



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 36

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

21 May 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, at this time, to inform the hon. House of my department's approval for water and sewer projects and municipal road upgrading and paving projects in various areas of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:
These approvals will enable the municipal councils concerned to proceed, without delay, to finalize detailed plans and contract specifications for early tender call.

As this hon. House is aware, I announced to the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities in early October, government's plan to call early tenders for municipal capital projects, and by so doing will also address concerns expressed by the construction industry to have an early start in order to create much needed employment in the Province.

The department is very pleased to announce a total of \$11,345,000 in capital projects which represents

less than 50 per cent of the total budgetary allocation for 1986 - 1987. The allocation of the remaining funds will be forthcoming as projects are finalized.

The following is the list of projects which have been approved to date:

In the district of Gander \$800,000 which will enable Gander, in conjunction with \$900,000 of federal funding, to install hydro dynamic separators and make other improvements to the town's sewer system.

In St. John's, \$2,948,000 cost-shared 60/40 between the Province and the city to enable the council to proceed with its 1986 capital roads programme.

In Port aux Basques, \$800,000. This project will be cost-shared on a 60/40 basis between the Province and the municipality of Channel - Port aux Basques and will be used for road upgrading and construction with the ongoing programme of water treatment and improvements.

In Pasadena, \$500,000 for the commencement of a much needed sewer system for the South Brook area.

In Shoal Harbour, \$950,000. This money will be used for essential development of a major water supply which will benefit both Shoal Harbour and Clarendville.

Corner Brook, \$1,150,000. This allotment will enable the City Council to carry out its proposed capital roads programme for 1986 and includes an amount of \$400,000 for the Corner Brook East Development Scheme.

The district of Fogo \$500,000, which will enable the commencement of a badly needed water and sewer system in the town of Fogo, and it will address the serious environmental problem as well.

Marystown, \$305,000 for the continuation of a water and sewer system.

Irishtown, \$500,000, this will also be used for the continuation of the town's present water and sewer system.

Again in the district of Fogo, down in Tilting, \$300,000. This will also enable the town of Tilting to make a start on a much needed water and sewer system.

In the district of Menihek, in Labrador City, \$144,000. This project will be undertaken on a 60/40 cost-shared basis between government and the municipality of Labrador City and will be used to pave and upgrade municipal roads.

Bay de Verde, \$256,000 for the continuation of a water and sewer system.

Birchy Bay, \$400,000 for the continuation of a water and sewer system.

Daniels Harbour, in the district of St. Barbe, \$365,000. This allocation will enable the town council of Daniels Harbour to address a serious sewer problem within the community, as well.

Carbonear, \$330,000 for the continuation of the town's water and sewer system.

Norris Point, again in the district of St. Barbe, \$177,000 which was announced last week. This allocation, if accepted by

the Council, will address a serious environmental sewage problem within the town.

Brighton, \$300,000 for phase 1 of a water and sewer system in the community.

Stephenville Crossing, \$200,000 for the continuation of the town's water and sewer project.

Paradise, \$300,000. This will enable the town of Paradise to continue with an additional phase of it's water and sewer system.

MR. BUTT:

Along the main road.

MR. EFFORD:

That is to flush out the member.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DOYLE:

Exploits, \$120,000, and this money is to be used by the Exploits Valley Regional Water Board to take corrective action with respect to the regional water supply, pending the outcome of a study that is presently underway to determine a long term course of action.

Mr. Speaker, additional projects will be announced as and when the funding allocations for additional projects are approved; however, as all members can readily observe, these projects are spread all over the Province providing essential municipal services to many of our citizens and a much needed stimulus to the construction industry in the Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I
thank the minister for giving me
the list a few minutes before the
House opened. We feel that it is
sad that this list would have to
be provided a minute or so before
the House opens when we have had
hours of going through the
estimates for the Department of
Municipal Affairs in the Estimate
Committees. We feel that if we
are going to approve the estimates
of this department, the list should
be made available to the Committee
so that we are able to question
the minister at the time it is
going through. In other words, we
would like to have the right, at
least, to discuss prior approval
rather than block approval.

We have to, as members of this
House, sit and go through the
estimates and I feel that time
would be the right time to have
the budget brought up.

MR. WARREN:
You do not know what you are
talking about, boy.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:
I am sure that the minister could
have had this list available
rather than bringing it in as he
is doing now, in dribs and drabs.
I notice that there are twenty-six
of them. Why is it so necessary
for them to tear and shout when he
announces an Opposition district
if there is not the pork
barrelling effect? This is the

thing that I ask about. The thing
that concerns me is that if we did
prior approval in the Estimates
Committee and not block -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman is not
commenting on the statement. The
statement has been given by the
minister and he should comment on
the statement. What he is doing
is commenting upon the way the
minister did not bring it into the
Estimates Committee. Now, if the
hon. gentleman wants to comment on
the statement, why does the hon.
gentleman not comment on the
number of Opposition districts
that have been covered by the
minister's statement instead of
trying to camouflage it the way he
does? And, when he is
camouflaging, Mr. Speaker, he is
avoiding the rules of the House
and he is completely out of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon.
the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
On that point of order, Mr.
Speaker -

MR. J. CARTER:
Stuck for words, are you?

MR. BARRY:

No, no. I was going to rise when the member finished, and it gives me an opportunity to do so now. If the Government House Leader does not agree with the very legitimate position being put by the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), and if the Premier is prepared to say that his administration is committed to having the allocation of water and sewer money and roads money done on the basis of the greatest need rather than the vote in the last election or the hope for a vote in the next election, let me suggest this: that the Premier authorize the Government House Leader to approve a special debate with respect to the water and sewer and highway needs all around this Province, let us have both lists and let us have a debate on whether the areas of greatest and highest priority are met, whether the allocation is being done on the basis of need or on the basis of politics. If the member is not afraid, let him agree to that special debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what better way can you have a debate than a Minister of the Crown bringing in a list showing Fogo, Tilton, Gander, St. Barbe and Labrador City. Now, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they are abusing the rules of this House. Let them lock with the issue, which is an issue they have been trying to bring up in this House to the effect that the government only puts money into Tory districts,

which is completely untrue. The issue is that they have to face from this statement the fact that this government acts fairly to all its citizens no matter what their politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

If it looks like a duck, walks like a duck and quacks like a duck it is probably a duck. If the Minister of Transportation says he is allocating on the grounds of politics I think we are entitled to believe the allocation is on the grounds of politics. Mr. Speaker, the minister says 'what better debate can you have than a Ministerial Statement.'

What pure and utter tripe! The rules of this House say that on a Ministerial Statement the minister gets up and reads, and then the Opposition have one-half the time the minister took to respond. The minister and his colleagues are afraid to have the people of the Province given the information, given the full list, Mr. Speaker, of which communities are going to get money for water and sewer or for paving. They are afraid to do it in the estimates and they are afraid to do it in a special debate of this House, because they are allocating money on the basis of gutter politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, all I will say is if the hon. gentleman wants to talk about ducks and try to camouflage us further, in a certain profession they call certain people 'quacks'. The hon. gentleman is a politician who is a quack and he is showing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I would like to rule on that point of order.

When an hon. member is responding to a Statement by a Minister, he should certainly confine his remarks to the Statement, but it is very difficult to be precise in that and for the Chair to decide that a member is straying from that, so I must rule there is not a point of order in that particular case.

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Good! Good!

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Premier whether he is prepared to have the full list supplied on water and sewer and pavement for a special debate in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, to advise hon. members of this House of the Province's appointment of Mr. E. W. (Ted) Best to the Board of Directors of Fishery Products International Limited to replace Mr. Robert Gimlin of Abitibi-Price, who recently resigned from the board of FPIL. Mr. Gimlin has now retired from active business and the Province fully appreciates his contribution to FPIL during his tenure on the board.

Mr. Best of Calgary, Alberta was Vice-President, Operations, and Director of British Petroleum Canada Limited until his retirement in 1985 and has also served as Chairman, Board of Directors, Canadian Petroleum Association. Mr. Best remains a director of a number of companies, including the Nova Corporation. The Province welcomes Mr. Best's acceptance to the Board of Directors of Fishery Products International Limited, one of the world's largest fully integrated fishing companies with annual sales in excess of \$300 million.

Mr. Best's extensive petroleum-related business background will undoubtedly provide considerable benefit to the ongoing operations of FPIL, particularly as it relates to interaction between the fisheries sector and the ongoing offshore development. It is noted that FPIL has a major offshore fishery in areas of the Grand Banks where the most promising oil discoveries have been made.

Mr. Best joins two other provincial appointees on the Board of FPI, Mr. Henry Collingwood of Baine Johnston and Co. Ltd. of St. John's and Mr. Roger Pike of the Pike group of companies, St. John's. Federal - provincial appointees on the board of FPIL are Mr. Victor Young, Chairman of the Board, Mr. Paul Desmarais of the Power Corporation, Montreal and Mr. James Greene of O'Dea and Greene, St. John's. Federal appointees on the board are Mr. William Janes of Falconbridge Inc., Toronto, Mr. Howard Hawke of Bache Securities, Toronto, Mr. A. Crosbie of Crosbie Offshore Services, St. John's, Mr. Frank Stronech of Magna Inc., Toronto and Mr. Albert Hickman of Hickman Motors Ltd., St. John's. The Bank of Nova Scotia's appointee on the board is Mr. Tony Brait of St. John's, formerly President of Newfoundland Telephone.

In making this announcement, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise this House, that both government shareholders are extremely pleased with the ongoing performance of FPIL and there is little doubt that the overall objectives of the fisheries restructuring process are being successfully achieved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for giving us a copy of his statement prior to the House opening. We, on this side, of course, welcome the appointment of Mr. Best to the Board of Directors of Fishery Products International. I am sure not too many Newfoundlanders will know too much about Mr. Best, but obviously he comes to the board with some very impressive credentials, credentials, yes, in oil and gas. It is regrettable, maybe, that he does not have some experience in the business of fisheries, but maybe, Mr. Speaker, his experience in that particular field will stand him in good stead in terms of serving on the Board of Directors of FPIL.

Fishery Products, Mr. Speaker, is a very important corporate entity in this Province. In fact, I suppose it is probably one of the largest sources of employment in the Province, and that is why the selection of people to serve on it's Board of Directors is a very important matter and one that certainly we on this side of the House do not take too lightly.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that it does have a very impressive list of directors, including two Newfoundlanders appointed by the Province, Mr. Henry Collingwood, who is a well-known and highly successful Newfoundland businessman and, of course, Mr. Roger Pike, likewise a very successful Newfoundland businessman.

I notice too, Mr. Speaker, another gentleman whose name appears on the Board of Directors, one that has been in the limelight in recent days, one Mr. Frank Stronech of Magna Incorporated. That is the gentleman, of course, as we all know, who was recently involved in the Sinclair Stevens controversy in Toronto.

But again, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the appointment of Mr. Ted Best, we wish him well, and we hope that the government will succeed in attracting more such people to the Board of Directors.

Maybe a little thought should be given, Mr. Speaker, to appointing more Newfoundlanders to that Board. We have nothing against outsiders serving on that Board, we only remind the government that there are Newfoundlanders who are ready, willing and certainly able to make a very worthwhile contribution to the Board of Directors of our company, the company of which the Newfoundland Government and the Newfoundland taxpayers are a major shareholder.

Again, we welcome the announcement, Mr. Speaker, and wish him well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a brief statement. Six days ago, members will recall, I announced in the House that, because of the extreme forest fire hazard, a total ban on

outdoor fires of any kind would be put into effect immediately. Today I have to remind the public that this ban is still in effect.

Over the past week to ten days we have had, for this time of the year, an unprecedented number of forest fires of unusual severity. Several communities were evacuated at varying times and fires, in some cases, burned to the doorsteps of houses. Considerable property has also been destroyed, Mr. Speaker. Current estimates are that fires have burned about 400,000 acres in total gross area. Of course, we have no estimate yet of the volumes of timber lost.

