



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 17

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
***(Hansard)***

***Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas***

Tuesday

22 April 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

With respect to the point of privilege raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on Thursday I must rule that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has not established a prima facie case of breach of privilege, because I do not believe that the role of chairman of a standing committee is analogous to that of Speaker of this House, his is a lesser role, and for that reason the restraints on the conduct of the Speaker in carrying out his or her responsibilities as the Presiding Officer of the House are not fully applicable to him.

A second reason why I find that the issue raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not constitute a prima facie case of breach of privilege is that all the authorities are agreed that a matter arising in committee is first to be dealt with in committee and only secondarily in the House. Should a matter come from a committee to the House for consideration, it must come by way of a substantive motion of which motion must be given.

In this connection, I would refer all hon. members to Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, paragraphs 608 and 609 on page 196.

I would also wish to inform them that I have been informed by the Clerk of the House of Commons of Canada that that is the procedure followed there on a matter of this type. And in consultation with authority at Westminster, a similar opinion was given.

However, in ruling as I have I do

not wish to be seen as condoning the actions of the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, agricultural limestone is essential to the farming industry in this Province because our soils are naturally acidic and large quantities must be applied to obtain optimum crop yields. Over the past several years, farmers have been able to use local limestone from Daniel's Harbour. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I have to announce today that we must discontinue the use of Daniel's Harbour limestone. A research project on this limestone was recently completed by the Agricultural Canada Research Station, St. John's. Their findings indicate that the continued use of this product could cause problems in the long term. Therefore, we feel it prudent to discontinue supplying this product.

Daniel's Harbour limestone was compared with Mosher limestone in the research experiment to test for cadmium and zinc. The results indicate that levels of zinc and cadmium in the soil are increasing at rates higher than anticipated. This means that the amount that can be applied within acceptable limits has been reduced considerably and continued use of this product will likely increase

levels in the soil to above recommended limits. The research also indicates that crop yields decreased with higher application rates of both Daniel's Harbour and Mosher limestones, but there were generally greater yield reductions with higher rates of Daniel's Harbour limestone on cabbage and potatoes. These results indicate that there could be yield reductions in some crops with continued application of the product.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that the research experiment demonstrated that the plant levels of cadmium did not increase with the application of Daniel's Harbour limestone. This indicates that there is no health hazard from plant uptake. Zinc, of course, is not a health hazard from plant uptake.

As an alternative to providing limestone for farmers for this year, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development will supply subsidized agricultural limestone to farmers as follows:

(1) Bagged limestone will be tendered for delivery to railsidings at a farmer cost of \$17.00/tonne. This is the same system as used in previous years for bagged limestone.

(2) Bulk agricultural limestone will be tendered for delivery to farms in containers at a farmer cost of \$17.00/tonne. Delivery will depend on the availability of hatch top containers from TerraTransport. Quantities could be limited somewhat due to the anticipated higher cost.

For subsequent year, Mr. Speaker, the department will work with the

Department of Development and the Department of Mines and Energy and federal funding agencies during 1986 to assist private entrepreneurs in developing a local production and delivery system to be ready for 1987.

There are some recent events that indicate local production might be feasible in conjunction with other ventures. We intend to pursue these possibilities. We want to ensure that quality limestone is available at a reasonable cost to farmers, with convenient delivery service.

Mr. Speaker, for the past five years, Hawke Industries of Hawkes Bay, Newfoundland, contracted with my department for the supply of limestone from Daniel's Harbour. This firm has performed outstanding service to the farming community. Regretfully, because of this technical problem, we will not be renewing contracts for the supply from Daniel's Harbour. I have met with the owner of Hawke Industries in order to express my appreciation for his past service and to explain the results of Agriculture Canada's research.

Mr. Speaker, because limestone from Daniel's Harbour, which has been supplied by Hawke Industries in Hawke's Bay, is not going to be used, at least this year, does not mean that Hawke Industries, or any local companies, cannot tender to acquire the contract to supply limestone for this year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a disappointment, I am sure, to everybody, that we are not going to be able to see local production of limestone from Daniel's Harbour. It is always good for us to be self-sufficient in the materials we need in our agricultural industry, and we are now going to start importing limestone again. I am pleased to see that the minister is looking at, for next year, the possibility of some local production of limestone that could be utilized. We would support that. We think that is the direction in which we should go.

I would also ask the minister to make sure that the figures are double checked. It is possible for the experts to make mistakes, and the minister should make sure that the research findings which indicate that the Daniel's Harbour limestone is not suitable for continued use in agricultural purposes are, in fact, verified and re-verified, because it would be too bad if we made this decision based upon an improper study.

If the study was carried out properly, there is not very much the minister can do, there is not very much anybody can do. Nobody wants to see a material applied to the soil of the farms in this Province that could lead to lower yields in the long term.

So we would ask the minister to, first, see that those figures are rechecked and, secondly, as quickly as possible see a local production of limestone and a delivery system put in place.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this stage I would like to

welcome to the Visitors Gallery Grade XI students from St. Augustines School, Plum Point, and Grade XII students from Evely Collegiate, Roddickton, with their teachers, Kathleen Brenton, Abby Hynes, Karen Baggs and Reverend Baxter Park.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to address a question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Over the last few weeks we have seen a number of so-called experts in the field come up with very pessimistic projections with respect to the possibility of Hibernia being started this year. I think that those projections are in fact unnecessarily pessimistic. I think that there is a reasonable prospect for Hibernia getting underway. I think that if you look at the oil supply that we can reasonably anticipate oil prices going up in the early 1990s or mid-1990s. And I would ask the Premier has he been able to ascertain just what form of federal commitment is going to be necessary in order to see Hibernia get underway this year?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am very pleased to hear that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has adopted the position that I have taken and that the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) -

MR. BARRY:

I always have.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- has taken through the last month or two months, when we heard as oil prices started to go down, that that does not necessarily mean that Hibernia will not get going, and that there is a reasonable prospect of that occurring still, even though a lot of people are very pessimistic about it.

I cannot answer the Leader of the Opposition's question directly for a whole range of reasons, which I am sure he will appreciate. But it is ironic that he should raise the question today, and rather timely, because the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate is not in his seat today, and that is due directly to the Hibernia situation. As hon. members know the minister was not here one day last week for the same reason. The minister has been busy outside of the Province talking to the companies and talking to the federal government yesterday and today. There is no exception to that. As I have indicated on a number of occasions publicly, negotiations are proceeding. There are a range of issues which the Province, the federal government and the companies have to deal with. Where exactly the federal government sits on it will depend upon the kind of responses that we

are involved in, the kind of negotiations we are involved in with the company. So from day to day where and when the federal government moves in or moves out on a given issue changes. It would not be appropriate for me at this fairly delicate period of time to say much more, except to say that negotiations are proceeding. Late last week, yesterday and again today the minister was away on matters relating to that in talks with the companies and with the federal government, and those talks will be proceeding through the next couple of weeks.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I think the Premier will acknowledge that we are not adopting the Premier's position, that we have consistently said that we anticipate oil prices will go up in the 1990s, and that, of course, is what the planning for Hibernia depends upon. I would like to ask the Premier in light of the fact that the Government of Canada has made a commitment to the Western oil industry and has supplied a certain number of dollars in terms of financial commitment and is indicating, I think again today, that the PGRT tax, the petroleum gas revenue tax, is likely to be lifted several years earlier than it would have been normally, and in light of the high unemployment rate we have in this Province, and a business climate which is every bit as devastated as that in Alberta, would the Premier seek, as soon as possible, this active

commitment on the part of the Government of Canada, a public commitment to confirm that they are prepared to put the financial backing behind Hibernia that will be needed to see it start this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that has already been done this past two or three weeks by the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate in meetings that he has had with the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Ms Carney), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), Mr. Crosbie, our federal representative in the Cabinet of Canada, and also representation by me with the Prime Minister's Office along the lines that the Leader of the Opposition just mentioned. We, for our part here in Newfoundland, believe that we are as devastated as Alberta if not more so. We came through a recession which we were hit a lot harder with than many other parts of Canada, and we expect, obviously, to get like treatment, that anything that is done out West, the same kind of effort and commitment will be made by the federal government to ensure that our oil resources get developed as soon as possible.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Would the Premier indicate what is the latest time at which a decision by the Government of Canada will become necessary in

order to permit the Hibernia development to proceed according to the schedule which was initially laid out in the Mobil Environmental Impact Statement? It seems to me that we are already three months, approximately, behind schedule. I think Mobil originally intended to allocate the project management in February. They had indicated to industry the project management contracts would be allocated in February, that has not yet been done, so we are behind now two months, March and April. What is the latest point in time when we can expect to see any substantial work being started this year for that financial commitment by the Feds?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Let me just say on oil prices first, Mr. Speaker, because I guess the Leader of the Opposition and many members of the House read in *The Financial Post* on Friday an article dealing with oil prices in which analysts were predicting a price of \$18 US by September of this year. Perhaps it is a bit too early for us, perhaps we would like to see it stay down low while the development is going ahead and then have it go high come 1990 and 1991. So I think there will be some stability in prices over the next several months in any case, and even more so in the 1990s.

The last date is very difficult to say, because people within the companies are giving sort of different dates in order to see something start this year. My guess would be, and it would only be a guess, but based upon information that I have, it would be difficult to get substantial

work done this year if we did not have, say, green lights on everything by the end of May or the first week in June. That would be perhaps the outside. The first or second week in May would be a more preferable time from our vantage point, but I think most of the observers, from the companies and the federal government and ourselves, are saying that perhaps we could get to the end of May or the first week in June, but beyond that it may be difficult to see substantial work this year. And, of course, our whole effort now is being applied to getting that early release as soon as possible to make it possible for work to be done this year.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor). The negotiating teams for NAPE and Treasury Board apparently went back to the bargaining table at two o'clock today. In view of the fact that I understand the last proposal made was made by the NAPE negotiators, I would ask the minister has the government something new and substantial to place on the table for the present NAPE negotiations? Perhaps the minister can indicate the nature of what those proposals might be.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman surely does not think I am going to negotiate with him or that I am

going to tell him what may or may not take place at the bargaining table this afternoon. Let me simply say that on Friday afternoon we became aware that there was perhaps some movement on behalf of NAPE that interested us to the point where we contacted their office and suggested that it might be appropriate for us to go back to the bargaining table this afternoon and discuss just what their proposal might mean if it shows some realistic movement on their behalf. Obviously the proposal at the moment is still far in excess of government's position but at least it is starting, for the first time, to show some movement in the right direction. If there is any possibility there to see further movement, to get down to some realistic and reasonable discussion, then we want to seize every opportunity.

So we have asked them to come back to the bargaining table and they are there now and have been since two o'clock. We will be discussing that proposal with them and as to what may or may not take place following those discussions, Mr. Speaker, I am obviously not at liberty to say.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We are into a queer situation here. It seems that at times the government chooses to negotiate in public, when it suits its own purpose in trying to put NAPE in its place.

Let me ask the minister another question. He has told everybody

else except this House what is going on and he has negotiated in public when he wants to. Should negotiations fail this time around, from what I am hearing there is a very high probability that we will have a second, more serious strike on our hands than we had the last time. What plans does government have to avert such a strike?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to predict when people are going to choose to break the law. We certainly hope that that is not going to take place again. We think that the proposal that we have put forward is a reasonable one. We have indicated that we are prepared to negotiate that. We would hope that the union would also be prepared to negotiate it and that we will see this afternoon at the bargaining table a response from them which indicates a willingness to negotiate fair and reasonably toward obtaining a collective agreement which is satisfactory to both sides.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary to the Premier. This strike has cost the Province a tremendous amount of money, a tremendous amount of the taxpayers' dollars, not the least cost, of course, is the ads that we have seen placed in various newspapers around the Province and

on various radio stations. Could the Premier inform the House just what the cost of those advertisements of one kind and another were, and just what department paid for the ads during the present NAPE dispute?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have those numbers at my fingertips. I think the bills are still coming in, but we will when all the bills are in and paid, inform the House just exactly what the advertising cost was.

MR. TULK:

Which department?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not even know which department it was, off the top of my head, and what subhead in what department's estimates. But when all the bills are in and paid, then we will inform the House. But I cannot give a number right now because we honestly do not know, because all the bills are not in and have not been paid. But when they are we will have no problem in informing the House just exactly how much the cost was.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the President of Treasury Board again this afternoon accusing NAPE of breaking the law and so on. The



President of Treasury Board has had close to seven weeks to bringing this dispute to a rational end. I would ask the Premier, since the President of Treasury Board has succeeded in doing nothing, but aggravate the dispute and carry on confrontation, does the Premier have any feeling at all that it is now time to give someone else a chance to see if they can settle this strike?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the President of Treasury Board was signing - When? Today or tomorrow?

MR. WINDSOR:

Today.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Today is signing an agreement with NAPE.

MR. WINDSOR:

No. 18 and No. 19, one Friday and one today.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He signed one Friday, No. 18, and he is signing one today, No. 19. He has signed nineteen contracts. I think the President of Treasury Board has done an excellent job in the last few weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Some hon. gentlemen, including the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), might forget that the President of Treasury was President of Treasury Board back

in 1979 when he did an excellent job on behalf of government. And I have every confidence and faith in what he is doing now. I do not see anything mysterious in what the President of Treasury Board just said, in answer to a question, about breaking the law. I guess everybody here in this House, both on the floor and in the galleries, knows that the law has been broken, and we do not want to see the law broken any more. We want an end to this dispute, and we are being very reasonable. As a matter of fact, we have moved on nineteen issues upon until Friday when NAPE had not moved on one. We had moved on nineteen. And that we had provided parity like we promised, and not only on wages but also on a range of other issues in those nineteen points that we moved on. The President of Treasury Board, in my view, is doing an absolutely excellent job on behalf of the taxpayers of this Province and he will remain as President of the Treasury Board and continue to do the good work that he started.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, now that the Premier has publicly embraced the President of Treasury Board we can get on with the real issues of the day.

I want to ask the Premier, or the appropriate minister, a question relating to Dr. House's statement recently that the report of the

Employment/Unemployment Commission would now not be ready until September. This represents a couple of delays. It was originally scheduled for March 15 and then for some time in April. Would the Premier or the appropriate minister indicate whether this latest delay has the concurrence of government or, alternately, is government doing something to have the receipt and the publication of the report speeded up somewhat?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have met with the Chairman and other members of the Royal Commission in the last week and a half or two weeks and they have run into some difficulties in writing the report for a whole range of reasons. We reluctantly agreed to the September date. We had wanted it earlier than September. It looks like most of the work could be ready by the end of June or July. They have done an awful lot of independent research work, contracted out to other people I forget how many reports, some forty or fifty substantial reports that stand on their own feet, independent, and we thought that it would be appropriate for the report and its recommendations to come out simultaneously with those thirty or forty other research projects rather than come out in dribs and drabs. So we have reluctantly accepted the reasons given by the Royal Commission that it would perhaps be mid July or around that time, and that would not be an appropriate time for good public debate on them. Therefore, rather than put it out in July when everybody would be on holidays and you would not get public debate,

we have agreed with them. They are very keen on it being an excellent report and excellently written, and so for a whole range of reasons, based upon independent research projects, based upon their desire to have it well written, we have agreed that the report be ready no later than the first or second week in September. We insisted on that for the following reason, that in September, when everybody is back to work and all the rest of it, we begin our budget preparation and our Throne Speech preparation. So it would flow nicely into our schedule for next Spring on the Throne Speech and budget and therefore would not interfere with that. September is a better time than July because it would get more public profile and more public debate, which we will encourage at that time. So, we have reluctantly agreed with the September date.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I construe from what the Premier said that this will be made available to the public in September, given his argument about the need for the widest possible public debate. Would the Premier indicate whether that is the time that his administration will receive the report, or will it have it in hand some time before that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, we will not have it before

that. We have asked and the royal commission for their views in the post-secondary area. If they have their research done in the post-secondary area, we would like to get a rough draft of the kinds of things they are talking about in post-secondary because the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) has a White Paper that has already been out to the public on which we have public responses, and we would not want to move without that information. That is the only area where we would want to move sooner than when the report is now due to come. So I have asked the commission to sit down with the Minister of Career Development and review with the minister the kinds of things that they would be saying in the report, if that is completed, on post-secondary education and the reorganization of the whole system in post-secondary. That they have agreed to do so that the minister can move ahead with his White Paper before the Fall, hopefully move ahead with the White Paper within the next month or so.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Forest Resource and Lands (Mr. Simms). Back in February I acquainted him of the problem experienced by some 120 people who were employed by the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, albeit on a part-time basis, in Bay d'Espoir. At the time he indicated that the FEST Programme,

he felt, was cancelled but there was a possibility it would be continued on with the signing of a new forestry agreement.

Now we understand that the new forestry agreement has been struck between the minister and his federal counterpart so I wonder is there anything done so that we can advise those people that their jobs have been protected?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for his question. In fact, the forestry agreement has not yet been signed. The forestry agreement will be signed next Monday, April 28. In that agreement there is provision for funds to be spend in the silviculture area and in that connection I hope to be able to make some announcements at the appropriate time, following the assigning of the agreement, and there should be some funding in there for some projects in a number of areas around the Province, some of which would, I think, hopefully benefit some of the people in the Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir area. In addition to that, what I indicated was that the CEIC Programme, the Job Strategy Programme, now has funding appropriated specifically for forest related projects. And if there are groups or associations in various parts of the Province who would like to apply for silviculture related projects, there are projects available and there is funding available. We, in fact, will get already, I think, about \$1 million out of our CEIC Programme this year, fortunately, for

silviculture projects and that is on top of what will be outlined in the new forestry subsidiary agreement which, I might add, I can tell hon. members, will be substantially greater than what we have had in the last number of years.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker, that is not the answer to the question that I asked the hon. minister. I asked the minister, you know, what had he done concerning these 120 people, who were employed between seven and thirteen years with the Department of Lands and Forests, whose jobs are being eliminated. Now he comes on with the CEIC Programmes and potential jobs in the new agreement, but has he done anything regarding these 120 people, who are now unemployed and will continue to be because they will not qualify under the CEIC unless he does something to intercede for their jobs. What has he done to intercede, to protect the jobs of these 120 people who are employees of his department?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, from recent communications that I have seen from that particular district, I would say I have done an awful lot more than the hon. member has done. I have not gotten any criticism other than from the hon. member.

We are prepared to look at proposals and projects that would be undertaken in the Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir area as we will do in other areas of the Province. I hope in the not too distant future, following the signing of a new federal - provincial agreement, that there will be funds appropriated for new projects so that people in that area can be employed. I do not know what other kind of an answer the hon. member is looking for.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary.

MR. GILBERT:  
The question I asked the minister was what had he done to protect the jobs of the 120 people there. I have done my job. He is not even answering his correspondence, neither he nor the hon. the Premier. Those people are concerned. Those 120 people are employees of his department. What has he done to ensure they are going to be hired back again? Never mind fudging and saying they are going to get jobs through CEIC. I am asking the hon. minister are these 120 workers going to be employed by his department this Summer?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I will try to say it in baby talk so the hon. member might understand what I am trying to say. The new federal - provincial agreement will be signed on Monday next. In that agreement there will be a significant amount of money

allocated for silviculture projects. Silviculture projects are labour oriented. Silviculture projects employ people. There will be projects undertaken in all areas of the Province, hopefully including the Bay d'Espoir area. In that case, people who are unemployed down in that area will be able to get jobs on those particular projects. Now, what else does the hon. member want me to say?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). The new ferry for the Gulf service, the Caribou, is coming into service shortly. It has been brought to our attention that the John Hamilton Gray will be the back-up ferry. As the minister knows, and as most Newfoundlanders know, the John Hamilton Gray is not the best vessel in the world, especially for that service, when we are talking about tourists coming to this Province. We realize it is a federal decision, but what has the minister done to try and convince his counterparts in Ottawa that perhaps the Marine Atlantica should be retained, if she is not already leased to some other service, as a back-up to the Caribou? Has the minister done anything about that? If not, will he do so?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank

the hon. gentleman for the question. The Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), who is responsible for Tourism, myself and also the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) have made representation to CN Marine with regard to that particular situation. I would like to point out, though, Mr. Speaker, that the new vessel that is coming onto service, the Caribou, will be perhaps the best of its kind if not the best of its kind in the world, and should improve the service considerably. As it relates to the back-up, we have indeed corresponded through CN Marine and their senior officials to see if it is not possible to retain the services of the Marine Atlantica or the Marine Nautica - I am not sure which it is right now but one of that class of vessel - to go on that service rather than the Hamilton Gray. We should hear back in the next few days as to whether that is a possibility or not.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Dinn). Would the minister tell us if the 328 units in Stephenville are sold now or if they will be free for tender in the months coming?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, not only are the units in Stephenville not sold yet, but they are not for sale

yet. An assessment is being performed on the buildings and when that assessment is completed we will accept proposals from anyone who is interested in a building, two buildings, ten buildings or all of the buildings. We have not even put the proposal call out yet and we will not do so until we finish the assessment to find out what the buildings are actually worth.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Would the minister tell the House if he knows now how they are going to be tendered in the sense of the number of units or the maximum number of units that people will be able to buy? The reason that they are being sold is to get a bit of a monopoly situation, so we would not be able to see one group as such come in and take it over. Can he possibly tell us right now if that situation could be watched?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Yes, it certainly will, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it right now the hon. member knows of one or two individuals interested in buying some of the units in Stephenville. I understand the Tenants' Association is looking at the possibility of forming a co-operative, and we look at that very favourably. But whichever way the buildings are sold, I can assure the hon. member that the tenants will be looked after in every respect in that the

negotiations will go on with any new owner or owners to make sure that the tenants are looked after. I do not think anything adverse can happen out in Stephenville, outside of the fact that the rumour mill, I understand, is very rampant out there. The hon. member would do well to allay their fears because we intend to sell some buildings out there but certainly not the 500 units that we have. Some of the 328 multiplex buildings will be sold. As far as we are right now is doing an assessment.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). Now that his department is trying to keep the aged out of the hospitals as long as possible, I want to ask the minister is he satisfied that there is sufficient home support care, where relatives and friends can take the older person into their home? Is he satisfied that there is sufficient home support services in place to provide adequate care for the aged? I am thinking especially, Mr. Speaker, of home support care in the rural part of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not presume that ever we can meet the epitome of idealism in providing everything that is humanly possible, but we have made great strides this year. Some \$1.2 million has been appropriated

which is an increase roughly of 48 per cent for home care services in this Province.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

I want to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, is he aware of any cases where the aged have been sent home from hospital and placed in the care of relatives are not able to cope with aged people? Are you aware of any cases where they have to be tube fed? Now, I am aware of at least one case. I am wondering how prevalent this is around the Province, where the aged are sent from the hospital, they have to be tube fed in some cases, and the relatives cannot cope? Is this very prevalent in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I am aware of one case where it was claimed the patient had to be tube fed. I believe that patient resided in your district, some miles distant from you. I understand that that patient did not have to be tube fed. I understand that that patient had to be fed with a syringe and it took time and patience to complete that procedure.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle

Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Obviously it is much better to have to be fed with a syringe, Mr. Speaker, than a tube. I am sure that will satisfy the relatives.

Are individuals required to sign an undertaking that they will take the aged person back after he or she has been released from hospital although the relatives are not able to cope with the illness? Is that very prevalent in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot give you an overall policy because it is not a policy of the department, it is a policy of the home or the hospital.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. It is a district question. As he knows, Twillingate was supposed to be number one on the list now for a new chronic care home. It was third, but the other two have since been taken care of. Will he confirm that fact, Mr. Speaker, that Twillingate is now number one on that list that was established back in 1982, I think?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I know nothing that has made a change from the list

that was drawn up five years ago.

### Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like to welcome to the galleries Mayor Elliott and councillors from Point Leamington and I would like to recognize also Mayor Michael Cousins and councillors Herb Stacey and Pearcey Holloway from the community of Point May.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table for the information of the House the annual report of the Department of the Social Services for the year 1983 - 84.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Section 12 of the Workers' Compensation Act, I am pleased to table the report of the Workers' Compensation Commission for the year 1985.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act." (Bill No. 21)

### Petitions

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to present on behalf of sixty-five people from the Town of Englee a petition requesting the upgrading and paving of Route 432. This, as hon. members know, is the eighth day that I have stood in this House and presented a petition on behalf of the people in my district concerning roads. The sixty-five people who have signed this petition did not sign the other petitions presented, Mr. Speaker, although the prayer of the petition is exactly the same as the prayer of the other seven petitions that I have presented. This shows, I am sure, some of the concern that exists among the people of Englee and that area for their roads.



Mr. Speaker, one of the Whereases says, "WHEREAS the residents of our town have suffered tremendously down through the years because of terrible road conditions." Mr. Speaker, I can speak from experience because I am very much aware of what the people of Englee are talking about when they say how they have suffered down through the years because of terrible road conditions.

The road from Plum Point across to the Canada Day Branch was put through in the late 1950s. When that road was put through the road from St. Anthony to Deer Lake had not then been complete. You could go as far South as Eddy's Cove and you could get up as far North as Flower's Cove. Since the road has been put through from Plum Point to Roddickton, Mr. Speaker, the people of Englee have watched the road from St. Anthony to Deer Lake totally built up and paved. Since the road to Roddickton and Englee was built, Mr. Speaker, there has been a totally new road taken from somewhere over on the West Coast and put through to Burgeo. I can name all over this Province places which did not have any road, but since the road to Englee was put through, those roads have been totally upgraded, totally built and totally paved.

Now the people in Englee and the people in Roddickton and Bide Arm were content to wait because they recognize that the road from Deer Lake to St. Anthony was the main thoroughfare up the peninsula. They waited patiently, Mr. Speaker, from the time when the main road up the peninsula was paved and they realized that if they were to put extra pressure on any level of government at that time, it might interfere with the main road up the peninsula. But

now, that road has been paved up the peninsula and the road to Plum Point to Englee is not yet paved.

The people of Englee are petitioning this hon. House of Assembly. They are not out blocking roads, Mr. Speaker. They are not trying to tear down the established system, Mr. Speaker. They are going about this in a very humane, sensible, reasonable way. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that in Englee today there are many people who are wondering what the hon. the Premier thinks when he hears about this particular road.

The hon. the Premier worked in Englee for at least one Summer, I believe, it might have been more than one Summer, as a welfare officer, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
1964.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you. I knew he was there one year. I am sure that the people in Englee are wondering why it is that the hon. the Premier is so callous that he can totally disregard this cry which is coming from people of Englee who say in one of their Whereases, "WHEREAS the residents of our town have suffered tremendously down through the years because of the terrible road conditions which lie within our boundaries and which lie on Route 432," which is the road from Plum Point into Englee.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today on behalf of those sixty-five people to stand up in this House and, on their behalf, request that the government would heed the prayer of the petition and would take every step at their disposal to ensure that Route 432 and that the roads within the town

of Englee, indeed, within all of the towns that are not paved, will be paved as fast as is feasibly possible.

Thank you.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in support of the petition so ably presented by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker). It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the people of Englee to see a response to the many petitions they have had presented to this House over the years. They have been seeking better roads for a long time.

It should not be necessary for these people in 1986 to have to put up with the terrible road conditions which they are experiencing, the higher costs that result in terms of damage to automobiles, the inconvenience, the delays, Mr. Speaker, and the increased cost of living probably because of the greater expenses of businesses trying to operate over those roads. All of these are reasons why we should see some response from members opposite, from the minister responsible for Transportation (Mr. Dawe), or his colleagues, from the Premier, from somebody to do something to see better road conditions established for the people of Englee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very sad to see, day after day, the members on this side of the House get up and present well-drafted, well thought out petitions by people

who are concerned for themselves and for their families and to see very little in the way of a positive response from members opposite. One would think, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite, once they get appointed to Cabinet, once they get into the House and get settled away with their comfortable sinecures, that that is as far as it goes and that they can wait then until the next election before they do anything.

While I am sure that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) and all members opposite will keep the heat on for members on the other side of the House, eventually, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province will realize that it is a waste of time to expect any sort of constructive approach to the problems of this Province for members opposite and, Mr. Speaker, we all know what the result will be in the next election.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased on behalf of the government; as I did indeed last week, to support the petition so eloquently presented by my hon. colleague for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker). As I mentioned at the time and as the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) mentioned, when he supported the petition and, indeed, others on this side who support the petition, we certainly do share with the people of Englee their desire for an adequate transportation system and for the necessary improvements in

the road system. I think the vast majority of hon. members, except those whose roads are exclusively in urban districts, but the vast majority, and that includes both sides of the House, the majority of us have areas where road conditions in certain parts are inadequate and where water and sewerage and other municipal services are inadequate and, indeed each year, the government, through its Budget and through the Estimates voted by this House, take every reasonable measure which are finances permit us to make these improvements.

The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) seems to doubt the veracity of this statement but if he looks in the Estimates he will see about \$75 million, I do not have the exact amount here, which is there for roads. If he looks last year, he will see tens of millions as well. I do not remember the exact amount. Every year there is an enormous amount for roads and while I am far from being a prophet, I would say that next year there is also going to be tens of millions and the year after there will be tens of millions. There is around \$75 million in this year for roads so, it is quite obvious that, within the financial capacity that we have, the government, through the money voted by this House, is doing its best to improve the transportation system within the Province.

Obviously, it is impossible to do it all in one or two years but we do everything we can. Indeed, the government's seriousness was shown by the fact that we even had pre-tendering now for the past few years whereby tendering could be done early and a start could be made early. While it is

impossible in any one year to look after all the legitimate needs, whether they be for roads, for water and sewerage, for necessary municipal services or all kind of things, hon. members are aware that if this government did not give the highest priority to the transportation needs and road needs of the people, such as the people of Englee for whom the hon. member is speaking, then obviously we would not be voting \$75 million from our Budget.

The hon. gentleman can rest assured that the government is very supportive of the prayer of that petition. This year and in the years ahead we will do everything we can to meet the legitimate requirements and needs of the people of the Northern Peninsula, of the Southern Peninsula, of the Burin Peninsula, of the South Coast, of Central Newfoundland, of the Northeast, of the West Coast of the Province and of Labrador, indeed, the entire Province. The hon. gentleman, although he sits on the opposite side of the House, representing the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), I know that he is a fair-minded man and I would not doubt that while certainly he does have, as he must have to be in politics, a partisan aspect to him, I think there is another aspect of him which realizes that this government is acting in a responsible manner with the stewardship that it has of the people's finances. I am sure he recognizes that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

0 0 0

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, before we move into Orders of the Day -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

- I would like to seek the unanimous leave of this House, Mr. Speaker, that we all send our congratulations to the newly elected Premier of Prince Edward Island. I am sure we were all delighted, Mr. Speaker, to see that continued trend towards Liberalism in this country, a trend, Mr. Speaker, which is going to continue in this Province when the next election is called.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like, as is the practice, for this House to join in a message to Premier Ghiz, the new Liberal Leader of Prince Edward Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I do not think it would be appropriate for the House of Assembly to send Mr. Ghiz a message of congratulations. I am certainly sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), in his capacity as Leader of the Liberal Party here, could wish to do so and I am sure he would be able to find the stationary and the

stamp. There is no need to use the stationary or the hard to come by stamps that Your Honour has sequestered from his budget.

MR. BARRY:

Maybe you could send the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) to draft the letter.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition agrees to send it as drafted, we will agree with that the hon. member for St. John's North draft it. But I am sure there will be a number of hon. members who will want to send Mr. Ghiz their best wishes but I think it is better done on an individual basis.

#### Notices of Motion

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Real Estate Trading Act To Provide For The Establishment Of The Real Estate Foundation," carried. (Bill No. 25).

On motion, Bill No. (25) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Emblamers And Funeral Directors Act, 1975," carried. (Bill No. 22).

On motion, Bill No. (22) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Implement The Convention Between Canada and The United

Kingdom Of Great Britain And Northern Ireland Providing For The Reciprocal Recognition And Enforcement Of Judgements In Civil And Commercial Matters," carried. (Bill No. 26).

On motion, Bill No. (26) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions", carried. (Bill No. 24).

On motion, Bill No. (24) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 1, Committee of Ways and Means.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the most pleasant sentence in this entire Budget, in the entire reading by the Minister of Finance, in my view, was the last sentence that he read. The last sentence that he read was the sentence that rang the best tune in my ear and it was: "There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is on a forward move, and the good news is that Newfoundland and Labrador is about to match the marching pace." I want to read that sentence again in case hon. members missed its impact and the beauty of it. "There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is on a forward move, and the good news is that Newfoundland and Labrador is

about to match the marching pace."

Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part about that upbeat sentence is that this particular band is unaccustomed to playing that kind of upbeat music, they are unaccustomed to this triumphant music, they are unaccustomed to marches of victory. They are more accustomed to marches tuned to the death knell, marches of national discord, marches of national decadence. In this fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that before this band can gain any credibility with respect to this kind of music it is going to take a lot of rehearsal, it is going to take a lot of practice; they are going to have to fine tune their instruments a little more before they can expect the people of Newfoundland to believe in that kind of rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, were this the kind of music that we were accustomed to hearing from this hon. government, then I would have found it very, very pleasing, but it is so transparent, everybody can see through it, everybody can see the political rhetoric of this particular statement. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, though this upbeat, though this tone appears to look good on the surface, when one gets beneath the rhetoric and sees the kind of music, if you will, that this government has been accustomed to playing, then it does not look very credible.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Budget, the way to measure this Budget, the way to see what is in this Budget is to ask two or three very simple questions, and the questions I would like to ask are these: What is in this Budget, first of all, for business small

and large, particularly small business? The reason I chose to start off with this particular question is because it is the business community that this government believes in. Indeed, in the last Budget Speech the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) made reference to that fact in a sentence that went something like this: 'This government believes that private enterprise is the engine, the motor that will stimulate and generate the economy of this Province.' Since the business community is such an important philosophy of this government, that is why I want hon. members to think of that question and the people of Newfoundland. What is in this budget for business small and large, but particularly small business?

Again, this government believes in small business and what it can do for this Province, believing business to be the engine that will stimulate and generate the economy of this Province. If that is what they believe, Mr. Speaker, private enterprise to be the essential and the integral element in the Newfoundland society that is to get our economy going, that is to stimulate our economy and generate jobs for the people of this Province, then one would have thought that there certainly should have been some real initiatives in this budget to ensure that that happened.

What, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is the truth? What is here for small business or big business in Newfoundland? What is there for the private sector? What is here to generate and stimulate the economy? As I read through all of the initiatives put forward by the minister, sadly I saw nothing that

would make private enterprise very happy in Newfoundland, after that budget. I saw nothing that would cause private enterprise to go about the streets beating their chests. I saw nothing! I think there might have been two small initiatives, one, to raise the ceiling of the rural development grants and, two, they raised the amount of money allocated for agriculture, for farmers. There were at least two initiatives. Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure that is something that is really going to do something for small business in this Province, these two initiatives in particular. I believe what small businessmen were looking for was not something to increase their indebtedness, and what farmers were looking for was not something to increase their indebtedness but something that would increase their cash flow. I am afraid that in this direction the provincial government had nothing; there was nothing in this policy that would generate cash flow, that would give the small businessman or give the farmer monies that would get back into the economy, monies that would generate the economy, it was a matter of trying to push private enterprise further in the red, push them further in the whole, put the onus completely on them without giving them some breaks.

MR. SIMMS:

How about some positive criticism?

MR. LUSH:

Well, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) wants some information, wants some ideas. Why was this government not brave enough to do as they have done in Nova Scotia, bring in a corporation tax holiday? a corporation tax holiday as brought in by the P.C. Government in Nova

Scotia and brought in by the P.C. Government in Ontario. We could call it a corporation of small business tax holiday, because we are minus the big corporations, where we give them a break from corporate taxes for a little while, say a year or two years, to see if we could not stimulate the economy. I am afraid, with these kinds of breaks in Nova Scotia, in particular, this Province is going to lose business. In Nova Scotia we are going to find these businesses picking up and taking business from this Province because their government dare had the nerve to do something innovative, to do something constructive.

There is nothing in this Budget, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that this government is trying to take any steps to generate the economy of this Province. As a matter of fact, it is a most unusual, most abnormal, routine, unimaginative Budget, probably one of the most unimaginative budgets ever presented to this House; nothing in it innovative, nothing in it that is going to stimulate the economy of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, talking about its abnormal and unusual routineness, I refer again to how proud the minister was to say that he had taken \$2 million off the provincial deficit. Now, every provincial government in Canada is trying to reduce its deficit, as is the federal government, but what will demonstrate how creative a government is is how they plan to reduce that deficit. That is what will demonstrate their creativity. That is what will demonstrate how innovative a government is. But I am afraid, again, this government did not illustrate itself to be very, very

innovative in this area.

There are two ways or a combination of two ways to reduce a deficit: One is to cut expenditures and the other, of course, is to raise the revenues that come in, taxes! Now that is always the least desirable one. What every government should do is try and cut its expenditures. What did this government do? This government tried to raise its revenues again.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I want to comment on why, the first day or so, this Budget received a reasonable level of acceptance. In the first day or two, there was a degree of acceptance among the business community, in particular, and among ordinary Newfoundlanders, but the reason for it was that this government, being shrewd, had built the people up to contemplate some increases in taxes.

We know very well, Mr. Speaker, that this government cannot, in terms of retail sales tax, increase that anymore, we are already the highest in Canada. In just about every area we are taxed to death. I think the Premier has been on record as saying that he was not going to increase the retail sales tax anymore. I think he said that. Of course, the people did not believe that, they were not sure, and when they were waiting for their budget, they were waiting for this increase in taxes. And the business community was scared of it, too. They were scared because they know this crowd has not always done anything very constructive or they have not come out with any creative policies. So they, too, were expecting an increase in taxes and, when it did not come, there

was almost a sigh of relief throughout the land and the Budget was half accepted without looking into it to see what other initiatives there were to stimulate the economy. Also, of course, what people forgot was that the federal government had taxed us to the hilt, that the federal government had brought in all the taxes that one would normally expect. So the government had no choice in view of the fact that our taxes are so high anyway, in view of the fact that the federal government taxed the people to death. What was left for the Finance Minister to do after he found out that the federal government had increased the retail sales tax, our personal income tax, and just about every vital area in the economy of Newfoundland? What was the poor old Minister of Finance going to do? Were there any other areas that he could tax?

Well, I suppose you have to give him some points for being able to find some areas that could be taxed, Mr. Speaker, and let us take a look at what they were: 'The budget contains the following revenue generating measures.' That is the equivalent of saying the government found these areas in which to increase taxes, the government found these areas in which to impose a further financial hardship on the people of Newfoundland. The first one was one the minister should have thought untouchable in terms of stimulating the economy; he goes right to the construction industry, a labour intensive industry, and the tax of 8 per cent already in existence on building materials he increase by another 4 per cent, to bring it in line with the general retail sales tax of 12 per cent. I would

suggest to the minister that that is probably going to be the costliest increase in taxes that he ever imposed on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. That tax, Mr. Speaker, is going to hurt the people of Newfoundland. It is not just going to hurt people building new homes, because all the time there is activity going on with respect to building. Goodness, you cannot go anywhere in Newfoundland but there is somebody building all the time; somebody is building a shed, or extending upon their house, or they are putting in a basement. There is always that kind of activity, quite apart from the building of new homes by younger couples. Older couples, and couples not so old are always engaged in improving their homes, improving their property, doing something to it all the time. This year, that is going to cost them more money. Any improvements in your home, any improvements in your property is going to cost people more money because they have to now pay that full 12 per cent on building supplies, when, previous to that, they were just paying 8 per cent.

Now, when I talked about the taxes here some time ago the Premier followed me and thought he was going to blow me out of the water by posing such questions as can the Opposition tell me whether or not we are going to generate, in terms of jobs or in terms of extra spending, any monies to replace any reductions that we might may in taxes? The Premier thought this could not be achieved, as if somehow what we are saying here, that the reduction of taxes will create extra money into the economy, will stimulate the economy, were somehow some new unproven theory



or unproven philosophy that had not been touched before.

The Premier ought to know that the policy of overtaxing people and tax reduction is as old as economics itself. Some of the greatest economic areas in the world believe that if you overtax the people it is going to have a negative effect; people are not going to spend as much, it is going to cut down on the spending, everybody is going to be cutting down and there is going to be no money in the economy, there is going to be no money to create jobs, and so it goes.

Mr. Speaker, the economy of reducing taxes, trying to keep the level of taxes as low as possible, is a theory espoused by many economists and by many governments throughout the world. So the Premier need not pretend that this is a stupid policy, this is just something that somebody thought up overnight. It is a long-established economic theory that once we overtax people we are removing the money from the economy that normally would be there to participate and promote its growth, development and expansion. There is nothing in this document to do that, nothing for private enterprise, nothing to promote the growth, development and the expansion of the economy. As a matter of fact, all of it is having the very reverse effect. And the fact that this government, one year after its mandate to create jobs, could come in with a document so dull and so uninspiring is incredible. It is absolutely incredible, Mr. Speaker!

AN HON. MEMBER:

How many jobs did they create?

MR. LUSH:

That is what I want to get to, Mr. Speaker, when I have been talking about how dull it is, how abnormally and unusually routine this document is, how unimaginative it is. As I have said, to get the essence of this document to get the meat of it I wanted to preface my remarks with this question, what is in it for private enterprise? And I believe that I have made a clear case, that there is nothing in this document for private enterprise, nothing to stimulate the economy, nothing to stimulate growth, nothing to encourage the private entrepreneur to expand, nothing that will generate the economy, nothing that will stimulate the economy so that the private entrepreneur will say, "I am going to have to hire a couple of people this Summer." There is nothing that will generate the economy to the extent that some small businessman in Bonavista North will say, "I have to hire three or four extra people this year." Or the farmer will say he has to hire six or seven people. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing! There is nothing for the contractor in construction, because he realizes that the construction industry is going to be down by the imposition of this 12 per cent sales tax.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have done nothing to help these people psychologically, to boost up their spirits, to think that in July and August things are going to start booming, because they know that this 12 per cent sales tax is going to hurt the construction industry, that it is going to prevent people from building, it is going to prevent people from building new homes or doing any kind of renovations. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this for

private enterprise.

The next question I want to ask is what is in it for the ordinary Newfoundlander, a person who is working, making a few dollars? What is in this budget for him? The 12 per cent retail sales tax, no doubt, applies to him, as well, because he is the type of person, or she is the type of person who maybe would want to do some improvements to their home, and maybe thought this might be the year they were going to do it, and now they find out they have this full 12 per cent retail sales tax to deal with. So it is not likely to do much for them, Mr. Speaker. They know the federal government has increased their personal income tax, they also know that in addition to the increased sales tax on building materials, imposed by the provincial government, the federal government has increased retail sales tax all around. They also know, by this budget, that just about every service offered by government has gone up, and fees and licences will be increased.

Now, what are these fees? The cost of a licence for a motor car is going to go up, going to cost them more. The cost of a licence to operate a sawmill, that is going to go up. Every kind of fee that government administers is gone up.

DR. COLLINS:  
Gasoline is going to be down.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. LUSH:  
Gasoline is going to be down! There is no thanks to the Minister of Finance because if he had his way, we know where it would be

going. He is not helping us now, because the people of this Province are not getting the decreases as quickly as they should. The Minister is not doing anything to ensure that the public of Newfoundland get the benefits of these decreases as fast as they get the ill-effects of increases.

MR. CALLAN:  
Government is going to get what we are saving on gas, he is making sure of that.

MR. LUSH:  
Exactly. So, Mr. Speaker, increases by the federal government, with these fees and licenses, will affect, I would suggest, every living Newfoundlander and Labradorian. So what this Budget has done, in effect, is increase the cost of living for every Newfoundlander and for every Labradorian by the imposition of these increases in fees and licences. What is in it for the ordinary Newfoundlander? Nothing, Mr. Speaker, only taking away more income. The ordinary Newfoundlander today will have less disposable income in his or her pocket because of the measures of this Budget, because of the measures to increase fees and licences. That is what it has done for the ordinary Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN:  
How about (Inaudible)?

MR. LUSH:  
I know the member for Torngat does not like to hear the truth. He does not like to hear something being dealt with in the detailed manner in which I am doing it. I know he does not like that, and I am sure he is afraid that Newfoundlanders are going to hear what this Budget really means.

Mr. Speaker, what is in it for the ordinary Newfoundlander? An increase in the cost of living, a cost of living that is already the highest in Canada and maybe the highest in the Western World. That is what it is going to be, Mr. Speaker, an increase in the cost of living, a cost of living that is already the highest in Canada.

DR. COLLINS:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. LUSH:

No, because the minister is going to get a chance to respond.

DR. COLLINS:

I had my chance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

That is right. He had his chance and I am responding to it now. He had his chance when he gave the blow to the ordinary people of Newfoundland, to the ordinary Newfoundlander, when he told them, 'I will be taking more money out of your pocket to try and help reduce the deficit.' That is what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, one of the poorest ways to try and reduce the deficit.

Of course, the point I made the other day is that a lot of people do not know that reducing the deficit does not at all address the Province's public debt. We are going to reduce the deficit by \$2million. That is what the minister hopes. We hope he gets there, too. We hope he can do that. But that does not address at all the public debt, which is \$4.2 billion. As a matter of fact, in the last four years this

government have a great record. They are adding to the public debt of Newfoundland every year by \$250 million, on the average. Let me make it crystal clear it is not the public debt that we are so concerned about, it is the fact that there is nothing to show for it in terms of employment for our people. Of course, we are only going to get rid of that public debt when we create employment for the people.

How can we stimulate the economy, how can we hope to ever generate enough funds to pay back that public debt if we have no employment? Mr. Speaker, I think again I have demonstrated that there is very little in this Budget for the ordinary Newfoundlander.

DR. COLLINS:

(Inaudible) institutions.

MR. LUSH:

Yes, and I will tell the hon. minister this: He is talking about institutions. If we do not do something about the job situation in this Province he is going to have to get more institutions, because we are all likely to end up there. We are all likely to end up in some of these institutions because the psychology, the mentality that is prevalent in our land now, let me tell the hon. gentleman, is not something good for the psyche. It is not awfully good for the morale, when we look around and see the young people who are walking around the streets of Newfoundland completely and totally without a ray of hope for the future. I tell the minister he can be proud and we are proud of the institutions for senior citizens, but he is probably going to have to build more

institutions, and not for senior citizens, if we do not get our young people working, if we do not get something constructive for those people and for thousands of other Newfoundlanders who cannot bear the financial burden with which they are faced today. Mr. Speaker, let us not have any more of these inane interruptions again.

I have asked what is in this Budget for the private sector? Very little. What is in this Budget for the ordinary Newfoundlander? Very little. To put it more succinctly, what is in this Budget for the thousands of unemployed Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, young and old? Now, if they were waiting for this Budget for the Premier to honour his mandate to create jobs - remember the Premier's mandate? We as a group of people, as the people of a Province, must never fail to remind the Premier that he sought a mandate to create jobs, as if he needed that mandate, as if he needed the permission to do it. What else do people elect governments for if it is not to create jobs? Well, the Premier tried to make this a sort of new election platform, a new stance in politics, and went out to the people and said, 'I want a mandate, I want your permission, people of Newfoundland and Labrador, to create jobs.' Well, the people of Newfoundland listened to the Premier, listened to his election rhetoric and they said, 'Yes, Premier, we want jobs, we want them for ourselves, we want them for our relatives, we want them for our children, we want the jobs, Sir, and we are going to give you the mandate,' believing the Premier would be a man of his word and he would create the jobs.

Last year the Budget was not very fruitful in that direction, it did not offer much in that direction, so this year, beginning year two, there is no doubt that there were a lot of people out there waiting for this year's Budget. But, alas, I believe before the Budget came down they recognized that this government had no jobs, had no programme, had no policy. I believe the government gave away their hand; I believe there was a lack of confidence in this government before the Budget came down; I believe the people of this Province lost their confidence in terms of this government creating any kind of employment strategy; I believe they lost confidence long before the Budget came down; I believe they lost confidence when they saw the Premier embark upon this false advertising, saying that he had created 8,056 jobs. I believe when the people saw that they realized the kind of programme that the Premier was talking about. Make work programmes, part-time jobs, that is not what the people of Newfoundland had expected from the Premier when they gave him a mandate to create jobs.

When the Premier, who apparently was so discouraged and had come to such a level of despair that he would advertise the fact that he had created 8,056 jobs in view of the rampant unemployment that we had, he would have the effrontery and the audacity to advertise in the papers of this Province and with the electronic media - and charge the taxpayers for it - to say that he had created 8,056 jobs, I believe that then the people of this Province saw the hoax. I believe they saw then what they were in for. And it would not have been so bad if the Premier could have claimed even

8,000 jobs on the federal make work type programmes, but he claimed credit for an emergency response programme given by the federal government to fishermen.

All hon. members will recall that fishermen had a difficult time last year all over Newfoundland, particularly on the Northeast Coast, and many of them who normally had to work ten weeks to qualify for UIC benefits were not going to be able to do it, and we brought to the attention of the public that if the government did not do something fishermen and their families were going to face a Winter of starvation and disaster. So what did they do? They go to the federal government, they get \$9.5 million, for which we are very grateful, but not for the government then to go out and say they created 4,000 jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what kinds of jobs were they? Some fisherman needed two weeks work to get his UIC, when he got his two weeks he was laid off and some other person in the community worked for another two or three and the Premier very proudly said, 'We have created 4,000 like that,' and that, of course, made up the 8,056. Is that not a disgrace? When the people of this Province say that I think they lost confidence, they were not waiting for this budget. When they say that they said, 'Is this what the Premier calls jobs? Is this what we put our trust in the Premier for? Is this what we put our confidence in the Premier for, to carry on with these Canada make work jobs? And thank God for them! We on this side have never criticized them, not like hon. members. We believe that they have their role, but they must not be the main thrust of a

government. These part time jobs cannot be the main thrust of a government. That is not what we are going to build the economy of Newfoundland on. We are not going to put Newfoundland on a firm economic and financial base on these make work programmes. Mr. Speaker, I have lauded them and praised them many times in this House. They have put facilities in every district in this Province, particularly recreational facilities, that we would never have.

I never saw any government, up until that time, go out advertising, saying, 'We created this number of jobs through these make work programmes.' Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people of Newfoundland did not have to wait for the budget to see what this government was going to do with respect to creating jobs.

What did they say about creating jobs? They dealt with it. They said, Mr. Speaker, 'To stimulate employment, government will be allocating funding as follows:' Now let us see what they believe in for their major job creation programme, to give jobs to the hundreds of thousands of people young and old throughout Newfoundland and Labrador. Again, the minister shakes his head.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is a bit of an exaggeration.

MR. LUSH:

The minister says it is a bit of an exaggeration. Does the minister realize that there are agencies now throughout Canada engaged in getting statistics relating to unemployed, that there are agencies saying that the Newfoundland number of unemployed is now close to 100,000? Mr.

Speaker, that is not exaggeration, that is not even exaggeration relatively, that is just to emphasize the point. And when we talk about the rate, we must be talking about close to 50 per cent. And the government does not blink an eyelash at it. They realize the accuracy of it.

Mr. Speaker, I remember, first when I came to this House, that when the rate of unemployment struck 10 per cent there was great fear throughout Newfoundland. The labour movement became concerned and they set up a committee. I think a book came out of it. I just forget what it was called, but I know the emphasis of it was 'putting a face on unemployment.' The youth were concerned. The unemployed set up a committee. There was great concern around Newfoundland and these groups started to pop up almost all over the place in reaction to the large numbers of unemployed people in the Province, and we were talking 10 per cent. Today we are gone to 20 per cent, and over, and we have almost come to accept it as a matter of course. The government is in despair about it. They say, 'There is nothing we can do.' Well, I can tell hon. members that they have a responsibility, number one, to awaken some concern in our people, that they should be initiating some activity around this Province so that our people do not accept these large numbers of unemployed in the Province, that our people are not complacent about this. Because once that sets in, that we realize we do not have to work - because there are people who realize there is no work, they cannot get a job - there is almost complacency around. I know government likes that complacency, but they should be the very last to accept that

and they should be out working with groups trying to generate employment and trying to generate concern right throughout this Province.

Our people must not tolerate nor accept the high levels of unemployment in this Province today. But I believe the government is almost encouraging this acceptance. 'This complacency is great, because as long as the people do not want the jobs, we are great.' Mr. Speaker, this is something they should be fighting, this complacency. We cannot be complacent about the lack of work, it will destroy our moral fibre, it will destroy the fibre of this Province. And this government cannot sit by much more tolerating the complacency, they should be out trying to reverse the trend.

Mr. Speaker, what is in this for the unemployed? Let us see: This is what the government plans are: 'To stimulate employment government will be allocating funding as follows: An amount of \$27 million for the Community Development Programme to create short-term employment for up to 12,000 people.' Is that a new plan? Is that going to generate a lot of employment in Newfoundland this year? How many more people are going to be employed this year as a result of that programme than were employed last year?

As a matter of fact, if government are sure where they are going, if they are sure of their employment strategy, let them tell the people of Newfoundland and Labrador tomorrow how many more people will be employed this year than last year as a result of their initiatives, let them tell the people of Newfoundland by how many

percentage points they will reduce unemployment in this fiscal year, and next year, and the next year until they arrive at a 0 per cent level of unemployment in this Province. They have never done it, Mr. Speaker.

Now, their federal counterparts have a lot more confidence in their programmes than this hon. crowd, Mr. Speaker. At least the federal government did say that their target rate of unemployment for this year will be 9.6 per cent.

I challenge this government to tell the people of Newfoundland what the rate of unemployment is that they are aiming for this year? Is it to keep it at 20 per cent? Will it grow to 21 per cent? Will it go down to 19 per cent? Will it go down to 18 per cent? Let them tell the people of Newfoundland and Labrador the targeted rate of unemployment that they are working for this year and that will prove the confidence of their programmes, that will prove to the people of Newfoundland that they know what they are up to, that will prove to the people of Newfoundland that they have a plan to attack unemployment in this Province, that they are not drifting along aimlessly and rudderlessly.

Mr. Speaker, let the Minister of Finance or some other minister, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), answer that question. Let us see if he can be as bold as the Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson). There is nothing earth shattering about it, Mr. Speaker, but at least the man had the gumption to say what rate of unemployment they are aiming for this year in Canada, and he said it is 9.6 per cent.

Now, does this government have the nerve to say the rate of unemployment they are aiming to achieve this year? Their federal counterparts said it. The hon. Mr. Wilson said 9.6 per cent. We wish it were lower, but at least the man had confidence enough in what was going on to say that this is what it is going to be. What is going to happen in this Province? We are at 9.6 per cent nationally now, are we not? Are we supposed to stay along the levels we are at? I realize that that does not affect the national average very much. We can still have some increase in unemployment and not affect the national figures that drastically.

But, Mr. Speaker, until we have arrived at that particular point in time with policies and programmes and employment strategies to name, to identify the target rate, then I am afraid this government has no commitment to what it is doing. They do not know where they are going. Until such time as they are able to tell the people of this Province the rate of unemployment to which they are aiming, or the numbers by which they plan to reduce unemployment this year, they cannot expect the people of Newfoundland to put any credence in their employment strategy, in their employment programmes.

Mr. Speaker, that was the first initiative they were going to take to stimulate employment, an allocation of \$27 million for the Community Development Programme to create short-term employment for up to 12,000. What is this short-term work doing, Mr. Speaker? What is it doing? It just takes people off social welfare of the Province and then, after they have worked on these

jobs, they get unemployment. And I am not sure that programme is as successful as we would like to think it is. I am not so sure. I am not so sure that government should boast too much about this programme; I get a lot of complaints about that programme. I am not so sure that it is as successful as government members have come to think it is. I am sure that they, too, must get the same kind of flak and the same kind of complaints that I get. People work on them because Newfoundlanders want to work, but, Mr. Speaker, again it is not the kind of programme that we are going to expand and stimulate the economy of this Province with.

How much better is it than last year? Do hon. members know how much better this programme is than last year? Last year there were \$25 million in this programme for 10,000 jobs, and this year they are expecting \$27 million for 12,000 jobs. I have not seen the statistics to know whether, indeed, 10,000 people did work last year. That was the aim last year, to give employment in this questionable area to 10,000. That was their aim last year with \$25 million, this year it is 12,000.

What is the next initiative, Mr. Speaker? An amount of \$2 million as the provincial contribution to "Challenge '86", a Student Summer Employment Programme, estimated to employ 6,000 young people. I cannot say for certain but I do believe that \$2 million represents about the same figure they contributed last year. So, there is no improvement there. For any students, for students who are going to University or various other post-secondary institutions who are looking to the government for additional job opportunities,

there are not too many there for them this year. Did they not realize the problem they had last year? They are going to create 6,000 jobs of various duration. So there will be 6,000 jobs, the same as last year. Mr. Speaker, there is not much there for our young people.

What was the last one? A sum of \$3.5 million to complement the \$35 million federal Canadian Job Strategy Programme. I believe again that is in the same ratio as last year. As a matter of fact, the total might even be a little less because I believe - no, \$38.5 million, that is what it is going to be this year. So again the same level, nothing extra, it is going to be at the same level. That is why this hon. gentleman does not want to say by how much they are going to reduce unemployment. With these initiatives, they are not going to reduce unemployment by one person. They are not going to affect the unemployment rate positively in one little way.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the initiatives by this government: The \$27 million for community development programmes; the \$2 million for the contribution to Challenge '86 to provide jobs for University students and other students attending post-secondary institutions; and \$3.5 million for the federal Canadian Job Strategy Programme. So, we can almost give the numbers now for what we can expect. I can give the numbers for that programme now.

The minister is talking about \$12,000 for the social services. They should never include that in the job strategy programme. He is talking about 6,000 jobs for the young people and \$38.5 million for



the federal Canadian Job Strategy Programme. How many jobs did that create last year? Four thousand. That is what is created last year. It is not going to create any more jobs this year, is it? It is probably going to be less. That \$38.5 million is going to create no more than 4,000 part-time jobs. That is what it created last year. So this year the government is going to have less to boast about.

Last year they created 8,056 jobs. Were they able to boast about that this year? No, Mr. Speaker. They are only going to be able to boast about 4,000 part-time jobs because pray to God they will not have to give that Fisheries Response Programme which gave them the other four. Pray to God they will not have to give them that. Pray to God that our fishermen will have a successful year and will be able to do without that and give the government the chance to boast that they have created 4,000 jobs. So, Mr. Speaker, that is what it looks like, 4,000 jobs.

MR. POWER:

What about the \$500 million in education? The \$500 million for education does not create a job or does it?

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister is prattling about the monies to education. Let the minister get up and tell the people of Newfoundland how many jobs that is going to create. Let him do it. I am giving the hon. member the chance to get up and tell the people. That is what I want him to do. That is what the people of Newfoundland want. That is what the people of Newfoundland and Labrador have been asking, for the

minister to get up and say how many jobs there are. Let the minister, when I take my seat and I will take my seat, Mr. Speaker, in due course and no one is going to tell me, other than the Speaker, when I take my seat. His Honour can tell me but nobody else in this House tells me when I take my seat, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

I shall be finished shortly and then the minister will be able to get up and answer the question. This is the question: As a result of the employment initiatives taken by this government, let the minister tell the people of Newfoundland by how much unemployment will be reduced in the Province this year. How many fewer people will be unemployed in the Province this coming year as a result of the employment strategy? Is the minister willing to answer that? How many fewer people will there be unemployed this year as a result of these employment initiatives than there were in the 1985 - 86? Another way the minister can do it is to tell us how many more people will be employed. You can put it two ways. How many more people will be employed by these employment initiatives in this fiscal year 1986 - 87 than there were in the fiscal year 1985 - 86? Let the minister get up and tell the people that.

Let him tell the people furthermore, let him go a little further, let him be a little more brave, let him have a little more nerve and tell the people by how much he plans to reduce unemployment in the next year and the next year. Let him do two or

three year projections. Let him do targeted projections for the next two or three years, Mr. Speaker, and we shall believe the minister and we shall believe what this government is then saying.

Up to this point in time, we have seen no evidence of a systematic employment strategy programme by this government. We have seen no evidence of a systematic employment strategy by which the government has laid out how many jobs they plan to create in each year. Talking about that, the Premier did that once and I do not think he will ever do it again, the Premier did that once in an election year, the Premier promised to create 40,500 jobs. Well, how nice that was ringing in the ears of Newfoundlanders! What music to the ears that was to hear that we were going to have 40,500 jobs! What Newfoundlander would not vote for a government promising to create 40,500 jobs? It would have to be somebody who had to have something wrong with them not to vote for that. Well, they voted for that, they voted for 40,500 jobs, Mr. Speaker. What were the results?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I started off by giving some credence to this budget as a measure of evaluating how good this budget was by asking three questions and now that I have brought hon. members to the end of these three questions, let me rephrase them. Let me rephrase them again and for each, in his or her own heart, to decide whether or not this budget was a good budget for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I asked, "What is in it for the private sector?" We concluded, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing in this for the private sector. I

asked, "What was in this budget for the ordinary Newfoundlander?" We said nothing other than putting an extra financial burden on them, increasing fees and licences that was going to increase the cost of living to every living Labradorian and Newfoundlander. That is what it has for the ordinary Newfoundlander, that is what is in this for the ordinary Newfoundlander and the ordinary Labradorian. It is going to put further financial hardship on every person in this Province. It is going to make life just a little bit harder, a life that is already complicated by unemployment and the high cost of living, the high cost of electricity and the high cost of home heating oils and fuels, all of that. It is already going to add, Mr. Speaker, to the high cost of living. That is what this budget is going to do, with the revenues that this government will collect from the people of the Province, that is what it is going to do to our people. It is going to increase the cost of living and it is going to mean a financial hardship to many, many people throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

And my final question was, "What is in it for the unemployed?" Mr. Speaker, every initiative that I saw was at the same level of funding that the provincial government was involved in last year. It was at the same level, so I can now tell the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), I can now tell him that in that Canadian Job Strategy Programme, we can now tell him that the number of jobs that are going to be created in that programme are going to be approximately 4,000. That is how many jobs they created last year with \$38.5 million,

\$38.5 million last year for the Canadian Job Strategy Programme produced approximately 4,000 jobs. So if \$38.5 million produced 4,000 jobs in the fiscal year 1985/86, the question I ask you is how many jobs will \$38.5 million create in the year 1986/87? It is a clear cut mathematical problem and the answer is the same number. If I were to ask that question to a class of Grade VI students and ask them how many knew the answer, every hand would go up and they would say, "Sir, the same number." And I would say, "You are so right."

If it is not the same, how can we create more jobs? Has the cost gone down? Is government going to be callous? The only way they can increase the number of jobs is reduce the rates by which they employ these people, is to reduce the hourly pay? Certainly, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to do that.

Mr. Speaker, my beginning sentence was, as I recall, that this budget is an abnormally, unusually routine, unimaginative budget. I believe that is what I said. I believe I have proved it, that this budget is an abnormally, unusually routine unimaginative budget with no policy to enhance the things that a Tory Party normally believes in. They have no policy to enhance or to improve the principles under which they themselves function. They have no policies, Mr. Speaker, to substantiate their own political existence. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that again because I think that is a gem of a sentence, if I can get that creativity just to flow over me again. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that they have no policy in this budget to

substantiate their own political existence, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

- namely, Mr. Speaker, to do something for private enterprise. The Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) must remember his gem of a sentence in the 1985 -1986 Budget when he enunciated something to the effect that the private sector is the engine or is the motor by which we must generate and stimulate the economy. Well, I want to tell the hon. minister that the engine today is barely sputtering, Mr. Speaker, and I would say it has come to a complete standstill.

Well, Mr. Speaker, having said that and made my feelings known about this budget, I would like to move an amendment to this budget. I move, seconded by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) that all the words after "that" be struck and replaced with "this House condemns the government for the failure to do anything to deal with the real problems of this Province, particularly that of unemployment, especially as it relates to the youth of this Province."

MR. POWER:

That is the same wording you used last year. It shows no imagination.

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I await your decision on this particular amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The amendment is in order.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. This motion is a clear motion. It is a very concise motion.

MR. PEACH:

Put together by Rex.

MR. LUSH:

There is nothing confusing in it, nothing complicated. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me remind the hon. member, who is in the wrong seat, from Carbonear (Mr. Peach), that unlike members on that side, we on this side need nobody, we need no assistance, we do not need anybody to put things together for us. We do not need people to put things together. Let me tell the hon. member this, that as much as we turn this House upside down now in Opposition, wait until we get in government, we will turn it right side up.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a few remarks. I think the major point of that resolution is to emphasize again the fact that this government has done nothing to create employment in this Province, and I have demonstrated that quite clearly.

A few moments ago, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) volunteered to get up - he is going to get his chance, because I am not going to be too much longer - and tell this House by how much this Province plans to reduce unemployment in this year, or, specifically, how much the

initiatives of this programme will reduce unemployment in this year. I believe that is what the minister said. He is going to stand and tell us how many fewer people are going to be unemployed this year than last year as a result of the initiatives in this Budget. Now, let the minister tell us, and the minister has talked about other things.

The government last year, let me just remind the Minister of Finance one more time, boasted of creating 8,056 jobs. Now, the minister asked me how about the dollars in education. Well, were there no other dollars last year? Paving and water and sewer, that was in the Budget last year. Reforestation programmes, that must have been in the Budget last year. A lot of the things that are in the Budget right now were there last year, because that is why I said it is a routine budget. The Premier never talked about any of the jobs that were created by the Province's contribution of guaranteed loans to water and sewer, he never talked about how many jobs were created as a result of road construction. He never talked about that. And that is why I did not talk about it today, because the Premier only talked about, 'We created 8,056 jobs.'

I would like the Premier to tell us how many jobs were created as a result of the total initiative of the government. I see the Minister of Mines is looking and listening very attentively. That is what I have been telling the people today. The people of Newfoundland would like to know and I think the minister, being a Minister of Labour and Manpower at one time, will address this question. If the government have

any confidence, if the government have any faith in their programme, if this means anything, the minister should get up and tell the people of Newfoundland by how much this document will reduce unemployment in this Province in this year, 1986 - 1987. That is what we want the minister to address.

I again say that this government cannot demonstrate its commitment to the people of this Province until they are willing to do something of that nature, to either get up and tell us what the rate of unemployment will be in this fiscal year as a result of the initiatives in this Budget, or tell us by how much they plan to reduce the level of unemployment in this year. If they cannot tell us this, then they have no confidence in their document, they have proven that they have no direction, they do not know where they are going. Because the federal Minister of Finance, at least, did have the gumption and the confidence in his own document to tell the people of Canada what rate of unemployment his government had targeted for this year. Does the hon. minister know what it was? Does any minister know what it was? The rate of unemployment that the federal Minister of Finance said his government had targeted for this year as a result of their initiatives is 9.6 per cent. That is what the federal minister said.

Now, will some hon. member stand in his place and tell the people of Newfoundland what the target rate of percent is they are aiming for this year? Let them tell us. They can do it in numbers, they can tell us how many more people will be employed in the Province

this year as a result of these initiatives, or - three ways - they can tell us how many fewer people will be unemployed as a result of these initiatives, the whole bit, as the minister tried to throw me off track a moment ago by saying.

Obviously, the Premier did not put any credence in any of this stuff, the road construction programmes etc., because in the 8,056 jobs he created - and that shows what his emphases are, that he did not allude to that at all - he just talked about the Canada Job Strategy programmes. Well, that is not what the people of this Province voted for; they thought that this government had something a little more solid than that.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I want to say at this moment. I would like for the minister, when he stands in his place, to answer these questions that I have directed to him so emphatically and so precisely.

Mr. Speaker, another matter that is of concern to me today is the state of labour relations in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now, I am sure no hon. member on the other side can object when I say that labour relations in this Province are at an all time low. And this did not happen overnight, this is the result of a government that, over the years, has not demonstrated any kind of sensitivity to labour and, of course, it has escalated into what we have today, one of the worst labour relations records in all of Canada. Mr. Speaker, that can be substantiated by the fact that we have had the largest number of lost days due to strikes, or we could say strike-lost days, we have had the

largest number of strike-lost days than any other jurisdiction in Canada. The fact that we have the largest number is not so bad, but we double the national average. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is that doing for employment in this Province? What is it doing for investors, the state of labour relations we have today? Is that very encouraging to companies that want to come here and set up business, want to come in and set up in business related to the offshore? Certainly, when they see the kind of labour relations we have been having in this Province, they want to think twice before they come into this Province. When they realize the kind of labour relations we have, when they realize the kind of provincial government we have, or its relationship with labour, certainly it is not too encouraging.

I believe the state of labour relations in this Province is preventing a lot of companies from coming into this Province, that might otherwise do so, to invest their money and to create a few jobs. Certainly, goodness, we need every dollar we can get. We cannot afford to have this state of labour relations that we now have.

The minister says I am misinterpreting. I have just given a fact. I have just stated a fact. How can one misinterpret a fact? I could misinterpret the conclusion, I suppose.

DR. COLLINS:

How many days were lost in industrial? You are talking about public sector.

MR. LUSH:

I am talking about the total.

Now, the public sector might put it a little more out of proportion, but, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about that. We are talking about Newfoundland Telephone, last year. That is not the public sector. Newfoundland Telephone added to that, the brewery added to that. These are not the public sector. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, and the facts are, that this Province lost more days due to strikes than any other province in Canada and it is not just that we lost more, it is the enormity of it. We double the national average.

MR. WARREN:

That is not true.

MR. LUSH:

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) says it is not true. Well, I can tell the member that it is true, that it is factual, that it is irrevocable. Unequivocally I say that. Mr. Speaker, I do not have them right here, but I produced the figures in Question Period here not too long ago, I read the figures from The Financial Post here not too long ago, one of the most reputable papers in Canada if not the most reputable paper in Canada, a national paper.

DR. COLLINS:

How about The Evening Telegram?

MR. LUSH:

The Evening Telegram is a reputable paper but it has not reached the status of The Financial Post, and I do not think that would be any insult to the writers of The Evening Telegram to say that.

DR. COLLINS:

You did not mention The Gander Beacon?

MR. LUSH:

Another great paper, Mr. Speaker, and I love it. As a matter of fact, they carry the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) in it just about every week.

MR. TULK:

Which one is that?

MR. LUSH:

The Beacon. I am in the paper just about every week. It is a good paper. And if I had to rate the papers on that level I would say The Beacon is the best in Canada. As a matter of fact, it carries the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

MR. TULK:

As a matter of fact, the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) is thinking about suing you for taking up all the space.

MR. LUSH:

Well, it is a good paper and I would not want to use that as a criteria, but the Finance Minister sort of got me off track. I was talking about the good paper, as well.

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the point I was making to demonstrate the level of labour relations in this Province, and to point out the number of days we lose in this Province through strikes. I have said that we are the highest in the nation but not only that, we are double the national average. If I could just illustrate to the member for Torngat Mountains, I believe the average last year in the nation was something like two and a half days per unionized member across Canada. Got that? The average was 2.5 per unionized member across Canada. In Newfoundland, it was close to 5 days per

unionized member.

DR. COLLINS:

You are against workers being unionized.

MR. LUSH:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about how poorly this government deals with unionized members. That is what I am demonstrating. I am talking about the abysmal record that this government has in terms of dealing with labour, dealing with unionized people. That is what I am talking about, that is the point I am making.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this government has to do something to improve labour relations in this Province and, by so doing, they will be doing a lot for industry in this Province and for business in general. By doing that, if they can generate a better labour relations atmosphere in this Province, we are likely to be able to bring in more business. Until that happens, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid of what is going to happen with respect to companies we want to come to this Province, we want to come to this Island, we want to come to this city and set up in business. It is certainly enough to scare the company that would not be fully committed at this point in time, and that is the very worst we could say.

Mr. Speaker, in wrapping up my debate, my concluding point in terms of what the Budget has done for business people. Let me inform hon members of something else that is happening in the Province in addition to labour relations. They have the labour movement alienated practically and, if that were not good enough, they have also alienated the

business community. Now, I say again, doing something for the business community, having a climate that is conducive to the growth and expansion of business is the very existence of the Tory party. Catering to the business community, doing things for the business community is certainly the philosophy that gave birth to the Tory party. I have said there is nothing in this Budget for business, but, much closer to home, Mr. Speaker, last week it was revealed in one of our newspapers that we are beginning to get certain information now from this Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment. Well, what came out of that? I believe that maybe that commission is going to come up with some sound recommendations to the government.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were against that.

MR. LUSH:

Yes, I am against it, Mr. Speaker, but I respect the people who are on it. I think they are sincere people and I do believe they are going to come up with some recommendations, but I am not sure we needed to spend that kind of money to know what to do. We will see when the recommendations come out, but I believe they are going to make some recommendations that are obvious, ones that you and I could have known before we set up a commission.

In the meantime, a little bit of information came out a few days ago on the basis of some information they got back from the business community, and the business community said that the biggest enemy they have in this Province is the government. That is what private enterprise said.

The group of people these people try to kowtow to and do things for so that we can stimulate business in this Province, they said that this government was enemy number one, that it has them overloaded with taxes and the bureaucracy, and all the things they are required to do is just not conducive to developing business.

DR. COLLINS:

I think you misunderstood what they said.

MR. LUSH:

No, Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not misunderstand. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is wishing that I misunderstood but that is wishful thinking. I think I have proven unequivocally and irrevocably that in this Budget there is nothing for anybody. One would hope that there would have been something there for the very existence of the Tory Party, for the private sector, but even they have begun to complain, even they are now asking for what the Liberal Party started out asking for last year in the election, the abolition of some of the horrendous taxes that we have in this Province, the reduction of the retail sales tax, and why do we not do like the people of Nova Scotia did and the people in Ontario, give a corporate tax holiday and to see if we cannot, Mr. Speaker, reinvigorate the stagnant economy of this Province. But, no, Mr. Speaker, they are afraid to do anything that looks positive, they are afraid of experimentation, they are afraid of anything new. That is typical Tory philosophy, afraid of experimentation, afraid to touch anything new, afraid to do anything that might look like it is a change. They are afraid of change. Mr. Speaker, they cannot



even maintain the status quo.

First when I came in this House, we used to say the Tories were trying to maintain the status quo, but they lost that battle too. So, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is too much to expect that they will do anything that will impact upon the economy positively when, as I said before, they have lost the battle of maintaining the status quo, they have lost the battle of staying even.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think I have demonstrated, in cluing up, that there is nothing in this budget for the ordinary Newfoundlander, there is nothing in this budget for the private sector and, above all, there is nothing in this budget for the unemployed, both young and old but, particularly, the younger people of the Province. I believe that this budget, on this basis, needs to be condemned not by only members of this side, Mr. Speaker, but by members on the government side, to show their concern to wake up the government, because I know a lot of the members over there are helpless, they do not have much input into government policy, that they do not have much influence, that they do not have much clout, I know that. Well, this might be the opportunity for these members in the backbenches, this might be their opportunity to rise up and let the people of Newfoundland know that they are not contented with this budget, that they are not contented with the lack of employment initiatives in this budget, and maybe it might be the chance to wake up their fellow colleagues, their Cabinet ministers. This might be their opportunity to wake them up to do something. So this might give them the opportunity to let their

constituents know where they stand and, Mr. Speaker, to do something to wake up government to do something in the next little while to create employment -- for the people of this Province.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will take my place.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks I would like to rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Yes, a point of personal privilege. I wanted to do it earlier, Sir, but I was waiting for CBC to deliver this press release to me, which came a few minutes ago, and I did not want to interrupt the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), who was speaking.

However, for the past number of days, and I am sure other hon. members in the House have also received many, many telephone calls and many inquiries. I have already spoken to the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) about my point of privilege that I was going to bring up. Mr. Speaker, it has to do with CBC's broadcasting of the Montreal/Hartford hockey series. It is presently shown on the French network here in St. John's, but there is a big section outside of St. John's, outside the

overpass, that does not receive cable television and, unfortunately, they have no access to this series between the Canadians and the Hartford Whalers. I would think, Mr. Speaker, as a taxpayer of the Dominion of Canada, that this is infringing on my rights or infringing on the rights of many other Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who want to have the opportunity of viewing such a programme. I will table this press release, Mr. Speaker, that was delivered to me moments ago. I think their reasons are very, very weak indeed for not showing it on their English channel at the present time.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would be only too glad, if the hon. gentlemen will allow, to read the whole release and maybe the hon. member can get it from there or I could send him over a copy.

Mr. Speaker, to continue, just underlining some of the items that are mentioned there. "Hockey Night In Canada has adopted a new scheduling format for the quarter finals and the semi-finals." CBC said they felt obliged to avoid having hockey on both its English and its French network. I would probably agree with CBC on that point. But if CBC cannot show it in other parts of Newfoundland and Labrador, I do not care if it is in French or it is in English, as long as they can show it. That is my concern, as long as they can show it either in French or in English. A lot of people cannot see it at all. It is only the people in the larger settlements and larger towns like St. John's

and Gander and so on who can see it on the French network. Now I do not care if it is in French or English as long as we can see it. This is the concern, Mr. Speaker, that has been expressed by thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders. In fact, CBC is admitting that they are receiving hundreds and hundreds of requests concerning the same thing.

As long as the picture is there on the screen, I am sure that a lot of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians would be quite satisfied. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that CBC has an obligation to the taxpayers of this Province. If they are going to show a particular hockey game, then they should show it to anybody who is within hearing distance and visible distance of the CBC network.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rest my case on that and ask the House to, maybe in due course, perhaps before the day is gone, send a strongly worded telegram to the CBC objecting on behalf of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who cannot avail of particular hockey games that they are showing to some segments of the province.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, while the hon. gentleman raises a very good question about CBC coverage and its obligation to Canadians, I would suggest to Your Honour that that is not a point of privilege. The fact that CBC chooses to broadcast hockey games in one way

or the other in no way impedes a member of this House or members of this House from carrying out their duties.

I say to the hon. gentleman if he perhaps proposed to bring this up tomorrow in the appropriate place, the House might indeed contact CBC as to what we feel are its obligations to Canadians. After reading the press release, this side might indeed be led to support that kind of representation to CBC but it is not a point of privilege because it in no way impedes the ability of the member or any other member to carry out their duties in this House and that is the distinctive character of a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

In the opinion of the Chair, it is not a life and death issue that has to be decided immediately. I do not wish to set any precedence by making a decision right now so I will take it under advisement and I will render a decision tomorrow.

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make some comments concerning the good news budget but first I wish to comment on what the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) said. In listening to the hon. the member for Bonavista North, I am sure that the hon. member said the same thing in the budget debate as he has said for the last five or six years. The hon. member does not know a good news budget when he sees one.

I think the hon. member should realize that there are some very valuable items of interest in that budget. Once and a while it would be appropriate for the hon. member to get up and recognize publicly what some of those good initiatives are. Just in case the hon. member did not recognize some of the positive elements of the budget, maybe I should refresh the hon. member's mind and outline a number of those positive initiatives that have been brought in by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

Now, Mr. Speaker, in our Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, alone, the hon. member never mentioned that the small business loans, administered by the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, have been increased from \$25,000 to \$50,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not find that negative. Here is a department that is interested in getting ordinary human beings, ordinary Newfoundlanders and Labradorians out into the business field and giving them the opportunity to borrow at low interest rates up to \$50,000. I believe it is something like 3 per cent below prime. The hon. member spoke for an hour this evening and he never did mention one positive thing in this budget.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, maybe the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), if he follows me, can find some positive things in a budget that he would love to talk about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go from

the small business loans to the -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

I only just want to remind the hon. member at this point in time that the hon. the member for Bonavista North spoke for something like an hour and thirty-seven minutes. Now, I know that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) must have found it so interesting that it only seemed like he spoke for an hour but he did speak for an hour and thirty-seven minutes. It was a terribly interesting speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. the member for Fogo for reminding me that the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) spoke for an hour and thirty-seven minutes but, Mr. Speaker, he could have said the same thing in five minutes.

However, Mr. Speaker, I also want to remind hon. members that the hon. gentleman from Bonavista North did not even mention the farm loans administered by our department. Farm loans administered by our department have gone from \$30,000 up to \$75,000.

Mr. Speaker, the special sawmill

assistance programme the hon. gentleman's district avails of every year. Some of his constituents take advantage of this assistance programme administered by our department. So, I believe the hon. member should realize that a budget can only be as bad as an individual wants to make it. I believe the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is trying to paint this budget as a bad budget when, Mr. Speaker, there are so many positive initiatives in this budget. The hon. gentleman should just look at it positively for about a half-hour and stand up and be counted and show the people of Bonavista North that they put him here to at least elaborate on the facts, not only some of the facts, but all of the facts that are detailed in the budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I will go from Bonavista North to the district of Torngat Mountains. I do not think that in the district of Torngat Mountains there has been one person who has called me saying the budget was no good for my district, not one person, while other years there have been a number of them.

I remember getting up in this hon. House and making a rebuttal against the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) on the subject of *Them Days* magazine. The hon. the member for Naskaupi wrote a letter to the Premier addressing a clipping from *Hansard* and a little note from *The Evening Telegram* where I said, "Do not worry about it." And, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman from Naskaupi knows he should not have worried. I told him then and I tell him now that *Them Days* were going to get a grant. Now they will get their grant and furthermore, Mr.

Speaker, I should advise the hon. gentleman there are better days to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to advise hon. members opposite that this year the commercial caribou hunt has been an undertaking of great initiative on the part of the Native organization in my district. A number of members had the opportunity of attending the kick-off banquet at Holiday Inn and they have seen the commercials on T.V. advertising this. In fact, caribou has become so popular that National Sea have requested 200,000 pounds, an order we are unable to fill. I can tell the hon. gentleman, here is something undertaken by a Native association with the backing of this government and it is showing dividends already, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

A good member.

MR. WARREN:

Hear, hear! A good member! I would say to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) that the member for Torngat Mountains is bringing along some goodies in the budget for his district. I think any district at all can receive good things from the budget if they will work honestly and energetically. Hard-working members will get results, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member started that sports caribou thing a few years ago. Do you remember?

MR. WARREN:

That is right. In fact, the hon. gentleman is reminding me of our hunter capability test.

MR. SIMMS:

No, I was not going to mention that.

MR. WARREN:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have to go back to the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). He talks about jobs. You know, Mr. Speaker, because of the development programme administered by the Department of Social Services, at the present time, anyone capable of working in the town of Nain is presently employed through the community development programme administered by the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, last year I had the opportunity of taking the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) through my district. Let me advise members on both sides of this hon. House who have not had the opportunity of going through a district in which there was unfit housing, that the minister saw for himself the conditions under which those people were living. And, Mr. Speaker, within two weeks there was action on the renovation of that housing. In fact, I have to compliment The Evening Telegram on making a trip through the district and seeing some of the conditions that prevail along the Labrador Coast. I think that The Evening Telegram has to do more of this, getting their reporters outside of the overpass and seeing for themselves what kind of conditions prevail in areas such as Coastal Labrador and the South Shore. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite worthy to note that the name of the reporter at that time, I think, was a lady by the name of

Ms Whelan. I think she did a fantastic reporting job. In fact, this past weekend, seeing the stories that were carried in The Evening Telegram about the development associations in Southern Labrador just goes to show that all the media has to do in this Province is get outside the overpass and see the other parts and follow the example that The Evening Telegram has taken in the past number of months.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, to my hon. colleague from Menihek, (Mr. Fenwick), one time last year, after those houses were repaired, I contacted an individual with a media network in St. John's and asked him to go into Nain and do a story on what had been done on those houses. I was refused, Mr. Speaker. They did not want to show the good things after the bad ones were all repaired. So I would throw out a challenge to the media of this Province. Sometimes it is worthwhile to get outside the overpass and show some of the things that the government is doing to correct some inefficiencies that have occurred during a number of years.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman realizes that our Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development this year will be completing the last of the government-owned stores. A new \$600,000 government-owned store is going to be constructed in the town of Hopedale this year. That will mean a new modern facility in every town in my district where government runs a store, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) had the opportunity of visiting the one in Postville. The one in

Makkovik, which the minister opened there a couple of months ago, is a similar product and the same thing will be built in Hopedale this year. You are going to see a new modern store constructed in that community.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did he mention that?

MR. WARREN:

No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member never mentioned that. He never took the opportunity of mentioning anything positive about the Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There are a half a dozen meetings going on.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), when he speaks on this Budget, I am quite confident that he will get up and see some of the positive items that have been outlined by the Minister of Finance, in particular as it pertains to his district, concerning Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, concerning construction on the Edward's Brook Bridge which is in his district, concerning Them Days, which includes all the districts of Labrador. I am sure the member realizes that regardless of how negative he can be, there are positive things that outdo all the negativeness that he may muster.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, as hon. members opposite and hon. members on this side have said time and time again, about the high cost of electricity. Mr.

Speaker, I am alarmed, I am disgusted, I am shocked and everything else to know that an individual in Cartwright, an individual down the Southwest Coast, Port Hope Simpson pay so much for electricity, while an individual in Goose Bay can use the same number of kilowatts and only pay roughly one-quarter or one-third of the cost. Mr. Speaker, I believe the people in Labrador City even pay less.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we have to arrive at a time in society when every Newfoundlander and Labradorian is compelled to pay an average for the consumption of electricity. Whether the people in Labrador West and the people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay have to pay more and, Mr. Speaker, whether the people on the coast have to pay less, it is not fair at the present time the way the people along the Labrador Coast, the people in the diesel generation areas of the Province are having to pay such a high cost for electricity. I have gone to bat for them and I will continue to go to bat for those people. As long as I am an elected member of this House, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things that I will continue to do and, hopefully, the appropriate authorities will see that what I am saying is that those people, which have the lowest incomes, are the ones who are paying the most for electricity. It is unfair and I think that the Minister of Energy is seriously looking at this. I think we should get some action to see if these inequalities can be ironed out.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I will answer

the hon. member's question if he will go to his own seat but not from someone else's seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:  
I would like to ask the hon. member what kind of power does he have in his cabin, is it gasoline, or diesel, or electricity?

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, number one, I do not know anything about a cabin. Furthermore, I would suggest to the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) that he should read The Evening Telegram today which has a headline saying: Efford Criticized For Attack Against Brett On Exon House.

MR. EFFORD:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WARREN:  
I think the hon. member for Port de Grave should get up and apologize to the House for what he has been saying about Exon House and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). Stand up now and be counted, and apologize to the House, if he wants to.

MR. TOBIN:

He is a fraud.

MR. EFFORD:

Are you going to answer the question?

MR. WARREN:

So, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Answer the question!

MR. TOBIN:

He is a disgrace, that is what he is.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Apologize! Apologize!

MR. WARREN:

As I said, Mr. Speaker, in the beginning, I will respond to the hon. member that he has showed a disregard for the Department of Social Services, a disregard for the people and, Mr. Speaker, I think it is ridiculous that the hon. member should have the gall to come back into this House today without first apologizing to the minister and to the owners of the home. I think it is disgusting the way the member has been acting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, he has the opportunity to get up and apologize and he does not want to apologize because, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. EFFORD:

I ask the hon. member will he run out in Port de Grave district against me in the next election?

MR. WARREN:

- he does not have the intestinal fortitude to apologize to those people that he has inflicted wounds on, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!  
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am having some difficulty hearing the eloquence of the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and I request the Speaker to exercise his authority and keep both sides of the House quiet so I can hear.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member made a valid point of order, as far as points of orders go. Of course, the enforcement of it will save the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) the embarrassment of being called onto to apologize.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the point is well taken. There is far too much interruption from both sides.



MR. WARREN:

Yes, we are talking about the budget, Mr. Speaker, and I think it was in the Estimates Committee where the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) attacked the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and the group home personnel, Mr. Speaker. When we are debating the budget, whether it is in the estimates or whether it is in this House, I think the hon. member for Port de Grave has an obligation to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to apologize for those remarks he made against Exon House and against the group homes in this Province. Mr. Speaker, it was a cowardly act on behalf of the hon. member.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, he was here this morning discussing Public Works estimates and was asking questions about last year's expenditures. Mr. Speaker, I think it is ridiculous that members come in and ask questions about last year's budget.

So I think the hon. member should hold his head in shame. Mr. Speaker, he will not get up and back up what he has said in the committees. He will not get up in this hon. House and tell them that he made a mistake. Be an honest man, be a gentleman and get up and show the people of the Province that you did not mean what you said, and the churches too, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is unreal, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman should be allowed to make such an attack on Exon House and on group homes in this Province and on the churches which support the group homes. Mr. Speaker, everybody has respect for the churches in this Province who support the group homes. I

believe it is disgusting, it is disgraceful and the members should be chastised, Mr. Speaker, in fact it is almost to the point that I should rise on a point of privilege and ask him to be named or withdrawn or pulled out of the House, Mr. Speaker, because I think he has gone too far.

As an elected member in this House he has an obligation to the people who elected him and also to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member for Fogo's (Mr. Tulk) question, I believe the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) does not need any member on this side to protect him. The Minister of Social Services, I understand, fared fairly well in the estimates the other night, in fact I believe the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has, according to what I am hearing, done a very, very good job in the estimates committee the other night and has really showed what kind of fraud the member for Port de Grave is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

He has really showed what the member for Port de Grave is made of and all he is trying to do, coming to the House day after day, is trying to make Brownie points on the backs of innocent Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. That is what he is trying to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Public Works and Services, I asked the minister a question today concerning a lot of activity that is on the go up by the Marine Institute. I notice there is a lot of activity up there and I was not aware of what is going on, Mr. Speaker, but something like \$37 million is going to be spent up in the Nagles Hill area by the Marine Institute, not only for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, Mr. Speaker, but for people all over the world to train and practice. A world class institution, Mr. Speaker, and not one word from the hon. member from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) about the Marine Institute, a new modern facility that has just been completed.

The hon. member spoke for an hour and thirty-seven minutes and never once mentioned the new School for the Deaf. He never once mentioned one word about the hospital in Clarendville. Mr. Speaker, I remember the hon. member was in Labrador, in fact, I believe he lived in Churchill Falls for a while, but I had the opportunity of taking the hon. member along the Coast with me back in former days. The hon. member enjoyed himself while he was with me and it is best to probably leave it at that. The hon. member is okay.

I want to continue, Mr. Speaker, on some of the other positive items that are in this budget that was not brought up by the hon. member. Is there any construction on the go this year? There is an extension to the Grand Falls hospital and the Harbour Lodge in Carbonear. The member never said one word about it. There is also the Wooddale Nursery. Now there are three items that are funded by the government of this Province

that the hon. member is not speaking about.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in my district, in the town of Nain, this Summer, there is a four-unit housing facility being built for single parents, the first ever built on the Coast of Labrador. I think hats should come off to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Dinn) for making sure that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, when the need arises, will be supplied with accommodations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Seeing that it is getting close to closing time, Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, call it six o'clock.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, before the motion to adjourn, I will pass along some information with respect to the Committee meetings: Resource Committee meets at 7:30 p.m. in the House to review the estimates of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, that is tonight; Social Services Committee will meet at 7:30 p.m. this evening at the Colonial Building to review the estimates of the Department of Health; tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. in the House the Resource Committee

will meet to review the estimates of the Department of Développement; 9:30 a.m. tomorrow in the Colonial Building the Social Services Committee will do the estimates of the Department of Education; and, the Government Services Committee will meet in the House at 7:30 p.m. tomorrow to review the estimates of the Department of Public Works and Services. That is all clear.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 23, 1986, at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 23, 1986, at 3:00 p.m.