



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 21

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

28 April 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I would like to ask leave of the
House to send a telegram to the
Corner Brook Royals, who are now
leading three to nothing in their
series.

MR. YOUNG:
You remember what happened last
year.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I remember last year.

Since they are playing so far from
home this year, hopefully, with
the good blessings of everybody in
the House of Assembly they will
win the Allan Cup and do us very
proud. They have done very well
this year. They are on the brink
of winning, and I think a good
telegram from the House of
Assembly, urging them on, would be
a great thing for them.

MR. FUREY:
Unanimous consent.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Unanimous consent would be a great
thing, and we would see them go on
to victory and do us very proud.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We, on this side, would certainly
like to participate in a
congratulatory message to the
Corner Brook Royals, who are doing
so well in the Allan Cup
playdowns. It looks like this
year, for the first time, we will
have an Allan Cup champion in our
Province. As my colleague, the
Minister of Public Works (Mr.
Young) said, the hon. gentleman
did the same thing last year and
from there on the Royals went
downhill. So we are hoping that
will not happen this year.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I am told
that in their next game the Corner
Brook Royals will be wearing the
uniforms that were paid for by
this administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of
privilege.

o o o

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the
member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
I apologize to the Premier, who
was standing on a Ministerial
Statement, but at the beginning of
the House I thought Your Honour
would be dealing with the matter
of privilege that was before the
House last Friday. Since it is
not being dealt with, I chose now

to stand on a new point of House privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to attempt to make a prima facie case, and I would ask to be heard without interruption. Last Friday, a matter involving the House was carried outside the House through part of this Assembly, the press gallery, which is only sitting with your authority, Sir, as the Speaker. I refer to the reporting of an incident which occurred in the House revolving around this legislature. My point of privilege is that unless we as members of this House can be assured of accurate, fair reporting by all members of the press gallery, because the press gallery is part of this assembly, we are going to have to deal with it. All members are affected. I refer to last Friday when incidents arose in the House over matters of privilege and matters of the names of members of this House being slandered. The report carried from the press gallery was carried quite accurately by most members of the press, with the exception of one. When these incidents occurred, members of the House of Assembly were asked to give their points of view. In this case, my colleague from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and myself were interviewed in what we call a scrum by all the media that encompassed the press gallery. All media carried what I thought a pretty accurate report of what was said and what took place, with the exception of CBC. For some reason, CBC chose not to carry it at all on the television media, despite the fact that NTV carried it quite accurately and adequately. CBC chose not to even mention the fact.

But that is not my point. The

point is that this morning CBC chose to have a full editorial comment on what they, themselves, call 'The Goon Show', namely, their own editorial which they call, 'The Goon Show'. They were commenting on what takes place in this Assembly in an editorial way and referring, in particular, to my colleague for Burin - Placentia West and myself as being named the goons and tried to indicate clearly our background, our character and the role we play in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious matter when we have members of the press gallery choosing not to report accurately and fairly in an unbiased, impartial way the proceedings which take place here and what is said by all members in this House. Not to do that, and not to carry anything regarding the House of Assembly but to carry their own editorial comment, as was done this morning, I say is very serious. Because this House has given the press the right to sit here in order that they may carry the proceedings of the House to the public, if certain of these media chose not to be fair, I pose this very serious question: What do we have to do as government members to ensure that certain media are going to carry the proceedings accurately and fairly and in an unbiased way? Surely we do not have to cozy up to CBC to get coverage in an accurate, fair way - not coverage, what is being said on the government side of the House. What do we have to do?

What I am saying as a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I think is very important. The press gallery has to get its act together to ensure that not one of their media, and that covers the whole

gambit of the media, spoils the real true image of the job the others are doing, because most of the other media are doing quite a good job.

But CBC is tarnishing the reputation of the media because of the manner in which they are reporting from this House. I say it this a very sincere way, therefore, I would ask the Speaker to take this matter under advisement. Surely we, as members, do not have to be overly friendly to the CBC, and get cuddly and cozy with CBC merely to be quoted accurately from this Legislature, which is for the benefit of our constituents, etc. We should not have to do that. I have no intention of doing that as one member of the House, but I want what I say or do covered accurately and fairly. That is all I am asking for.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping you will take this point under advisement and that you will consider the whole matter, because it is important to all members of this House and, in fact, to the whole proceedings of this House, how we are portrayed to the rest of Newfoundland. Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see that the member was allowed to develop his point. It is a long-standing tradition in this House and it has been honoured again today. Having said that, the Speaker, of course, is never in a position to know

whether there is a point of privilege until the member lays it out, lays out his concerns. The member for Bonavista South has done that today and I think it must be clear to all that he has no point of privilege. If he is asking that this House participate in press censorship, we cannot condone that. If he is asking that sometimes when the press does not treat an individual member as glowingly as we would like that we should limit their rights here, we cannot condone that. I understand the member is upset, but I suggest to him that it is with himself that he ought to be upset, with his action, not with the accurate report of those actions. I say to him, also, that if he is upset with the accurate reporting of CBC, he should be more than upset with the even more accurating reporting of CHCM, which we heard on the weekend.

Mr. Speaker, there is clearly, clearly no point of privilege. The member, though, draws attention to an issue, a very important issue, and that is as so long as we, for whatever reason in this House, allow the press to report what happens here secondhand, we will have to put up with whatever happens. The solution is to allow the cameras in, to allow the mikes in, and let the happenings of this House go out across the Province firsthand and then people will be able to judge for themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I must rule the hon. member has not made a prime facie case.

I would like to take the

opportunity now to rule on the point of privilege that was raised on Friday. I was waiting, actually, for one other hon. member to be present, but that matter can be dealt with when he is in the House. Over the weekend, I carefully checked Hansard of Friday last. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle stated and I quote: "I have seen this so-called 'goon squad' in action." He continues: "Where they have come to disrupt." Later in the day he uses the phrase "when the squad is called off." I refer hon. members to Beauchesne, page 104, Paragraph 319, Subparagraph (3) which states, "A member will not be permitted by the Speaker to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case."

I now call on the hon. member for the Strait of Belle to withdraw (a) any imputation of unworthy motives and (b) the words 'goon squad'.

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, without any equivocation I withdraw any motives that I attributed, and I withdraw the words 'goon squad'. I trust the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Matthews) will also be asked to withdraw the words 'goon squad'?

MR. SPEAKER:

I realize the Opposition House Leader is not here at the moment, but I will ask him to deal with this matter when he is. However, the hon. Opposition House Leader made it quite clear that he was not implicating the Premier in any conspiracy or instructions to any

member. I could not find any indication that this was done by any one in the Opposition. The hon. member for Fogo did say, 'They are behaving like parliamentary thugs in that they are trying to obstruct the process, and in that sense you call them a goon squad.' There is clearly here an imputation of unworthy motives. The term parliamentary thug is unparliamentary. I refer hon. members to Beauchesne page 104, Paragraph 320: The first reference to an unparliamentary comment is 'a parliamentary pugilist and parliamentary bully', and I put parliament thug in that category. When the hon. member is present, I am going to call on him to withdraw any imputation of unworthy motives in the words 'parliamentary thug'.

The hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), in referring to the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), stated, and I quote from Hansard, "that is action similar to a goon squad, a squad that was sent out, Mr. Speaker, to deliberately prevent proper things from happening in the Committees. I would ask the Speaker to look into this behaviour and see if it is not similar to the planned actions of a squad sent in to disrupt." Again, this is imputing unworthy motives and I call on the hon. member for Gander to withdraw the term 'goon squad' and any imputation that there were unworthy motives by any hon. member.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw words I have said that have imputed motives, specifically, the reference you made a moment ago.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thank you.

I now come to the point of privilege raised by the hon. the Premier. The first part referred to the term 'goon'. That has been dealt with, and will be dealt with by the other member when I ask him to withdraw his comments. The second part refers to, and I quote the Premier, "That I, as a Premier of this Province, have instructed members of my caucus to obstruct the workings of the committees of the House." I could find nothing in Hansard to substantiate that and nothing to say that members of government were involved. I got the clear impression from reading Friday's Hansard that hon. members on my right felt that hon. members on my left were acting in unison and it is unfortunate that the term 'goon squad' was used. That remark has been withdrawn and also any imputations of unworthy motives, and I feel that disposes of the point of privilege.

The lesson to be learned from the incidents of last Friday, certainly from my point of view, is that I have been too lax in allowing unparliamentary remarks to stand. My only excuse is that I am still in the learning stage. Some comments slip through which, with experience, will be picked up right away. But with the co-operation of all, I feel this and other matters will improve.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We thank Your Honour for these rulings. It sounded as though I missed an interesting session of

the House on Friday. I was out on Her Majesty's business, very effective business, too, I might add. I think we sewed up at least two and a half districts on the weekend.

MR. TOBIN:

Two hundred people? What happened to the 250?

MR. BARRY:

Actually, the member for Fortune - Hermitage stated there were 300. I think he was a little enthusiastic. There were about 285, I think.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

What is the point of order?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the point of order I am making is that Your Honour's rulings are correct, as was indicated by members opposite in their response. I find it a little difficult to understand how we are going to deal with the matter of unparliamentary conduct. Your Honour has dealt in his ruling with unparliamentary language, I would submit to Your Honour that unparliamentary conduct is even more serious, and this is what I understand led to this dispute. The unparliamentary language has been disposed with, but what now do we do with the unparliamentary conduct, where we do have problems and we do have the Opposition being obstructed in its attempt to question government in the course of its estimates?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order. If there is any misconduct in the House, it will be dealt with.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I was quite delighted to hear the tone of what Mr. Speaker had to say a few moments ago, because I think it represents an important departure in this House. We have had some real difficulty earlier in the session, one series of events I remember going over two or three days, when a number of unworthy motives were attributed to the Leader of the Opposition by members opposite without any intervention from the Chair. So I take great encouragement from the notice given by the Chair that this is not going to be allowed to go on in future and I hope members opposite will take due notice of that, as well.

MR. TOBIN:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I will just speak very briefly to it. I think Your Honour has given a very accurate description of how the Chair is going to deal with these aspects. As it relates to the two points of order which have been recently raised, one by the Leader of the Opposition and one by the member for Fortune - Hermitage, I think we are seeing again a clear indication of what led to the problem, and that is the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Fortune - Hermitage getting up on spurious points of order, trying

to make points. This morning, Mr. Speaker, we intentionally watched the Committee meeting. There was one point of order raised. That point of order, Mr. Speaker, was raised by the member for Fortune - Hermitage, asking the Chair to deny me the right to ask several questions as they related to the Marystown Shipyard because he felt I should know the answers.

Now, that is my job as a member of the Committee, and if that is obstruction, Mr. Speaker, my conduct this morning in asking these pertinent questions as they related to -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

We are not dealing with any discussion of the Committee or what went on in the Committee.

To the point of order.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order raised by the hon. member, I would like to say that both he and the Leader of the Opposition have demonstrated quite clearly that they are the ones who are standing, both in the House of Assembly and in Committee meetings, raising spurious points of order, and I think, Your Honour, they should be dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule that there is no point of order. The hon. member on my right and the one on my left took the opportunity of giving their points of view.

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. members to some important events involving forestry that have taken place today, for the benefit of the House.

This morning the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the federal government signed a major new agreement that provides for the expenditure of \$48 million in forestry activities in this Province during the next four years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
- under a 70/30 cost-sharing ratio, 70 per cent federal and 30 per cent provincial.

The agreement, known as the Canada - Newfoundland Forest Resources Development Agreement, will enable this government, through the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, to continue without interruption the vital forestry initiatives that were started under two previous federal/provincial cost-sharing arrangements that resulted in the expenditure of close to \$130 million during the last eleven years. The funds generated through previous agreements, made it possible for us to begin the task of repairing damage to our forests caused by centuries of neglect, insect devastation and

fire.

We have reached the point now, Mr. Speaker, where our efforts launched under the two earlier agreements have started to pay off. This new agreement will allow us to get on with the job of forest renewal and enhancement through our work in silviculture, protection, forest utilization and research and development, along with many other aspects of forest management that are essential to our economic future.

While the primary aim of this new agreement, as with the earlier ones, is to ensure the future of our forest resource and the industry it supports, there are a number of immediate benefits, especially in job creation. The average annual expenditure of \$12 million under the new agreement will lead to the creation of about 1,250 jobs each year, or a total of about 5,000 jobs over the four year period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
These are jobs that would not exist at all if we had not succeeded in negotiating this federal/provincial agreement with Ottawa. Not only would the jobs not exist, but we would have virtually no way of ensuring the future of our forest industry.

The last agreement, Mr. Speaker, provided an expenditure of \$54 million over six years, or an average of \$9 million per year. This new agreement will generate an annual expenditure of \$12 million, a 33 per cent increase per year for the next four years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

One of the main components of the previous agreement was silviculture and this is even more pronounced in the new accord. During the last six years, under the old agreement, we planted about 22 million seedlings that we had grown ourselves in the provincial tree nursery at Wooddale, near Bishops Falls. We also carried out various other forms of silviculture treatments such as the thinning of overstocked stands of young trees, on almost one million acres (40,000 hectares) of forest land. Under the new agreement we will spend some \$28 million on a variety of silviculture activities, including seedling production and planting, in other words reforestation, site preparation, thinning and research into ways of improving tree growth through genetics. It is in silviculture as well that most of the jobs will occur, mainly in planting and thinning.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly mention some other highlights of the agreement, including a proposed expenditure of about \$5.5 million for maintenance on forest access roads, reconditioning and a certain amount of new construction. Most of our needed access road construction has already been completed under previous agreements. Another \$5 million will be spent for inventory and planning and just over \$1.2 million will be used to increase our own fire protection efforts as well as for combating insects and disease.

One of the new ideas slated for introduction under this agreement

is a pilot programme to encourage proper management and utilization of privately owned woodlots. The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) will be providing more details about this initiative in the near future. However, I would like to note in passing that this will be a fairly significant effort with a total of \$1.5 million set aside for carrying it out.

The agreement also includes \$3 million for a number of other important projects and activities, including a communications and public awareness program, human resource development, administration, management and evaluation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize once again for the hon. members that the signing of this agreement marks an important step in the evolution of forestry in this Province. In the space of barely a dozen years, we have come from the point where all we could do was provide some basic fire protection to the realization that we are well into a system of intensive forest management that is rapidly approaching standards as high as those found anywhere in North America.

Meanwhile, I would like to extend my congratulations to all those who have helped put this agreement in place, including the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the honourable the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) as well as Mr. John Crosbie and the honourable Gerry Merrithew, the federal Minister of State for Forestry.

In closing, I also want to direct the attention of honourable

members to the official opening in Gander this afternoon of a new forestry protection centre. This centre was build, at a cost of about \$900,000, under the previous federal/provincial forestry agreement. The centre will fill a number of needs but basically it will simplify the logistics involved in forest protection, especially firefighting. It contains facilities for waterbomber and spotter plane crews, during the fire season, space for storage and maintenance of firefighting equipment and room for labratory work by personnel involved in collecting data on insect pests and tree diseases.

The official opening, by the honourable the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) with Mr. Merrithew and a number of guests, took place about one hour ago.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the signing of an important new agreement, coupled with the official opening of a major new forest protection facility, should be viewed by the honourable members as an indication of the importance of forestry in the economic and social life of this Province, especially to rural Newfoundland, where most of the activity occurs.

I am very pleased that we have been able to increase the amount of funding over what it was under previous agreements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we are happy to see the signing of this agreement which will mean additional money coming into the Province from the Government of Canada for expenditure in the forest industry.

We do, however, have to question for the Premier with respect to his figures. I think the Premier has made a mistake. I stand to be corrected, but the information that we have on the previous agreement, which was signed in January, 1981, indicates that the total expenditures were \$60,793,000, of which the federal portion was \$54,714,000. So, the \$54 million that the Premier refers to is actually the amount that came from the Government of Canada.

Now, the point that should be made here, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier wants to compare what is happening under this present Tory administration in Ottawa and what happened under the previous Liberal administration, is that, as the Premier stated, this is a 70/30 arrangement where only 70 per cent of the expenditures come from the Government of Canada. The previous forestry agreement, signed in 1981, was a 90/10 agreement, 90 per cent came from the Government of Canada and the Province only have to put up 10 per cent. Now, I am sure that was obviously just an oversight on behalf of the Premier that he forgot to mention that but he should check his figures with respect to that \$54 million because I think that he has made a mistake and that, in fact, what we have over five years -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Over six years, not five.

MR. BARRY:
It was from 1981 to 1985, whether there was an extension or not -

AN HON. MEMBER:
It is more money

MR. BARRY:
- but these are the figures that I have for the five years, from 1981 to 1985. Mr. Speaker, again, if the Premier wants to compare, wants to go back in history, let us use his own figures and see what the average was per year. He talks about \$130 million over eleven years. Now, divide eleven into \$130 million and I think you get approximately \$12 million a year which is exactly what is being expended right now. He is trying to downplay, Mr. Speaker, what has happened before. He is trying to exaggerate what is happening today. He should get his figures straight.

I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am disappointed that we did not hear him refer to the fact of our getting a Federal Forestry Centre in Corner Brook. We are still waiting on that, despite the fact that New Brunswick, British Columbia, and Quebec have seen forestry centres. I think there was \$16 million promised for that and it is a promise that has not yet been completed.

I would also like to say that we will see the creation, according to the Premier, of 1,250 jobs each year. I would like to have the Premier, at some point, indicate whether these are part-time or full-time jobs, and approximately how many months a year people will find themselves employed in this

position. As has been already pointed out in the Estimates Committee, we have seen a steady erosion of jobs in the forestry industry or a loss of jobs over the last several years.

Mr. Speaker, the other point that should be made here is that my colleague in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) has, on a number of occasions, raised the fact that there were 120 workers laid off down in his district as a result of the closing out of the former federal/provincial agreement. I wonder if the Premier could check into whether or not these workers will now find themselves employed as a result of this new agreement being signed?

Again, I ask the Premier to go back and check his figures because the figures supplied to me by the very knowledgeable new forestry critic, the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), indicates that \$60,793,000 is the actual amount spent under the previous agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform hon. members that the support announced for agriculture in the budget reconfirms this government's commitment for the continued development of this

industry in our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The \$1.3 million development fund for 1986 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a typical reaction of what the members of the Opposition think about agriculture in this Province. To them it is a laughing matter and it certainly is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the \$1.3 million agriculture development fund for 1986 has been designed to assist farmers undertake expensive capital improvements on land development, buildings, and purchase of superior quality breeding stock.

Details of the programmes and the application forms will be available in all regional offices by May 2, 1986, one month and a half ahead of last year, Mr. Speaker.

The potential for the further development of the agriculture industry in this Province is considerable and the programmes established under the development fund will play a role in helping achieve some of this potential.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I have heard a lot of Ministerial Statements but that is one of the strangest that I think has ever come before the House. I think what the minister has done, he has finally gotten around to reading the Budget, discovered what is set out in the Budget and is now announcing it. Well, we have had a copy of the Budget and we have been able to read that.

Mr. Speaker, we would be much more interested in hearing the minister get up and tell us whether he has found his federal/provincial agricultural agreement yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now, the farmers out in Humber Valley would like to know that and farmers all around the Province would like to know because the farmers in this Province are very concerned that the minister is not living up to his responsibility to see that they are protected. This is a very modest effort that the minister is announcing here today, a very modest effort indeed, and the farmers of this Province deserve better and deserve more than the minister has produced so far.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not have to tell me what the farmers of this Province need. I do not say he knows three farmers in the whole Province.

Mr. Speaker, the second Ministerial Statement I would like to make today is that I am pleased to inform hon. members that the Agriculture Branch of my department will host an Agricultural Resource Camp for high school students once again this year.

The camp is scheduled for August 18 to 26, 1986 at the Rotary Park in St. John's.

This is the eighth year for the event which is designed to familiarize students of Grade X and XI with all aspects of agriculture in Newfoundland and Labrador. It promises to be a fun-filled learning experience for some twenty students from all across the Province, including Labrador, Mr. Speaker.

The deadline for applications for the camp is May 23, 1986. Information regarding the camp is presently being distributed to all high schools in the Province. Students wishing to apply should contact their principal for details or call Judith Kelsey at our department.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is information that should go out to high school students in the Province but in terms of the significance of the statement, Mr. Speaker, one has to question. Is this what the minister spends his day at in terms of dealing with agricultural matters? Mr. Speaker, we are happy to see that students in this Province are being encouraged -

MR. YOUNG:
Do not be a dictator.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, that is an example of the parliamentary conduct that we have been referring to. It is much worse in Committees than you see it here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, there is a Development Association in my district on Bell Island which, for a number of years now, has been trying to interest young people in getting involved in agriculture. They have a very successful farming operation on Bell Island and the minister, I am sure, is aware of this. We have made suggestions that there be agricultural programmes included in the vocational school programme of the Province. I mentioned this to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). I have not heard whether or not this is going to be followed up on.

MR. DAWE:
It has already been in place for years at Bay St. George Community College.

MR. BARRY:
Yes, but it is a little difficult for students on Bell Island to get over to the Bay St. George Community College. They have a

vocational school on Bell Island.
That is what we are talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there is a vocational school over on Bell Island and the point is to have some courses included in the curriculum of that school.

We support, Mr Speaker, the initiatives taken with respect to interesting young people in agriculture. As jobs are more and more difficult to find, every possible job that we can see created in this Province, we must create, and informing young people of the potential of agriculture is a good start. So I do not mean to criticize the minister for taking these initiatives.

I do want to point out, however, that in terms of the funding that is made available, in terms of the actual follow-up, in terms of having programmes provided in vocational schools and so forth, we have not yet seen the minister's rhetoric translated into action.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this stage I would like to welcome to the visitors' gallery ten Level II students from Holy Trinity School, Torbay, with their teachers Sister Nancy Macachern and Ray Bonia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, last week I questioned the Premier with respect to provincial input into the free trade negotiations and he said he was satisfied with the consultative mechanism that had been put in place.

Two days ago, we heard the Premier of Alberta, Mr. Getty, state that he was dissatisfied with the lack of action in putting a proper provincial consultative mechanism in place. Would the Premier indicate has there in fact been a consultative mechanism put in place and is he still saying that he is satisfied despite the comments of Mr. Getty?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes and yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the premier briefly indicate to this House what is the consultative mechanism that is in place? How will the Province have input into the free trade negotiations? And, how will the Province be able to ensure that provincial jurisdiction is observed and respected?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is still before the provinces and the federal government. At some point in time there will be a statement, no doubt, by the Prime Minister or some relevant minister in Ottawa with the other ministers across Canada on the format that will be laid out for significant provincial input. I am not at liberty at the present moment to disclose that, but it will be disclosed very shortly, I am sure, by all of the provinces and the federal government.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier confirm, then, what in fact is happening is that the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador has been forced to give a blank cheque to the Prime Minister of Canada but other Premiers are able to fight to protect the interests of their provinces?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, Mr. Speaker, that is completely untrue.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
I have a question for the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn). Could the minister tell the House when he expects to see hiring full-time employees by the Minworth mine at St. Lawrence? I understand \$7 million or \$8 million from the Burin Peninsula Development Fund

have been poured into that particular mine. Could the minister tell us when he expects to see hiring of full-time employees at that mine?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, there is no specific date that people will be hired. They will be hired over a period of time. They are currently doing the mine entrance, etc., and they are doing the shaft. They are also doing the building and bringing the equipment in for the inside.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
They will have a mill for the first time in history.

MR. BARRY:
It is going very slowly.

MR. DINN:
Well, the plan was laid out about a year ago as to what the time frame was and everything is on schedule in St. Lawrence. We expect for it to be complete by the end of this year and the mine will get into full operation early next year.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
My hon. friend for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) tells me that it is a year behind schedule, but I will take the minister at his word. Could the minister tell us how many full-time jobs he expects will be created at this mine in St. Lawrence, particularly

in light of the layoffs we saw of miners in Labrador West, Buchans, and now lately the 165 miners at Daniel's Harbour? Could the minister tell us how many miners he expects will be hired there?

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, right at the mine site and the mill we expect to employ about 120 full-time miners and mill workers.

MR. FUREY:
Starting next year?

MR. DINN:
Well, over the year.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier which relates to the announcement by FPI to go to a world-wide tender call on six trawlers. I wonder would the Premier square this with a commitment in the Federal/Provincial Restructuring Agreement of September, 1983, in which both governments undertook to use their best efforts to put trawler work into the Marystown Shipyard? Would he square the two for us, for starters?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, the management and board of FPI have gone out for bids on trawlers, as I understand it, and they have ensured that Marystown Shipyard obviously will have the opportunity to tender on the boats that are to be built. And we are hopeful now, with the experience that Marystown has had, that they will be successful. We also understand from the board and management of FPI that they will look very favourably upon Marystown Shipyard and try to give them every break they can in any of tendering that does take place. So there is by the board and management of FPI a realization that they have to use their best efforts to do as much work in the Province as they can, and they have assured the Government of Newfoundland that they intend to do that. We will wait and see when the tenders come in and the awards are made.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
As the House will know, National Sea recently got some of its work done in Iceland. The very reason for Clause 14 in the Restructuring Agreement was to protect yards in Canada against yards which are being heavily subsidized by their own governments, which brings me to my supplementary. Would the Premier indicate what steps he and his administration have taken to persuade the federal government to give some tariff protection - I am thinking in terms of the current exemption, an exemption that

started I think under Mr. Diefenbaker and has now gone through six Prime Ministers now - the exemption on fishing vessels over one hundred feet. Has the Premier and/or his administration made some particular representation to the Mulroney administration to have that exemption removed?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, we have been in constant contact with the federal government and the various departments of the federal government over the last several months on the whole question of the shipbuilding industry in Canada. We will continue to use our best efforts in trying to persuade the federal government to put in place certain protections for the shipbuilding industry.

It is true that in Spain and in Korea and in Iceland in parts of Japan there are various subsidy programmes and so on in place, and besides in some areas the labour cost is low, but the overriding difference very often comes out to be one where there is some government involvement by that national government. So we will continue to make representations to the federal government on that score and have, over the last several months, been doing so. Perhaps when we see just exactly where the bids come in on the tender call that has gone out now, we will know specifically how we can engineer programmes to ensure that some of those are built in Canada.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). We have recently heard members talking about the signing of federal agreements. We just heard the Premier announce the signing of a new Forestry Agreement. I wonder could the Minister of Transportation tell me when does he anticipate that he will be signing a secondary roads agreement with the federal government?