The fire situation has eased somewhat, Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of days through the combined efforts of firefighters and the weather. All of the major fires are generally holding to their existing boundaries, but over 500 men are still fighting them in Central Newfoundland, supported by some fourteen helicopters and ten water bombers.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I have to remind everyone that we cannot relax. The ban on outdoor fires is still in effect. We have been granted a couple of days of damp weather to try to get things under control, and it would be unfortunate to have new fires to contend with. There have been unconfirmed reports, Mr. Speaker, that some members of the public have still had outdoor fires, despite this ban. I simply want to take the opportunity, as has been done today in the editorial of *The Evening Telegram*, which I am pleased to see, to remind everyone that such action could result in fines of up to \$10,000 or jail terms of up to two years.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation and we must continue to receive full public co-operation and support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We, of the Opposition, have no problem supporting the statement by the ministers today urging the public to obey the rules set out by the minister, and we would also like, at this time, to take the time of the House to thank provinces which have contributed their efforts and their water bombers and their equipment and so on to this Province, as they have certainly helped us fight the fires and tackle a very serious situation. I would like to see this House send a telegram to those provinces, as a matter of fact, thanking them, because they came through in the clutch for us. Of course, we would have done the same. We would also like to thank the firefighters who have been fighting these forest fires over the last few days and the last few weeks, and we also thank the volunteers for their efforts. I think their effort has been excellent, and hopefully the public will follow the situation very carefully and take very, very good care when they are in the woods and in the forests. I would like to thank everyone involved actually for their efforts in this very serious situation.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Can the minister confirm, Mr. Speaker, if TerraTransport has sold off all of its trucking routes to a private transportation company on the mainland of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

As it relates to the mainland operation of TerraTransport, Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the question under advisement, try to find the information and get back to the hon. member. My understanding of the situation, as it relates to TerraTransport and its trucking operation is that it has every intention to remain in the Province and remain to be a very viable and active part of the transportation network in the Province.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, it appears as though the minister is saying, no, that there is no truth to this suggestion. It appears that is what he is saying. Let me ask the minister, then, will he assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that he will endeavour to find out if there is any truth to the

suggestion? And if there is, will he assure this House that he will do all in his power as Minister of Transportation to see that that does not happen? Would the minister assure the House of that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, in my initial comments I indicated to the member that, with regard to the details about what he mentioned, I will indeed take it under advisement and advise the House or the member individually, or however he wants to do it, as soon as I can get the information.

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 Forestry (Mr. Simms) whether there has been any analysis of the extent to which adequate fire breaks exist around the various communities in the Province? I know certain communities have fire breaks to some extent, but it seems that the recent crisis which occurred in a number of our communities would indicate that such fire breaks are inadequate. I wonder if the minister is prepared to look at a programme which would ensure that adequate fire breaks are provided for those communities which are located in the heart of our heavily timbered areas?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to take that matter under advisement and discuss it with my officials. It is not a matter that has been brought to my attention by my department officials at least. I know that wherever there are breaks they are breaks that have been developed as a result of the instructions of the people who were in the field in that particular area, under the direction of the fire boss in that particular area wherever it might be, but I would certainly take that under advisement and have a discussion with my officials about it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I thank the minister for his response. Might I also ask the minister if he would take under advisement the possibility, with or without federal cooperation, of putting a programme in place - we cannot do it over night, it may take several years - on a regularized systematic basis, to see, either through the various Summer employment programmes or the Canada make-work projects, whatever their name might be, that we might identify this as an area of high priority. Because surely the minister would have to agree that there was a very real threat to Grand Falls, Windsor, Lewisporte, Brown's Arm and other communities around this Province, and that in itself would seem to indicate the desirability of more adequate fire breaks than now exist around those communities. Would the minister agree with this?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to be perfectly honest with the Leader of the Opposition, I do not know, I am not an expert in firefighting or anything like that. I have officials who are experienced in that area, have been involved in it for twenty or thirty years, but, as I said in response to his initial question, I would be happy to take that matter under advisement and have some discussions with my officials. If it is determined that maybe something along those lines is necessary, then I am sure that this government, which has indicated in recent years, in particular, its commitment to protecting the forest resource, will be prepared to look at anything we can do to make sure that situation is improved in the future, if indeed the experts, my officials, tell me that that is something that would be reasonable and sensible.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister agree that just like war is too important to be left to the generals, there are many areas that are too important to be left to the experts? I would suggest to the minister that we are now talking about common sense. Granted, it has been hindsight. But let us not make sure we have to resort to hindsight after a disaster occurs in the community.

We have to keep in mind there are environmental and aesthetic considerations we cannot forget in terms that people like to have their trees around and so forth, but does common sense not indicate that right now the line is too finely drawn between where the forest stops and where the residential areas of our Province begin? Does common sense not indicate that with adequate fire breaks, because there were not hurricane winds involved, there were high winds in some of these areas - I was out in some of these areas and saw them myself - but there were not hurricane winds, there were not exceptional circumstances or they would be gone, so would common sense not indicate that whatever the experts say, the minister, as a politician, should get the experts out of their rut? If they are thinking complacency, get the experts out of their rut and force them to start thinking in terms of better fire breaks for some of these communities.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was very responsible in his first two questions and tried to be reasonable and rational. I would stake my common sense against the Leader of the Opposition's common sense any day of the week and any day of the year. I can only say to him what I said in response to the first two questions, that I will take a look at it, I will discuss it with my officials. Unlike him I do not necessarily think the experts or the officials are in a rut. I think that they are doing a very good job. They

are very well prepared. They know what they are doing. I have to rely on their expertise and advice. But in any event I said, in response to his first question and in response to his second question, and I will say it again in response to his third question, that I will take the matter under advisement and be happy to discuss it with my officials.

MR. BARRY:

Be forceful.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I will take my lead from the Leader of the Opposition in that regard.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands also. I was wondering if the minister could give us an indication as to the amount of valuable forest land that has been lost, as related to Crown land and as related to private land, as there are a number of enquiries coming in to us?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give an estimate just yet because we, quite frankly, are putting all our efforts into putting the fires out or fighting the fires. That is our number one priority. Obviously, at the appropriate time, the officials in the

department, the technicians, will be taking the inventory maps and checking to see what inventory in what particular area is actually productive forest area, what areas are not. A lot of the area that has been burned over is bog area, water bodies and things of that nature. I can tell him that the estimated area that has been burned over is about 400,000 acres. But in terms of what actually in that 400,000 acres is productive forest area, we really do not know at this stage. Quite frankly, we have not had time to do an estimate of that kind of damage at this stage.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the minister for his answer. I would also like to ask him if he or his department have any immediate plans, if they have started on any plans for the cleaning up of the situation? Also, as to the reforestation of the whole thing, which is definitely needed if a lot of land that has been destroyed is related to our industries, do they have any plans to maybe look for more money from the Feds, as a kind of emergency programme in that sense? Are they working on that now?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

I was thinking about the F.E.S.P. Programme. Mr. Speaker, there is

one very important point here that seems to have been lost in all of this. Let us not forget that these forest fires in Central Newfoundland are not yet out, so I mean it is very difficult to go in and start cleaning them up when they have not been declared out. It may be weeks or months before they are declared out or under control. That is quite possible.

The 1961 fires, as a matter of fact, burned all Winter long. It was the following Spring when a certain number of hot spots flared up and they were the results of the big fire of 1961, the year before. So, I mean, we can hardly go in, make plans to move things out and everything like that, start tearing things out if the fires are not yet under control. So it may be a moot point but it is an important point that members should want to recall and remember.

But in terms of trying to access funding or programmes or plans for silviculture, the hon. member is well aware that in fact the policy of this government has been, as a result of the largest forestry agreement we have ever signed in our history in recent weeks, to put more money than ever into silviculture. Generally speaking, \$28 million out of that \$48 million is going into silviculture activities. We are also making representations, and have made representations, both the Premier and myself, to federal officials, Mr. Crosbie and others, to access funding for a special silviculture programme, to somehow replace that F.E.S.P. Programme, if you want, in high unemployment areas. In addition to that, I have asked my officials to communicate with the federal government to see if in fact the comments of the last day or so

about emergency funding being available is in fact accurate, and if in fact those funds could be accessed for reforestation programmes or anything. We are already on top of that, we are making representations, and if there are funds available there we have indicated to them we want some of them.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
I have also a question for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. Can he at this point indicate, even in a preliminary way, what kind of cost has been involved out of the public treasury to combat these fires? Also, can he indicate whether he has ruled out the possibility of seeking federal funding to help underwrite that cost?

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, to put it in perspective, I should indicate to the hon. member that last year we budgeted about \$3.7 million for fire suppression; those are funds budgeted in my department for the salaries and all the rest of the administrative costs, and funds voted in the Department of Transportation which looks after the Air Services aspect of it. So we budgeted \$3.7 million and we spent \$4.5 million last year, so we spent nearly \$1 million more than we had budgeted. This year we have budgeted in both departments a little over \$4

million for forest fire suppression. I would estimate that expenditure will increase a significant amount, but we really have no idea at this point in time exactly how much those monies will increase. But I am quite confident, quite certain they will increase.

The other aspect was whether or not we will try to access any funds from the federal government. Yes, as I sort of indicated to the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), we will try to access any funds that may be available, although I do not know the emergency programme that the federal spokesmen were talking about really would apply to silviculture or whatever. But, in any event, I have instructed my officials to make some enquiries, to follow up on these comments that we have heard in the last day or two, and if there is anything there we are certainly going to go after it.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

I wonder does the minister know if any of the independent contractors or private citizens in the Bay d'Espoir area have suffered a loss as a result of the current forest fire? And if so, does his department intend to get help to get those companies back in business?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware, not only in the Bay d'Espoir area but in other areas of the Province as a result of fires, as I indicated in my statement today and on other occasions, there has been some loss of private property. I am aware in the Bay d'Espoir area, as a result of reading something in The Evening Telegram this afternoon, that there was some contractor who apparently lost a \$12,000 outfitter's cabin or something along those lines.

MR. DAWE:

There were cabins burned.

MR. SIMMS:

There were sixteen cabins lost in the Badger Lake area, there were eight or nine over on the West Coast, in the McDougalls area, three or four up in Labrador, three or four, I gather, down in the Bay d'Espoir area, but I can only answer him generally at this point in time.

His question was whether or not we are going to help them. Well, first of all, I have not had any request for any assistance. Presumably most of these people I am aware of had their cabins and whatever insured.

MR. GILBERT:

I am talking about businesses.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, the answer is, no, I have not been made aware of anything. Nobody has made any request to me.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Not unrelated to the earlier questions, and because of the importance to us all, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) in this regard and ask her, in view of the recent forest fire situation and the potential for a really hard Summer in that regard, what recent steps have you taken, as the minister responsible for considering Emergency Measures, to ensure that adequate Emergency Measures' plans, such as evacuation and so on, are in place?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the whole idea of the Emergency Measures Division of the Department of Justice is to anticipate possible disasters and emergencies and map out contingency plans so that in the event of a forest fire, such as the one that occurred last Summer in the North West River-Goose Bay area, a plan of action is put in place involving the local authorities as well as the provincial Director of Emergency Measures. Similarly, the Director of Emergency Measures monitored the forest fire situation throughout the Province in recent days and was involved in dealing with these various threats not only to public property but private property, and in some cases to lives.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I am pleased that the minister made reference to a particular situation in Labrador last Summer

because that prompts my supplementary. The minister is aware, of course, that in certain areas of this Province evacuation is virtually impossible, and the area she talked about, Lake Melville, is one of them. I should say Upper Lake Melville area as opposed to the Naskaupi District. She must be aware that evacuation from there would be extremely difficult if not virtually impossible. So I wonder what has she done as a minister to come up with a plan to solve that? How do you overcome the fact that you virtually cannot evacuate the Upper Lake Melville area in the event of a major forest fire?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the Director of Emergency Measures, in dealing with the forest fire threat to Goose Bay, Sheshatshit and Northwest River last Summer, worked with the municipalities of the area and local authorities to make contingency plans for evacuating the population. Of course, these authorities have to deal with certain geographic realities and in that particular case two means of removing people that were considered, but thankfully because of a favourable change in the weather were not necessary then were airlifting people from the Goose Air Base and also removing people by water. Those are contingency plans that were developed for that particular area which, as the member points out, is not an easy one from which to evacuate people. Nevertheless, where there are two definite possibilities, airlifting and removing by water.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Is the minister telling the House that you can call upon enough water traffic and enough air traffic to move 7,000 or 8,000 people on short notice?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, we are talking about Goose Air Base which has large cargo aircraft in place which may be accessed and the facilities there used. But what I said in my earlier answer, which I think has to underlie planning for any kind of contingency, is that there are constraints, there are geographic problems, there are peculiar circumstances there. There may be other kinds of problems in another area of the Province. That area is blessed in having the Goose Air Base.

MR. KELLAND:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Is the minister aware that there are not that many large transport aircraft stationed in Goose Bay? Now, mind you, we have a fine, large airport facility on which a lot of CSAs or whatever else you require to airlift 7,000 or 8,000 people, could land and take off, but is the minister aware that there are not that many aircraft there, nor are there that many ships available to come in to the

port? You know, the biggest ship that goes in there is the Sir Robert Bond. Now, I am sure that the minister does not mean to imply that at the drop of a hat she can have that many aircraft and that many ships available to evacuate 7,000 or 8,000 people.

I would also like to ask, as a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, Has the minister given consideration to the needs of senior citizens and other disadvantaged people who are not in a position to look after themselves in the event of evacuation or a major disaster such as a forest fire? What sorts of plans will be put in place to make sure that these are looked after?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, priority is always given in this kind of planning to the needs of the elderly and the handicapped, and that was seen in the response action taken in Central Newfoundland and Lewisporte this week past. When it comes to the particular Lake Melville area situation, if the member for Naskaupi is genuinely concerned and would like to meet with the Emergency Measures staff to go into the particulars of planning for various contingencies there, my door is open and the door of our Director of Emergency Measures is open. Why do we not arrange a meeting in the short-term to talk about that particular situation? But I can tell the member, and I expect he knows this already, that last Summer, when there was an emergency resulting from a forest fire in the Lake Melville area, our Director of Emergency Measures, the mayor and

councillors of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, as well as other local leaders, the police and the military, all co-operated very satisfactorily, and the best brains and the best resources of the area were marshalled in a very short time to work out the best possible plans for evacuating people, if there had been a need to remove people from that area.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
Is the minister aware that one of the suggestions that emanated from all these meetings - and I should point out the fact that I was mayor of the town when the first Emergency Measures' plan was put into effect, and it is an ongoing thing, a thing I am deeply interested in - for evacuating the Lake Melville area was to transport people by road up to Churchill Falls? Does she realize the major disaster that that in itself could cause?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, if the member, as mayor of Happy Valley - Goose Bay a few years back, was involved in preparing the emergency plan for that area, why did he ask me questions to which he knew the answers?

MR. KELLAND:
Because I am now a member and you are the minister.

MS VERGE:
Obviously the member is simply

posturing and trying to score a few political Brownie points. Mr. Speaker, matters such as Emergency Measures and planning for forest fire and other nature emergencies, are not, I suggest, subjects for political grandstanding. If the member has some practical suggestions or advice to offer for improving the emergency plan for Happy Valley - Goose Bay, I now invite the member to meet with me and the Director of Emergency Measures so that we can have a constructive conversation about improving the plan.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That was a final supplementary.

MR. KELLAND:
A new question, Mr Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are talking about an ongoing problem, Minister, we are talking about an ongoing problem. The fact that I was mayor some time ago and was deeply involved with Emergency Measures planning is fine, but it is an ongoing concern. So I would like to ask the minister why is she getting up tight on this question right now? This is an ongoing problem., I am concerned about the people in Naskaupi district and, in fact, all the Province from now on. You know, a fire that may occur tomorrow, not something that happened two years ago when I was last mayor when some of the suggestions made by your Emergency Measures people at that time were certainly inadequate to the

situation.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 129.

"171 A question oral or written must not:

"(c) multiply, with slight variations, a similar question on the same point.

"(d) repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused."

It goes on to say on page 132, "359 (1) It must be a question, not an expression of an opinion, representation, argumentation, nor debate."

Now, look, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has asked these questions that have been answered quite adequately by the minister, and I suggest that if the hon. gentlemen there opposite have no better line of questions to ask than they have and have not got more complete preparation for Question Period, then we proceed with the business of the day.

MR. KELLAND:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, I have now read from the comments by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that he would rather come up with a Beauchesne interpretation of his own that would attempt to stifle a genuine concern that I share, and one surely every member of the House of Assembly shares, on the safety of life and property in our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

I think to try and stop legitimate questions by quoting or misquoting or misinterpreting what he sees as the rules of order is a terrible thing.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now we see the hon. member for Naskaupi in his true colours. As the hon. minister just mentioned, he is grand-standing because now, in responding to a point of order, he is trying to use the threat of fires in Happy Valley - Goose Bay to override Beauchesne and the rules of this House. Nobody in their right mind is going to get up here in this House and suddenly try to chastise the government for bringing up a legitimate point of order because of a potential fire threat somewhere in the Province and how awful this would be. It is terrible for the Government House Leader to get up, Mr. Speaker, and somehow diminish the threat of fire in Happy Valley - Goose Bay on the back of Beauchesne! I mean, this is

terrible of the Government House Leader to do the like of this, Mr. Speaker!

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there have been a series of questions placed here today and I would suggest that the Premier and the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) could get some guidance from the very responsible, I think by and large, approach taken by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We are not saying that anybody is infallible or omniscient in terms of being able to look into the future and predict so that everything is covered. What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we can learn from problems of the past. The minister even might be able to learn from problems of the past. What the member for Naskaupi has done, in standing in his place, is suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are very real lessons which can be learned for the entire Province -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What has that got to do with the point of order?

MR. BARRY:

If the Premier would stop interrupting out of order, I would deal with that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

What the member for Naskaupi has tried to do is say that we can learn, he can learn, the minister can learn, all members can learn, the public can learn, the fire-fighters can learn, the fire bosses can learn and the Emergency Measures Organization can learn from the lessons of the past.

When the member gets up with concern for life and safety and has a minister of the Crown, who has been derelict in so many areas, accuse him of political grandstanding, let the minister have it on her head if she does not listen now to what this member is saying in a responsible fashion and do some planning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

If there is any political grandstanding that has gone on here today it is over there in that corner, Mr. Speaker, and it is wearing a purple dress. That is the political grandstanding that is going on.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

We will ignore the hon. gentleman's sexist remarks for the moment, Mr. Speaker. I just want to refer you again to what I was

quoting from Beauchesne, and I will also quote from Beauchesne again with respect to the whole Question Period, page 133, 362, "Reading telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers as an opening to an oral question is abusive of the rules of the House." Now get this, Mr. Speaker, "It is not good parliamentary practice to communicate written allegations to the House." Now what has happened with the whole Question Period is that they are completely devoid of leadership, completely lack-lustre! Rex has written their questions and you notice they get answers but they keep coming back. So, Mr. Speaker, this a complete abuse of the Question Period and the hon. gentleman's questions to the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) is indicative of that.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, I have heard sufficient to rule on that.

I recognized the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) on a new question. Now, from what I could judge his question was related to questions that he had asked earlier, but it is impossible for the Chair to determine exactly what it was, and I am satisfied that the hon. member was in order at the time.

The hon. member for Naskaupi has just about a minute left.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you.

I simply, in my new question, Mr. Speaker, ask the Minister of Justice why she was getting uptight about this particular

situation when it is a matter of concern for all of us and should be for her? I would be more than happy to meet with her and her officials to discuss it, or with the EMO people back home in Naskaupi district.

I deny the fact that I was posturing.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The hon. the member for Naskaupi got up and said he was asking a question of the minister about why she was getting uptight. Now, if that is the question for Question Period, I would like to know how. He then goes on to start making statements. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has already quoted Beauchesne extensively on the matter. Now the hon. member gets up and says, 'What I wanted to ask the Minister of Justice, is why was she was getting uptight?' Now if that is the question, sit down and let her answer why she is or is not getting uptight. If that is not the question, then why should the member be allowed to go on after asking that question to make a statement? That is against the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Simply, Mr. Speaker, now the member should change his question to why is the Premier getting uptight, when he is asking a question dealing with life and safety in this Province?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Easy. There are rules that have to be applied in this House, Mr. Speaker, and you cannot go using the potential of a fire in Happy Valley - Goose Bay to overrule both Beauchesne and the Standing Orders of this House.

MR. BARRY:

Beauchesne comes before live and safety?

MR. KELLAND:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

I would think, Mr. Premier, and other members of the House that any time the question of live is the issue that it would overrule virtually anything else that we could think of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman poses so sanctimoniously. The fact of the matter is he asked that question first off to the minister. The minister answered the question quite adequately right from the first. So that is not the point. The point is what the hon. gentlemen are doing shows they are devoid of any substance, they are led by a lackluster leader. They come into this House day after day with their questions written out and their responses written out, and they do not realize when they get an answer to the first that they got an answer, so they continue on asking questions on the answer that they have gotten. So they are questioning the answers, and are not even receiving the fact the questions have been answered.

So the fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman is completely out of order. We answer all of the questions on this side willingly. Why do not the member for Twillingate and the member for Bonavista North and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle today get up and ask questions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave, by leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. gentlemen have no questions to ask in this House. They do not know how to conduct the sessions. They are led by a lackluster leader and their questions are written by a person who could not get in

through the threshold of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

It is very curious, Mr. Speaker, how when members get up on this side and suggest, not criticize - nobody stood up and criticized the minister. We think the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), by and large, did his best and was out, Mr. Speaker, supervising.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We were not trying to make political hay, Mr. Speaker, on petty criticism of the minister or of his colleagues. What we have been trying to do is put forth constructive suggestions, Mr. Speaker, that should be listened to in planning for the future. But how is it that this becomes political grandstanding? Yet when the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not speaking to the point of order that was raised. It is a different matter.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. When the Premier and the President of Council (Mr.

Marshall) started to allege that there was a threat to life and safety because of the icebergs during Winter drilling, all of the sudden with a federal election, Mr. Speaker, and a change of government, all of a sudden the icebergs changed political colour as well, and that is the last we heard of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the suggestions by the member for Naskaupi were a lot more constructive than anything that came out of the President of Council or the Premier in that regard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not speaking, obviously, to the point of order. I think Your Honour would be better armed in this House with a tranquilizing gun that they use on four legged animals and shoot it at the Leader of the Opposition from time to time to tone him down. Because the fact of the matter is, and it burns him, that under his lacklustre leadership he has been unable to lead any attack in Question Period in this House against the government, as we have seen today, and he has to rely on Rexograms to bring into this particular House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The point of order raised by the hon. the Premier is well taken. As a matter of fact, I had, just before the Premier stood up, called the hon. member to order because he was beginning to make a speech.

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is Private Members' Day. I will call on the hon. member for Gander who adjourned the debate.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

How much time do I have?

MR. SPEAKER:

Seventeen minutes.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is good to see the Premier, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and those people over there getting up to leave. I suppose that they have no interest in what I am going to say.

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, presented by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), is one that I am certain has members opposite hurting and smarting. You could see it last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, during the debate. They are really hurting over this particular resolution. It is the kind of resolution that deep down I suspect none of them opposite can disagree with. Yet they have made up their minds to vote against it.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with my view of unemployment in relation to this resolution. The resolution starts off, "WHEREAS unemployment remains the number one problem affecting the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador." I wonder if members opposite actually realize how serious a problem it is because we hear about unemployment so often that we kind of get used to hearing unemployment figures thrown around.

There are some interesting figures that have come out lately, Mr. Speaker. I would like to try to deal with them in a particular way. First of all, it seems to me that it must be a fact that the work force in Newfoundland is somewhere between 215,000 and 220,000 people. That is the number that continually comes out in the unemployment figures and statistical notes that we continually get delivered to us.

For the month of March, they talk in terms of a labour force of 218,000 workers. It varies. It could go up 5,000 or 6,000 or down 5,000 or 6,000. Maybe 220,000 is a figure that can be accepted. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we are told that there have been in each of the last three months over 100,000 people registered for unemployment insurance in any given month. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that out of a total work force of a little over 200,000, over 100,000 during any month are actually looking for work, which means that at some time during the month they do not have work.

If we were to equate that, Mr. Speaker, with the total work force, we would find that, in actuality, between 45 and 50 per

cent of our work force is unemployed during any given month. This means that there are areas of the Province where it is a little less but there are areas of the Province where it is more, which means there are areas of this Province that month by month, every month, would have 50, 60, 70 per cent unemployment.

When the figures come out and they say that the unemployment rate in Newfoundland is 20 per cent or 24 per cent, as was stated in March, we tend to get a little complacent of that and say, 'Oh well, over three-quarters of the people are working,' when in actual fact that is not so.

The unemployment figures that we get with the percentages are done up in a particular way and if, for instance, I was working during the first week of March and not during the second and third weeks, I would not be considered as one of the unemployed during that month. Therefore, I would show up as one of the 75 per cent employed. That is the way it would show up.

Mr. Speaker, it is more sensible to look at it the other way. If, in fact, I am unemployed for most of the month, then I should be classed among the unemployed and not amongst the employed.

MR. J. CARTER:

We want to make you unemployed.

MR. BAKER:

The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) says that he wants to make me unemployed. I would like to inform him that there is no way anybody can make me unemployed. I would always have a job, I would inform the member for St. John's North, and it would be a wasted effort on his part to try

to make me unemployed at this particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is the unemployment problem in this Province is far worse than the figures seem to indicate. In any given month, in actual fact, 40 to 50 per cent of the work force of this Province are looking for a job, which means, as I say, that there are sections of the Province where there is far more than 50 per cent unemployment.

DR. COLLINS:

Do you know that teachers are unemployed three months of the year?

MR. BAKER:

Well, using the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) logic - let me, Mr. Speaker, use his logic for a moment - if on January 2nd or 3rd I was working, then why not carry it to its logical extreme and say that that means that during that year I was working, therefore, during that whole year I was not unemployed. Using the minister's logic in that sense, our unemployment rate would be down to 4 or 5 per cent, therefore we could go around boasting about how wonderful everything is, we have such a tremendously low unemployment rate. The minister could fiddle with the figures that way if he wanted to.

DR. COLLINS:

You can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink.

MR. BAKER:

I am just suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the official unemployment figures are figures that have been fiddled with. I am sure the Minister of Finance would like to fiddle even further and instead of

applying it to a one month period, he would love to apply it to a whole year and be able go around telling people we have full employment in this Province. Regardless of how the minister fiddles with it, the people of Newfoundland would not believe him, just like they do not believe now that our unemployment rate is 20 per cent. They do not believe that and they would not believe the other type of fiddling that I referred to either, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the Premier and others love to fiddle around with those figures and the fact that we have such a high unemployment rate is very helpful to them. Maybe that is why there has been nothing done about it in the last short while. It is very very helpful to them. For instance, we always hear members opposite, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the Premier and so on making the announcements about the jobs they have created. Every time there is a rise in the number of people employed in the Province then they say, 'We have created 4,000 or 5,000 jobs this month, are we not wonderful?' Do not forget the point I made a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that those jobs probably mean that somebody was employed for two or three days during the month, that is what they mean. Anyway, every time the number of employed goes up, 'Are we not wonderful? Have we not created all those jobs, how wonderful we are! People of the Province look at this, vote for us again.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, that can be fiddled with too and we can turn that around too. I could point out to the Minister of Finance, he loves figures, that during July of

1985 there was 208,000 jobs in this Province. During January of 1986 there was only 160,000. Now, that is a drop in six months of 48,000 people in this Province, a drop. Now, we could fiddle around with that and go around talking about the government and how they have destroyed 48,000 jobs in that six month period. What a nasty bunch of people, destroyed 48,000 jobs in six months. We could fiddle with figures as well, Mr. Speaker, but we would not do that.

Yet, on the other side, members opposite frequently and continuously during the six month period where it is growing talk about all these jobs they have created, while during the six month period when it is falling, they do not mention the drop in jobs or the jobs that they, using their own logic, have destroyed. If they created the jobs on the upturn, when the downturn comes, obviously they must have destroyed the jobs. Mr. Speaker, we do not hear any talk about members opposite destroying jobs and doing away with 40,000 or 50,000 jobs in a six month period. So figures can be fiddled with. We see a lot of fiddling with figures.

I would suggest that the impression that the people of this Province have concerning the unemployment rate in this Province is a lot more accurate than the official figures that come out from the federal government. In actual fact, we have a much more serious unemployment problem in this Province than members opposite would like to think.

What else does the resolution say, Mr. Speaker? It says, "Whereas certain areas in the Province were more deeply afflicted by the

problem of unemployment than the Province in general," that is fact. As a matter of fact, the Central Northeast region, I think, last month was the most seriously affected region of the Province in terms of unemployment.

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House deplores government's business as usual approach to critically high unemployment." Now maybe that is the one little thing in this resolution that members opposite cannot agree to. However, I would like to skip over that and get to the positive and creative suggestions.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that government, upon identification of these areas of Newfoundland and Labrador most seriously ravaged by unemployment, proceed to the designation of these areas as reduced tax zones for the purpose of providing extraordinary economic stimulus where it is most needed."

Now the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), when he finishes his conversation, I know that obviously he is concerned with these resolutions that talk about reduced taxes. The Minister of Finance is obviously very concerned about any mention of reduced taxes. The reason is that he talks about taxes in the sense that some taxes are better than others. He talks about taxes in terms of being good in that there is a good tax, there is a better tax and there is a best tax. That is the way he talks about taxes.

He laughs at suggestions like this from the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and says, "We cannot do that." I would like to remind the Minister of Finance of something. I hope that at least

he has one of his ears open. Other areas of Canada and other provinces in Canada have chosen this method to create jobs - tax reduction.

The Province of Quebec, for instance, has what it calls investment tax credits where over the past few years they have allowed entrepreneurs who have some spare money lying around, if they would put that money to use in the Province of Quebec, then they get a tax write-off. As a matter of fact, there are instances, depending on the area where they put this money, where the tax write-off is 150 per cent of the amount of money invested. In other words, it is an extreme stimulus to get entrepreneurs to take their money and to put it to work in the Province. Now, this applies in the Province of Quebec to the buying of stock even. If you buy stock in a Quebec company, it is income tax deductible. As long as you keep that money there for two years, when you take it out again, you do not have to pay taxes on it. It is better than the RRSPs, the same kind of idea but better because when you take it out again, as long as it is in there for two years, you do not have to pay taxes on it or any profit you make from it.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are areas of this country that have used the principle of tax reductions or tax credits, whatever you want to call them, to stimulate the economy in areas that need it. Unless members opposite think, 'Well, we do not want to go along with the Province of Quebec', I would like to point out one thing: That particular programme in the province of Quebec is credited over the two year period after businesses started to move out of

Quebec - we all remember the referendum and so on, after that - in that two year period it is credited with putting into circulation in the province of Quebec an extra \$4 billion, that tax credit alone. It tended to save the economy of Quebec and give it the boost it needed to bring it up.

Unless members opposite think this is only Quebec, I would like to point out to them there are seven provinces in this country that have the same kind of reduced tax zones, whatever you want to call it, to varying degrees. Not all of them would give 150 per cent tax reduction, some would give 40 per cent and some 60 per cent but seven provinces have used this idea in varying degrees to stimulate areas of their province that need the economic stimulation.

We suggest it here and members opposite, one after the other, get up and laugh at it and say, 'We cannot do that. Where would we raise the extra money?' They do not understand the economics of it, obviously. We have seven other Finance Ministers who appreciate the logic of it and we have our one Finance Minister here who does not see the sense of it.

I know I only have four or five minutes left, however, this resolution also asks for initiatives that are innovative, aggressive and original. My goodness, who can disagree with that? After what we have seen in this Province, who can disagree with that? What we have seen are initiatives that are whatever the opposite of innovative is, that is what the initiatives have been. You cannot even call them initiatives because when you call

them initiatives you automatically think of some progressive action that is taken. What we see are continual attempts by this government to stop erosion, that is all.

They are like the little Dutch boy, they see a leak here and put a finger in, a leak over here and they put another finger in. All they are doing is fighting a rear guard action to try to preserve the status quo and, Mr. Speaker, they are not even successful at that. At this point in time, Mr. Speaker, they have run out of fingers to put in the holes in the dike and they have run out of toes. They may have a few noses left and some members opposite perhaps are better endowed than others in than regard. They have a few noses left.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has run out of time.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ten seconds, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. BAKER:

But, that is why it is absolutely crucial right now that we stop this rear guard action and that we actually come up with some ideas to create jobs, which they are totally lacking. I would suggest, as a final statement, Mr. Speaker, that designating areas as tax reduced zones would be a very positive step in the direction of creating jobs where they are most needed in the Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, rather than debate with the member for Gander who just took his seat, I would like to challenge him to bring in some proof of this \$4 billion that was suppose to have found its way into the Province of Quebec because of an enlightened tax measure. If he has any supporting evidence or if he has any documentation that can support this claim, I think he has an obligation to bring it into this House or at least bring it to the attention of the Finance Minister or the attention of the administration. I will not debate that with him. I will just issue the challenge and say he either should apologize to this House for misleading it or else he should bring in the documentation and lay it on the table or give it over to the proper people who can make use of it. So I will just leave it at that.

I think this resolution is sleazy and slippery. I think it is a bad resolution for a number of reasons, and in the next few minutes I will try to outline my reasons.

MR. FUREY:

So you are against it, are you?

MR. BAKER:

You have said that about every resolution that has come up.

MR. J. CARTER:

I know and I am absolutely certain that the members over there sat down in some dank hole and plotted together a resolution that we would have to vote against and yet, by voting against it, we would appear to be as backward and as right wing as it is possible for us to be. In other words, they wanted to put us into the position of having to vote for, if not an increase in taxes, certainly the maintenance of existing taxes.

Well, I do not think it is going to work. I do not think any one in their right mind is going to allow the clever use of language that is in this resolution to fool them. I do not think it is going to fool anyone. It is designed, I believe, to put government in a bad light. This was the purpose of it. It has no other purpose. It is tragic, Mr. Speaker, it is just tragic, the debate in this House. We can have a little bit of partisan fun, but when serious debate in this House has been reduced to the level of trying to put one another in a bad light, then I think the people of Newfoundland are being short-changed. I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) should be ashamed of himself for putting them up to it, because I see his final Italian hand in the language and phraseology of this particular resolution. He should hang his head in shame.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is such a dynamic speech that I think there should be more members here. I would like to call a quorum?

MR. SPEAKER:
Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
There is a quorum.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, may I perhaps move the adoption of the entire Order Paper?

In the absence of the Opposition, perhaps we could move the adoption of the entire Order Paper. It might save a lot of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Carried, carried!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay, nay!

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Opposition, -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:
- we have just unofficially passed all the items on the Order Paper. Now perhaps the House, after today's sitting, can relax for the Summer. I see no objection opposite. I will defer later on to the House Leader and perhaps he will give us a further discussion on it.

I was saying, when I was so rudely interrupted, that the Leader of

the Opposition should hang his head in shame because I see his fine Italian hand in the construction of this almost diabolical resolution. To suggest that we should Balkanize the Province of Newfoundland or the country of Canada further! Already we are suffering from interprovincial smuggling because of the difference in the tax rates. There are no borders between provinces in Canada, and traffic can move back and forth quite freely. If, for instance, gasoline or cigarettes are even a few cents different from one province to another, then you are going to get people moving from one province to buy their goods in another province and then come back across the unregulated border. The only response to that is to have the taxation in the various provinces as nearly equal as possible. I would suggest that this is one of the arguments that will be being used in the discussions on free trade now taking place in Ottawa.

I think that, since Canada and the United States have the largest and longest undefended border in the whole World and since travel between these two countries is merely a formality - the customs very seldom crack down on you - and if goods are significantly cheaper in the States than they are in Canada, or vice versa, then, whether we like it or not, the buying public are going to buy where the goods are cheapest. To suggest that certain areas of Newfoundland should have a lesser tax of any kind than another area is to make it possible for people to move from one part of the Island to the other just to do their shopping.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, if the sales

tax were significantly lower in one community than in another! All the shops in the community where the sales tax was highest would just have to close up. Instead of increasing employment, this measure, if adopted in its present form, would produce the most rip-roaring unemployment that this Province has ever seen, along with extraordinary economic dislocation. So, in addition to being a sleazy and foolish resolution, it is also a very pernicious one. I do not think it can stand examination in the light of day.

There is no doubt about it, nobody likes taxes. We would like to do away with all taxes, if possible, but that is not possible, unfortunately. We have to provide some services so we have to have taxes. Let us hope that they are not raised any more. Let us try and hold the line at least and let us hope that we can look forward to a general reduction in taxes sometime in the not too distant future. To suggest that we just reduce taxes here and there as an economic measure is absolutely lunacy and cannot be defended at all.

Now, the events of the last week have pointed out, I think, some weaknesses in our forestry policy in that if we are going to have a dry Summer, as dry as the Spring has been so far, then we may see a lot more destruction of our forest resource.

I would wish that we start sometime in the near future to re-examine our forestry policy and to perhaps make public land more available to the private sector. I think if people owned more of their own land, if the forests in Newfoundland were more privately

owned, or to put it another way, if more of the forests in Newfoundland were privately owned, as they are in neighboring Nova Scotia and, to some extent, in New Brunswick, then I think they would be more carefully looked after. I think the danger from fire might be lessened and certainly the damage from fire would be lessened because the forests would be more carefully maintained. As far as I am concerned, that is axiomatic. I believe this firmly and again I make an appeal to the administration to very seriously consider making more public forest land available to the private sector.

MR. FUREY:

Frame a resolution.

MR. J. CARTER:

I might indeed. The member over there says I should frame a resolution. Well, I was slow off the mark. I do not have a resolution on the Order Paper and I do not think we will get through all the resolutions that are here. It might be a good idea for another time to put such a resolution on the Order Paper and I may do just that.

Now, the unfortunate thing about Canada is that although there is a tremendous amount of tax money available and although the Canadian budget is enormous, still, because of our social policy, it is not possible to bring in a negative income tax. I think if all the social capital were spent in bringing in a negative income tax or a guaranteed annual income, then a lot of our economic problems would evaporate. Now, unfortunately, doing such a thing would be incredibly complex and it would rely, to a large extent, on

sensible debate, and I know it is too much to expect that we get sensible debate from the Opposition in this House. All we get are clever little resolutions designed to put egg on our faces and to embarrass us, but, as for serious debate, forget it. It is too bad! Yet, this is the very Opposition whose government, when they were in government, caused or allowed to happen that frightful situation of Churchill Falls, that \$800 million blunder.

MR. FUREY:

That was decades ago.

MR. J. CARTER:

It was a long time ago, but it is still in effect and the present members over there, the inheritors of the Liberal tradition, have not repudiated that gross and grave mistake. Now, I realize that when the contract was first entered into no one could foresee the tremendous twenty-fold increase in the price of oil but, at the same time, there was no need to enter into a seventy-two year contract, one that is going to be very, very hard for us to get out of.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), when he was Minister of Mines and Energy, was well aware of the inadequacies of that contract, and the least he could have done when he crossed the House was to have got the present Liberal Party at least to repudiate - they could not repudiate the contract effectively, but they could repudiate any future Liberal involvement or any defence of that contract. I have yet to hear a word from the Liberal Party opposite to suggest that that contract is anything but firm and good, and I think this is the most treasonable attitude possible.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A 'treasonable attitude' is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think a treasonable attitude is exactly what it is and unless I am instructed specifically by the Speaker to withdraw it, I will not only confirm it but I will repeat it.

MR. BARRY:

It is unparliamentary.

MR. J. CARTER:

A treasonable attitude, Mr. Speaker, that is what I said. In relation to the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party, I said their attitude is treasonable. Now, if it is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it, but until it has been shown to me and I have been instructed to withdraw it, I will hold to it.

MR. BARRY:

Is the member going to withdraw it or is he not?

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order?

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes, to that point of order, Mr. Speaker. A treasonable attitude, I think, is a valid debating remark. If I am asked to withdraw it, I suppose I will have to, obviously, I am in the Chair's hands. But until I am specifically asked to withdraw it, I will not.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is saying it, obviously, Mr. Speaker, in the

sense that it is well known by everybody that the Opposition is not acting in the best interests of the Province of Newfoundland. I am sure that is what the gentleman means and he means it in that particular context, which I think is quite evident to everybody.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary, the choice of language. Quite frankly, if I stood in my place and called the Premier a terrible liar or the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) a terrible liar, that would be unparliamentary just as treasonable is clearly unparliamentary, and we ask, Mr. Speaker, that you ask him to rise in his seven foot place and withdraw that.

MR. J. CARTER:

Further to that point of order. A little more argument, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, what I said was that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the Liberal Party have shown a treasonable attitude in their attitude towards the Churchill Falls contract. Now, I am not suggesting that they are traitors, I am not suggesting that they are subversives.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, come on! Clearly it is unparliamentary. He is making an ass of himself.

MR. J. CARTER:

I am saying that their attitude is treasonable. Now it is perhaps a nice point. It is perhaps verging on the insulting. But I think it is a legitimate debating tool, because I do not know how else to deplore their attitude sufficiently. If Your Honour would like to take it under advisement, certainly I will be in Your Honour's hands at any time in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I would ask the hon. the member for St. John's North to please withdraw the unparliamentary language.

MR. J. CARTER:

Very well, Mr. Speaker. If you ask me to withdraw it, I do. I am sorry that the attitude -

MR. BARRY:

Do not question the Speaker now.

MR. J. CARTER:

I am not questioning the Speaker. I am saying that I am sorry that members opposite are taking the tack, because it is at their insistence that Your Honour is asking me to withdraw. But I do withdraw it and I will try and rephrase my remarks in a more acceptable fashion.

However, I do await with interest whoever is getting up next. I would be very interested to hear any remarks that he could make that would defend the Churchill Falls contract in any way, shape or form. I would listen with all

ears. He would have my most rapt attention.

MR. FUREY:

There is no way for you to defend the last thirteen years of Tory government, the hardship and poverty and unemployment.

MR. J. CARTER:

I do not think that is worthy of a reply. The hon. gentleman is just trying to throw curve balls. I think my time is nearly up, and if the member who wishes to succeed me would like to start off trying to defend the Liberal policy as exemplified in the Churchill Falls contract, he will get my absolute attention.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, it is always nice to speak after the member for St. John's North because just standing up sort of counterbalances a lot of his arguments, because he really does not say too much. I think that if we were to talk about the resolution so ably put forward by my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), we would have to put the member for St. John's North down as at least questionable when it comes to voting for it.

It is nice to hear the member get up and once again refer to the Churchill Falls agreement that was entered into back some years ago, before most of us here were involved in politics. There is

only one member left in the House, and I think he is on that side, who voted for it - maybe two.

In defence of the Churchill Falls agreement I would say that the government of the time thought they were acting in the best interests of Newfoundland when they signed the agreement. I am sure the two members opposite who voted, the two members who are still here, who were in Opposition, who took part in that unanimous vote, felt it was in the best interests of Newfoundland.

If we get the Atlantic Accord legislation brought in and we get a chance to debate it, I hope that in fifteen years time, after we have been over there for fifteen years, we will not keep reminding members opposite of the mess they made of the Atlantic Accord by not signing it in 1979, when they should have. I think we will do better than that, because we will improve on it over the fifteen years instead of talking about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution put forward by my colleague for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) says, "WHEREAS unemployment remains the number one problem affecting the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador." I find it awfully hard that anyone could say that this is not a serious problem.

"AND WHEREAS it is every day more apparent that the problem requires as part of a total solution initiatives that are innovative, aggressive and original;

AND WHEREAS certain areas of the Province are much more deeply affected by the problem of unemployment that the Province in general;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House deplores government's business as usual approach to critically high unemployment;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government, upon identification of those areas of Newfoundland and Labrador most seriously ravaged by unemployment, proceed to the designation of those areas as reduced tax zones, for the purpose of providing extra ordinary economic stimulus where it is most needed;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that government, as a means of direct stimulus to the provincial economy, and as an encouragement to small business in the creation of jobs, immediately move the reduction of provincial sales tax."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I find it almost unbelievable that any members could get up and be against this resolution. The member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) got up last Wednesday afternoon and his defence was that he did not have a defence; he defended the job strategy programme that was put forward by the federal government last year and, as everybody here in this House is aware, it is not working in rural Newfoundland. One of the most important whereases in this and the one that the government certainly has not paid any attention to, is where certain areas of the Province are much more deeply affected by the problem of unemployment than the Province in general. But the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) got up and he praised the programme that everybody in Newfoundland knows is not working in rural Newfoundland.

Then we heard the member for

Carbonear (Mr. Peach) stand up and defend his stand for voting against this very fine resolution put forward by my colleague for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and he talked about resolutions in general that had been put forward by members opposite. For instance, he was critical of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and his resolution on labour relations in this Province; he talked about the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) bringing one forward on fishermen's unemployment insurance, which he was critical of, and he claimed that we were putting forward resolutions that were politically catchy.

Now, I do not think that labour relations in this Province or unemployment insurance for fishermen are politically catchy items. I feel they are very important items in the Province of Newfoundland, and I am sure the people who are out there living in the real world in Newfoundland instead of in this House of Assembly are quite aware that there is a problem in labour relations and there is a problem with unemployment insurance for fishermen.

He was also critical of the resolution that I had for them, as critic for Municipal Affairs, about a Municipal Financing Corporation being set up to ensure that provision of services to communities in Newfoundland are made on a priority basis and not on a political pork barrelling basis. We saw an example of that in this House today when I tried to respond to a statement from the minister and we saw the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) become very upset, because I was questioning the way this list was proposed and put forward, and he

claimed it was a debate that we were getting into. Let the minister read it off and we just stand up and slavishly accept what the minister said. We were not allowed to question the method the minister had taken in providing this list. That, to me, seems to be the type of thing this government has become involved in since the government took over in Ottawa in September, 1984, the federal Tories tell them what to do and they sit and accept it. This is the type of debate that the Government House Leader wants us to take part in as far as his list from the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is concerned.

Now, we have heard on Private Members' Day since the House opened, besides a few very good ones from members on this side, the member for Humber West's (Mr. Baird) resolution on the Nielsen Report, and when we tried to strengthen that, tried to beef it up a bit, all of a sudden it was not strong enough and members opposite could not support it. They could support the weak, wishy-washy one that was originally put forward on the Nielsen Report, but when we were really going to beef it up, no they could not support it.

I looked through the resolutions that have been put forward and the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) has a resolution going through which says, "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Honourable House go on record and commend the Provincial Government for its efforts in protecting and promoting the viability of this vital resource sector." The vital resource that he is talking about is the fishery. Now, what else would you expect the provincial

government to do but protect a vital resource like the fishery, the number one employer in Newfoundland? I think the member for Carbonear saw the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) bring in a resolution on the fishery last year, and it seems that maybe he has gotten a little closer to the Premier because of that, and this is why he thought it would be good to come out with a question on fishery policy. This might be the reason the member for Carbonear did it, he is trying to work his way into Cabinet. I do not think it is going to happen, now mind you.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, one of the most important whereases in this resolution put forward by my colleague has to do with certain areas of the Province having a higher unemployment than other areas of the Province.

Now, I happen to be fortunate enough to represent a district that has employment. On the Western end of the district they are the envy of most of the Province, in the communities of Burgeo and Ramea. Even the coastal communities of Grey River, Francois and McCallum have a better rate of employment than many places on the Island. But I happen to also represent the area of the Province that has the worst unemployment rate in Newfoundland, somewhere in the vicinity of 90 to 95 per cent. This is not a new thing that has happened, Mr. Speaker. The employment history of Bay d'Espoir is very simple. Bay d'Espoir was settled originally by people who made their living from the woods surrounding it. They operated small sawmills. As a boy growing up in Placentia Bay, I can remember that the spars for the

boats and the plank for the boats came from Bay d'Espoir. There were sawmills there that operated and supported a very viable industry. And, as I understand it, they also supplied lumber to St. Pierre and along the South Coast. This was their way of life. They were not fishermen, the people in Bay d'Espoir, they made their living from the hills around the sawmills, they sawed logs.

During the mid-1940s, there was a transition in the Bay d'Espoir area. Bowater came in and provided the first hope of steady employment for the people of Bay d'Espoir and they were then going to have a way of life that would give them equality with the rest of the people in Newfoundland. Alas! that was not to be, Mr. Speaker. Because between the mid-1950s and the early 1960s, Bowater phased out their operation meaning, once again, the people of Bay d'Espoir were tossed out to find out how they were going to make a living. There were attempts made at establishing a sawmill industry, then the big hope came when the previous government, the Liberal Government just referred to by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), and the Churchill Falls - it is strange that there is never any mention made of the hydro development in Bay d'Espoir. This was also a Liberal project, Mr. Speaker, and it supplies 42 per cent of the hydro for Newfoundland right now, the cheapest hydro, I might add, that is coming from anywhere in Newfoundland. This was put in Bay d'Espoir with the understanding that it was going to create employment in this area that had, continuously down through history, a very high rate of unemployment.

Again there were studies done on the area which showed that there was indeed a very serious need for a development, and there was a report done by Project Planners of Toronto, in 1965, which was called the Bay d'Espoir Area Development Study. This study, Mr. Speaker, pointed out the serious problems that were in the Bay d'Espoir area, and by that I mean St. Alban's, Milltown, Morrisville, Conne River, St. Joseph's and St. Veronica's.

There are some interesting statistics here that turned up in this 1965 report, and now we look at them in 1986. First of all, the recommendations of the 1965 Development Study were, (1) increased employment opportunities and income for everybody in the Bay d'Espoir area; (2) equality of employment opportunities and per capita income level in all parts of the Province. In other words, give the area of Bay d'Espoir a per capita income the same as the people enjoyed in St. John's, instead of the inequality which now exist between cities and rural areas of Newfoundland, you know, create an equality.

It is interesting to note that at the time the survey was done they were talking about a population of 3,700 people who lived in those communities I just named. I think the current census figures give somewhere around 4,100 to 4,200, approximately, as the number of people who are living in this area right now. They had a work force in 1965, they say, of 1,200. The work force today is 1,700. They said there were about 300 people out of that work force involved in the service sector, working with the government, teachers and business, today there are about 350 to 400 people working in the

service sector, teachers and business people.

We are talking about the number of people who were actually working. But we find that unemployment then was extremely high, something like 70 per cent to 80 per cent. Today it is even higher. The latest figures I had from Canada Manpower for that area showed that there were somewhere in the vicinity of 1,400 people drawing unemployment or registered for unemployment.

There are approximately 200 family members, or families drawing some type of social services. We just heard the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) announce that he had signed a Forestry Agreement. I have been talking in this House for the last two to three months about 120 people who were involved as part-time workers with the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, but in the Forestry Agreement which the minister just signed, he was unable to conclude a F.E.S.P. agreement, so I was told by the Premier that those people should apply under CEIC, that groups from the community should apply.

I received a letter from the Premier yesterday which stated that there was one project already approved for down there, one project employing ten people, Mr. Speaker, and that, I do not think, is good enough for those people who have been downtrodden and have suffered the pangs of serious unemployment, the crime of serious unemployment all through their history.

Then we get the current members opposite saying that there is no problem, all the groups have to do is apply, there is lots of money

in CEIC. I asked the minister to provide a list. I was referred to his Deputy Minister and his Deputy Minister referred me to the Chief Forester down in Bay d' Espoir and, from what I can understand, they are not aware of any projects that have been approved by his department for CEIC. I am sure the minister will be making projects available down there, because it is not his intention to try and starve those people who were put out of work because he was unable to conclude a proper forestry agreement with Ottawa.

In the twenty years since this development study was done, what progress has been made in Bay d' Espoir? Members opposite have been in power for fifteen of that twenty years, so they must take some responsibility for the serious unemployment problem in the Bay d' Espoir area.

The development plan talked about some great plans for Bay d' Espoir, and one of them was brought up in my discussions with the committee that was formed to try to do something for the Bay, a very public spirited committee. They have talked about one of the recommendations in that report, and that was that the Bay d' Espoir area be made into a deep water port to be able to handle shipments from Grand Falls, be able to handle the tourism industry, and maybe have CN come in there. The one asset that the Bay d' Espoir area has that does not require too much development, the natural infrastructure is there, there is a tourist industry that we could very easily establish and which is one of the things that I would recommend to members opposite, but the thing is that the port of Bay d' Espoir, the port of St. Alban's, is one of

the best deep water ports in Newfoundland and it is ice free twelve months of the year. For this reason, I think there is potential in Bay d'Espoir and I think this government has put its head in the sand and forgotten about Bay d'Espoir for the last fifteen years. It is for that reason that when I look at Page 33 of this report -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. GILBERT:
And I was making a great speech, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have looked forward for some time now to participating in the debate on this resolution presented by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). I have been trying to pay attention to what has been said by previous speakers. Other than a few pertinent points made by a few members on this side of the House, I, quite frankly, have some difficulty in understanding what members opposite are saying in terms of addressing the resolution as outlined by the member for Bonavista North.

I must say, first of all, the member for Bonavista North, whom I have a great deal of admiration and respect for, generally puts forth non-partisan resolutions in the best possible way that he can

in order to make them more acceptable to members on both sides of the House. I must say I was taken aback somewhat when I read the resolution, Mr. Speaker. If I may be permitted, I would just like to rush through the reading of the resolution and get to the point that I am trying to make.

"WHEREAS unemployment remains the number one problem affecting the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador;" Well, we do not have any objection to that being in there as a WHEREAS, it is just a fact. We all know that.

"WHEREAS it is every day more apparent that the problem requires, as part of a total solution, initiatives that are innovative, aggressive and original." Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we are doing. So we have no disagreement or argument with that.

"WHEREAS certain areas of the Province are much more deeply afflicted by the problem of unemployment than the Province in general." Well, I mean, that is hardly a surprise comment by anybody. So I say to the hon. member opposite, he did not use much innovativeness or originality when putting together the WHEREASES. Now we come to the resolve part.

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House deplores government's business as usual approach to critically high unemployment." Now, Mr. Speaker, one would have to be an awful clod to expect members on the government side to agree and support that part of the resolution. I mean, it is just not like the hon. member for Bonavista North to word these

kinds of things.

MR. HISCOCK:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I am just making some comments in passing, if I may. The hon. member, the next time he puts a resolution forth, might remember that in order to try to get some acceptance generally. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, wipe it out or not, it is there, it is public and the attack has been made and the criticism has been made. Mr. Speaker, that is so unlike the member for Bonavista North I almost feel that he regrets having put it in there now. He looks a bit sheepish and everything over there, as I mention it.

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that government, upon identification of those areas of Newfoundland and Labrador most seriously ravaged by unemployment, proceed to the designation of those areas as reduced tax zones, for the purpose of providing extraordinary economic stimulus where it is most needed." Well, that may be a wise suggestion. I do not know, I am no expert on it. I would like to have more information. I did not hear it in the hon. member's opening statement, when he presented the resolution to the House, where he had twenty minutes to talk. I did not hear him elaborate much on that or provide much explanation. So, when he closes the debate, I hope he will be able to elaborate a bit more and give me an opportunity -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Could you get me a Newfoundland flag?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, I can get the hon. member a

Newfoundland flag if he gets down on his knees. We will discuss it outside the House.

Then, finally, Mr. Speaker. "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that government, as a means of direct stimulus to the provincial economy, and as an encouragement to small business in the creation of jobs, immediately move to a reduction in the provincial sales tax."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter that has been debated off and on in this hon. House, and outside the House by many sectors not only the political society here in this House and outside but business communities, business sectors have made comments with respect to that suggestion. All I can say to the hon. member is that from time to time, I guess, we look at providing some tax relief in certain areas and certain sectors, and we have done so, in fact, on a number of occasions. With respect to a general total tax reduction in terms of it being able to be a stimulus, I am not so sure that that would be a wise solution. For every one percentage of sales tax we drop it is - what? - \$30-odd million, as I recall - \$38 million or \$39 million - lost revenue. So if you drop it 2 per cent, as the hon. member is suggesting - he is outside in the lobby, I know, but he is very general in the resolution. He did not say how much to reduce it by, but I presume he is not talking about reducing it by 1 per cent, from 12 per cent to 11 per cent, he is talking maybe down to 8 per cent, to make it significant. So immediately you have a loss of roughly \$110 million to \$120 million in tax revenue to the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced, personally, that by taking such a measure it would, in fact, ensure that there would be a great rush by consumers to spend enough to bring back the \$110 million to \$120 million that you are going to lose by reducing it to 8 per cent, say, and, at the same time, also get back an additional \$120 million which would make us even, if hon. members can follow my logic.

So I am not so sure that that is a viable suggestion. To use the words of the member, in his resolution, it is not very innovative, it is not very original, and it certainly was not aggressive or aggressively put by the hon. member for Bonavista North. I do not think he really has his heart into the resolution. I think it was presented on opening day in the House, as these things are, it was put together for him by somebody, and he got up and made the presentation and now finds himself having to try to defend it. But I have not found any arguments put forth by members opposite that have made me feel any stronger in terms of supporting the resolution.

I want to touch briefly on some of the comments made by the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) before he sat down. He made reference to the fact that this year there will be some people who had been employed in forestry related activities over the last number of years who will not be employed now unless organizations in the area get approvals for silviculture related projects in the district of Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a point I have addressed in response to

that kind of criticism on a number of occasions. I have explained what has transpired. I do not think I need to go over it again, because it would just be repetitive. However, during his comments in the debate on this resolution he said that we have been in power for fifteen or twenty years. That is not entirely accurate at all. A Conservative Administration has been in power since 1972, which is fourteen years, but this particular administration has been in office only since 1979, which is only seven years. So there is a slight difference. This is the third administration that we have had in the Province, and it has only been in power for approximately seven years.

Then he said we have done nothing in Bay d'Espoir over the years. Well, Mr. Speaker, just for the information of members, during the seven year period that this administration has held office, I want to say to the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir that the Department of Forest Resources and Lands alone has, for the last seven years, spent nearly \$7 million in the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir - \$6.6 million - and have created, in its totality over that period of time, 1,218 jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is from a government which he says has done nothing in his district over the last number of years. That is just not true, Mr. Speaker, an unfortunate, misleading statement to make. And if this is what he is trying to use down in his district to get people turned against this government, then we may have to go down and make sure that this information is publicly known. We have spent \$6.675 million over the last seven years and created 1,218

jobs, Mr. Speaker, an average of 174-odd jobs a year. His one argument about a problem being there this year is an accurate one and a fair one, but to suggest that nothing has happened over the last seven years and that this government has done nothing is not a fair criticism at all, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to address that, Mr. Speaker, in passing, because it irritates me to hear those kinds of misleading comments made. I do not think the people will be fooled when the time comes for them to make a judgement on the performance of this government in that area, as opposed to the performance of the hon. member, who, let us not forget, is also an elected member of this House. We are all elected members. One of our main responsibilities is to try to help constituents with problems of employment, as well as many other things. So I ask the hon. member to get up in the House some day and tell us what he has done as an elected member to create jobs or help people get employment in his district. I challenge him to do that sometime. I suspect he never will, because, obviously, he probably has not been able to perform to the expectations of his constituents, and I am sure they will let him know that the next time we go to the polls.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we heard in the first day of debate on this resolution, some comments used by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and others, trying to seek that much sought after headline; in other words, when they try to present a resolution, their one objective is to try to get a headline so they can get a bit of coverage and people will

perhaps stand up and heed. So they use all kinds of things like 'The Province is still in intensive care', and 'Brains must be washed before they enter the Legislature', these kinds of silly little comments, trying whatever they can do to get a headline.

Mr. Speaker, it must be great to be in Opposition these days anywhere, I suppose, anywhere in the world, for that matter, but specifically here in Newfoundland. It is great to be in Opposition. You do not have to be responsible for anything that you say; you do not have to provide any facts to back up your allegations or your suggestions, you simply just get up and make them. It does not matter if you have any facts or not, it makes no difference whatsoever. You just get up and say anything you want, then you just flutter out of the House and hope that the media will ask you a question as to what you were saying in the House that particular day that was negative.

But there is a syndrome associated with Opposition members. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I am sure, would not mind my using some comments by him to me over the last year or so. He suffered for a number of years in the Opposition in this House; so did the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). And the member for Port au Port has admitted to me that if you spend - well, there is the member for Torngat Mountains, I am sure he would admit it too - if you spend enough time on the Opposition side, you fall into that syndrome and you feel as if you have to criticize, criticize, criticize simply for the sake of criticizing. You must be negative. You have to be

negative. And that is a fact, Mr. Speaker, substantiated by my two friends and colleagues from Port au Port and Torngat Mountains who have experienced a good bit of time over there and could not take it anymore, obviously could not put up with that, aside from the principles on which they decided to change their allegiance.

MR. WARREN:

We could not put up with (Inaudible) no more.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, to be honest with you, Mr. Speaker, I have a funny feeling that the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is about the closest member over there to fit into that category. I know he is not a negative person. The member for Bonavista North is not a negative person, Mr. Speaker. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a resolution that was put together for him by a research officer down in the Liberal Opposition office and he happened to draw that one on opening day: "Here, Tom, you take one," - 'Tom' picks this one. And I tell you, it is so negative, it is not fitting to the hon. member's personality and all you had to do, Mr. Speaker, was look at the hon. the member for Bonavista North when he presented this resolution a week ago. It was so lack-lustre, no enthusiasm, no aggressiveness, simply because, Mr. Speaker, he does not believe in the Opposition syndrome. He cannot be negative. He cannot criticize for the sake of criticizing.

So it is very, very unfortunate, and I think I probably hit the nail on the head. I must admit I was a bit disappointed in the hon. member's presentation last Wednesday. It was not like him at

all. The resolution, as I say, is very negatively worded and, of course, it criticizes the government outright. Now, who but a clod would expect government members to support a resolution that actually criticizes the government? I mean, you would have to be out of your mind. I am sure the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is not out of his mind. But I would not be surprised if some members over there with him are, and those who work in the Liberal office. It is not very good politics at all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get to a few points I want to make on this resolution. I think I have a few minutes left. I hope I have, anyway. They have been totally negative about everything, Mr. Speaker. They say we are doing nothing, there is nothing happening. I want to run through just a few things that we are doing as a government, a few potential opportunities, a few areas where we are being aggressive and we are being innovative. We are working with the private sector in many instances to develop job opportunities in this Province, which members opposite totally ignore. They do not wish to consider them at all.

You talk about the limestone possibilities over on the Port au Port Peninsula, where there is a good possibility of something happening and jobs being created and developed; you talk about a potential pulp mill operation in Goose Bay - Labrador, where there is the potential for 400 or 500 jobs directly and maybe another 1,000 jobs indirectly; you talk about an integrated sawmill operation, Mr. Speaker, in Goose Bay, where there could be another

100 to 150 jobs.

What about the gold mine, Mr. Speaker, down on the Southwest Coast? Members opposite do not think any of this stuff is going to come about, I am sure. They probably hope that nothing happens in respect to these potential opportunities. But there is a good opportunity for a gold mine on the Southwest Coast. Several hundred jobs involved there in totality, construction and otherwise.

There is a logging opportunity now coming up in the White Bay area, going to provide 200 or 300 jobs over the next number of years. Perhaps for a long time, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Kruger operation. And if this government had not gone out and sought somebody to take over that operation in Corner Brook, there would be no mill but there also would not be this job opportunity that is going to develop up in the White Bay area, Mr. Speaker.

How about the potential for the military presence in Goose Bay, that NATO base, if we are ever fortunate enough to get that NATO base? Look at the hundreds and hundreds of jobs that are going to be created as a result of that. Look at the silviculture jobs that are going to be created, Mr. Speaker, over the next four years - 5,000 jobs in silviculture over the next four years.

Look at FPI. What happened to FPI? Of the fifteen plants that were put up, twelve of those plants have already been sold, Mr. Speaker, and there has not been one cent of government money invested in those takeovers, not one cent.

How about Baie Verte, Mr. Speaker? This government is doing nothing! How about Baie Verte? \$12 million, \$6 million over the next two years, to keep that operation going and, in fact, to improve its operation, putting in a wet-milling process. How about St. Lawrence? What about St. Lawrence? Nobody mentioned St. Lawrence. That is going to be, hopefully, in full production next year, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, how about the hundreds of dozens and dozens of loan guarantees that we put in place here every year, year after year, to provide and protect jobs and to provide increased number of jobs in fish operations in particular? How about all the construction projects like the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) announced, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) announced? And I have not even mentioned the offshore, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite always say we have oil on the brain. I have mentioned all of these things just in passing and have not even mentioned the offshore.

I have only a couple of minutes left, Mr. Speaker, and I want to get to some statistics. I know hon. members opposite, particularly the member for Bonavista North, love to hear statistics. What has happened in the labour force, Mr. Speaker, during this past year? The hon. member for Bonavista North might like to know. He might not admit it, but he might like to know that the number of people employed in this Province, April, 1986, is up 6.2 per cent, Mr. Speaker, larger than the Canadian average of 3.8 per cent for April. The number of people unemployed, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, April, 1986, is

down 12.5 per cent, greater than the national average which is only 9.3 per cent, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of other things too that I just want to mention in passing. Interest rates are down, 2 per cent and .5 per cent.

MR. EFFORD:

Oil is up.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the gross value of manufacturing shipments, by the way, for the member's information, is up in February 14 per cent, 8 per cent in Canada. For January and February, it is up 19 per cent, 9 per cent in Canada, Mr. Speaker. How about those for comparisons? The volume of iron ore production is up 38 per cent in February, up 3 per cent in Canada.

The fish landings, Mr. Speaker, just look at this: The total volume is up 60 per cent, total value up 72 per cent. The volume of cod landings are up 98 per cent, the value of cod landings up 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker, 100 per cent from January to March 1986.

New car sales are up 33 per cent, Mr. Speaker, in February, 14 per cent in Canada. Retail trade is up, Mr. Speaker, in February 8 per cent; January, February 8.9 per cent, and residential construction, Mr. Speaker, up 43 per cent. Mr. Speaker, 45 per cent, 23 per cent, 17 per cent, these are statistics that do not lie.

Hon. members opposite may want to use them to twist, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this government is doing everything that is outlined in the resolution's WHEREAS portions, everything that it possibly

could. Mr. Speaker, we will not be deterred by the negativity that oozes from members opposite day after day in this Legislature, trying to deter us from doing what we are doing for the betterment of the people of this Province. We will not follow the philosophy of members opposite that we all know about in this Province - giving it away, give it all away. We will be doing it, Mr. Speaker, under the leadership and guidance of an administration that has, without any question, Mr. Speaker, the interest of the people of this Province at heart, unlike members opposite who have one interest only and that is to get elected and for their leader to become premier of this Province. That is the only thing they have in their mind, Mr. Speaker. So I strongly, strongly oppose this particular resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear. hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know if there is somebody else who wanted to speak in this debate. Mr. Speaker, I will have a few comments on it.

MR. WARREN:

Tell us about the Bellevue by-election.

MR. CALLAN:

I could tell the hon. members opposite about the Bellevue by-election, but that would not be in order, Mr. Speaker. It created some employment.

MR. WARREN:
By leave!

MR. CALLAN:
Yes, if I can talk about it for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, what happened was the P.C. candidate who ran against me was campaigning for six months. Who was paying his salary? He was travelling throughout the district of Bellevue.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the member is not dealing with the resolution.

MR. WARREN:
Who was paying your salary?

MR. CALLAN:
I was working in the hon. Don Jamieson's office downstairs so the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the taxpayers' were paying my salary.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to this resolution. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just took his seat talked about the Liberal giveaways of twenty years ago? As the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) pointed out, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in the Legislature on this side of the House who voted for that Churchill Falls deal. The only two members who are present in the Legislature who voted for it are the member for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey). These are the only two members who voted for it. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, these are the only two members who remember very much about that the Upper Churchill deal.

I think they would agree, Mr. Speaker, that twenty years ago,

with the price of oil the way it was at that time, it was not a bad deal, it was not a bad contract. The people blamed poor old J.R. Smallwood for signing it, but the man, in his retirement, has appeared on radio programmes and elsewhere and he stood in this Legislature when I was a colleague of his in the Liberal Reform Party back in 1975 - 1976, and he defended his actions. He said he did not sign the deal.

MR. J. CARTER:
He knew all about it.

MR. CALLAN:
Yes, he knew all about it, but the members who I just named who were Opposition members here knew all about it as well. They knew they knew enough about it to know -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
No. The information was not made public.

MR. BAKER:
Like you guys are behaving now.

MR. CALLAN:
That is exactly it, that is true. There is a lot of information lacking but there was enough information. There was just as much information, Mr. Speaker, as there is in the Atlantic Accord for Opposition members today.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
That is all there in black and white.

MR. CALLAN:
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:
If that is all you have, we are in trouble.

MR. HISCOCK:
What is the price going to be for

a barrel?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, you need a ouija board for that.

MR. HISCOCK:

Well, (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) would like to participate in this debate. If he would like to, I would gladly take my seat because I was not scheduled to speak in this debate at all today. Perhaps the member for Eagle River, if he did not speak last Wednesday, would like to do so because I am rambling and I realize that, but I am being interrupted by members opposite and members on this side as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Accord legislation was introduced in February and then the House closed suddenly and unexpectedly, even though the legislation was not debated at length and it was not sanctioned by this Legislature. It does not appear as though, Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Accord legislation is going to be reintroduced in this Session, before we close for the Summer. Perhaps the member for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) can tell me if it is going to be reintroduced. He should know. He is the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs and the Atlantic Accord is intergovernmental for sure. If the Legislature closes in a week or two for the Summer and if it does not open in the Fall, as the Premier has threatened that it will not - we will never have another Fall Session, he says - then when will the Atlantic Accord be reintroduced? Is it going to

be next Spring?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It has to be mirror legislation which in the federal process moves very slowly, whether Tory or Liberal. It is slow coordinating the bureauracy, that is what it is. But then, (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

I see. So what may happen is we could be called back here in the Fall for that purpose alone, if it mirrors what is happening in Ottawa. That is what I think the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is saying.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even though the member who just took his seat, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), talks about this present government as doing everything that is suggested in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. There are many things that this government could be doing to stimulate the economy in this Province and to try to make this Province a better place for young people to grow up in and to find employment than they are doing.

This government, Mr. Speaker, is fifteen years of age and the government is behaving, I believe, Mr. Speaker, like a typical fifteen year old. They have no direction. They are like a fifteen year old boy or girl. They are just interested in having lots of fun and good times at the expense of the taxpayers of this Province.

I attended a graduation, Mr. Speaker, on Friday night past. My daughter was one of the graduates graduating from Grade XII or Level III, eighteen years of age, has no more idea of what she wants to do

or where she is going than this government.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Like her father.

MR. CALLAN:

No. Her father knows exactly where he is going. I probably did not know when I was an eighteen year old but that is the point I am making that this government is fifteen years of age and like the typical fifteen year old the government, hitting into age sixteen and seventeen before the next election rolls around and puts an end to it, this government is just faltering from one crisis to another and there is no direction. That is why my colleague for Bonavista North, Mr. Speaker, says in his first whereas, "WHEREAS unemployment remains the number one problem affecting the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador." That is a fact and this government has to shoulder some of the blame.

Mr. Speaker, the second last set of federal statistics from Statistics Canada that came out said that the unemployment rate has gone down Canada-wide but, it said out West it had gone up and in Eastern Canada it had also gone up. I said to one of my colleagues when I heard it the obvious solution to the problems in Canada is to have more Liberal governments because the only place where the unemployment rate went down was in Central Canada and in Ontario and Quebec you have two Liberal governments. Of course, we saw what happened in PEI. They have seen the light. The people in New Brunswick will see the light perhaps before this year is out and, I feel, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Bonavista North feels when he so seriously

presented this resolution that it is time for a change in this Province.

This government is old and worn out after fifteen years Mr. Speaker. We have the same old tired faces in the Cabinet and the backbenches. Even though every now and then you see the backbenchers changing because somebody decides to scamper from this side over and jump on the bandwagon -

MR. SIMMONS:

They could not tell a bandwagon from a funeral cortege.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, in the second whereas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

'Leo' was the one who joined a funeral.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

You are being heard in intellectual silence, I will say that for you.

MR. CALLAN:

In the second whereas my colleague for Bonavista North says, "AND WHEREAS it is every day more apparent that the problem of unemployment in this Province requires as part of a total solution," - not all, but part of a total solution, - "initiatives that are innovative, aggressive and original." You will not get any originality from this old and tired crowd because they have been around too long. You will not get any aggressive action because, like

I said, they are like the typical fifteen year old. They do not want to be aggressive in their actions. All they want to do is have fun and games. Innovative ideas, the only innovative idea that the member who just left now, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) had since he was kicked out of the Moore's Cabinet after four or five events many years ago, the only innovative idea he had was to hire a plane and go to get a closer look at Halley's Comet. Now, what an innovative idea! What a way to create employment in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

The pity of it was it was a return trip.

MR. CALLAN:

The pity of it was that the plane did not run out of gas and stay up there. In the third whereas my colleague for Bonavista North says, "AND WHEREAS certain areas of the Province are much more deeply afflicted by the problem of unemployment than the Province in general;

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House deplores government's business as usual approach.' That is it, business as usual, fun and games, let us enjoy it while we are here; and if I need to be only half a Cabinet minister; and if the taxpayers of this Province are willing to pay Cabot Martin \$150 an hour to do my work for me while I am half a Cabinet minister; and if the taxpayers of this Province are foolish enough to pay Peter Loughheed from Alberta, the man, and I heard this on radio no later than this morning, this same gentleman that the taxpayers are paying - what is it? How much money is it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

\$40,000 a year.

MR. CALLAN:

\$40,000 a year.

MR. SIMMONS:

At least.

MR. CALLAN:

At least.

MR. GILBERT:

That is plus expenses.

MR. CALLAN:

I heard this morning it was \$300,000. Was that his contract for five years? That would be \$200,000 if it is \$40,000 a year. He is probably there until death do us part anyway but at \$40,000, who is this Peter Loughheed? He is the same gentleman who a few years ago, when he was the Premier of Alberta and was trying to get the price of oil up, he said, 'Let the bastards out East freeze in the dark.'

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, that was the Mayor of Calgary (inaudible) who said that.

MR. CALLAN:

Well, all I can do is quote another Tory, Bill Rowe, the Tory Open Line host said it this morning. If you want to check with VOCM or check with Bill Rowe, you will find out that that is exactly what he said.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) no Tory.

MR. CALLAN:

Well, I mean he went down to LaPoile with a suitcase when he should have had an overnight bag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

That was what he did in the last election. He went down there as a Tory. He came back as a disillusioned whatever, I do not know, whether it was a Tory or not I do not know, but he went down there with a suitcase when he should have gone down with an overnight bag, according to the CBC's Here and Now programme.

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED," Mr. Speaker, "that government, upon identification of those areas of Newfoundland and Labrador most seriously ravaged by unemployment," and that should not be a very difficult task to find out the areas of this Province which are ravaged by unemployment, upon finding that "proceed to the designation of those areas as reduced tax zones". That is what my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) suggests.

MR. SIMMONS:

Another innovative idea.

MR. CALLAN:

That should not be difficult to do either, Mr. Speaker. "For the purpose of providing extraordinary economic stimulus where it is most needed," he says. A sensible resolution I believe, Mr. Speaker, and a sensible solution.

No matter whether it is good or bad, Mr. Speaker, it obviously must be better than doing nothing at all, which is what the government opposite is doing, nothing at all, taking credit, as my colleague from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), said. My colleague from Port de Grave yesterday was talking about how the Premier took out full page ads and so on and went to the public media to take credit for 6,000 jobs created by the federal government, the same

sorts of make work programmes, short-term jobs that the Premier roundly condemned when the Liberals in Ottawa had them on the go just two short years ago.

MR. FUREY:

They were a dirty word then.

MR. CALLAN:

That is right. "AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that government, as a means of direct stimulus to the provincial economy", my colleague from Bonavista North says, "and as an encouragement to small business in the creation of jobs, immediately move to a reduction in the provincial sales tax." Reduce the sales tax as a stimulus so that there will be growth in the economy. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more sensible than that.

The gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), when he was talking, condemned it because he said that with each percentage that you take off the sales tax you lose \$39 million and \$40 million a year. So, he said, if you take off about 4 per cent, which would bring it down to 8 per cent, still probably the highest in Canada, you would lose \$160 million in one year. He says, you know, there must be some way to make up for it.

What my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that there will be more money. It will be creating jobs and the people who will be creating the jobs, Mr. Speaker, will be paying taxes in other ways. They will be paying taxes when they are not paying taxes at all now because they do not have any money to spend in the first place. If they had a job and got \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year of an income, they would be spending money. They would be paying in

taxes. They would be paying income tax as well as building homes for themselves. They would also be paying the sales tax on building materials and, of course, they have to live anyway and so they would be paying taxes on the usual sorts of things that people pay taxes on in every store in this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a sensible and a good resolution I believe. Why it is that members opposite, like the member for Grand Falls, instead of taking good Liberal ideas and trying to make them work, instead of doing that, why they condemn them is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why this Province is in the mess that it is in today. They are too good to be told. Government members and the Premier opposite are too good to be told. Any suggestions that come from anybody else, whether it is the Board of Trade here in St. John's, no matter who it comes from, my colleagues here on the Opposition benches, the Leader of the Opposition, no matter where the suggestions come from, because they were not the original ideas of the members in Cabinet and on the government benches opposite, then they are no good. Just criticize them and find fault with them.

Mr. Speaker, I will take my seat now. I think my time is up. Perhaps somebody on the other side would like to take five minutes before my colleague takes his twenty minutes to clue up the debate at twenty minutes to six.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. The resolution does talk about jobs. There is one thing that, since being here in 1979 -

MR. MARSHALL:

It is nice to see the hon. member drop by.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you kindly. I would like to extend the invitation to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) to come down to Labrador also.

With regard to the job situation in our Province, Mr. Speaker, we have seen, since 1979, a reduction in jobs and we find since this government has been in power, since 1972, there has been very little creation of long term jobs. One of the things that has been pointed out by the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) and some of the other members is the programme that Manitoba has, which sets up a fund and allows our younger people in the Province, between the ages of seventeen to twenty-five, to borrow from a fund and set up their own businesses. We need innovative programmes in our Province for our younger people, particularly with unemployment as high as it is.

Unfortunately it has been suggested by this side and maybe that is the reason why it is not carried out.

We do need programmes to allow our younger people to not rely on government Canada Works projects but support them in setting up

businesses themselves. A lot of the younger people, I am please to see, are doing this themselves irregardless of help from government.

The other thing I want to say is that even with regard to the creation of jobs or the creation of projects as we have seen by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) and other departments is that when it comes to funding money, they are often funded on a political partisan basis. For example, in the announcement today by the minister he said these were awarded so that early tendering could take place. Cartwright, Labrador applied twice in a row for this project and if there is any place in the Province that needs early tendering, it is the community of Cartwright. The minister says to Norris Point, if you have your money, we will help you. Cartwright says for two years in a row "we have it" but ends up being told no again. I assume that in the next announcement hopefully Cartwright maybe there.

The job situation, as pointed out by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), is a problem that needs to be looked after. Unemployment does remain extremely high in this Province. We have seen the closure of industries. I can think of McNamaras right away being taken over by Easteel who had five or six hundred people working there. I had three brothers there and now only one is working there. We have seen a reduction in ERCO; we have seen the closure of the oil refinery in Holyrood; we have seen a reduction in mining in Lab City; we have seen the closing of the mine in Daniel's Harbour; we have seen the

closing of the mine in Buchans and also Baie Verte itself being brought to a day to day operation with only government finances. The people in St. Lawrence are still waiting for the start up of the mine there, again it is dragging on. You could almost say it is like Chinese torture the way the people of St. Lawrence are being treated.

I have to point out how the Opposition sees the government. They are bankrupt of ideas. Maybe it is a fact that it is a carry over from the former Premier Moore's days and many of the Cabinet ministers are still in the Cabinet. They are looking forward to being appointed to the Senate or become a new Lieutenant Governor or be appointed judge or get out in private business or appointed to another board of government and be able to draw their pensions. I think that many on the government side are more concerned about their pensions and retiring from politics than they are in the service of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL:

Where do you get that?

MR. HISCOCK:

I get that by just looking at the apathy that is exemplified by the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson).

MR. MARSHALL:

You have not been here to look at it because you cannot look at your own side.

MR. HISCOCK:

If we look at our side, to the President of the Council, one will find out that the average age on this side is quite different from the government side itself. In

actual fact, I think there should be a review of the pension plan in this Province because I think it is overdone.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

It is now twenty minutes to six.

MR. HISCOCK:
In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I will turn it over to the member for Bonavista North. I hope that the government will have sense enough to vote for this resolution and do something about the unemployment in our Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, in cluing up this debate on this particular resolution, there is not much that hon. members opposite said in terms of refuting or condemning this particular resolution in terms of any facts or in terms of any substance.

What the arguments on the other side showed was the complete temerity on the part of this government to accept any new ideas or to accept any innovative concept with respect to stimulating the economy of this Province. They just demonstrated, as I have said before, absolute temerity. They are afraid of new ideas and afraid to try something that would result in stimulating the economy of this Province. They stood here to defend almost the indefensible.

Can anyone in Newfoundland and Labrador imagine the audacity and

the affrontery of a group of people who would get up and joyfully and gleefully defend an unemployment rate hovering around 20 per cent? Mr. Speaker, that is what they have done. This government can talk all they like about the initiatives they have taken. They can talk about the measures they have taken. They can talk about the statistics. But the stark reality of the situation is that we have had an unemployment rate consistently hovering around the 20 per cent level for the past three or four years.

They can try to disassociate themselves from previous administrations. But the fact of the matter again is, since this administration took over, they have succeeded in more than doubling the rate of unemployment in this Province from the early 1970's until now. In their fourteen years of office, they have seen the rate of unemployment in this Province more than double. That is the stark reality, Mr. Speaker, of the situation.

I could refer to some of the inane remarks made by members opposite with respect to my own personal style, the way I represent the district of Bonavista North and the way that I represented the Terra Nova district in this hon. House. I suppose that is hardly worthy alluding to, but, Mr. Speaker, it does deserve some comment.

The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) - I am sorry that he is not in the House because I really would like to set him straight - mentioned in recent days that the member for Bonavista North was making some nasty remarks. The

member for Grand Falls, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) mentioned something to the effect that I was not a critical or a negative person. I might say, on that account, he is correct. I am not a negative person. I am not a critical person. But I can assure the hon. member that the performance of this government can allow anybody to be critical and to be negative. I am certainly not negative and not critical by nature.

I also want to tell the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands that nobody prepares resolutions for this hon. member. Nobody prepares questions for this hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
I have made it on my own in this life this far and I expect I will make it further without help and without assistance and without being fed by other people, Mr. Speaker. I do not need words put in my mouth. I am capable of speaking on my own, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. J. CARTER:
Is the hon. member suggesting for one minute that that resolution that he purportedly put together was not seen and approved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry)? Did the officials in the Opposition office not have a hand in the final drafting and the approval of that resolution? Is

this what the hon. member is saying? I would like him to be perfectly clear on this issue.

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

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I can expect that I am going to be interrupted because I am going to be saying some strong things from here on in, Mr. Speaker, and I expect to be interrupted quite often.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
I have received the right motivation, Mr. Speaker. They have put me in flight. Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been remarks made about this member crossing the floor, about my loyalty to the Liberal Party. Let me deal with it, Mr. Speaker, once and for all. Mr. Speaker, if there is one hon. member that should not be suspected of crossing the floor it should be this member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have been loyal to every leader that this party has had and I find it very easy being loyal to our present leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, members opposite might not like that. The present Leader of the Opposition started

the rise of Liberalism in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

He started it last Spring, Mr. Speaker. Since that time we have had three Liberal governments and, in a short while, there are going to be four, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members opposite can do all they like to try and discredit the present Leader of the Opposition. They can try to create a false conflict but, Mr. Speaker, Liberalism is on the rise! What a time to cross the floor! I did not cross it when we were down to the bottom, and I am surely not going to cross now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there lies the port and the vessels puffs her sails. The vessel is ready, we got the crew, Mr. Speaker, we got the captain and we are headed for government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

So, Mr. Speaker, disspell any notions about this hon. member crossing the floor.

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I wonder if he could inform us as to who made the suggestion that he might or should cross the floor? I do not remember hearing anybody on this side even mentioning it. Can he

elaborate?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I was going to be interrupted because hon. members opposite do not like to know.

MR. SIMMS:

Answer the question.

MR. LUSH:

They do not like to hear, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal star is out there on the horizon beaming bright. They do not like to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and not even the Azores will shoot us down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

So let us disspell that notion once and for all.

MR. SIMMS:

Who put the notion in your head?

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to talk about these matters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

I know there are hon. members who do not want me to get into the substance of this resolution.

MR. TOBIN:

Did you ask -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the pith and substance of this resolution requests government to take two substantive measures which, in the opinion of the Opposition and which in the opinion of many expert economists, and which has been proven by many governments throughout Canada, Mr. Speaker, will have the effect improving the economy of the Province. That is what it has done, Mr. Speaker. It will have the effect of stimulating the economy.

Mr. Speaker, unlike what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) tried to say, and unlike what the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) tried to say, we on this side of the House do not think that this resolution will have the affect of solving all of the economic woes of this Province. We do not believe that this resolution or these two measures in this resolution will create full employment. That is nonsense, Mr. Speaker. We have never said that.

We believe that these two measures requested of government will have the effect of stimulating and expanding the economic growth of this Province, namely, by the establishment of tax reduced zones for businesses throughout the Province, identifying those areas where unemployment is at its worst, where unemployment is highest, where the economy is stagnant, identifying those areas and reducing taxes to businesses, new businesses and old alike, Mr.

Speaker, in an effort to stimulate the economy.

Though we take the credit for enunciating this idea here in the first place, it has been adopted by the colleagues of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The federal government has accepted this principle in Cape Breton. That is what they have done. They have established a tax free zone to encourage business to come there to invest and to help those businesses that are already there. So by not supporting this motion, they are condemning the actions of their own federal counterparts, Mr. Speaker, and other governments throughout Canada. Other governments throughout Canada have tried this idea and they have found that it is working.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modified version of introducing the concept of the small business corporation tax holiday. This is a recommendation made by the St. John's Board of Trade, a highly respected business group in this city. They have recommended the establishment of a small business corporation tax holiday. So, Mr. Speaker, this concept is not without proven substance. It has been tried in Canada and it is working but, this government is afraid of new and innovative ideas.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of the resolution addresses the fact that the consumers of this Province are heavily taxed. They are heavily burdened with taxation measures emanating from both levels of government, the federal level and the provincial level, to the point of diminishing returns. Mr. Speaker, heavy taxation is self-destructive and that is the road that we are on, the road to

economic destruction.

No, we on this side, Mr. Speaker, do not believe that these two measures, taken in isolation, will solve our total economic woes, but they will establish -

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the hon. gentleman for the past few minutes getting on with this nonsense about crossing the floor. The Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) asked him to identify the person who asked him to cross. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is not true that he said in his meeting with the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) the other day, or if he did not tell him that the only way he would get in government would be if he did cross the floor.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I will not be detracted or diverted, but let me say this, Mr. Speaker, I have talked to nobody. I have not made the slightest suggestion, not one iota of a suggestion to anybody in the Tory Party from Vancouver to St. John's ever about joining that crowd, ever, Mr. Speaker, ever!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Now, let me carry on, Mr. Speaker, again, because obviously the point is not made. Let me tell hon. gentlemen where I am coming from.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:

We should rise whenever we hear a statement that is obviously incorrect. I was on an elevator with many of my colleagues. The hon. gentleman tried to get on and we had to tell him there was no room.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, there must be some protection from these frivolous points of order.

Let me tell hon. gentlemen again, Mr. Speaker, where I am coming from because many of them never heard me articulate and enunciate my political philosophy.

Firstly, I am a Canadian, