the hon. member, that this statistic is accurate or this statistic is not accurate? All I can say is that the government, for a long period of time, since I have been involved, has been pushing our local preference policy for all Newfoundlanders, regardless of where they live. As I have said on many, many occasions, one of the first times I had an opportunity nationally to try to defend the local preference policy, the first phone call I had on that national radio programme one Sunday afternoon was from a Newfoundlander who opposed what we were doing.

Mr. Speaker, over the last number of years, both inside and outside this House, there have been quite a few Newfoundlanders who opposed what we have been trying to do to ensure that a lot greater than 50 per cent or 60 per cent of the people who get the jobs offshore come from Newfoundland and Labrador, wherever they happen to live here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the minister said he is

presently monitoring this problem with the brewery strike. There are a lot of people out there in the ever-declining economy losing jobs day after day. Truckers, service stations, convenience stores, lounge owners every day have to lay off people. And we went through a couple of strikes just last year, the Newfoundland Telephone strike, and now the university strike, which is an ongoing thing and which is always affecting the average household earner.

Can the Minister of Labour be more specific and tell this House if he can do something presently to intervene in this strike? Surely, he can do better than just monitor for the next four or five months an ongoing problem.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, I think, ought to be aware that we cannot conduct negotiations in public. These are sensitive negotiations. As I just said in answer to his previous question, these are more than usually sensitive, Mr. Speaker, because there are some complicating factors. When I say we are monitoring the situation, I must say, you know, these parties have rights. All three bargaining units have been recognized. They have exercised their right. In one case, the bargaining unit at Labatt's Brewery is on strike, in the cases of the other two breweries, Carling O'Keefe and Molson, they are locked out, and these are all legal rights that are being exercised by the parties. Now, other than inviting them to the table and trying to help them work out their problems,

not much more can be done. We fully recognize the seriousness of the situation and, as I said, this very afternoon the unions are being invited in to discuss some method of clearing the logjam there.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it seems like nothing has changed in the labour problem.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You would like a beer now.

MR. EFFORD:

You have your say when your turn comes.

Mr. Speaker, another question is some of the West Coast lounge owners are talking about getting permission to import beer from Nova Scotia or the Mainland. I would like to ask the hon. minister what is his position on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, that is not the responsibility of the Minister of Labour. I would say the licencing of people who may want to become licenced to import beer is the matter for the appropriate department, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) just so he does not feel left out sitting in the back row. The question is about PCBs. I bet you would like to sit in this back row.

MR. DAWE:

Look who is talking about being in the back row.

MR. BAKER:

The one over there.

I understand he is in the process of getting ready for a conference, somewhere on the Mainland, I understand, a conference about PCBs. Everybody knows that recently there have been a number of occurrences regarding PCBs. There is the Kenora situation where PCBs were spilled on a highway, a situation in British Columbia in the last few days where there was a cupful of PCBs spilled in a river, and we all know the reaction to that, so I am wondering if the minister can tell us if there are any problems related to PCBs in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. member for his question. We have a few environmental problems with PCBs, but nothing of a major nature that is under the direct control of the Department of Environment. I believe the one area that the hon. gentleman alludes to now is in Goose Bay on a military reserve. He is quite right in that I will be meeting with my federal counterpart on May 31 to discuss the whole issue of

relating to PCBs, how they are going to be stored, who will be licenced to act as a carrier and so on. But on the military reserve in Goose Bay we have some problems with it because we have a fair amount of the material stored outdoors, in barrels, of course. And since it is not under our jurisdiction I am initiating meetings with the Minister of National Defence's (Mr. Nielsen) office while I am in Ottawa to have this situation addressed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear,hear!

MR. BAKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us how many storage sites there are in the Province and where they are?

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, we have about fifteen storage sites in the Province. We have under our control in Goose Bay, Labrador, some 150 barrels of PCB contaminated material along with sixteen transformers and one large capacitor stored in an underground bunker with a 16,000 pound door up to it. We have some sixty barrels in Rambler Mines with seven transformers. We have some ten barrels of PCBs in ASARCO in Buchans. This is not PCB in its raw state, as you know, it acts as a coolant for transformers, but rather PCB contaminated material. We have

eight barrel at Price Abitibi in Grand Falls with one transformer; four barrels with IOC; one barrel of contaminated material at Wabush Mines; one dozen capacitors with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and we also have a small amount in a couple of buckets with Newfoundland Light and Power. We have an inventory underway with Kruger, which was Bowater in Corner Brook. And there was a small amount of PCB contaminated material on the Argentia Base, and that has since gone to the U.S., so we no longer have it around. And we have a couple of locations in Stephenville where we just recently discovered PCB contaminated material in storage and that is presently being analyzed by the West Coast office just to check on the concentrations. So I think that covers the entire Province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
That is an amazing list, Mr. Minister, some in some buckets somewhere and so on. I am wondering about control measures. You were in the process, I understand, of recently discovering where these things are, I suggest you also check along the Topsail Road since there is also some stored in that area.

MR. BUTT:
Owned by Light and Power.

MR. BAKER:

Yes. I would also like to ask the minister - because the main concern, Mr. Speaker, in Quebec was with the PCBs that are still in use in the Province, not so much with storage sites for the PCBs - how much PCBs are actually in use in the Province now in addition to all that is stored in these fifteen sites?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, we have a very small amount of electrical apparatuses now in the Province using PCBs. Because since 1972, I think it was, or 1970 or thereabouts, in that time frame anyway, PCBs was discovered as being an undesirable substance to be used as a coolant in transformers and I understand that that is now replaced by a high grade mineral oil. Well, we have I think about fifteen major transformers around the Province which still have PCBs in them as coolants. There are three or four which have just recently been taken out of service by Newfoundland Light and Power and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and these will be stored in a licenced area by the Department of the Environment. So we have a handle on it. I guess when I came into the Department of the Environment it was probably an opportune time, or an inopportune time, because we just had the Kenora incident and everything and PCBs were highlighted in the media, so I immediately initiated some action with my officials to get an inventory of what we had on the Mainland portion of the Province, in Labrador, and on the Island in order to get it all under our control and then to negotiate on areas that were not

under my purview, like Goose Air Base which is the military reserve and I am quite pleased with the progress we have made to date and I think within the next couple of weeks, certainly by mid-June, I will have a handle on all of it.

MR. BAKER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The minister is probably aware that the usage of PCB materials is very suspect all across North America. I understand that Churchill Falls, Parsons Pond, Holyrood, Bay d'Espoir, Newfoundland Telephone in some way, Kruger and Price are still using these particular transformers and capacitors. And I suspect that because there is so much of it around that there are cases where there are leakages and so on. There have been over the past couple of year some rather serious spills and leakages, one in Gullbridge Mines. You indicated they are no longer there so they must have been moved, and that brings up the problem of transportation of those things. We have heard nothing about safeguards taken for the transportation of these things and I am wondering what is being done to ensure that these things that are in use now are not dripping, and in all those storage sites the things are not dripping and, when they are transferred from one place to another, what kind of safeguards are you insisting be put on?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, to answer the second part of the question first, the fact of the matter is where there is an electrical apparatus now in operation that is cooled by PCBs, that is registered with the Department of the Environment, with my department. When PCB contaminated material, or PCB in its raw state is transported anywhere in this Province, I think there are two or three licenced carriers - there are not very many - and they have stringent guidelines to go by when they are moving this, which they do under the direction of the Department of Environment.

I might just point out for hon. members' information that there are presently scientific tests underway in the United States, under the Environmental Protection Agency there, to bring in a mobile high-temperature furnace where they will actually be able to come on site and destroy PCB contaminated material on the spot, at a cost, of course. Combustion engineers and scientists have it almost developed to perfection right now, and Environment Canada and all provincial Departments of Environment are really looking forward to the time when we can actually pick up the phone and order one of those pieces of apparatus. Actually it is a furnace on wheels, a very complex piece of machinery.

We will be able to order one and have them come here to the Province and actually destroy this unwanted material that we have around.

MR. BAKER:

The Opposition would to be excluded.

MR. BUTT:

I want to say to the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) that things are well in hand. I say, 'Be a good friend to PCBs, take one out to dinner.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

My question is to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), and it concerns the request made by ambulance drivers, represented by NAPE in the Province, to take a course that is being prescribed now by the Canadian Medical Association, recognized and funded by other Canadian provinces, and availed of by ambulance drivers in, I believe, every other province but Newfoundland. Will the minister say if it is the intention of the government to, first of all, recognize that three-level course, and then to assist the drivers who want to take it by funding it for them?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

It is not the duty or the responsibility of the Department of Health, or of the government, to interfere with the relationship between the General Hospital ambulance operators and the Reclassification Board of the Pay Division of the Department of Treasury.

As you know, they have applied for reclassification. Their

reclassification was refused or rejected. They had the right to appeal and an appeal is underway at this particular time. It is not my duty or responsibility to interfere with that appeal in any form whatsoever.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is the responsibility of the Minister of Health to make sure that ambulance drivers, people who perform a very important function in the Province, are indeed properly trained. The drivers will tell you, Mr. Speaker, and they are the first to recognize it and admit it, that they are not properly trained to undertake the job for which they have been hired, and, with that in mind, they want to avail of this very important course, a course, as I said, that has been prescribed by the Canadian Medical Association, funded by governments in the other nine provinces, and taken advantage of by ambulance drivers in the other provinces. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of public health, and in the interest, maybe, of saving money, the Minister of Health just cannot slough off responsibility for the competence or otherwise of ambulance drivers and put the blame of the Hospital Association.

I ask him again, Mr. Speaker, will he then intercede and request the people he says are responsible to give very serious thought to at least recognizing this three-level course - I think they have had one level, they want to take the second level, and some of them the

third level - and to insist that it be funded and the drivers be given the opportunity to avail of it?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

I fully agree with you, Sir. It is our duty and our responsibility to support this kind of training and we have done so. We were, at the beginning, responsible for paying the salary of Dr. Colohan, who is Chairman of the Emergency Service of the Health Sciences Complex. That is number one, so we had an interest there. Number two, we fully supported the nurse when she went away for special training in relationship to the cost, so obviously we agree with you there. Lastly, we did really, indirectly, fund those ambulance drivers who were anxious to take this course as they did it within the time in which they were on duty. So in other words, a great part of their time when they took this course was subsidized by government funds and services.

Last but not least, it is not our intention in any way to interfere. It is going through a process, and I am sure you will concur that that process must be gone through otherwise the Department of Health might have to jump in when any organization or group wishes to bypass the format of government procedure in dealing with these problems. In essence, I certainly agree with you and we have helped to a great degree.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the minister agrees and I respect him for his honesty. Now that being the case, and realizing the fact that this course is important by their own admission ambulance drivers will tell you that they do not feel properly trained; that is why they are anxious to be able to avail of this three level course - I guess, Mr. Speaker, it is another question, of being out of step with the rest of Canada, that the other nine provinces recognize the importance of this course, recognize the importance of their ambulance drivers being properly trained and, in fact, are prepared to fund it.

I would ask the minister again, and by his own admission he agrees that there should be more training, if the people responsible, the Hospital Corporation actually, should decide not to accept the request or the recommendation of the drivers, will he then as minister, again recognizing his responsibilities, I am sure he is aware of them, intercede and make sure that ambulance drivers in Newfoundland are properly trained and are given training similar and equal to that given drivers in other Canadian provinces?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Does the minister have leave to respond?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has been granted.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I still concur, and where advanced training can be given to any department or any individual in Health Services, I would certainly encourage it. That is number one. Number two, we have assisted in funding them; that has been done. We admire everyone who can acquire extra expertise in any field of Health Services. We agree with you there. But at the moment it is going through a process in government, which you understand, I am sure, and it is not the duty of the Department of Health, or of me as Minister of Health, at this particular time to interfere with that process. It is being appealed and we have to await the result of the appeal board.

MR. SIMMS:

Very responsible, very responsible.

Presenting Reports by Standing
and Special Committees

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the annual report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation for the year 1983/84.

Notices of Motion

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act.

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BRETT:
I have the answer to two questions, Mr. Speaker. The first one was asked by the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). It was quite some time ago and I must apologize to the hon. member because I had the answer the following day and put it in my desk and forgot it. The question is fairly long but, I think, basically, what the hon. gentleman said was: 'I was wondering are there any other discussions ongoing, or are there any plans for the future, for the setting up of this advisory council?' What he was talking about was an Advisory Council on the Status of Disabled Persons.

My answer, Mr. Speaker, is the idea of an Advisory Council on Status of Disabled Persons grew out of the discussions and dialogue that took place during

the International Year of Disabled Persons, 1981, and was one of the recommendations contained in the official report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Disabled in Canada. The same recommendation formed part of our provincial Advisory Committee to the Minister of Social Services, which was established in the Year of the Disabled. The discussion paper regarding the formation of a provincial advisory council has been prepared by the Division of Rehabilitation Services. This paper has been circulated to several agencies to give them an opportunity for input into the proposal. The concept of an Advisory Council on the Status of Disabled Persons does have merit and the next step in the process is to call a meeting of the agencies involved to further refine the proposal for government consideration.

I have another one, Mr. Speaker, and that question was asked by the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) in the latter part of last week. There were several parts to the question. The first part was, 'Why was a certain person, or staff member, who was overseeing the boarding house programme, laid off?' The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that the present system of boarding houses in the St. John's area is unable to accommodate the many clients with special needs who have had to be placed in emergency accommodations. The solution to this problem did not prove to be the assignment of one person, who, despite valiant efforts, could not provide for the integration of the majority of these clients into the existing system of boarding houses in the city. Last July there were thirty-three individuals in

emergency accommodations at an approximate cost of \$40,000 a month and this April there were thirty-one at a cost of \$49,000. The person hired to oversee the boarding house situation was hired on a temporary basis for a twelve month period with the salary paid from a permanent position. The temporary assignment has now expired. It was extended for two months, and the position will be advertised and filled through the normal channels, that is, a competition through the Public Service Commission.

The next part of the question was, 'Who will now monitor the situation in the boarding houses in the city?' The answer to that is a member of the permanent staff will be assigned to the responsibility.

The third part of that question - the question was given as one but there were four or five parts to it - 'What is the number of individuals now in hostels and what is the cost?' The answer is thirty-one people at \$49,000 a month, in hotels.

'What is the number of people in boarding houses now in the city?' The total number of cases on social assistance in boarding houses in the St. John's area - that is not in hotels, that is in regular boarding houses - boarding with non-relatives we have 76 and boarding with relatives we have 362 in St. John's East; in the Center, boarding with non-relatives 143 and with relatives, 311; in St. John's West, 78 with non-relatives and 398 with relatives; and that gives us a total with non-relatives of 297 and boarding with relatives 1,071, for a total of 1,368 in the city. These are figures, I

suppose, Mr. Speaker, that one would hardly expect me to have on the top of my head but I hope that it is the information that the hon. member is looking for.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to get up relevant to Question Period and the business of the EIS and copies for all the members. I have had this checked out. There were copies sent to all ministers, there were seven full copies sent to the Opposition office -

MR. BARRY:

Only one initially. We had to go back for more.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I was not aware of that.

Well, there was a copy sent to all ministers. The latest information I got is that there are seven gone to Opposition offices and three copies gone to government members offices. We have requested that, as soon as possible, to make sure every single member has a copy. We have contacted the Petroleum Directorate, the panel, Mobil, and everybody else to ensure that it is done as soon as possible.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HICKEY:

The answer, Mr. Speaker, provided by my colleague the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) did

not address fully the questions I raised, indeed one of them is not addressed at all. I would ask that the issue be placed on the Late Show. I would like to discuss it further.

Petitions

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. House of Assembly, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 297 residents of the towns of Milltown, Morrisville, Head of the Bay, and St. Alban's. The prayer of the petition is: Whereas the level of unemployed from Morrisville to St. Alban's is three times the provincial average;

Whereas the level of unemployed young people between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four is virtually 100 per cent, and because of the level of employment opportunities for pursuit of post-secondary educational opportunities are virtually non-existent and;

Whereas this is a persistent chronic and tragic problem, we the undersigned petition the Provincial Government to address with some urgency, with a programme of specific action, the problems of unemployment, particularly and emphatically, youth unemployment in our area.

Mr. Speaker, that is a tragic petition when you take in that area that there are 297 young

people between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four that are unemployed and most of them have never had a job other than maybe a ten week period at a make-work project. Some of them are not classed in your statistics that are put out by Canada Manpower because they have never had a job. And that is the tragedy of the thing, if they have not had a job, they are not classed as statistics. Consequently, when the make-work projects come up, when those people go looking for jobs, they are told, 'I am sorry, if you are not on the unemployment list, you cannot get a job.' You have to be there to be a statistic because it embarrasses the government to have them as statistics. But when they are unemployed and never had a job, it really does not matter. Nobody is concerned about them. They have to get that first job. Some of those people want to go to university and they want to go to trade school. They come from homes where their father is living on \$7,000 a year. Remember, in that part of the district, the Milltown-St. Alban's area, 75 per cent of the work force is unemployed, with no future and with no hope of anything other than ten week.

So, I feel this petition should be given urgent support by all members in the House because of the fact that it is a problem in this area of district of Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir and in the area, the unemployment is three times the provincial average. I feel that something has to be addressed to handle the unemployment in that area, otherwise, we are going to be into a very, very serious situation. We have lost a generation of those people down there now. They are

aimlessly wandering the streets with nothing to do, no hope to be able to get out of it or to improve their lot. And this petition is a cry, a plea for sympathy and for help, so that these people can be put back to work and to be made into useful citizens of Newfoundland, instead of having to depend on some sort of government handouts for the rest of their lives.

I support this petition and I ask that it be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department concerned.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. member for Stephenville.

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

I would like to stand and support that petition from the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). I am glad to see it brought in. I am going to be bringing a few in myself. But it is a tragedy that is going on and it has been going on for years, and it is starting now to come to a point where, if we do not soon do something, have some action, than we will not have anybody to do the action for. It is an immense tragedy. It is up to 40 per cent and rising. There is nowhere they can turn to, and they are out there looking. As a matter of fact, I have attended two or three conferences. I am going to another one this weekend. They are trying to find suggestions and they are looking for leadership from the budget and they are looking for leadership from the government over there. A number of provincial governments

in Canada are now starting to realize the same problem and are doing something about it. Ontario has a Ministry of Youth. They even have a Youth Commissioner, who is looking into the problems.

I implore this House to start waking up and doing some about youth unemployment. It is becoming a worse and worse problem and it is not getting any better. So I would like to make that point and stand and support that petition. I think it is probably the most worthy petition that could probably be presented in this day right now.

Thank you very much.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Motion 1, the Budget Debate.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is the beginning of the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, the first chance we have had to respond to the empty phases of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I think if we can characterized the Budget by any particular label it would have to be characterized as a business as usual budget at a time when we have a crisis of unemployment, a business as usual budget which ignores the fact that we have a crisis of unemployment. It does not, Mr. Speaker, live up to the commitment that was given by members opposite, given by the Premier, given by the Minister of Finance, indeed, to the people of

this Province in the course of the recent election campaign, when we consider that the Premier called the election asking for a mandate to create jobs. We look at the budget and nowhere do we see, Mr. Speaker, a programme geared to the creation of long-term jobs, and then we can see that members opposite have broken faith in less than a month - when was the election?

MR. BAKER:
April 2.

MR. BARRY:

- to be fair to them, members opposite in less than two months have broken faith with the electorate that put them back into office. They went with a mandate to create jobs, and what do we see in this budget? We see, Mr. Speaker, nothing other than part-time, short-term, make-work projects. We see, Mr. Speaker, the government borrowing additional money on capital account, recognizing, Mr. Speaker, to that extent, that there is a need to stimulate the economy, but, Mr. Speaker, making a serious error, the same mistake that they have been criticizing the Government of Canada for, by putting money into the creation of short-term jobs. What is happening is we see more money being spent on construction by government, to a large extent because the fiscal policies of government, the approach taken in previous years by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has driven away private investment. The attitude of the Premier, the way in which the Premier has been treating the private sector, has caused private investment to decline in this Province and government has had to spend more money to try to take up the

slack. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is only a Band-Aid on a bazooka wound. All that is being done is that some money is being thrown into the economy for this Summer and Fall and we are going to see the same problems facing us this Winter as we have had. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am not even sure that we are going to get through this Summer. I am not even sure that the measures contained in this budget are going to turn around the unemployment rate, which we saw increase, Mr. Speaker, in April over March. The unemployment rate, instead of declining as we would normally expect this time of year, has been on the increase, with it already being at a record level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, until we see the Statistics Canada figures for the months of May and June, we will have very grave concern as to whether we will not have this crisis magnified to unbearable proportions even this Summer, not to talk about next Winter.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a government that has failed to draw up a programme, a systematic and a planned programme for dealing with unemployment over the long term.

In order to properly manage the economy of this Province, Mr. Speaker, certain objectives should be set with respect to the number of jobs that the government would expect to create. An objective should be set - and these two are related - to the level at which they would hope to bring down the unemployment rate. Now, we all accept, we all recognize, that the unemployment rate is not going to be brought down overnight to where it was when the Conservatives came in power, because it is their

policies of thirteen, almost fourteen years, which have seen the unemployment rate increase from 9 per cent in 1971 to approximately 15 per cent in 1979, up to over 24 per cent in January of this year. Was it 24 per cent or 26 per cent? I think it was over 26 per cent. The numbers are getting to such a level, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to keep track of them.

So we have seen unemployment close to triple in the years that we have seen members opposite in power. And we are not going to be able overnight to bring things back to the good old days when we had an unemployment level of only 9 per cent, which was then considered unacceptable. Mr. Speaker, even if members opposite set a programme in place over a ten year period - five years would make more sense - but even if they took ten years, if we could see projections for a steadily decreasing rate of unemployment, a steadily increasing number of jobs in this Province to keep up with the numbers of people coming into the labour force, Mr. Speaker, there would then be some hope. And how can members opposite say that they are good managers of the economy when they do not set those objectives with a planned, systematic approach? One of the basic elements of proper management is setting yourself an objective or objectives. It is the only way you can keep yourself accountable. It is the only way you can measure how good a job you are doing. And it is the only way other people can measure how good a job you are doing.

Maybe the reason why members opposite are afraid to set objectives is because the Premier tried it. He recognized that

basic management principle in 1979 and he set himself the objective of creating 40,500 jobs, a good approach. He set himself the objective of creating 40,500 jobs and, of course, he failed miserably, and maybe that is why we now have a complete abandonment of this management by objectives approach. Maybe that is why we have the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - Can you believe it? - when he is asked how many jobs will his budget create, admitting he does not have a click or a clue.

MR. DECKER:

In England he would resign.

MR. BARRY:

I think he would give up his little red boxes and resign if he were in England. He would pack it up, take off his new shoes that I assume he had on on Budget Day, and give up, Mr. Speaker. He would not have the face to come in and tell the people of this Province he does not know how many jobs his budget is likely to create.

MR. DECKER:

He should know, that is why he is there.

MR. BARRY:

You are absolutely right! The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) has put his finger right on it! He should know, because he should be setting those objectives in conjunction with the Premier, in conjunction with Cabinet. Those objectives should be set out and the people of this Province should be told what are the objectives of this government over the next year, over the next five years, Mr. Speaker, and what would they like to see if they had a chance of getting back after that five

years. Even though that would be a purely academic and theoretical exercise for them to engage in, that is the only thing that they can do, to have something to aim at, to have an objective.

Mr. Speaker, we have a complete abdication - I am really trying to figure it out. It is a rare occasion when you have a Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and you have a Premier refusing to set themselves objectives, refusing to indicate to the people of the Province where they hope to bring the provincial economy over the next year, or two, three, four, five years, where they expect to bring the unemployed.

MR. PATTERSON:

It would have been very difficult to bring them anywhere if you had sold out the oil on them.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the bitterness of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) in being by-passed yet one more time for a Cabinet position. I can understand the cruel bitterness of the position that the member for Placentia finds himself in. I can understand why he goes out and sides with the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) and points out how unfair the Premier is being in his treatment of the member for St. John's East Extern. I can understand the bitterness.

MR. PATTERSON:

I am not bitter.

MR. BARRY:

But the member for Placentia should keep his bitterness and direct it to members on that side of the House, to the Premier who ignored him again, Mr. Speaker.

That is why we see the member for Placentia squirting his poison periodically, but he should be squirting it in the right direction. His bitterness and his bile, Mr. Speaker, spill over, and it is understandable after being by-passed not just for Cabinet, being by-passed for a parliamentary assistantship.

MR. PATTERSON:

I am an advisor to the Premier.

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Placentia is an adviser to the Premier the Liberal Party is in good shape for the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We have it made, Mr. Speaker, we have it knocked.

But anyhow, Mr. Speaker, it is not the member for Placentia who is the problem as far as the economy is concerned, it is the Premier, it is the Minister of Finance because the member for Placentia has been given no responsibility. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility does not rest with the member for Placentia, it rests with the Minister of Finance and the Premier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is because the member for Placentia is trying to curry favour again now that he took a few flicks at the Premier initially, but maybe he is trying to curry favour to hope that if there is a Cabinet shuffle he will get in next time. But maybe the member for Placentia would have a better chance of getting himself into the Cabinet if he stood up in this debate and made some

constructive proposals as to how to deal with the high level of unemployment in the Placentia area as well as other parts of the Province. Let us have the member get on his feet, Mr. Speaker, in the course of this debate.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. PATTERSON:

When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was in Placentia campaigning, he promised 20,000 jobs for two years. Now, what was going to happen to those who were employed after the two years? Would you tell me what you were going to do with 20,000 people after that?

MR. SPEAKER:

On that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. member was not sitting in his correct place.

MR. BARRY

What a Speaker! What a Speaker! Mr. Speaker, topic number eleven, youth unemployment, I have it right here. I will be coming to that in three or four days. If the member keeps listening I will be dealing with that subject in the course of the budget debate in two or three days. But right now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia, if he wants to make it into Cabinet, the way he should do it is start standing up in this House and submitting some constructive proposals and ideas as to how the Premier and the Minister of Finance could better deal with the unemployment rate. We have yet to hear the member for Placentia get up and make that type of

constructive suggestion. He is the master, Mr. Speaker, of the one liner from the depths of the back rows. But, Mr. Speaker, we have yet to hear him on his feet making constructive proposals about what should be done.

MR. PATTERSON:

Oh, yes. I am still waiting for you to say something sensible.

MR. BARRY:

Now if the member would listen, I will show him how it might be done, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance and the Premier are afraid to set out and reveal their objectives, if they have any, is because, Mr. Speaker, that would probably reveal that they are starting from wrong assumptions. They are starting right from square one with the wrong assumptions as to where the Province is going as far as employment is concerned in the normal course. And I would mention specifically, Mr. Speaker, their projections with respect to Hibernia, their projections with respect to the numbers of employed likely to come from the Mobil development of Hibernia.

We heard the Minister responsible for Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) - Is that the correct title? They keep changing it. We do not have legislative approval for that yet - on television a couple of months ago saying, "There are going to be 10,000 jobs from the offshore." And then thirty seconds later he said, "Oh no, there is going to be 20,000." And I heard people the next day, Mr. Speaker, and over the next several weeks coming up and saying, "Do they have any idea, do they have any clue at all how many jobs will

be coming from the offshore? Is it 10,000? Is it 20,000? Is it something in between?" But for a Minister of the Crown with special responsibilities for Manpower to flick out, "Oh, there is going to be 10,000 or 20,000 jobs from offshore development," gives people some idea, Mr. Speaker, of how little is known - maybe it is how little is known - or how little members opposite are prepared to reveal to the people of the Province as to the true reality of employment from the offshore.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we have that Mobil Environmental Study which members opposite kept concealed, kept secret for months wanting to get past the election first, and they have managed that. They got one election out of it by keeping the information hidden, but the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, when they now look at the employment figures that are contained in that Mobil report will know that they have been betrayed again, betrayed not just, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that members opposite are not living up to the mandate to create jobs, but betrayed by being supplied with false information.

MR. TULK:

By who?

MR. BARRY:

False information by the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), by the member for Ferryland, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), by the Premier. They have all been spewing out false figures, false information, misleading the people of this Province as to what could be expected from jobs, Mr. Speaker, in the offshore. Because

the reality, Mr. Speaker, is as I pointed out in this House of Assembly last Fall, even with a concrete platform, we are looking at peak employment in the area of 5000 to 6000. Mr. Speaker, that is direct employment. But you know something? That is direct short-term employment.

DR. COLLINS:

How about induced employment.

MR. BARRY:

We will be very interested in having the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) stand up and tell us what the multiplier effect will be. We had the Premier, a little while ago, talk about all the indirect spinoff. Remember when multiplier was a dirty word. Well, members opposite, this tired government opposite, bankrupt of ideas, bankrupt of policies, are falling back now on this notion of, oh, it is the multiplier that is going to solve the problems of unemployment. Let the Minister of Finance get on his feet and tell members of this House how you get a multiplier for long-term jobs from part-time construction jobs. From short-term construction jobs how do you get a multiplier for long-term jobs? The minister should not be so foolish. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is going to get up and talk to this House about multiplier when those 5000 jobs that we are talking about, those jobs that are set out in this Mobil package, Mr. Speaker, are short-term. I will give Mobil credit. They stressed time after time that these are short-term jobs. They are not permanent jobs. All of those jobs at Come By Chance, for example, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) has been aware for a long time and has been telling his constituents, and that is why they

put him back into office with that overwhelming majority, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

MR. CALLAN:
It is certainly overwhelming when compared to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands and a half a dozen others over there.

MR. BARRY:
That is right. And, Mr. Speaker, I am being very generous when I talk about 5000 jobs because when we look at the chart that Mobil is putting out we see from fixed production systems, that is the building concrete platforms, we see it peaking at 2145 jobs in 1990.

MR. TOBIN:
Is that the gospel?

MR. BARRY:
Now the member for Burin-Placentia West asks: 'Is that the gospel?' He is referring to the fact that the Premier has said, 'we are not going to take Mobil's word, we are going to get up and we are going to make Mobil have more jobs provided.' Well let us see, are they going to make sure that every job tied into the concrete platforms comes to Newfoundland? Let us give them the benefit of the doubt. They are going to do that. They are going to get every single job, as bizarre as that may sound. Well, you know something, that is why I am being so generous because the peak is in 1989. In 1989, every single job, not just everywhere in Canada, everywhere in the world that would be tied in with the Hibernia development would total - every single job -

would total 5195 jobs.

MR. PATTERSON:
Now, that is one well, that is Hibernia now.

MR. BARRY:
We will have to explain to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) the difference between an oil well and an oil field. Hibernia is an oil field and there will be many wells, something between eighty or one hundred development wells will be drilled, so we are not talking about an oil well. We are going to give the member for Placentia a little explanation at the appropriate time as to the difference between an oil well and an oil field. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the constituents of the member for Placentia will be very interested in the extent to which he has kept himself informed. And maybe that is why, Mr. Speaker, we are so slow seeing development move in Placentia with respect to the offshore. If the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) still does not know the difference between an oil well and an oil field, shame on him, shame on him. So, what I am doing, Mr. Speaker, is giving credit to members opposite, to the Premier, to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) for being able to get every single job tied into a concrete platform for Newfoundland. Maybe even make the President of Mobil Oil will come down and operate out of this Province and you will get 5195 jobs in total. Now what are they going to do?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Will they all be Tories, do you think?

MR. BARRY:

Are they going to do any more than that? Maybe they are going to make the company create jobs out of thin air. Maybe it will be like the featherbedding we have had in certain trades. Maybe they are going to insist that for every real worker making a contribution to building a platform, they are going to force them to hire five or six others. Well, that is the multiplier effect. They would have to have four for one featherbedding in order to get it up to 20,000 jobs. Is that what they are proposing? Is that how the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is going to explain how the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) can flick out this figure of from 10,000 to 20,000 jobs, or how the Premier can talk about the multiplier effect making the difference between the figures that Mobil give?

DR. COLLINS:

Will you permit a question?

MR. BARRY:

Sure I will permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Does the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) have any idea of the employment in the Norwegian area on the Norwegian oil shelf?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have information on that. I cannot give the minister the exact figures, but there are tens of thousands of people now employed in North Sea development, but there are a few little points that

should be pointed out here. There are - what is it - a dozen or so fields on the Norwegian side now? I cannot remember the division between Norway and the United Kingdom, Mr. Speaker. But we have, say, a dozen oil fields that are producing for Norway - at least a dozen.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are the number of wells to a field?

MR. BARRY:

The number of wells to a field - you might get eighty to one hundred - not as many in the North Sea fields because they are generally not as fractured as is the Hibernia field. And I must say, the Norwegian government is not as fractured as members opposite and they are becoming more and more fractured every day.

MR. TOBIN:

Do you want to know what you said in 1974 about jobs?

MR. BARRY:

I would be delighted, Mr. Speaker, to have the member for Burin - Placentia West, who spends all his time pursuing Hansard, get up in the course of debate and describe what we have said as far as employment is concerned.

What we are dealing with now, Mr. Speaker, is the expectations that were created in Newfoundlanders, in men and women in this Province, who have made a decision to move back to Newfoundland to await the oil boom. 'When can we come home?', they are saying. Well, the real question is why is it they are still finding that they have to leave. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Premier would build up

expectations knowing that people would make investments? Maybe that is why we have the private sector leaving this Province, because they know that the information being supplied by this government, by the Minister of Finance, is not reliable. They have come in here and they have made investments and they have seen their investments go down the drain because they were relying on information supplied by the Minister of Finance and the Premier, Mr Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, the level of bankruptcy has doubled. In January 1985 the number of bankruptcies were doubled what they were in 1984 in Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN:

You bankrupted half the companies.

MR. BAIRD:

You forced Fishery Products out.

MR. TULK:

How low.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY:

It is enough to make you weep. The level of input from the backbenchers, the level of input, Mr. Speaker, into this debate when we are talking about the Minister of Finance and the Premier having set out information, projections, as to what investors could expect from this Province, men and women invested their hard earned dollars, their lifesavings in some

cases, expecting that business would be there. They borrowed money from the banks and they waited year after year after year. And you know something, there are probably going to be people out there now listening to the Premier in recent months, listening to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who are going to make investments over the next three or four years based upon this notion of the member for Ferryland, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), that there is going to be from 10,000 to 20,000 jobs coming from Hibernia, at least 20,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies owes it to the people of this Province to get up in this debate and we will get him in the estimates if we do not get him in this debate. We want to know when will we get these jobs? Where will we get these jobs? What will be those jobs? How long will those jobs go on for?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

MR. BARRY:

Why was it necessary to create a Royal Commission on Unemployment, Mr. Speaker? They admit they had run out of ideas for new jobs.

DR. COLLINS:

It is a Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment.

MR. BARRY:

A commission on unemployment and employment, exactly, admitting, Mr. Speaker, that they had run out of ideas. Why did the Minister of

Career Development and Advanced Studies support the setting up of that Royal Commission? We will want to have an answer to that question as well from the minister either here, or in the Estimates Committee, Mr. Speaker. The minister is going to have to answer that.

If I could get back, Mr. Speaker, to the logic of my argument here, the real reason, I think, for the failure of government to set objectives, for the failure of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to set objectives, against which we can compare performance is; one, because they failed before and failed miserably when they tried to live up to objectives they set before and; secondly, Mr. Speaker, because they would have to admit to the people of this Province that they have misled the people in terms of the jobs that are expected in the normal course of events without any special job initiatives, and this is confirmed by these figures set out in this Mobil report. This confirms that the jobs are just not there in the numbers that will be needed. They are not there, and, Mr. Speaker, now we will be able to pin members opposite and ministers opposite into the responsibility for looking after each sector of the economy that they have been ignoring for past years.

The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) shakes his head. Maybe it is because he is a lame-duck member now, Mr. Speaker. I think last Fall I even listed him as a putative leadership candidate; it was a toss up between the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) and the member for Grand Falls in terms of the leadership lineup. Mr. Speaker, maybe it is because of his narrow win, his narrow

majority that he was able to have forced down his throat his department accepting a lower percentage of the provincial budget.

MR. SIMMS:
Not true.

MR. BARRY:
The minister says it is not true. Well, now, let us go to our statistics here, supplied by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and we see, Mr. Speaker, in the little chart that is at the beginning of the resource sector in the budget, 'prepared by the Minister of Finance'. So if it is not true, the member for Grand Falls has got some heavy-duty questioning of the Minister of Finance, and we hope to hear that.

MR. SIMMS:
I am at him every day.

MR. BARRY:
Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at this little chart that is set out here. We have in this resource sector chart the setting out of gross current and capital expenditures. Forest Resources and Lands is on page 57 of the budget document, and we see that in the percentage of the total revised for 1984-85 Forest Resources and Lands had 1.5 per cent of the provincial budget. And do you know that the estimate for 1985-86 is only 1.4 per cent?

MR. SIMMS:
That is the estimate.

MR. BARRY:
That is the estimate.

MR. SIMMS:
What was the estimate last year?

MR. BARRY:

Do you know what the minister is saying? The minister is admitting that the estimates are not worth the paper they are written on, which is what we have been saying for the last several months. We now have a member of government itself, a minister of the Crown admitting that the Minister of Finance's document is useless, Mr. Speaker, is useless in terms of trying to predict what is actually going to be spent. It is unbelievable!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. TULK:

Come on over. You might save your seat next time. Come on over.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is serious. I do not know how the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands can stay in Cabinet. I do not know how a person can stay in Cabinet, shave his principles that closely, if he believes that what is set out for his department is not accurate. Mr. Speaker, we have been saying that, and that is point number five in my speech on the budget, which I will get to by Friday, or Monday of next week.

MR. PATTERSON:

I should replace him. Put in a word for me and I will replace him.

MR. BARRY:

Do you know something? That might not be a bad idea. Mr. Speaker, that might be all right. The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) should be given a chance, and I cannot think of a better place to do it than in a department where we see the minister being forced to accept a smaller percentage of the budget for his department than he

received last year. I have to assume it has to be because of his narrow showing in the election. I have to assume that that has totally demoralized the minister and has lost him a lot of credibility he had in Cabinet. Because he was a strong minister, Mr. Speaker. He used to be a strong minister and you would never see, a couple of years ago, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) permitting his department to be downgraded. You would never see the member for Grand Falls permitting his department to be downgraded in the way we see the Department of Forest Resources and Lands being downgraded today. But it is understandable, because I think the morale has been completely destroyed in that department ever since the Kruger deal.

MR. POWER:

There was a change of ministers, too.

MR. BARRY:

Maybe it was the change of ministers, as the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) mentions. That could destroy morale, as well. We now have morale destroyed both in the Department of Forest Resources and Lands and in the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

Mr. Speaker, during the Kruger deal, we saw a total abandonment of these forest management principles that the former minister and the current minister were espousing as great management principles. We saw those being torn up and we saw government fold over and play dead. As soon as Mr. Kruger said, 'Shove your forest management principles,' I want the 1932 legislation to apply

to my new operation. What did government do? Did they try to explain that times have changed? Did they try to explain that maybe something had been learned from the mistakes of the past when it came to drafting forest management legislation? No! No, they did not. What they did, Mr. Speaker, was totally cave in and give the Kruger Corporation the right to have the 1930s legislation apply to the massive, massive woods holdings which that company now has in this Province. So, of course, what happens is that people devote their lives within a department of government to try to establish certain principles, to try to work for the benefit of the Province the best way they know how, and when they see the rug pulled out from underneath their feet by the Premier, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and the minister of the department, it is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that morale is being destroyed. It is no wonder that this department is now being downgraded. Because what happens then, you see, is that the civil servant, the bureaucrat, the public employee, does not have the same vigor.

MR. MORGAN:

They cannot do their jobs.

MR. BARRY:

It is not just a matter of not doing their jobs, but when it comes time to fight for their share of the pie, they just cannot get the old zest in there anymore, they cannot get the old enthusiasm into their argument, because they have been gutted head-on, Mr. Speaker, by the actions of government in tearing the rug out from underneath their feet, tearing up those forest management principles and going back to 1930s legislation. How can any

professional person sit idly by, accept that and then, the next day, go back to fighting for his department with the same enthusiasm, the same vigor? It is not possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

Would the hon. chipmunk -

MR. SIMMONS:

You are asking too much, boy!

MR. J. CARTER:

Would the hon. hon. chipmunk permit a question?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), a constituent of mine during the Summer in Mount Scio, has been spending too much time in his savory-drying room again. He has inhaled too much of that savory dust, Mr. Speaker, and I suspect that some other stuff gets mixed up with it once in a while. Mr. Speaker, that is the only explanation I can find for the types of incoherent comment that comes from the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), he has been spending too much time in that savory-drying room that he has. I must say, it is a nice design that he has. Buckminster Fuller would be proud to see the practical application of his geodesic dome, Mr. Speaker, but I am not sure that even Buckminster Fuller, who, himself, has his wild moments of imagination, so I am told, would recommend that the member spend so much time inside his savory-drying room. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the member to get out of that geodesic dome for a while and come back down to ground zero before he starts making any further comment in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I will move on from that point now, but I think we have firmly established from that little interchange that we have seen a downgrading of the Department of Forest Resources and Lands. We have heard the minister of that department admit that he does not accept the figures that are contained in the estimates as being the true spending that he intends -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Basically, we have seen the death of a minister, a minister who has totally caved in through just a minor set-back at the polls. He has lost all confidence. He has lost all enthusiasm. He has lost, he thinks, credibility. I think we should still give him a chance here in the House. If members opposite will not give him consideration, members on this side of the House will, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the member that we will permit him to re-establish, if he can, credibility. But, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to see a better job than has been established in the course of the preparation of these estimates for his department.

MR. TULK:

How about Fisheries?

MR. BARRY:

No, Fisheries is item number nine. I will get to that by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week.

Mr. Speaker, because the level of unemployment is so high in this Province, we have some very anxious moments awaiting many people in this Province between now and Thursday night. And we hope and expect that greater

sensitivity will be shown the unemployed of this Province than members opposite have been showing them. We hope and expect, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Mulroney and his new government will actually keep the faith, that they will not break faith with the people who put them in so quickly, as have members opposite, and we hope and expect, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister of Canada will show more sensitivity to the unemployed than members opposite have. We hope the budget being brought down by the federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) will be a better budget for the unemployed than this budget we are now debating. Because, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the way in which unemployment insurance is dealt with is going to have very serious ramifications.

Now, we all hope and, indeed, I think expect, that there will not be any serious change that would hurt the unemployed in his Province. We all hope that the eligibility criteria will not be stiffened up. We all hope that until we see jobs being created, we will not see this social safety net taken away from those tens of thousands of Newfoundlanders who are now unemployed or facing unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that the Prime Minister of Canada lives up to his commitment to inflict prosperity on this Province. We anxiously and eagerly await it.

Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting, in the context of the discussion in preparation for the Budget Debate - I do not know if members saw it last night - the poll that has been carried out across Canada.

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes, the PCs are leading..

MR. BARRY:

The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) said that the P.C.s are leading. Well, the poll that I saw reported indicated that there was a level of 50-odd per cent dissatisfaction -

MR. SIMMONS:

Fifty-nine.

MR. BARRY:

- a 59 per cent level of dissatisfaction with the Conservatives' economic policy, treatment of the economy. And I can assure the member for St. John's North that if that type of treatment of the economy continues, then it will not take long for that increase in the polls to evaporate.

The interesting thing about that poll is that it shows that the people of Canada, by and large, and I think it is true of the people of Newfoundland as well, accept the notion that we have been putting forth in this party, that there should be a stimulation of the economy, even at the risk of a higher deficit, in order to bring down the numbers of unemployed. And, Mr. Speaker, this is the challenge that faces members of this House today, this is the debate which is central to this sitting of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to see merely business as usual, or are we going to see government being prepared to undertake bold new initiatives, to recognize that we have a crisis of unemployment in this Province that must be dealt with, and that can only be dealt with not by a business as usual budget but by special new initiatives?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Tell us what you would do.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I will tell the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) what I would do. What I would do is, number one, reduce taxes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Number two, reduce taxes, number three, reduce taxes.

MR. MATTHEWS:

And raise the deficit.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

You have been brainwashed by the Care Bear.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I am happy to see that we have the mayor of Gaultois and some representatives of that community here with us. That is a community, Mr. Speaker, that recognizes the threat of unemployment. And here is where I come to my next suggestion as to what may be done: Keep all fish plants open in this Province. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Do you want another suggestion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Do you want another suggestion, Mr. Speaker? Keep all fish plants open in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, we all saw in the agreement between the Government of Canada, the Province of Newfoundland, and Fishery Products International, the agreement that if you had more than one hundred people affected in a community a plant could only be cut back or closed with the consent and permission of members opposite.

MR. PATTERSON:

And who would pay the deficit? If you ran your law practice (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

There is the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) again, 'Who will pay the deficit?

MR. PATTERSON:

That is right. That is right. If you ran your law business like you would run the country (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

That is the debate, Mr. Speaker. And we are going to be interested in listening to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) tell us how he is going to see the deficit brought down by having more and more people out of work, less and less productivity in this nation. Is the man insane? Is that how you get a country developing? Is that how you get a country working itself out of a deficit, by having more and more people unemployed?

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the concept of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). I do not understand his economics. He says he is going to spend more money, yet he is prepared to cut the earning power. Now, where would the government get the money if they reduced the SSA tax by 2 per cent, which would be \$40 million a year? Where would you get the money? And would you tell me the name of the lawyer who forced Fishery Products into bankruptcy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that there is no point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:

Well, who was the lawyer?

MR. BARRY:

That, Mr. Speaker, is the typical type of low, despicable attempt to attack individuals in a personal capacity that all too often we have seen the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) engage in. I will give full answers to those questions, Mr. Speaker, but the real thing the member for Placentia has to explain to his

constituents, and to the people of this Province, is when is he going to start making a constructive input into debate in this House, and when is he going to show that he is fit to be in a Cabinet? Maybe if he showed he was fit to be in Cabinet he would not continue to be bypassed, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A further point of order, the hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

I am not as learned as the hon. gentleman, but I am a businessman, I have survived for thirty-five years, and every Saturday I met a payroll for thirty-five years. Now I would like to know how you can increase work by cutting your earnings? What school of economics did you go to? And who was the lawyer who forced Fishery Products into bankruptcy?

MR. TULK:

You do not understand, 'Bill'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, order! Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now I am going to attempt to give

the member for Placentia, Mr. Speaker, a little basic economics. I realize very few members of caucus are talking to him lately because he has been outspoken within caucus and he has been critical of the Premier. He has been bypassed again not just for membership in Cabinet, but he has been bypassed for a parliamentary assistanceship, Mr. Speaker, and he has been around a long time.

MR. TULK:

He is upset now.

MR. BARRY:

I can understand why he is. But now let us have a little economics. Mr. Speaker, the only way that a country or a province can deal with its deficit is by seeing more productivity, great productivity. Now, if we have more and more people unemployed, these people have to live, government has an obligation to look after them. Whether it be by means of welfare payments, unemployment insurance or whatever, Mr. Speaker, money still has to go to these individuals. How much better, Mr. Speaker, for these individuals to be working, to be earning money, to be able to pay taxes. How healthy, Mr. Speaker. Let us do a little calculation: If we take the 60,000 men and women now unemployed and say they contributed only \$1,000 each in taxes - I add three zeros - do you know what I have, Mr. Speaker? An additional contribution to the economy of \$60 million. Now, \$1000 is very low. They only have to contribute about \$1,500 and we would have, Mr. Speaker, \$90 million coming in, enough to wipe out the projected deficit and give us an \$8 million surplus on operating account.

What we are suggesting is having individuals employed and the way they will be employed, Mr. Speaker, is by the private sector, with the stimulus of tax reductions. If there is less of a burden on the private sector tax wise, they are more inclined to invest in this Province. We have the admission of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that his current policies are driving the private sector away. We have the admission of the Minister of Finance that it helps to have a reduction in tax. The Minister of Finance has admitted that reducing taxes will stimulate employment, because he is doing it for the tourist industry. He is admitting, Mr. Speaker, that we would have more employment in the tourist industry, and therefore more money to the Province, if taxes were reduced. So, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that they agree with our basic concept that the economy has to be stimulated, the only problem is that through false pride they hate to admit that there is a good Liberal idea there that could help them deal with the economy, or else, maybe it is just lack of understanding that they feel they have to do it in a haphazard fashion creating a bureaucratic nightmare because of, as an example, tourists having to send back their receipts, the same sort of mess you have with children's clothing. How much better it would be if the tax rate was just decreased, Mr. Speaker. We have the independent businesspeople with their submission, Mr. Speaker, pointing out that the retail sales tax is one of the biggest problems they have in business in this Province and that is why we have recommended a reduction in the retail sales tax not as the final answer but just as a first step,

reduce that tax from 12 per cent to 10 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I think after that little lesson in economics even the member for Placentia can understand that if you have more people working and paying taxes, then you are going to have the deficit being reduced. But you are not going to see the deficit reduced if you put more and more people on welfare, on the dole. I mean, how many more working people can we afford to lose in this Province? We have one quarter, Mr. Speaker, of the work force now without work. We are losing the shoulder to the wheel. That one quarter of the work force could be putting their shoulder to the wheel of the economy out there producing, Mr. Speaker. Not just paying taxes, but also making a contribution to the building of this Province. When will the Tories understand? How many cycles of this have we gone through, Mr. Speaker? I was a Tory and I thought that finally we had a time when Tory governments were able to do away with the hidebound notion that you have to put the deficit before people?

MR. SIMMONS:

You were never a Tory, you were a PC.

MR. BARRY:

I found out that it was not the Progressive Conservative Party, it was still the same old Regressive Conservative Party. And that was when I abandoned ship and got out, when I saw the same regressive policies, Mr. Speaker, that failed in the Depression. That is the same mentality, Mr. Speaker, that was condemning FDR, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, when he said, We must stimulate the economy to cure the deficit. It is the same

mentality that was saying to Ronald Reagan, You will never get the American economy back on the rails by reducing taxes. Mr. Speaker, only a few years ago the same mentality was saying to Ronald Reagan in the United States, 'You cannot cure the ills of the US economy by reducing taxes.' And Ronald Reagan said, 'Just watch me.' Mr. Speaker, that is the essence of the debate and that, I suppose, is one of the great differences between Tories and Liberals. Tories are prepared to put the deficit, or the corporation, or revenue and that sort of abstract concept ahead of the ordinary man, woman, or young person. They are prepared to put these abstract theoretical notions ahead of the welfare of human beings, Mr. Speaker, and that is the essence of this fundamental debate which we have.

MR. PATTERSON:

You must have read Karl Marx.

MR. BARRY:

Better Karl Marx than one of the Marx brothers, whom the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is becoming more and more like.

MR. PATTERSON:

Tell us about McCarthy.

MR. SIMMONS:

Take a bow, Bill. Take a bow.

MR. CALLAN:

That goes to show why those two gentlemen are not in Cabinet, all they do is heckle.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, but they do the same thing in caucus. That is the problem. It is a personality flaw that the member for Placentia has. It is not a matter that he dislikes me any more than he dislikes the

Premier, it is just that if there is somebody speaking he has to heckle. I understand. I do not get too uptight about the member for Placentia.

Mr. Speaker, the essence is, are we going to put people first in this Province or are we not? That is the question that we will all be looking at when we see Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Wilson come out with their budget on Thursday night. I suppose it is the first time in history that we have seen a party that has run an election, that has put forward a programme, a platform, that looked every bit as good after the election was over as before. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, I suspect, judging by this Gallup poll, more and more Newfoundlanders, and indeed all Canadians, accept that we must stimulate the economy, we must create jobs, even if that does mean some increase in the deficit.

Now, members opposite talk about increasing the deficit as though it were a no-no. Mr. Speaker, we have seen members opposite with a record of uncontrolled deficit increase over the past several years. What is the basis for the deficit that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is projecting this year - \$72.8 million? Is it because they have a systematic programme to deal with unemployment? Is it because they are going to create so many thousand long-term jobs? Is that why they are saying we will have an increase in the deficit? No, Mr. Speaker, that is not why. The deficit is being increased this year because it went out of control last year. Not only last year, but I think it is the third or fourth year in a row that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)

comes in on budget day and says, 'Here is what the deficit is going to be.' We stand up and say, 'Minister of Finance you do not have a clue what the deficit is going to be.' And sure enough in a couple of months he sheepishly stands up at some press conference - he always does it when the House is closed, the first one is always done when the House is closed - so we will see a press conference now around August or September and the Minister of Finance will sheepishly have to admit that his projections for the deficit are out of wack again this year, revenue is down or something has happened. It is always beyond his control.

MR. TULK:

Do you think it would be the brewery strike that could figure into this, do you?

MR. BARRY:

It could be the brewery strike, lack of money from beer sales. That will probably be the explanation this year. There is always an explanation. Maybe it will be something that the Government of Canada does in its budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, every year we see the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) come in with a set of figures and we say to him, 'You are saying the deficit is going to be what?' And we say, 'Minister of Finance you are out to lunch again.' And sure enough you sheepishly get up at a press conference and admit that the deficit, and this will be only

three or four months after he brings it in -

MR. TULK:

By the time the ink has dried on the paper.

MR. BARRY:

- the backside is gone out of her again, the backside is gone out of the budget. You will come in and say in three months time the deficit is going to be doubled. Doubled is what he has been saying in recent years, double what it was.

MR. TULK:

I believe you are allowed to use that word.

MR. BARRY:

No, I do not think I am allowed to say the arse it out of her. I do not know.

MR. TOBIN:

He is speaking for the record. He should not be allowed to get away with that.

MR. TULK:

He is taking about a donkey.

MR. BARRY:

We are going to take great pleasure in seeing that the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is stricken from the record of this House the next election.

MR. TOBIN:

You could not do it this time.

MR. BARRY:

I did not get around to it this time, Mr. Speaker. But the member for Grand Bank is gone. As a matter of fact the member for Grand Bank, I understand even this time, was shopping around looking for a job with the Government of Canada. I think he was trying to

get a job as Executive Assistant to Mr. Price, but Mr. Price has to much sense, I think. The price is right.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a budget document that is projecting a deficit. Now, it is not that members opposite are against deficits. Every year they bring one in. The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), whom I am happy to see just coming into the House, for years and years based his entire political career on fiscal integrity, fiscal responsibility. The member for St. John's East is becoming a joke. He is seeing the very basis of his reason for being in politics, his *raison d'etre*, has been undermined by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just a little bit hesitant in making a point of order to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Barry) comments pertaining to Mr. Price and my wanting a job as executive assistant. What I might say, for the record of the House, is that not to long ago the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was very interested in Mr. Price's job, but once he got the polls back from Burin-Placentia West he decided not to run for the PCs in the last federal election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:
There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker, but it is an interesting topic and I think we should follow up on that. At the time I made my decision to move from the Tory side to the Liberal side of the House, I must say a move that I have not had one moment's sorrow about, not one moment's second thoughts about, at that time, Mr. Speaker, I did have an offer from the district of -

MR. SIMMS:
Grand Falls, White Bay, Labrador.

MR. BARRY:
That was another one - Grand Falls, White Bay, Labrador, and we had the poll in there which showed that I could win that seat incidentally. And, Mr. Speaker, we also knew that I could win the Burin-St. George's, they changed the name since then, Mr. Speaker. It showed that I would have swept the district. But, Mr. Speaker, I knew -

MR. TOBIN:
That you could have beaten Roger.

MR. BARRY:
No, Roger was not going to run if I had run.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
The member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), Mr. Speaker, was going to come back to the Province, as he ultimately did, because he wanted to make sure

that there was a good member there, and that is the only reason. When he saw that I was not running, that is the only reason why he did not come back then, Mr. Speaker. It did not matter what side of the House they were on, he wanted to have a good man there representing that seat. He would have been back in this House of Assembly several years earlier if he saw that I was expressing an interest in that seat, Mr. Speaker. But you know what we all saw, Mr. Speaker. We all realize that the problem is not in Ottawa, the problem is right here, here is where the fight has to be fought, here is where the future of Newfoundland and Labrador has to be decided, and it is only going to be by turfing out, Mr. Speaker, the negative wet blanket of ideas that we have over on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

That is the only way, Mr. Speaker, we are going to deal with the problems with Newfoundland. It is not by all of us taking off and running for Ottawa, it is by doing the job that has to be done right here. That is why the current federal member for Burin - St. George's (Mr. Price) decided that the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) -

MR. EFFORD:

Was not good enough to be his special assistant.

MR. BARRY:

That is right. So although the member for Grand Bank is trying to abandon ship, the member for Burin - St. George's decided otherwise.

MR. PATTERSON:

Tell me, how do I get in the Cabinet?

MR. BARRY:

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) will get in the Cabinet if he sits back and listens, a little less heckling, a little more constructive suggestions in the course of debate. When it is his time to speak, Mr. Speaker, if he would get up and give us, 'No, John, no'. Mr. Speaker, it is not that members opposite have anything against the budget, because, as I was saying, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has had the entire basis of his entry into politics undermined, taken away from him. He always said there had to be fiscal responsibility and that meant, Mr. Speaker, for years and years, that there could be no deficit on operating account. Well, we saw members accepting that principle. The first time it happened it did not happen in the budget of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), it happened three months after. He did not have the face to come and tell the people of this Province, 'or perhaps it was more likely he did not have the face to tell the member for St. John's East, he was going to have a deficit on operating account. Every year the deficit has been sneaking up and up and up. So what we are criticizing, Mr. Speaker, is this uncontrolled deficit, the ineptitude and incompetence and inability to budget, inability to project or predict what the deficit is going to be, and the fact that the deficit is increasing at a rate that has nothing to do with the needs of the Province but has to do with the inability of the Minister of Finance to predict what those needs are going to be. It is an unbelievable statement, it is almost as bad as the Minister of Finance saying he cannot figure out why personal

income tax is down. He actually has that in writing somewhere in his budget document. He cannot figure out why personal income tax is down.

MR. SIMMONS:
He said that?

MR. BARRY:
It is in the budget here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY:
I have to find that paragraph and read it out. "One particular problem has been personal income tax revenues. Over the past two years there have been downward adjustments in the receipts of personal income tax as compared with original projections." Listen to this now, listen to this beaut of a sentence. "The cause has not been clearly identified, although it may relate to the impact of the recession."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

DR. COLLINS:
What was that phrase there, again, about original projections? Just read that again, about original projections

MR. BARRY:
"One particular problem has been personal income tax revenues. Over the past two years there have been downward adjustments in the receipts of personal income tax as compared with original projections."

DR. COLLINS:
Who makes those?

MR. BARRY:
We will be delighted, Mr. Speaker,

to find out who makes the projections contained in this budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
You do.

MR. BARRY:
We would be delighted to find out, because that man should have a medal.

MR. TULK:
A bravery medal. One of those bravery medals they have over there.

MR. BARRY:
As a matter of fact, that man should be put out to study, he should be donated to a scientific institute and he should be studied for the rest of his natural life to see if it can be figured out how any person can be further out than if he flipped a coin - heads or tails - and based his decisions on that. How can any person be that far out?

MR. PATTERSON:
Who flipped a coin with Cashin at the Leadership Convention?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
No, no, I did not flip a coin, I flipped the gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could have stood up blindfolded in front of a dart board and said, 'What is my deficit going to be this year?', and with the blindfold on flung the dart, and I think he got triple tops and added on \$22

million.

MR. TULK:

That is right, and he only threw two darts.

MR. BARRY:

Actually, what did he hit? He hit the bull - what is the bull worth?

MR. TULK:

Fifty.

MR. BARRY:

He got fifty. The next one was a double sixteen. That is eight-two. The next one he put right in his foot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

He shot himself in the foot again, Mr. Speaker. He shot himself in the foot the same way he shoots himself in the foot every time he comes in on Budget Day and brings down another estimate, another projection.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

We will be glad to hear where it comes from. Another projection of what the deficit is going to be. But do you know something?

MR. TOBIN:

Do you like the cover?

MR. BARRY:

Do you where he got the basis for his \$82 million deficit this year? He has a strategy, Mr. Speaker, he has a strategy for the setting of the deficit, as to what the deficit will be. Now you might ask, is that strategy to base the deficit on the level of unemployment and the need to

stimulate the economy? Do you figure that that is what the deficit is based on, the level of deficit? Or is the deficit based upon the need for public expenditure in order to get the economy revived and moving, Mr. Speaker? Is that what the deficit - No? I will find now what his basis for - it is here somewhere if I could just have a moment.

The philosophy, Mr. Speaker, of how the deficit is selected is here somewhere, now if I could just - I think it was early on in the game, around the fifth page, Financial review - our budgetary - no, I do not see it here, but anyhow the basis of it is - I will find it in a moment, Mr. Speaker - the basis of planning the extent of the budget deficit, the strategy is not how many jobs do we need to create -

DR. COLLINS:

Here we are.

MR. BARRY:

What page is it?

DR. COLLINS:

Page seven.

MR. BARRY:

Page seven. It is not how many jobs we need to create - here it is, here it is. I got it. It is not how many jobs that we have to create. It is not how great is the need to stimulate the economy. Here is the reason for the deficit being set at \$72.8 million as opposed to \$12 million or \$175 million, or \$32 million: The budget strategy is designed to contain the current account deficit at a level less than 1984/85.

Now they go on, Mr. Speaker, to give three other reasons: provide

further incentives, give greater emphasis to employment creation, and expand the capital account programme, all of which is nonsense, because they do not do any of those things, Mr. Speaker. All of them are nonsense. The real reason is set out in number one, that they set the deficit based upon what last year's deficit was, and we all know of course that last year's deficit was unplanned, unpredicted, uncontrolled -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Certainly unexpected.

MR. BARRY:
Definitely unexpected, unreported in last year's Budget Speech. So, Mr. Speaker, what we have is the Minister of Finance coming in each year and projecting his deficit on the basis of what the uncontrolled deficit was last year, and bringing it in at a level about \$10 million less than what it was last year.

Now, I will make a prediction that when we see a budget deficit of \$175 million coming out of this one - \$150 million to \$175 million - well, if it is \$175 million this year which it could be based on the past track record of the minister, guess what the deficit is going to be next year?

MR. BAKER:
\$165 million.

MR. BARRY:
\$165 million, yes. The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) could learn from the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), he catches on fast to these economic lessons.

MR. PATTERSON:
That is the multiplier effect, is it?

MR. BARRY:

It is a ratchet effect I think is what you call it, the deficit is being ratcheted up each year based upon what the uncontrolled deficit was in the previous year. Now that is the extent of planning that goes into the deficit that we see in this nice little document.

Now the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) said, "Well, comment on the cover." Well, you know what we have here on the cover, what we have here on the cover is Mortier Bay, Mr. Speaker, at least a resemblance, a depiction of Mortier Bay. And Mr. Speaker, what we see here is the shipyard in the foreground -

MR. BAKER:
Nobody working.

MR. BARRY:
Not a soul working, three or four guys standing on the wharf with their hands in their pockets. Mr. Speaker, we see the fish plant with not a soul working over on the wharf on the fish plant, and we see Cow Head, Mr. Speaker, that great answer to the economic needs of the Burin Peninsula, we see oil rigs with nobody on them.

Now you know what the Cow Head Development consists of, Mr. Speaker. The Cow Head Development makes it easier to service the oil rigs in that instead of the workers having to go out from the Marystown Shipyard, to the middle of the bay, where the rigs used to be moored, they will now bring the rigs in and they will work on them by the wharf.

Mr. Speaker, do you see extra jobs being created through that little effort? We are going to look forward to the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) getting

up and explaining how Marystown and the Burin Peninsula are going to have to increase their municipal services, build new homes, bring in more Kentucky Fried Chicken outlets to cover the numbers of people who are going to be employed as a result of that development. It is a positive step, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

How about Kentucky fried turrs?

MR. BARRY:

Kentucky fried turrs? Yes, that might be all right.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) has come up with the first good entrepreneurial idea that has come from that government, and maybe the member had better grab the franchise before it disappears now, the Kentucky fried turr franchise.

But this is the sort of hipe that is thrown out by members opposite, particularly during the course of the election. A lot of economic planning by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and by government has to do with planning how to hold off any sort of economic stimulus until election year, and how to get as many projects as possible timed for election year. That was why they sent back the Environmental Impact Statement last November. It was because they were afraid that they might miss the peak of employment.

MR. TOBIN:

What were you saying about the cover?

MR. BARRY:

I am going to get back to that now.

If you notice, the peak of

employment - short-term, it turns out the peak of that employment will come in about three to four years time -

MR. TULK:

Yes. What is going to be on then, I wonder?

MR. BARRY:

- from concrete platforms. Now, you wonder why members opposite are fighting so desperately for concrete platforms. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be much too little much, much too late, because the men and women who will be looking at the performance of members opposite will be aware of the projected jobs that had been set forth by members opposite.

MR. TULK:

We will take care of that.

MR. BARRY:

And when the awful reality strikes home and they recognize that in that great negotiating fashion of our Premier, the great conciliator on the 8th Floor, that he is going to get every single job in the world that can come from concrete platform construction is going to be located in Newfoundland, that is going to be a total of 5,195, a global figure.

MR. TULK:

How long will that be for then?

MR. BARRY:

For one year.

MR. TULK:

Oh!

MR. BARRY:

For one year! That is long enough, members say, to get us through an election. Because it is going to fall off the next year

to 3,585 global, and then the next year it is going to fall off to 2,155. And if you look at the jobs in Newfoundland that they are talking about, by 1991 they will be back to 785, that is with concrete platforms.

Now, getting back to the cover, Mr. Speaker. We have the president of the Marystown Shipyard union here visiting the House of Assembly this afternoon and, I am sure, now down meeting with government officials. Now, why is the president of the Marystown Shipyard union in for discussions with government officials?

MR. TOBIN:
For very positive reasons.

MR. BARRY:
Why is it, do you think? Is it because they are so satisfied with the level of employment at the Marystown Shipyard? Is the member for Burin - Placentia West asking us to believe that the workers at the yard are satisfied with the level of employment there now?

MR. TOBIN:
Very satisfied about what the government has done, very satisfied.

MR. BARRY:
Well, let the record show, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is satisfied and government is satisfied with the level of employment at the Marystown Shipyard now.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the president of that union and the workers of that union see hundreds of jobs lost there in the last several months and there is very great concern. The hull that is

ongoing now, Mr. Speaker, is being built on spec - What is it? Hull 37 or 39? I think it is 37. Hull 37 is 50 per cent complete and lay-offs are occurring, as they do in the normal course of events there. There is one small ferry, the Ramea ferry, now to be constructed. And where else are the jobs going to come from? What does this budget contain?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Hull 69.

MR. BARRY:
Oh the Marystown Shipyard.

Where are the projects that are going to see continuing employment for the yard? No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the president of the union was in here to talk with government officials. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is an awful, awful misleading statement for the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) to say that these workers are satisfied with the level of employment now in that yard, because those workers are not satisfied.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A point of order, the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
The hon. Leader of the Opposition must not be permitted to mislead or to read into or put words in my mouth. The fact of the matter is I said, the shipyard union executive and the people employed at the Marystown Shipyard are indeed very grateful for the co-operation and, in particular, for the amount of work that this government had put at the Marystown Shipyard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, the amount of work in the shipyard in Marystown, government's involvement in the amount of work in the shipyard in Marystown started with the replacement of the Leader of the Opposition as Minister of Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
And, Mr. Speaker, since I became the MHA for that district, this government has called something in the area of \$60 million worth of construction to that Shipyard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
And we make no apologies to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Speaker, whose biggest problems with Marystown is the fact that I can win Burin-Placentia West in the four digit bracket and he can lose it in the same digit bracket as well.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

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

MR. BARRY:
I think that is a good point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that is a very legitimate point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Burin-Placentia West has had to get up and admit that the workers down in the Shipyard are not satisfied with the level

of employment.

MR. TOBIN:
They are very satisfied.

MR. BARRY:
Well, I mean which is it? Which is it? Are they satisfied or are they not satisfied with the level of employment?

MR. TOBIN:
Very satisfied.

MR. BARRY:
Get up again, explain again? Maybe the point of order was not that good.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Let us have another explanation?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. But there is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:
Okay, try for two. Try for two.

MR. TOBIN:
Okay, Mr. Speaker, I would assume now that I am speaking in debate.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:
I rose on a point of order, the hon. gentleman has taken his seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Is the hon. member raising another point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER:
By leave!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to get greater explanation and clarification than the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has given so far. What is he saying, Mr. Speaker? Are the workers and their representatives in the union satisfied with the level of unemployment at the yard? Are they satisfied with the level of employment now at the yard? Is that what the member for Burin-Placentia West is saying? Because that is what I said he said.

MR. TULK:
That is right.

MR. BARRY:
He has admitted, Mr. Speaker, when he just stood up that they are not satisfied, if I understand him correctly. The workers down there are not satisfied with the current level of employment and they are not satisfied with the lack of new products for the yard. They are not satisfied with the fact that they are looking at 50 per cent of Hull 37 left to be completed, and one small ferry. They are staring massive layoffs in the face, Mr. Speaker. And they want more -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:
They are the only people in Newfoundland then.

MR. BARRY:
- from the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) than these platitudes and these soapy compliments to the Premier to try and worm his way into the Cabinet.

MR. TOBIN:
How much did you send down?

MR. BARRY:
They want, Mr. Speaker, some action by the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). It is not what you have done for them yesterday, Mr. Speaker, it is what are you going to do for them tomorrow. You have gone, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. TOBIN:
I will put my record up against your any day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
- and sought election, and you set forth a commitment to work. Now what is the member for Burin-Placentia West going to do to ensure that we have better performance than we see on the cover of this budget, where you cannot see a single working soul? Is this another prediction and another projection by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)?

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, can you make some rule on his bawling?

MR. TOBIN:
Lock the doors on the fishermen, is it?

MR. BARRY:

Well, I will make an undertaking now. If the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) can keep his members quiet, I will cut down the level of my tone, but if I have to outbawl them I will outbawl them. But is this budget cover a prediction?

MR. TOBIN:

You are a disgrace.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Is this budget cover another prediction, where we do not see a single soul in Mortier Bay, except, presumably somebody on that supply boat that is cruising in the harbour. That is the only sign of movement that we see. Is that a sign of things to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

That might be on automatic pilot.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the record should be allowed to stand that the only movement in the Marystown area is the people on the design of the shipyard. That is a total insult to the integrity of the men who are working on that shipyard for you to suggest that the only amount of life there is what you see on a supply vessel.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He did not say that.

MR. TOBIN:

That is what he said, Mr. Speaker, and it is shameful and he should not be allowed to get away with it, insulting the workforce of the Marystown shipyard in that respect. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is very disappointed that I could win the district and he could not. His biggest problem, Mr. Speaker, was not just because he did absolutely nothing for the shipyard, it was the fact that he locked the doors of Confederation Building on the trawlermen when they came in to express their concerns to government when he was their MHA. That is why he is getting on with this.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order there is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what we see here on the cover of this budget is three individuals with their hands in their pockets standing on the wharf and we see two more individuals standing staring out at the gate and that is the only sign of life that we see. Now, I am wondering if that is symptomatic of what members opposite expect from Mortier Bay. Is that another prediction, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) because, Mr. Speaker, I fear that if we see the current policies of that minister continue, it is not just going to be Mortier Bay where we will see

fewer and fewer people employed, it is going to be many communities all around this Province and we will not have to wait much longer, Mr. Speaker. The next few months we are going to see much more hardship suffered by people in this Province and it will be traced back directly to the lack of any new policies, the lack of any special initiatives for job creation on a long-term basis in this budget. This budget is an empty document, it is another failure by the Minister of Finance. He should resign. He should resign. Every year he comes in, and not only are the figures untrustworthy, not only can we no longer trust the figures, Mr. Speaker, that are contained in this budget but, we are looking at a lack of imagination and a lack of ideas. We are giving the minister ideas. We are giving him ways in which he can deal with the problem of unemployment but he is ignoring it.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
No, I have a couple of more minutes. There is a lot to be said. There are several more days of debate yet. I want to take every minute that I can because, Mr. Speaker, we have too serious a problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY:
Do not be so foolish. The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is once again showing why both he and the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) have both been overlooked. You know something, that Premier has more sense than I gave him credit for.

He knows how to separate the wheat from the shaft and keep the shaft down in the backbenches there. Now, we are going to have to see some greater contribution to this debate than we have seen so far from the member for Burin - Placentia West, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more to be said because we have too many people unemployed in this Province. We have too little being done to deal with that problem and we have several more days, Mr. Speaker, in this budget debate to deal with that very pressing issue but right now it being 6:00 p.m. I would like to adjourn the debate.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 22, 1985 at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

May 21, 1985

*Tabled by Hon. Mr.
of Social Services,
21 May '85*

QUESTION:

Mr. K. Aylward:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to address this question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). I just received some correspondence from the Consumer Organization of Disabled People of Newfoundland and Labrador. It concerns the proposal for establishment of a Premier's Advisory Council on the Status of Disabled Persons.

What I am wondering is if the recommendation or the plan, or whatever, is preceding, if there are any discussions ongoing. The correspondence that I have had, that they have given me, the last one is dated December. I was wondering are there any other discussions ongoing or are there any plans for the future for the setting up of this advisory council?

ANSWER:

Mr. Brett:

The idea of a Council on the Status of Disabled Persons grew out of the discussions and dialogue that took place during the International Year of Disabled Persons (1981) and was one of the recommendations contained in OBSTACLES, the official report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Disabled in Canada. The same recommendation formed part of our Provincial Advisory Committee to the Minister of Social Services which was established for the Year of the Disabled.

A discussion paper regarding the formation of a Provincial Advisory Council has been prepared by the Division of Rehabilitation Services. This paper has been circulated to several agencies to give them an opportunity for input into the proposal.

The concept of an Advisory Council on the Status of Disabled Persons has merit. The next step in the process is to call a meeting of the agencies involved to further refine the proposal for Government consideration.

May 7th, 1985

Talled by Hon. Mem.
D) Social Services
21 May,
1985

QUESTION #1: Why was the person overseeing the boarding house program laid off?

ANSWER: The present system of boarding houses in the St. John's area is unable to accommodate the many clients with special needs who have had to be placed in emergency accommodations. The solution to this problem did not prove to be the assignment of one person, who despite valiant efforts, could not provide for the integration of the majority of these clients into the existing system of boarding houses in the City.

Last July, there were 33 individuals in emergency accommodations at an approximate cost of \$40,000 a month.

This April, there were 31 individuals in emergency accommodations at an approximate monthly cost of \$49,000.

The person hired to oversee the boarding house situation was hired on a temporary basis for a twelve-month period with the salary paid from a permanent position. That temporary assignment has now expired (after a two-month extension) and the position will be advertised and filled through the normal channels, that is, as competition through the Public Service Commission.

QUESTION #2: Who will now monitor the situation in the boarding houses in the City?

ANSWER: A member of the permanent Social Worker staff is being assigned the responsibility to monitor and oversee the situation with respect to boarding houses in the City.

QUESTION #3: What is the number of individuals now in hotels, and what is the cost?

ANSWER: 31 people - \$49,000 per month.

QUESTION #4: What is the number of people now in boarding houses in the City?

ANSWER: The total number of cases on social assistance, boarding in the St. John's area is as follows:

	<u>Boarding/ Non-Relatives</u>	<u>Boarding/ Relatives</u>
St. John's East	76	362
St. John's Center	143	311
St. John's West	78	398
Totals	<u>297</u>	<u>1,071</u>

Total - 1,368