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, I would certainly hope that it would be sooner than later. We are still carrying on discussions. As members of the hon. House will remember, we submitted a proposal that had essentially three phases to it. One dealt with the Trans-Labrador Highway, one with the primary highroad system, and the other with secondary roads. We signed an agreement of some \$180 million dealing with the first two, and we are still negotiating with the federal government as it relates to a very large secondary roads package.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:

I thank the minister, but a year ago when we heard of the other two. We understand that he is negotiating and I wonder, if he is negotiating, what priority is he giving to having the completion of the Burgeo Highway included in this secondary agreement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, that particular piece of road has a very high priority, as do all the secondary roads in the Province particularly the ones that are still gravel roads. We would hope to see them all paved in due course. That has a very high priority, Mr. Speaker, as well as a number of other roads in the Province.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder could the minister tell me has he put any pressure on his federal counterparts to see that the Burgeo Road is included in this agreement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly have.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the Minister of Transportation, again. The decision that Torbay could be used as an international airport, Mr. Speaker, was a ministerial decision made in Ottawa. However, the decision of Air Canada to actually choose to use Torbay comes under the aegis of the Canadian Transport Commission. I have recently appealed Air Canada's decision and they are taking the appeal very seriously. I ask the minister would he support my request to have a hearing to examine all aspects of the Air Canada decision?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the hon. member's action with regard to requesting an appeal procedure be in place, the Province had an opportunity during the whole discussion, Mr. Speaker, and publicly we indicated our position relative to the Air Canada situation and the importance of Gander retaining its international status. We were very open in a public forum with that. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, to go beyond that particular point. I think the CTC have yet to agree to address themselves to the request from the hon. member. We will have to wait and see what happens at that point.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

All we are asking for is an open, public hearing to discuss all aspects, and if we win or lose so be it. I am asking the minister why he is afraid of an open, public discussion or hearing on this issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat ironic that the hon. member opposite would get up at this point in time and request an appeal procedure into a decision that has effectively been made. This Province, this administration and the Premier, in a meeting with the town council of Gander and others, requested that they support a public enquiry into the removal of Eastern Provincial Airways, not only from Gander, but also -

MR. BAKER:

How long are you going to bring that up?

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to remind the member and jog his conscience every now and then. I think there is a responsibility and the member opposite has to account for his actions, or lack of actions, when they were asked to support that kind of a submission. The point, Mr. Speaker, was that EPA not to be removed from one community in this Province to another community, but to be removed from a community in this Province to a community in another province, and they would not even ask for a public hearing at that point in time.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I remind the minister that that instance he refers to did not come under the jurisdiction of CTC whereas this instance does. I would ask the minister to carry it a little bit further and, when the announcement is made of a hearing, will he make representation before the CTC at that point?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member is somewhat wrong. It is somewhat questionable, and I do not believe it is under the aegis of the CTC to make a ruling on that, and they will decide as to whether it is or not. So it is somewhat premature for the hon. member to indicate that it is under the auspices of the CTC and not under the auspices of the federal Transportation Department.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) whether he is prepared to commit the Province to negotiation with the Government of Canada with respect to a federal/provincial agreement to cover those Native people in this Province who are not either covered by the Conne River agreement or the Labrador

agreement?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is somebody in the gallery today.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, and somebody who is not getting answers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate with a yes or no whether they are prepared to negotiate a federal/provincial agreement to cover the interest of those Native peoples who are not covered under Conne River or Labrador agreements?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the government, of course, has very many responsibilities, has responsibilities to all the people of the Province. It obviously has responsibilities to people who are of Indian descent and has responsibilities to people who are descended of European or whatever stock it happens to be. So the government will act in such a way as to preserve the best interests of all of the residents of Newfoundland without prejudice to any of them and to the extent that that can be done without prejudicing anyone's interests, then we will do so. But we are certainly not prepared to act in a way which will prejudice the interests of any significant group of Newfoundlanders.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that a federal/provincial agreement for Native people would give them and give the Province additional funding with respect to many social and economic aspects, that this would not hurt other residents of this Province, that it is unrelated to Native land claims? Would the minister indicate why he feels negotiating a federal/provincial agreement to get additional money from Ottawa for these people would hurt Newfoundlanders, to use his terms, of other stock?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not as dogmatic in the expression of my views as the hon. member opposite, who states as a fact certain things which are only opinions. We shall have to see as matters develop to what extent these agreements can be entered into and what the conditions are going to be and the protection of third party interests. It would be necessary for these things to be covered before a definite answer to the question can be given.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister is still attempting to deliberately confuse the question of Native land claims with the completely unrelated question - which the Government of Canada has indicated it will treat as unrelated to Native land claims

- of negotiating money for health, education, social services, economic development programmes -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question? This is a supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

I did and I am in the process of finishing, Mr. Speaker.

Will the minister indicate and agree that the Government of Canada has said that this federal/provincial agreement can be dealt with separately from Native land claims? Would the minister indicate in those circumstances how can it possibly be necessary to deal with third party interests when there are no third party interests affected?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, if things were as simple and as black and white as put forward by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, then obviously it would be much more different. The hon. gentleman states, as if it were a given, absolute fact of which there can be no doubt whatsoever, that certain matters can be dealt with without any relationship to potential land claims. The hon. gentleman is obviously aware that the federal government is now in the process of reviewing its entire policy on land claims, that they appointed a task force, which has now reported, and that, no doubt, in a number of months the federal government will articulate what its policy is. But obviously the

federal government is reviewing its land claims policy and what the extensions of ramifications or results of that new policy will be, and what, in fact, the new policy will be will not be known until it is announced. So it is not in any way as black and white as the hon. gentleman puts it.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Will the minister confirm or deny that the Government of Canada is prepared to deal with a federal - provincial agreement separate from Native land claims whatever the new policy may be with respect to Native land claims, that that will not affect entering into a federal - provincial agreement with the Federation of Newfoundland Indians, with other Native peoples outside of Conne River and outside of Labrador? Will the minister just tell this House, has the Government of Canada said that this agreement is conditional upon its Native land claims policy? And if it is not conditional on the Native land claims policy, how does a review of the Native land claims policy come into it at all?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, if the federal Native land claims policy is entirely different in one, two or three months than it is now, then the mere fact of saying that something would not have any relation to a policy as it is now does not mean that it would not bear any

relationship to a new and different policy which could be articulated in two or three months time. In order to make that leap one would need a very accurate crystal ball and mine is out of kilter.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Can we then take it that the minister is saying there will never be a federal - provincial agreement with respect to these Native people as long as it is possible for the Government of Canada sometime in the future to change its Native land claims policy, that there will never be an agreement because the minister will never be able to see in total what the future may bring?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, Mr. Speaker. Again things, do not fall into the neat categories the hon. the Leader of the Opposition puts forward, the very simplistic categories 'never or ever,' 'yes or no,' 'confirm or deny.' These are extremely complex matters of great importance to the people of Indian origin, with very possible ramifications, of an enormous nature as well, to the other people of this Province and, until all of those ramifications are understood and it is possible to be as sure as one can that the legitimate interest of all segments of the population can be protected, then we are not going

to act in a way which might be prejudicial to the best interests of any group of people within Newfoundland.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I wonder in view of the tremendous financial burden imposed upon all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as a result of excessively high taxes by both levels of government, federal and provincial, and I refer specifically to retail sales taxes, in view of the burden imposed on our people as a result of these taxes forcing many of our people to purchase and buy pre-owned, previously used items and goods, and I refer specifically to cars, trucks, boats and the like, in view of this, and in view of the fact that the people purchasing these are people at the lower income side of the salary scale, I wonder would the minister, in an attempt to make life less of a financial burden for these people, consider eliminating what is commonly referred to as double taxation? Would the minister look at eliminating double taxation or at least reducing the level of double taxation?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon.

member is perhaps labouring under a misapprehension of what a retail sales tax is. A retail sales tax is what it says, it is a tax on a retail sale. Now it does not matter what is being sold, if a tax applies to it the tax is exigible. If the tax is applied to clothing, if it is applied to boats, if it is applied to cars, it does not matter when it was manufactured, who manufactured it, why it was manufactured, where it was manufactured, how it was manufactured, if it was manufactured, if it applies to the sale, it applies to the sale. That is what a retail sales tax is.

Now the hon. member may be thinking of another type of tax. He may be thinking of a tax on a particular goods. That is fairly common in Europe where they have a value added tax. That tax is not directed towards the fact of a sale, it is directed towards the type of good that is being sold. And if you have a good that has some added value put into it, whether in terms of material or services or anything like that, then the tax is exigible. Now if there is no good or no service put into that good, it is not taxable. That is the difference between a value added tax and a retail sales tax.

I can get the hon. member many books on this subject if he so wishes. We have in the Department of Finance a whole library on taxation and I think there are a number of books there, quite heavy tomes, I must admit, on retail sales tax. I think the hon. member would be very, very interested in reading these in detail. We have a long Summer coming up, I am sure the hon. member will have much time to spend, so if he will speak to me in private, I will get

those books for him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about is double taxation. That is what I am talking about, a tax that drives the ordinary Newfoundlanders, those on lower income and fixed incomes, to have to purchase pre-owned articles and goods. What I am asking the minister, in an attempt to make life less of a financial burden for these people, is would he not eliminate that double taxation, or at least lower the rate of double taxation to make life a little more reasonable, a little less worrisome, a little less frustrating for these people, these lower income people and the unemployed?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member knows that the retail sales tax is what is called a regressive tax. That is where if it is applied in a blanket way it bears more heavily on those with lower incomes than those on higher incomes. So we are very conscious of that and therefore we have ameliorated the retail sales tax in many ways. For instance, we do not apply retail sales tax to food. We do not apply it to fuels that are used for home heating. We do not apply it to certain industries in this Province which

need particular help. We do not apply it to childrens clothing, and so on and so forth. So there are many ways that we focus exemptions to cut back on the regressivity of the retail sales tax. We are quite willing to look at any suggestions that we might improve on that situation.

One thing we have to be careful of when we bring in these exemptions is that these are focused, that they are not capable of giving rise to a tremendous leak of taxation. I think, in what the hon. member is suggesting, I could see many opportunities where, perhaps even with the best of intentions you would have taxation leakage. You might put it on, say, secondhand goods but how do you define secondhand goods so that there is no significant leak in taxation? I think it would be rather difficult.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). He seems to be a bit relaxed there in his chair.

MR. PECKFORD:
He is still waiting for your report.

MR. EFFORD:
Let him give me a report on this question. As of January, 1986, the licensing board for the Day-care and Homemaker Services expired. Would the minister tell me is there one in place now or have any appointments been made for that

board?

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

MR. BRETT:
There is a process, Mr. Speaker, for replacements of various boards within government. Sometimes there may be delays for different reasons. I cannot be specific as to the reason for any delay here. There probably is no delay, we are probably looking for the appropriate people to fill such a board. I can probably tell the hon. member that I will check into the matter but, as far as I know, there is no reason that the board is not filled and neither are there any applications pending as a result of the board not being in place.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, as of January 1986, which was approximately four months, the board's term expired, yet the minister is telling me that he does not know why the board has not been appointed, and when I think that it is the minister's responsibility to see to that. Would the minister tell me when he expects to appoint it? Why has he not done it? It is his responsibility. He says there were no applications pending, but I believe he had better check his records and see if there are any applications pending before the board. If there have been any applications approved, who have been approving the licences?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

The board will be put in place as soon as possible, Mr. Speaker. Again I reiterate there are no applications pending before that board. There may be applications on file which are being considered, but there are no applications being delayed as a result of the board not being in place.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Would the minister tell me whether there have any licences approved by anybody since membership on the board expired?

MR. PEACH:

Get your facts straight this time.

MR. EFFORD:

I am asking the questions. Let the minister answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, the applications are not approved by the minister. The hon. member is up to his old tactics again. The hon. member is trying to suggest to the House that I should know if an application to operate a day-care center has been approved or not. There is no reason in the world for the minister to know. There

is a system in place, Mr. Speaker, and that system works. If there are applications, they are approved by the board and there is no reason for the minister to know.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I have a short question for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). There were a number of people in my office before Question Period who are part of the 20,000 young people who are unemployed in the Province. They were searching for work, they told me, and they did find work in Alberta as part of the reforestation programme in the foothills at Banff National Park. They went to Manpower, Mr. Speaker, to try to get some help with transportation out there and they were told no, simply because there are young people in Alberta who could fill these jobs. I wonder could the minister tell us whether the Province has any programme or anything in place to help these kids get to Alberta to find work so they can continue college?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see that even Alberta has a local preference policy these days. I know when the Newfoundland Government had a local preference policy it was the worst thing in the world because we were trying to force companies to hire Newfoundland persons who were qualified.

There is no programme in place with our provincial government to have persons leave this Province and go to other places to work. What we have done this year, Mr. Speaker, is put in place a fund of \$2 million provincial money, combined with \$5 million federal money, for a Summer SEED programme. Last year we had 5,500 young students in Newfoundland employed on that programme. This year we have the same amount of money, a little over \$ 7 million, and we will have about 5,500 to 6,000 students employed, depending on the ratio of nonprofit and private enterprise which take part in the programme. Besides that, Mr. Speaker, we have about 1,000 Summer students who get hired by this provincial government. Besides that, Mr. Speaker, we also have a large number of programmes, such as our loan guarantees to the fishing industry, about \$30 million, whereby many, many students this Summer around many parts of rural Newfoundland will have gainful, meaningful employment working in those industries where government has subsidized and put some money in place. The Newfoundland Government, Mr. Speaker, does not have all of the money to make sure that every single person in Newfoundland gets a job this year, but certainly for the amount of money we are spending there is a fine number of students who will get good, gainful employment this Summer.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

MR. FUREY:

A short supplementary by leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no leave granted.

MR. DECKER:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of privilege, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day, Your Honour asked me to withdraw some remarks which were unparliamentary and I did so because I respect this hon. House. Since I withdrew my remarks, I have been waiting for Your Honour to ask the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) to withdraw similar remarks. I refer Your Honour to Hansard, 25 April, R1202, where, while I was speaking, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth says, 'You are the real goon.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the least bit in the world being called a 'goon.' As a matter of fact, I was flattered by the remark. But since I have been asked to withdraw the remark, and remembering the old adage 'What is goon for the goose is goon for the gander,' I should draw this to Your Honour's attention. I point out that I do not mind in the least being called a 'goon', but if we are going to have a rule for

one side of the House, I think it would be appropriate to have it for both sides of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon. gentleman, as somebody has indicated, does not mind being called a 'goon'. He is probably complimented by it and, if he is, I can understand it.

MR. DECKER:
You are absolutely right.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I do not see any purpose in continuing with this as this matter was dealt with by Your Honour when the sitting commenced this afternoon.

MR. BAKER:
To that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of privilege, the hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, this particular matter has not been dealt with, contrary to what the Government House Leader says. The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth specifically called the member of this House a 'goon'. I was asked, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw the statement, 'Actions similar to,' which is far less imputative of motives than the statement by the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. I would suggest, Mr.

Speaker, that it is a pretty straightforward decision, that there is a point of privilege and the minister should be asked to withdraw his statement.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of privilege. Now, that my attention has been drawn to that particular comment, which I have already said was unparliamentary, I would call on the hon. Minister to withdraw it.

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Certainly, Mr. Speaker. When you request me to withdraw such a remark I do so very readily, but I do not rise in my place to withdraw remarks because some members of the Opposition ask. If I did call the hon. gentleman a 'goon', or in some way made an uncomplimentary remark to him, I certainly withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Pursuant to Section 51 of the Financial Administration Act I would like to table the report of Details of Guaranteed Loans which were paid in part or in whole since the last sitting of the House; and pursuant to Section 45

of the Financial Administration Act I would like to table an account of temporary loans and treasury bills that were raised between April 25, 1985 and April 17, 1986.

Petitions

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of thirty-one people of Marine Drive, in the town of Roddickton, I am pleased to present a petition on their behalf. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that this is day 12. Now, I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that something momentous is going to happen today, day 12. Today we are going to get a definite word, that is the feeling I have. Either I am going to be thrown out of the House and the Strait of Belle Isle is going to be abolished -

MR. PEACH:

Have you been fishing on the weekend?

MR. DECKER:

I have been to the top of the hill on the weekend.

Mr. Speaker, surely goodness, when a member rises for the twelfth time from twelve different groups of people to present a petition, it must draw the attention of somebody in this hon. House.

I will read the prayer of the petition. "We, the residents of Marine Drive, Roddickton, hereby

pray that the hon. House of Assembly will instruct the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Minister of Transportation to take immediate action to have Route 435 upgraded and paved."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in one of the Whereases, it says, "Whereas the people of Roddickton depend upon this road for all ambulance service to the hospital at St. Anthony". Now, the last time I presented the same petition by a different group, I was talking about the ambulance service. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when I ran out of time, that in the evolution that has taken place in health care in this Province, there has been a deliberate attempt - and a good one, there is nothing wrong with it - to close down the smaller health centres and smaller hospitals and use an ambulance service to take patients from places like Roddickton into the bigger hospital at St. Anthony. This is what has happened around the Province. It has been done deliberately and, in many cases - not all cases - in many cases it has improved the delivery of health care.

First, Mr. Speaker, when the stations were closed at Englee and Conche and Roddickton, there used to be a plane station. The Grenfell Mission, it was then, the Grenfell Health Services now, had a plane which floats in the Summer and skis in the Winter and they used to pick up the patients in Roddickton, Conche, what have you, and fly them in to St. Anthony. For some reason, the Government of this Province seems to believe that the road from Roddickton and from Englee and from Conche into St. Anthony is now acceptable and it is now good enough that the plane has been taken away. There

is no longer a plane up there.

Now, in honesty, I will say there is a helicopter available for extreme emergencies or in life or death situations, but the plane has been taken away so that now, 99 per cent of the patients who have to go to St. Anthony have to go by ambulance. Mr. Speaker, forty-seven miles from Roddickton, fifty-seven miles from Englee, sixty-two miles from Conche is on gravel road. The patients on the way in to St. Anthony must go over this big portion of gravel road before they join the pavement at Plum Point and go on to St. Anthony.

Now, as Your Honour is aware and as this hon. House is aware, it is not very conducive to the healing process to take a sick person and beat him or her over this fifty-seven, or whatever number of miles of road it happens to be, depending on where you live. The road, Mr. Speaker, is not fit to drive cattle over, let alone sick people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today, on behalf of those people in Roddickton, to stand up and support this petition. And, in supporting it, I point out that the road is not fit to carry cattle over. I say that publicly. For the twelfth time in a row, I am petitioning for this road on behalf of those people. It is not fit to carry cattle over, but yet, sick people are being beat over this road, taken up to St. Anthony hospital, and the only people who can hope to benefit from it is the funeral home up in St. Anthony, because the road does not do anything, Mr. Speaker, towards improving their health. Thank you.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

I would like to make a few comments on that petition.

Naturally, I support the request of the residents of any part of the Province. But I have to say I am inclined to agree with my colleague from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) who made this same point last week.

When you have a member of an area trying to get something done for his constituents, he is only jeopardizing his constituents with these type of tactics that he uses in the House of Assembly. I am referring to last week when he tried to slander the integrity and the character of this member here. I have had calls, indeed, from Roddickton. I have many friends in the hon. gentleman's area who took strong exception to the hon. member's statements made last week, carried quite a lot over CBC and heard down in the area, accusing me of being drunk and then retracting, of course, saying I was drunk with enthusiasm.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not speaking to the petition.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point that this is involving getting a road paved. If the hon. gentleman is going to try to persuade government to pave roads on behalf of the residents, he is not doing a very good job as

member when, around the same time he is bringing these petitions in and asking for support, he makes certain comments. I am saying I support the petition but I do not support the tactics used by that member when at the same time he stands to slander the character and integrity of members of this House.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:

With all respect, Mr. Speaker, I have to rise on a point of order. The hon. gentleman is somehow suggesting that these are my petitions. What does he suggest I do when I receive a petition from my district? Does he want me to throw it away? Does he want me to throw it in the garbage? When I receive a petition from my district, I will stand up in this House and I will present it. That is why I am here, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think I am breaking any law. I do not think I am treading on anybody. If they cannot accept a petition from the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, well, too bad for you! Too bad I say!

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance, to that point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, when a petition is presented in this House, hon.

members are supposed to present the wording of the petition and then say some words in support. Now what my hon. friend is saying is that the hon. member is not presenting the petition as the petitioners meant. I do not think the petitioners said anything about cattle going over that road in their petition. That was a pejorative term that the hon. member gratuitously added onto the petition and my hon. friend is merely pointing out that he is not serving his petitioners in their best interests by doing that sort of thing.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. If there was ever someone speaking in a pejorative manner -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard enough on that point of order. There is no point of order. I would ask the hon. member to speak strictly to the petition.

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your ruling. Indeed, I will speak to the petition. The petition is from very important constituents of the riding and people who indeed need their roads paved in a desperate way. I support them all the way in their petition to get their roads paved. I will do all I can to persuade my colleagues in government to consider the petition.

But I have to say, at the same time, that the tactics used in bringing forward these petitions

and the tactics used by the same hon. member are not sincerely on behalf of his constituents because he is talking away the possibility of getting something done in his riding. He cannot stand one day and try to slander members of the government, as he tried last week, tried to slander this member here and other members, and, at the same time, bring in petitions and say, 'Oh, now hon. gentlemen'. You are suddenly honourable now. You were not honourable last Friday.

So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), in speaking a moment ago, used two terms that I submit are clearly unparliamentary, particularly in view of your excellent rulings earlier this afternoon. He questions the sincerity of the gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker). That is a direct attribution of motive, Mr. Speaker. Beauchesne is very clear on this, and mentions this particular word, the word 'sincerity', 'A member cannot question the sincerity and therefore the motives of another member of the House'. He used the phrase 'tried to slander'. Now, Mr. Speaker, that again is attributing a motive and that is clearly unparliamentary and I would ask you to invite him to withdraw those terms.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

I am speaking to the point of privilege. I argue, Mr. Speaker, that there is no point of privilege because I did not impugn any motives to the hon. gentleman. I was merely pointing out the kind of attack that was made last Friday by the same hon. gentleman where he attempted to slander the character and the integrity of this member here, in particular, carried quite adequately by CBC, and I received many calls from his riding, in fact, from the town of Roddickton where now the petition is asking for paving. I support the residents, but I cannot support the tactics used by this hon. gentleman in trying to get things done for these people. It shows that he is insincere in what he is trying to do. He cannot be sincere when, at the same time, he is attacking hon. members.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say there is no point of privilege. I have not attacked the individual. I have not cast any character assassination in his direction at all as was done last Friday. I am merely saying the truth. He did attack us last -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman over there, I call him the junior member, the three in the back, the crackies over there, if the hon. crackies would keep quiet, I could finish.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:
The fact is that the hon. gentleman, if he wants something done for Roddickton, and I agree something must be done for Roddickton, if he wants something done -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! We are speaking to the point of privilege now.

MR. MORGAN:
Yes. If he wants something done, Mr. Speaker, I merely said that he was not using the proper tactics in getting things done. That is not saying in any way or casting inuendo in the hon. gentleman's direction.

MR. SPEAKER:
I am going to look over Hansard and I will have more to say about this at a later stage.

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and support the prayer of that petition. If ever irrelevance were to take form and substance, would that not be it?

Mr. Speaker, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) on a number of occasions now has, as it is his duty and his obligation on behalf of his constituents, appeared before this

House with a series of petitions all from the people of Roddickton, repetitive to the ears of some, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, but necessary for the people of the Strait of Belle Isle because they believe that by presenting their member with a petition time and time and time again, over and over and over, that some day, some how, Mr. Speaker, it will sink into the heads over there that these people are crying out for their just and right and moral deserts. I do not think that is asking very much.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a piece of road that is sixty kilometers in length. We are talking about a piece of road in 1981 where the Government of Canada, the former Liberal Administration had earmarked funding for to upgrade and to pave this piece of highway, because they saw the significance of it, Mr. Speaker. They saw how much it meant to industry, to business, small business, large business, the fish companies, to the people generally who are, in fairness, in an isolated pocket of the Northwest Coast. So money was put in place, but somehow, mysteriously, after September, 1984, that money dissipated, it disappeared, it got lost. So we have the Conservatives in power in Ottawa and the Conservatives in power here and we are pleading the case on behalf of these people who are merely asking, Mr. Speaker, as other administrations had seen fit to do, to provide them with money to clean up this rather terrible road.

Why is it important to industry? Well, there are a number of fish plants, least of which is the crab plant in Roddickton, Mr. Speaker. When we see and talk about the export of fish and the movement of

fish, if we continuously move it over dirt roads full of large potholes, this fish loses its quality and it is downgraded. Therefore, that is a reflection upon those people at the marketplace. If we see a lousy product ending up on the shelves of Boston and New York, coming out of Roddickton, coming out of Englee, coming out of Conche, if we see a product that is downgraded because of our transport network, we are going to lose those markets, Mr. Speaker.

What the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) is saying to this hon. House is for God sake wake up and put some millions of dollars up there. It is an investment into the future. It is the protection of those jobs at the fish plants in Conche, at the fish plants in Englee, at the fish plant in Bide Arm, at the crab plant in Roddickton. It is an investment in the future protection of the jobs.

Mr. Speaker, if we dump garbage fish onto the New England marketplace, what is going to be their response? It is going to be to turn their backs on Newfoundland's product, particularly in the North, in an area that I represent and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle represents. They will go elsewhere, elsewhere being Iceland, Norway, the Scandinavian countries and we are talking about hundreds of jobs, Mr. Speaker.

So I plead and beg, if necessary, that somebody on the other side wake up and recognize that this piece of highway, if corrective measures are not put in place, we are playing games with the lives of hundreds of people and their families and their jobs. All we

are asking for is an investment of \$15 million, is it?

MR. DECKER:

Less than that.

MR. FUREY:

Less than that.

MR. DECKER:

Well, there is thirty-six miles left.

MR. FUREY:

So we are talking about \$7 million or \$8 million, Mr. Speaker, to lay down pavement, to protect those jobs in Conche, in Bide Arm, in Englee, in Roddickton and we are begging the hon. gentlemen on the other side to take a long look. These petitions will continue until somebody over there reacts in a positive way to protect these jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I only wish that I had had hundreds of petitions from the miners of Daniel's Harbour to bring in six months ago to start waking up the government about the potential dangers that lay ahead there because somehow I think that if we had just gotten them out of their malaise, out of their morass, if we had shaken them a little bit out of their Rip Van Winkle, government as usual style, just perhaps, Mr. Speaker, just maybe the company would have sat down with the government and the government would have sat down with the company and there might have been a way to stretch the life of the mine a little bit longer.

This is what the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle is doing. He is not standing here, Mr. Speaker, time and time again because he wants to. No matter what the hon. the member from

Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), that definition of irrelevance taking on form incarnate, no matter what he says about the sincerity of the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, he has a right to be here, he has a right to say what has to be said on behalf of his constituents. He has said it eloquently, honourably, honestly and sincerely, Mr. Speaker, and I commend him. The government ought to haul the wax out of their collective ears and wake up before these jobs are lost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Public Service Commission Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 27).

On motion, Bill No. 27 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 1, the Budget Debate.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the moment, of course, we are speaking to the amendment and I would like to support the amendment so ably proposed by my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), the amendment being that we strike all the words after 'that' and replace them with the following: "That 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."

I suppose in all the non-confidence motions that have been moved over the years in various parliamentary chambers, Mr. Speaker, that has to be most on target in terms of addressing the issue that is facing the youth of this Province and facing the Province generally.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the statement by the hon. the Premier this afternoon in which he informed the House of the signing of a new Forestry Agreement. I could not help but wonder why it is that ministers of the Crown, including the Premier, have to come into this House and mislead. I can understand that they will want to put the best face on a situation. That is one thing. But to come in and give obviously false information is quite another thing.

My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, referred to the 1981/1985 Forestry Agreement. It was a four year agreement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, in line with the new squeaky clean rules that we seem to be following, at the urging of hon. gentlemen opposite, I would

remind the hon. gentleman that suggestions that anyone here is trying to mislead the House deliberately or otherwise are unparliamentary.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, of course it is unparliamentary and well established to be so that you cannot allege that a member has deliberately misled the House. What I said is misled and I go so far as to say that the misleading might have been unwitting but it was certainly actual.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I take it that there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. I have to say that obviously it is unparliamentary to impugn wrong motives on the part of any hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier this afternoon indicated to the House that the agreement which had been signed today represented more dollars than the previous four year agreement. Now, in fairness to him and to get our facts completely straight, the four year agreement ultimately became a five year agreement. It was initially an 1981 - 1985 agreement. Last year, you will remember, the Tory Administration in Ottawa agreed to that agreement continuing for another year. That was not a difficult thing to do, Mr. Speaker, when you realize that they did not put any extra money into it. When the Liberal Administration in Ottawa in 1981 entered into an agreement for forestry purposes with this administration here, it was for four years, 1981 to 1985 for an aggregate sum to be contributed by

both governments in the ratio of 90 to 10 federal/provincial, a total of \$60 million over four years.

It is true, and I concede this to the Premier, that the Tory Administration in Ottawa took the same money and spread it over five years and, hence, have \$12 million per year, if you prorate it, the same as is in this agreement. It was a Tory government, this time, today, and a year ago which decided that \$12 million was enough to spend on forestry per year, rather than \$15 million per year as provided in the 1981 Forestry Agreement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I make reference to this to illustrate an ongoing point, an ongoing concern that I have that is adversely affecting this Province, and that is to say that in Ottawa we have a government which is short-selling the provinces, particularly the provinces on the periphery geographic of this country, the Atlantic provinces and the Province of Newfoundland in particular, very badly. And to complicate matters, we have a government here, at the provincial level, which is aiding and abetting the process.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the administration here would at least be in character and would at least continue to do the kinds of things it has done over the years. I can only conclude that over the years it did it for partisan reasons. I would wish it were doing it for more substantive reasons. I wish it had the courage of some Tories elsewhere in this country. Last Fall, Mr. Speaker, a Tory MP, a gentleman I know quite well, Mr. Robert Corbett from New Brunswick, supporter of the administration in

Ottawa normally, was quoted in the Evening Telegram here last September 25 as saying, 'Mulroney is not fulfilling his pledge,' and he talks about the pledge to bring in a shipbuilding policy. When the same kind of issue was put to the Premier this afternoon he skates over it, because he has adopted the role of unadulterated apologist for the federal government no matter what they do. He exercises that role at the same time that one of Mr. Mulroney's own MPs is out in the public print criticizing him, the Prime Minister, for not keeping his election promise of August, 1984 to revive the countries shipbuilding industry with an appropriate shipbuilding policy.

So, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Premier and his administration that they have to begin exercising some courage on behalf of the people of Newfoundland, they have to start acting in character. I liked them better when they were on the offensive, when they were fighting for Newfoundland. They have stopped fighting now, they have become the unadulterated apologists for the federal government no matter how badly it punishes Newfoundland.

A spokesman for the shipbuilding industry itself, indeed the President of the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing Association, Mr. Henry Walsh, based in Ottawa, also goes on to say, in the last month or so, 'Shipyards across this country are going to lose about 5,000 jobs by the end of 1986 if the Mulroney government does not come through with its proposed shipbuilding policy and does not address some particular concerns about the need for extended financial terms to

domestic customers to prevent them from going outside the country to get their shipbuilding requirements.'

Mr. Speaker, there is only a half hour and there are so many issues we want to cover in this particular debate. The Premier last week in public print - I believe at a press conference actually - expressed some concerns that the current NAPE dispute was having a potential adverse effect on the offshore development. He expressed the concern that the current labour climate in the Province was not conducive to attracting business here. That is a concern I share. I suspect that he and I differ as to where we point the finger, but I am going to leave it to somebody else in a moment to point the finger because he and I can be expected to be partisan about the issue.

He expressed the concern, I share his concern that the present political climate in the Province is not very conducive to attracting investment to the Province. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised it took the Premier so long to realize it, or to articulate it publicly or to admit it publicly. But a case in point which does confirm that the Premier is right, that the current political climate in this Province, of which the labour climate is part, is not conducive to attracting and holding investment opportunities in Newfoundland, one company, and I have a letter here that I am prepared to table for the information of hon. members, last Fall wrote a number of its clients in this Province - it is an out-of-province company, a company with its headquarters in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, a company

which had established a branch operation here in Newfoundland, which continues to do business here in Newfoundland. It became so frustrated by the economic and the political situation that last Fall it wrote a letter to its clients and its business associates here in Newfoundland, and I would like to quote: 'I wish to advise you that due to the unstable economic conditions and the political environment of Newfoundland, our company has no other alternative but to close our Newfoundland operation effective immediately. All sales and accounting services will be conducted from our corporate office' and they give the address in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.

One company is saying that because of the unstable economic conditions and the political environment in this Province they cannot effectively do business -

MR. J. CARTER:

You have to table that letter..

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I intend to. They cannot do business here.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is right, people are expressing concerns about the political environment here, and they are going to be making decisions which are not going to work to the benefit of Newfoundland. But it is not enough, I say to him, for the perpetrator of a crime to rush out and report it. That does not exonerate the perpetrator. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that in this case it is the Premier and his team who are the perpetrators. They are the people to whom we must point the finger as those who have contributed towards an unstable economic

situation in this Province, towards an undesirable political climate, and towards an untenable labour climate in this Province. It is not enough for him to draw it to the public's attention, they have known it for some time, and they have also known it is he, the Premier, and his administration who must take the blame.

Mr. Speaker, how, then, did they, the administration, get themselves into this particular box? They got themselves into this particular box partly by being stubborn. I think that is an attribute that most people in the Province would associate with the current administration, stubbornness. Arrogance is another they would associate with them. Watching some of the ministers, notably the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in his projections which he has changed almost every month over the past couple of years in terms of the size of the deficit and so on, they associate the term 'incompetence' with this administration. So we have stubbornness, arrogance, incompetence. Watching the way government has handled the current NAPE dispute, the words 'inflexibility' and 'intransigence', these come to mind. My friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), Mr. Speaker, asked whether the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has any books on this subject. He has books on lots of subjects. That is not the problem, the problem is he will not read them. If he would read some of those books, we would be a lot better off.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned inflexibility and arrogance. Lack of willingness to listen is

another attribute we could assign to them. Here is the Chairman of the government-appointed Economic Council of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Harold Lundrigan, a great Tory if there ever was one, a long-standing Tory, and he recommended to the government - but the government has not been listening very well - back in January that the government take a leaf out of the book of the Government of Quebec. That government, as you know, Mr. Speaker, has a policy of attempting to stimulate economic growth in the Province of Quebec through personal income tax shelters which would allow the accumulation of private investment capital. That private investment capital portfolio approach to job creation and economic development is working very well in the Province of Quebec, so well that our own Economic Council of Newfoundland and Labrador thought fit not only to bring it to the attention of the Minister of Finance but, having brought it to his attention, to also go public. And without putting words into Mr. Lundrigan's mouth, I hear him saying, in effect, that he has not got to first base with the suggestion so he had to go public with it, which he did in January. None, Mr. Speaker, is so deaf as he who will not hear.

The government, from time to time, has had a number of suggestions put to it as to how it can get itself out of its dilemma. We have had a number of suggestions put to the government by this Opposition on how it can get out of the NAPE quandary but they are too deaf to hear, they will not hear. I believe they will not hear because they do not want to hear, because they want to prolong, they want to aggravate

even further. They have had it in their hands for weeks to find an amicable solution to this NAPE dispute. They will not listen. They have the tools with which to effect economic development in this Province, but they will not listen.

Mr. Speaker, on other issues, we have seen in the last two weeks the virtual destruction of the principle and the practice of Standing Committees of this House. It is a demeaning experience, with some exceptions, to sit in those committees any more. And while some of the terms my colleagues used may be unparliamentary and have been found to be so, the government would be callous and stupid, indeed, if it did not recognize the concern that those members are voicing. The message is clear. We are up to their tricks. The public is up to their tricks.

I was on the Burin Peninsula over the weekend, and I was amazed and also encouraged by the degree to which the people on the Peninsula are tuned in to what is happening here in the House, and I was also amazed at how disgusted they are with what is happening. They could give it to me chapter and verse. There are some members of this House who think they can come in here and play the clown and go back and play the statesman. The public are not going to buy that Jekyll and Hyde approach to being a politician. They know what is going on here. As a matter of fact, I was amazed at the detail with which they could quote incidents in this House to me.

So I say to my colleagues in the Opposition, take heart, word is getting out and hopefully that word, once it gets out, will get

back through those constituents to the members here who are seeking every day to frustrate the process of this House. We do not have to go to Grand Bank or Marystown to get examples, Mr. Speaker. As you well know, Sir, as Chairman of that august Committee on Member Services, Accommodations, and Benefits, whose findings were eminently sensible, you will recall that one of the persons appearing before that Committee was the hon. Jim McGrath, the federal member for St. John's East, not a political bedfellow of mine but a gentleman whose views on many subjects I have come to respect.

MR. DOYLE:

A good man.

MR. SIMMONS:

A good man indeed. I am delighted that the gentleman who is the Minister of Municipal Affairs, pro tem, concurs that the federal gentleman for St. John's East is a good man. Because one of the good things he said to that Committee, of which I had the honour to be Vice-Chairman, was that the idea of having parliamentary secretaries as chairmen of legislative committees is contrary to all parliamentary tradition, and back there, last October, perhaps unwittingly the gentleman who is the federal MP for St. John's East put his finger on the problem that we are having in committee these days. If you ask a parliamentary secretary, a member of the administration, to chair a House committee, it goes against all parliamentary tradition. Of course it does! Even more to the point, it makes for some real problems in the workings of the committee.

Now, I introduce that element into

the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, to make this point: The Budget process - we have been part of it in the Committees through the estimates - is not being well served. It is not getting the full scrutiny that it deserves, because the cards are stacked against the House. Not only against Opposition members but against the House itself, the cards are stacked and stacked badly, and the result is that the House is not really finding out what is going on. How can you find out what is going on in terms of government expenditures if most of your time is taken up in points of order and name calling and shouting in Committee?

Mr. Speaker, another theme I want to pursue for a moment: We were told during the last federal election that when we had two governments of the same stripe working cheek to cheek, hand in hand, everything was going to be hunky dory, absolute, unadulterated utopia, Mr. Speaker, while other provinces, like the gentleman from Alberta, Mr. Getty, the Premier, have been speaking out. Tory though he be, he has been saying that the free trade issue is less than perfection in terms of its present method of proceeding. Mr. Buchanan has been speaking out on the adverse effects of the last federal budget. Mr. Lee, the former Premier, or I guess the current Premier of Prince Edward Island until sometime today or tomorrow, spoke out - it did not save him but, to his credit, he spoke out on the adverse effects of federal policy in Atlantic Canada.

As I said, none are so deaf as those who will not hear, and while we point out that other people across this country are taking

leadership roles, the best the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) can remind one of is a comment by John Nunziata. 'Yes, Mr. Speaker, he helps me, because even in the party I am proud to belong to, we have people who are prepared to speak their minds even if their leader does not like it.' The gentleman from Burin - Placentia West would not know what I am talking about because he always says what his leader wants him to say. Right or wrong - my leader, right or wrong. The gentleman from Toronto, Mr. Nunziata, gave his views on the subject. It is not a view I share, it is not a view the majority in the party share, but he gave it. And that is the point I am making to the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West. Mr. Hatfield, the Premier of New Brunswick, Mr. Lee of Prince Edward Island, Mr. Getty of Alberta, Mr. Buchanan of Nova Scotia, four Tory Premiers, have been on the record taking issue with the federal Tories for certain of their policies. What have we heard, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister of Finance of this Province (Dr. Collins) and the Premier of this Province, despite the fact that the federal government is proposing between now and 1990 to take \$2 billion out of transfer payments? Who is going to hurt because of that? Alberta? No. Ontario? Not particularly. Saskatchewan? No. Who is going to hurt? Newfoundland, that is who. Federal/provincial transfer payments are going to be down by \$2 billion. That includes pensions, Mr. Speaker. That includes money for post-secondary education.

What a barrage of rhetoric we used to get when I was on the federal

side! Your Monday morning was not complete, Mr. Speaker, during the five and one-half years I was there, unless you had a four and one-half foot telegram from the Premier of Newfoundland - a four and one-half foot telegram at least, and that was a slow day, that is when he was busy doing something else - telling you what was wrong with the administration in Ottawa because of what it was doing to transfer payments or on fisheries restructuring or on shipbuilding policy or on Winter drilling out there. One of those days, Mr. Speaker, when the House has lots of time, I will bring up my file. I have a full file down there which I labelled in Ottawa about five years ago and it is just called 'Peckford Telegrams'. We could do a complete redecoration of this Chamber. It would not be a bad idea, Mr. Speaker, to have the words of wisdom of the Premier pasted all over the walls, what he said about federal transfer payments, the lack of a shipbuilding policy, Winter drilling out there, unemployment and fisheries restructuring.

MR. TOBIN:

We do not say anything different.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West says they do not say anything differently. That is not true. That is not true or, at the very least, they are not saying it very publicly; or at the very least, even if they are saying the same things, the message is not getting through. It certainly did not get through on factory freezer trawlers, I will tell them. It did not get through there. I say to him, perhaps they have to adopt another tactic other than the cosy,

behind-the-door approach. That behind-the-door, that in-closet approach is not working. What kind of a clock are they using today, Mr. Speaker? In the name of the Lord! Is this a thirty minute thing?

MR. FUREY:

Yes, it is thirty minutes. You started at twenty to.

He has ten minutes left, Mr. Speaker. He started at twenty to.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, somebody says five. Mr. Speaker, it went so quickly with the inspiration of you, Sir, in the Chair. And the presence of my good friends from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), it is always an inspiration to speak in their presence.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the inflexibility, the arrogance, the incompetence of this government have us in the morass we are in, have 20,000 young Newfoundlanders walking around out there. That is the official number. That does not reflect the people who have quit, who have given up on the system completely.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want all my speech to be loaded with invective about arrogance and inflexibility, I want to introduce, in conclusion, another element, and that is the element of optimism that comes through loud and clear when you go out on one of those weekend junkets with your leader, the Leader of the Opposition. I had the great privilege this weekend to be in Terranceville and Bay L'Argent with him, and then in the Marystown area to meet with various community groups, to have

a couple of public functions, to talk to a lot of people in the shopping malls and on the street and on the wharves and so on. A few weeks ago we were down in English Harbour West and had the same kind of experience.

The gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) had a similar experience with the leader a week or so ago, the gentleman from Gander (Mr. Baker) will have one this weekend in Gander, the gentleman from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) on Saturday night, and very soon in St. Barbe. The leader and his team are getting around this Province and they are listening.

DR. COLLINS:

Have you had any (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

There is another characteristic of a government on the run, Mr. Speaker. It is called wishful thinking. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing is that people see the light at the end of the tunnel, they see an end to the incompetence, to the wishful thinking, to the arrogance, to the inflexibility of this administration. They cannot wait to give them the boot. They cannot wait for the next election to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

They are repeating a good old Tory slogan, "The Time Has Come." As a matter of fact, they are saying, "Your Time Has Come". The time of the people of Newfoundland has come. The people of Newfoundland realize that and they just want the opportunity to exercise their right at the ballot box. They

will do away with these incompetent budgets that we are getting every year, they will do away with the inflexibility. They see hope, Mr. Speaker, hope for job creation, hope for attracting investment opportunities, hope for settling untenable labour situations. They see hope, Mr. Speaker. Now that is a subject that the hon. gentleman for St. John's North would know nothing about, and he has my complete pity on this subject. Hope, Mr. Speaker, is what they see and hope and reality is what they are going to get when we get rid of this hon. crowd and put the gentleman from Mount Scio and his team in office. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall be voting for the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Humber Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought it would be appropriate for me to have a few words to say concerning the Budget in the Budget debate. There are so many good things in it that I cannot see, Mr. Speaker, how hon. members on the other side can have a member up for half an hour trying to criticize it. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only appropriate that my few words concerning the Budget should be on what is a priority for me, and that is agriculture in the Province and in my district, in particular.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, and all hon. members saw it in the Budget

brought down by the Finance Minister some time ago, there was some \$1.3 million put in there by the provincial department. That represents, Mr. Speaker, only a small amount of the monies that will be spent by the department in the coming year on agriculture in the Province. This \$1.3 million represents a development programme which would greatly enhance the agricultural movement in this Province and, as all hon. members know, there is lots of room for development in this field.

Some facts, Mr. Speaker, pertaining to agriculture which probably hon. members opposite and, I suppose, some members on this side of the House as well do not know. The egg industry in this Province is approximately 98 per cent self-sufficient. It is one of the commodity groups in agriculture that we are self-sufficient in in this Province.

The broiler industry, Mr. Speaker, in the Province is moving towards self-sufficiency very rapidly. The effort being made by the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development with regard to farm products every year is really helping this industry progress and will probably bring it to self-sufficiency within another few years. The marketing programmes and the input from producers has really helped this industry take off over the past few years.

I have to say a few words on the dairy industry, Mr. Speaker, because it was through the efforts of the producers in the Province, coupled with the help of the Department, that set up the so-called Milk Marketing Board, I think approximately three years

ago, and this initiated a lot of activity in the dairy industry, which was sadly lacking in the Province.

An example, Mr. Speaker: Some three years ago, before the Milk Marketing Board was set up, there were some forty dairies in the Province producing approximately 33 per cent of our needs. Everything else was coming in from the Mainland; approximately 10,000 gallons of milk a week passing through this Province. As of today, some three years later, approximately 60 per cent of the milk needs of this Province is produced within the Province, representing approximately seventy producers. Now, that is in just three short years.

The consumption in this Province is only 43.2 per cent of the national average. Next to us is P.E.I., which has 102 litres per capita. We have 43.2. So you can imagine the steps that can be taken in the dairy industry alone in this Province. That is just one sector of the agricultural industry. If anybody wanted to do their math, their arithmetic on those figures, you can imagine the potential there is for jobs in the Province from that particular industry alone.

Last year the dairy industry alone brought approximately \$6 million worth of hay into the Province from Mainland interests. Just put that into jobs in the Province and see what it means, just the dollars alone. That \$6 million worth of hay was used just in the winter months to feed dairy animals. Also, Mr. Speaker, the money would be kept in the Province and other parts of the agricultural industry would be able to take advantage of it.

The Department of Agriculture is not only of direct benefit to farmers themselves. If we look at the budget, Mr. Speaker, we see an increase in rural development loans from \$25,000 to \$50,000. This is significant, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that any hon. member on either side of the House would have to admit that this is significant.

Rural Development, as every hon. member knows, covers the length and breadth of this Island, regardless of where people live.

The sawmilling industry, Mr. Speaker, has taken off under this programme. Loans in the sawmilling industry itself were increased from \$20,000 up to \$40,000, which would represent approximately \$30,000 which could be spent on raw materials and approximately \$10,000 or \$15,000 which could be spent on working capital. If I am not mistaken, Mr. Speaker, you just have to look at the figures over the past few months, since December 1985, and you have no problem telling how many people in the Province have taken advantage of that programme.

Mr. Speaker, when I sit down at an Estimate Committee on RAND, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, I find it frustrating to see hon. members from the other side of the House spend three hours talking about nothing but the fact that there is the possibility that some of the rural development loans might be going to urban centers in the Province. That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is hypocritical. As with any other Department of government, there are rules and regulations governing all loans. There is a criterion to be met and, if that is met, then that loan is

approved, whether the person is living in Gander, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Deer Lake or whatever.

Raw materials have to come from outside the smaller communities, Mr. Speaker, and you just cannot separate the urban areas from the rural areas of this Province and say, 'We will not approve this, because that man is from Gander, St. John's, or Corner Brook', when he is getting his raw materials from the real grass roots of this Province, the outer perimeters of the urban centers.' It was carried all through debate on the estimates considered by the Resource Committee.

They got into the energy estimates the other day and there were so many good things, they could not find anything to criticize. Their only criticism was that Hibernia probably would not come on because of the low price of oil. Last year I sat in on the same committees and the big thing was Clause 54, whether we would have Hibernia, whether we would have a fiscal regime, whether we would have an Atlantic Accord, or whatever, and this year, Mr. Speaker, it was the same thing. It is just an ongoing litany of criticisms which are not constructive, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I have gone off track a little. Getting back to Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development again, Mr. Speaker, we also have to look at the other positive things that have happened in the last Budget. You have to look at the Farm Development Loan Board, whereby this administration saw fit to increase the farm development loans from \$30,000 to

\$75,000. That in itself, Mr. Speaker, speaks well for this administration and how it feels about the agricultural industry in this Province, and the potential that it does have.

MR. WARREN:

It also has a good minister.

MR. WOODFORD:

I was going to get to that at the end, hon. colleague. In Rural Development loans have been increased from \$25,000 to \$50,000, farm loans have been increased from \$30,000 to \$75,000, and then you have to look at the \$25,000 that comes under the Rural Development Subsidiary Agreement, which is also administered by the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. So there are three of the most basic things you could have in this Province, Mr. Speaker. When you are dealing with rural areas of the Province, it is one of the most important portfolios in this administration; you are dealing with the basics, the grass roots of the Province. And it really generates small business and gets it going.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to heap too much praise on the present minister, but since he came into the ministry as of February of 1985, I would have to say that he has done more for agriculture in this Province than has ever been done. He has done more in the last fourteen or fifteen months than has ever been done, and I say that without exception, and not only for the agricultural part. You have to look at the rural development movement, and take that right through in context with the sawmills and everything else in this Province. You also have to look at crafts. Mr. Speaker,

that department covers the whole gamut of rural development in this Province.

The farmers in this Province are quite pleased with having someone who is communicating with them all the time and who is accessible to them. That is the big thing, and something that we never had. I am sure hon. members on the other side would like me to forget mentioning anything about the agreement that had been lost for the last four years, but I will not. I will not back away from that one, I will meet it head on. This is the fourth year without an agreement, but I will guarantee you one thing, it is not because of the present Minister of Agriculture. We have another Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa, we have another administration in Ottawa. Granted they are of the same political stripe, but I make no bones about it, Mr. Speaker, it is the fault of the Feds that this agreement is not signed. This minister and this administration are not going to let it drop there, we are going to pursue it. We look back, Mr. Speaker, and say that it is four years since we had an agreement, two of them with an Liberal administration and two with a PC administration. Right now it is fifty/fifty. Whatever happens in the next six months, Mr. Speaker, will say which is best.

With respect to my district, Mr. Speaker, we will just have a look at the last couple of years with regard to forestry. It was this administration, through my hon. colleague, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), one of the main players, and the Premier himself, which negotiated with Bowater and Kruger, Corner Brook Pulp and

Paper Limited right now, to sign that great agreement that brought Kruger into Corner Brook to save the Corner Brook mill and the city of Corner Brook. I would like to expand on that, because it was not only the city of Corner Brook and the people of Corner Brook who were saved by that, it was the whole region, the whole West Coast, Mr. Speaker. Nobody can speak with any more authority on that than I can, representing the district of Humber Valley, because the ripple effect came right on down through Humber Valley East, right out to Jackson's Arm and further, out into the Green Bay district.

MR. FUREY:

And Hawke's Bay.

MR. WOODFORD:

Yes, that is right. Hawke's Bay, the Roddickton area, right on down through. The hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) is right. It was unreal the effect that had on stabilizing the people who were involved in the woods industry. At least they could say, 'If I invest in a piece of equipment now, there is some stability in the marketplace'.

Mr. Speaker, just to give you an example of how it affects one part of my district, the White Bay area, Kruger has spent thousands, if not millions, of dollars so far just in the White Bay area alone trying to get the Main River project going. When they do, Mr. Speaker, there will be possibly 235 permanent jobs there. Their first estimate was for a period of twenty-five years, but that has gone to approximately fifty-three years, the reason being the taking into account of the silviculture programmes that will be carried on in the ongoing years, after the

project gets started. So transfer that into monies and payroll for that particular part of White Bay and, Mr. Speaker, it is a godsend for that particular part of my district.

That generates, Mr. Speaker, into a lot of other things which were also in the Budget. In pre-tendering this year I had approximately \$1.5 million for reconstruction of the road from the Trans-Canada to Jackson's Arm. This will finish reconstruction of that particular piece of road, and rightly so. I think that shows the concern this administration has for districts that can be identified in the Province as going to generate some stability and some jobs. That is one of the really bright spots, Mr. Speaker, in this Province right now.

As I just said, Kruger is going to start there with approximately 6,000 cords of wood, they are going to move from 6,000 to 25,000 in 1987, and from 25,000 to 75,000 cords a year in 1988 - 1989, which represents an awful lot of dollars and jobs for that district. If we do not have roads to drive over to get that material out, well, then, it is all no good. Now that has been addressed. The reconstruction will be finished as of 1986, with paving to start in 1987. I have to thank my hon. colleague, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), for having the insight, when I did explain the situation to him, to take it seriously and get that project approved.

Mr. Speaker, the fishery: I have a strong, strong fishery in the White Bay area of my district. All across the Province, I guess, the fishery looks exceptionally

well this year; prices seem to be stabilizing and it looks like the fishermen are going to get a lot better price for their product.

In the White Bay area we have P.Janes and Sons. They have taken over another plant, called White Bay Fisheries I do believe, and then we have Sop's Arm Fisheries, Sop's Arm, run by Mr. Azariah Fradsham there. According to all reports for this Summer, it looks like it is going to be an excellent year and it augers well for the economy in the district, and especially for the Province as a whole.

Mining: Another thing I have in my district, Mr. Speaker, is a really strong exploration programme. As hon. members know, my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), announced last Fall a big increase in claims, from approximately 600 to 800, that were staked previous to October 7, 1985. And what happened from October 7 to October 28, Mr. Speaker, was unreal in that approximately another 400 to 500 claims were staked, mainly in the White Bay - Sop's Arm area. So you can imagine the amount of exploration that went on out there last year, Mr. Speaker, and what will be going on this Summer. We have approximately some fifteen companies ready to move into the Sop's Arm - White Bay area of the district and, again, that augers well for the mining industry in the Province. And the thing they are looking for is gold. I know hon. members will probably say that last year we had oil on the brain now we have gold on the brain, but, Mr. Speaker, no matter what -

AN HON. MEMBER:

And a number of other things.

MR. WOODFORD:

We have a lot of things on the brain, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

No water.

MR. WOODFORD:

We have no water on the brain. Mr. Speaker, we are going to keep working at the mining industry, the forestry, tourism, agricultural, the fishery and what have you. We will leave no stone unturned in trying encourage companies to come into the Province to develop our resources so that we can ensure that our people will have a better standard of living, Mr. Speaker, as to mining, I do not need anybody to lecture me when it comes to mining. My father spent forty-three years underground in the mines, in Buchans, and was one of the very few who walked out alive, and is still alive. I worked there myself for six years, and, as I have said, I do not need anybody to lecture me on what it is like to work underground, or what it is to come from a mining community.

I can sympathize with the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) with regard to the 165 layoffs in Daniel's Harbour the other day. I make no bones about, because I know better than anybody in this House what it is like to come from a mining town and have such layoffs and have such disasters.

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is not in his seat today. I will probably get an opportunity to mention this some other time, if not, hon. members can pass the message along to him. I do not like getting up on points of order and the like, that, as far as I am concerned,

Mr. Speaker, is only wasting the time of the House. There is always an opportunity, in a speech somewhere down the road, to express your feelings. But the hon. member mentioned the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this administration helped give away the resources in the mine at Buchans. As everybody knows, when the Buchans mine was in its heyday, a Liberal administration was in power in this Province.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I worked there. I know that the Buchans mine was high-graded, there is no doubt about that, I know that parts of it definitely were, especially down on the seventeen, eighteen, nineteen and twenty levels of McLean's shaft. They used to take enough gold out of the mines in Buchans to pay their overhead expenses, which amounted to approximately \$14 million in one year. So, if that is not high-grading, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what it is. Right towards the end, in 1966, 1967 and 1968, it became more evident. Engineers would come down, pass through the tunnels, pass through the drifts and then the inspectors would do the same thing and it was just. 'Cut this dope, or cut that pillar', or whatever, and that is exactly what was done. The place was definitely high-graded.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention the great tourist potential and some of the incentives in the budget over the last couple of years pertaining to tourism in the Province, especially in regard to my district. One thing I must admit, Mr. Speaker, is that in representing a district like Humber Valley, a member has a lot to be proud of. Because no matter what you mention, the fishery, the

forestry, mining - potential mining I should say right now - agriculture and tourism, I have it all, Mr. Speaker, and in great quantities. All that is needed is someone to develop it. Mr. Speaker, if my work involves getting someone to go in there, that will be done over the next few years. I will make sure of that.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to touch on the tourism aspect of the district and the Province as a whole, and the great potential we have. People driving through this Province will never turn off onto that overpass in Deer Lake, and the nicest, the most beautiful scenery in the Province is when you go up through the Cormack area, up through Big Falls, down through the hon. the member for St. Barbe's (Mr. Furey) area, down through Woody Point and Gros Morne, right on down to L'Anse-au-Meadows, right down the Coast. Mr. Speaker, it is the most beautiful scenery in this Province or, as far as I am concerned, anywhere in Canada. We have to do more, Mr. Speaker, we have to spend more. And these are some of the things which have been addressed by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett), over the last year in particular.

With respect to the loans, Mr. Speaker, under the new Tourism agreement with the federal government, a lot of the private entrepreneurs in the district, and right down through, have taken advantage of that programme. It is an excellent one and hopefully it will be ongoing. Certainly, it will be until that agreement runs out in 1988 - 89, I believe. I have seen a great improvement in some of the cabins and the resorts

in the district, and not only in the district, but further down the coast as well. Right now we are working on a couple of resort areas for the district, in particular one in the Deer Lake area, at a cost of some \$1.3 million.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say, as a new member of this House of Assembly - I think we have been here a year and a couple of days - along with some of my hon. colleagues on the other side and one or two over here, you just have to sit back and observe and listen and when you decide you are going to get up to speak, you had better have some facts before you. The Budget debate provides a great opportunity for a new member to speak, because it is so far-reaching and such a wide range of topics can be covered. I know my time is up, I would just like to say, thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I must say I enjoyed the comments by my colleague opposite there -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
- who I found to be, I think, a

valuable member of House of Assembly, even though he is on the other side. Now, enough of the nice stuff.

The good news Budget! There are a couple of things there that I must say are good. There is \$1 million for the business school. That is going to see an addition built to that and I think that is a good move. It is something that will help the business school and develop entrepreneurs. There are some monies for our riding which I am surprised to see but it is very good to see it, for the hospital, I believe, and for the community college.

This Budget is a provincial Budget. It is suppose to develop policies or have monies in it to stimulate the economy, to stimulate growth, to get jobs, create employment and to solve many of the major problems that we have. The major one to solve, and then all the others will start to go away, is the employment problem. My measure of an administration is the rate of unemployment, if it is going up or down or if it is going to go anywhere. On this point, this administration has failed miserably. They would get an F from any teacher who had to evaluate their performance.

It is a shocking thing that we in Newfoundland have to live with 25, 22 or 23 per cent unemployment and a youth unemployment rate of 40 odd per cent that is accepted now by the Province. They say, "Well, there is nothing we can do about it, not one initiative we could take and we accept it. We say, no problem, we cannot do anything about it. It is out of our hands. When the oil comes, everything will be solved." Now

they are even admitting on the other side they do not know if Hibernia is going to go. That is a wonderful state of affairs we have in this Province today.

I wish it were a good news Budget. I mean, I would get up and I would say, 'Good news, great to hear!' We would feel optimistic. But there is not even one initiative. I mean, it is absolute foolishness to think we are going to go anywhere with this budget.

Half of our revenue comes from Ottawa. They are cutting back \$2 billion in transfer payments and we do not even have a call or a cry or anything going up to the federal government saying, 'Stop it! No, hold it! We have problems down here. If you do that to us, we are in a lot of trouble.' We have not even a telegram, nothing, sent off to talk to these people up in Ottawa to tell them to 'Just hold on for a minute because our problems are getting worse and you are not helping them.'

MR. FUREY:

Does that include the 100,000 on U.I.?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Well, the 100,000 on U.I., that is a shocking figure in itself.

MR. FUREY:

That is not part of the transfer?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

No, it is not. One hundred thousand people receiving unemployment insurance for the first time in history. That is part of the good news, I suppose.

You know, I cannot believe the change in this administration from

two years ago. It is just unreal how anybody could picture the Premier of this Province and its administration just giving in to the Ottawa heads of state. It is amazing! The word is 'unreal', there is no other word, to see Newfoundland, which in the hands it is now, is not going anywhere, to see us getting done in left, right and center. It is nothing compared to when the Liberals were up there. They used to just hit all over them for everything, even if it was good and for their own political gain, that is fine, but now we have to start talking about the reality of that political gain. That political gain has become a political loss, I would venture to say, and that will be shown in the next election. But, unfortunately, people have to wait.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

They have to wait for another three or four years and they have to go through unemployment -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There are discussions going on on both sides and I ask hon. members to keep it down a bit.

MR. BAKER:

A good ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

So, you have to wonder where the priorities lie. Are we going to say, now, we are safe for three or four years and not do anything and go with the status quo or are we going to try to do something? I venture to say from what we have seen in our good news budget that it is status quo, that 20 per cent unemployment or 25 per cent

unemployment is okay and that we are not going to bother to tackle it.

We have our offshore in major jeopardy and they will not even admit it. Nobody wants to admit it. I mean, we have to face the fact and have to try to haul it out. But, no, everything is going fine. And you have people coming out from every direction saying, 'Look, we need some help.' We have Mr. Getty from Alberta going home and saying, 'Help us out. Help us out.' The Board of Trade here in St. John's have already stated that, the Ocean Industries Association, Husky Oil, all of them.

We have a letter tabled by my colleague from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) who says that the labour situation here in the Province is so bad that businesses are not coming in here anymore. Now this is wonderful good news. The Province is going to take off. We are going to need some fire extinguishers. I would suggest we tender for them because we are going to need to put the fire of the economy out because it will be going so fast. The economy is going to overheat.

MR. FUREY:

(Inaudible) retail sales tax did not go up.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

No, the retail sales tax did not go up. We will have lots of comments on that.

But I have to quote this, that I think exemplifies the situation. We are talking about a provincial budget which is supposed to attack the unemployment problem.

Three years ago, the Youth

Advisory Council, under the mandate of Culture, Recreation and Youth, had a national conference on youth unemployment and they staged it here in Newfoundland. They came up with some recommendations.

AN HON. MEMBER:

When was that?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

1983.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Before the Royal Commission?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Before the Royal Commission. And I venture to say the Royal Commission's comments might not even be as good as these here because they are right from the youth themselves.

MR. FUREY:

They call for a revolution in the education system.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am going to read the resolution that was passed by the whole conference here in Newfoundland over three years ago, dealing with youth unemployment in this Province.

It is resolution number two:

"WHEREAS Nova Scotia has provincial employment programmes costing the provinces more than \$5 million;

"WHEREAS New Brunswick has provincial employment programmes costing the provinces more than \$12 million;

"WHEREAS the provinces of Quebec, Manitoba and Alberta have their own provincial employment and career centers;

"WHEREAS both the Yukon and North West Territories have territorial student employment programmes;

"WHEREAS, although the Province of Newfoundland has the highest provincial unemployment rate in Canada, it does not contribute significantly towards employment programmes and is the only province in Canada that has no provincial youth-oriented employment programmes;

"THEREFORE BE IT ADVOCATED that Newfoundland contribute more to federal job creation projects in Newfoundland" - fine - "Newfoundland establish and contribute to provincial employment and job creation programmes."

That says it all. It was over three years ago that youth took the initiative to try to do something about their cause and with the problem down here. The response has been \$2 million from the Province into a Summer SEED Programme. That is fine. I understand that that is a great help. But we have a massive problem out there and that is just one federal initiative. We are going to latch onto it and put a couple of million dollars into it.

I venture to say that again it is not attacking the problem because the problem is still getting worse. We still have 25,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 young Newfoundlanders out there walking around with nothing to do and nowhere to go. They are not getting any sense of direction and they are not going to get a sense of direction from this administration because there is no political will. All these comments about 'we are doing this and we are doing that', gloss over

what the real situation is and it is not going to help anything. Action is needed, not retort or words or anything else. You, ladies and gentlemen of the administration, are in the position to do something about it.

MR. FUREY:

What was their mandate?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The mandate was to create jobs. Probably jobs for themselves.

MR. FUREY:

Snow jobs.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The federal Minister of Youth, by the way, has come out with a new policy now and she wrote a letter informing all of her bureaucracy.

MR. FUREY:

That is the one without a department.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

That is the one with a department that was stripped away. That shows you the commitment to youth in this country by the Ottawa crowd up there.

We get the letter written by the hon. Minister of State for Youth saying, 'If they are of Tory persuasion, we are going to try to hire them and try to convince them to come with our party.' This was a letter written by the Minister of Youth up in Ottawa. Down here we do not get a response to that. Can you imagine if that was a Liberal Youth Minister up there now doing something like that? They would have been done in. They would have been called down. She would be gone. That is just the acceptance again, that 'well, Ottawa is going to do what they

want and we cannot do anything about it.'

MR. FUREY:

But they are afraid of overheating the economy.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

That is true, they are afraid of overheating the economy. We have seen that because they will not let it heat up. As a matter of fact, they will not even kindle the fire. I wish they would kindle the fire because there are a lot of people around here who would like to see the fire kindled and see a big, gigantic fire of jobs, of prosperity, of monies, thrown into the proper areas instead of this big, gigantic extra Confederation Building that we do not really need and renovations costing \$800,000 at the Premier's office. We have people out there walking around with nothing to do and they say we cannot do anything about it.

Another great initiative was taken today to co-operation and consultation. A Forestry Agreement was signed today and there were four press releases prior to this saying it was going to be signed. They must be awful happy to get one signed because they just blasted about a month before they got it here. We get it here and I was expecting something really good. We finally got some monies into the forestry. Yes, wonderful! That is really good. But you have to compare it because they are always comparing about what was like when the Liberals were in. Well, I will tell you. Right now the people of Newfoundland would have been better off with a Liberal Government in Ottawa than they are with the Tory Government up there now.

We have now a 70/30 cost-shared agreement for forestry. We used to have a 90/10 deal. Now that puzzles me a great deal. Maybe I am missing the boat altogether, 70/30 is that what we call -

DR. COLLINS:

That is the answer.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Well, if I have missed the boat, well at least I tried to get on it, some of us did not even try, as a matter of fact. But it is amazing that 70/30 is now what we call co-operation and consultation. Again, we have been knocked off. How can people possibly say now we are better off with two governments of the same Tory stripe. Anybody who says that, knows the difference.

MR. FUREY:

Is that the infliction?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

That is affliction. But I do not want to be inflicted any more about all this wonderful prosperity.

Another great initiative done by this government is the 4 per cent increase in the sales tax for the construction industry. There we go. That is another great thing that is going to help, no doubt about it, that is going to help the construction industry in Newfoundland where the unemployment rate is as high as it is, ridiculously high. Another great initiative carried out by yours truly, the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and his administration.

DR. COLLINS:

A recent survey shows that the construction industry is doing well.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, can you keep the Care Bear quiet?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I like that response. 'They have done well. So I tell you what we are going to do now, we are going to make them not do well, back them up again and then we are going to give them another tax break a few years down the road.' That is a wonderful philosophy, tax them to the hilt, that is the whole idea with this thing here. It is unreal when you think about it.

Six per cent we have increased on the fares to come over to Newfoundland now. They have increased the fares to come over here and we have not said a word. Deregulations come in, not a word, FFTs have come in, 'no, we cannot do much about that.' EPF funds are going to be cut back \$2 billion, 'we cannot do much about that.' Gander is in the process of losing its international status but you cannot do anything about that. They are trying to blame my colleague now for that I suppose, I mean, blame everybody, blame us for not governing. That is what it is coming down to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

No, Federal Forestry Centre.

MR. BAKER:

I blame us too because we are not in government.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

That is true, you are right. But it is amazing!

There was a recent article in *Atlantic Insight* which I think sums it up pretty well. The headline was *The Demise Of Atlantic Canada* because the federal government has given up on regional development. They have given up. Survival of the fittest are the new buzzwords now.

I want to quote the Premier of Newfoundland just a couple of years ago talking about regional development. 'Regional development cannot be left solely to the private sector. The private sector is extremely weak in most disadvantaged regions. Often private sector development, even in activities where the region has a comparative advantage, requires a programme of facilitative regional development activities by government. Because the private sector is so weak, a tax base approach or even the standard grant approach to industrial development will not bring about any significant measure of regional economic development.'

MR. FUREY:

Is that the same Premier today saying that?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, yes. We are now gone to a central Canada budget that was brought down federally and he calls it 'good stuff, a good budget for Newfoundland.' The same fellow who is going around waving this a couple of years ago, saying, 'we are getting done in and you had better give us some money to develop our region.' I cannot believe the turnaround. Well, I have come up with the word that describes it, and it is from a song I heard a few weeks ago. I must say it describes things very well. I would sing it but my

voice is not very good today. It describes this administration right to the hilt. It is called *Flip, Flop, and Fly*. Now, on the one hand, 'yes, we want regional development and you are not giving us enough money,' when the Liberals were up there. When the Tories get in, 'boy, whatever you want to do it is no problem,' *Flip and Flop*. And eventually we are going to have to fly.

Yes, we are going to take off. Then we are going to have fly back and stay where we are. *Flip, Flop and Fly* describes to the fullest extent, I think, this administration and the way its actions have been seen.

People out in Newfoundland and Labrador now just cannot take this any more. I do not mind you getting elected on a mandate to create jobs, I mean, that is fine, fine mandate but we, in the Opposition, have got to try to keep pushing you. The people of Newfoundland are suffering and it is time that besides just getting elected you started to govern the Province in the proper fashion, instead of this, 'Well, now we are elected we will take a break for five years.' That is the way you have been doing it every two and a half years, is it? So, I think that instead of the flipping and the flopping, we should start some action. Instead of cooperation and consultation, these wonderful two 'c's, and how we are going to get all our wonderful benefits down here in Newfoundland, I think we should have a re-evaluation of your whole stand because I think myself it is nothing but a total giving in and the likes will never be seen again.

This Province is going to take another five years to recuperate

after that, after you are gone, which will not be very long. Atlantic Canada is going to suffer tremendously. We have just seen the reaction from PEI as soon as they got the opportunity. We are going to see it again in New Brunswick in the near future and we are going to see it here in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. The silence is unreal. Everybody, it is not just a few people, are saying this.

I got a report here from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business presented October 28, 1985. Here is a summary of recommendations presented to the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment. One of the recommendations is: 'Eliminate provincial small business income tax to encourage business expansion and job creation.' Well, that was put but I do not think you are ever going to see anything on it. Another recommendation was, 'reduce the sales tax' for small business.' I am just reading this. This is what the Federation of Independent Business, which represents almost every small business here in Newfoundland, says.

'Require a small business impact statement for all regulatory change and establish maximum time limits for bureaucratic response' because they are getting nailed to the wall and the paper work they got to do. 'Establish a small business development corporation.' That is another recommendation they make. Throughout the report they talk about the lack of initiatives by government to deal with the economy, to get it going and to stimulate the economy. So they are saying this. Everybody in the offshore -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Who said that?

MR. K. AYLWARD:
The Canadian Federation of Independent Business.

Anyway, these people are saying it. We have the offshore people starting to say, 'We need help, we need help.' The great Atlantic Accord. We now are in a position to try to negotiate with the oil companies to haul out Hibernia and they may have to give away the shop to get it going to save their political hides. They may have to do it.

MR. FUREY:
It will not save them.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
It is not going to save it, I know, but to the detriment of people in Newfoundland and Labrador, they may do it anyway because the way they are it probably would not matter much what Newfoundland and Labrador people say. It is unfortunate. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), in his projections for revenue, does not even want to include the revenues for taxes for the offshore. He admitted that. He does not want to include them because he is not sure if he is going to get them, I suppose. Maybe he is going to give them away again. Maybe they are going to give them away to the oil companies so they can get them to come in.

MR. FUREY:
Did he give his revenues from the extra beer profits they made?

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I am not sure. A part of the good news we received today was that the university is laying off

people.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

What?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The university is laying off people today. We find out that sixty odd jobs are going to go today.

MR. BAKER:

A lack of money or what?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

They say it is a lack of money but I do not know. We are going to have to look it all over and find out. That move by the university, which comes under the provincial government here, is really going to help Newfoundland develop. It is going to help the youth of this Province who are trying to get an education. The administration might label it as good news, but I do not label that as good news. I think it is going to hurt us tremendously but it is unfortunate that we have to face the sad facts.

MR. BAKER:

It is good news for the Minister of Finance since this is his last budget.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Everybody out there is trying to say, 'it should not be so gloomy.' It is awful hard not to be gloomy when you see people in power, supposedly to do something and to change things, but do not want to try. They sold themselves out to the federal Tories when they got elected last time and they do not want to say anything. Our economy down here can go ahead and suffer because our lifeline is going to be cut.

Half of our monies come from Ottawa and the Minister of Finance

over there says, 'oh, we have to face reality.' He was not facing reality about three years ago though, I guarantee you, going around condemning the federal government for cutbacks and here now they are going at it at a level that is twice as bad. Every agreement we are getting is 70/30 and 60/40 instead of 90/10. What is he saying? 'Well, we have to accept the reality that the federal government has got to cut back their deficit on this, that and everything else.' We know, 'Short-term gain for long-term pain.' I think that is the idea. That is a new buzz word now.

We have been down here in long-term pain for I do not know how many years, especially since the hon. Premier took over. We have seen the unemployment rate go from 15 odd per cent in the last seven years up to 20 odd. It fluctuates here, there and everywhere but it is consistently high and to me it is the final measure of an administration. Unemployment is the most rampant we have ever seen down in this Province. In its history we have never seen it as bad. We get a good news Budget and we are on an uphill swing with 100,000 people on unemployment insurance for the first time in history. 'Well, that is the reality we have to face.' I do not want to fact that reality.

I would like to see some initiatives come forward that would see this problem solved, that would see regional development around this Province instead of this, 'well, we cannot do much about it. The status quo is this and the status quo is that. We cannot do something new because we are taking a risk there. We may lose so much money

and we may do this and we may do that.' That is a wonderful philosophy. If an entrepreneur had that philosophy, he would get nowhere and that is exactly what this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) optimist.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I am trying to give you optimism. You listen and you will learn.

DR. COLLINS:

(Inaudible) that is coming from over there.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Gloom! I am just trying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:

(Inaudible) reality 'Kevin'.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

He does not know what reality is, my hon. colleague, he does not know. That is our job over here see, to make you face reality, to make you be able to do something about that wicked reality that is out there.

I can only give you one figure, 100,000 are collecting U.I. for the first time in history. Is that a reality? I do not know. Maybe that is not to you but it is to me and it is to the people of the West Coast of Newfoundland. Talking about youth unemployment, they cannot even get money to go and get a job in Calgary anymore. That is amazing! They cannot even do that anymore. They have got some hope and they have got some optimism. The only reason being though is that we are coming and we are going to take over and we are going to try and straighten it

out. It is going to be awful hard, mind you. But at least they will say, 'we are trying this and we are trying that.' We are going to put some new initiatives forward. We are going to spend a bit of money on young people. We are going to spend a bit of money on people to get them work and if we have to battle the federal government to get our proper share that is due us, we will do that too. We are not going to sit down and give in to everything that they say and do up in Ottawa. It is amazing, it is unreal, to see that this is happening, to see that we are getting just knocked off to the side, like, 'Do not pester me now. You are just Newfoundland. You are only 500,000 people'. At least the Liberal Government in Ottawa, when it was there, knew we were down here and they tried to address some of the problems by putting monies into regional development.

MR. FUREY:

What is the in the Budget that is good news?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not know. There is no change whatsoever in the philosophy of high taxes and the whole works, and you have got unemployment rates that have stayed the same. I cannot believe it. You would think that after a while it would get into their heads that it is not working. So why do you not try something different? Not a chance! That is why we have to work over here to try to move your administration out of power altogether so at least we could try to come in with some fresh new ideas, which we are going to do.

It is unfortunate that we have to put up with this administration for another three or four years

and its lackadaisical attitude, a lackadaisical attitude that says, 'we have to face the reality that the feds are going to nail us to the wall and we cannot do anything about it. We have to face the reality.'

That is not the same government. That is not the same political will that was there years ago. It is going to be the end. I think the beginning of the end has started to appear with so many different problems that we have. Hopefully, we will see some improvement. I hope that somebody somewhere does something well in Ontario or somewhere that will affect Newfoundland so that we can see some improvement down here. It is like, right now, the shotgun approach, you know. It is like hauling out a bag of tricks; now, if this one works, right on! We have no idea if it is going to work or not. That is some philosophy on which to operate a government and on which to operate a province. The people in this Province are suffering for that philosophy. But do not worry, the time is coming and coming fast, folks.

The railway - I mean, that is another thing altogether - with this crowd over there it may be on its way out, but a lot of people are jumping on the bandwagon now. They are coming and they are going to take their frustrations out on this administration in the very near future. The winds of change are flowing. 'A time for a change' is a great phrase. I think it was used many years ago, but I think it is going to be even more effective the next time. People are talking about it now.

On that note, since it is 6:00 p.m., I will adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Before adjourning, I would remind the House of the Committee meetings for this evening and tomorrow. Tonight, the Government Services Committee will meet at 7:30 p.m. in the House to continue its review of the estimates of the Department of Finance and, if time permits, to begin its review of the estimates of the Department of Labour. Tomorrow morning in the Colonial Building, the Social Services Committee will meet at 9:30 to continue its review of the estimates of the Department of Social Services. The Government Services Committee will meet at 9:30 a.m. in the House; the department to be dealt with will depend on progress at this evening's meeting.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Labour will follow Finance.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
That is right, Finance and then Labour. Does the Table know what is coming after Labour? Well, we will endeavour to find out for this evening.

I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow at 3:00 p.m.

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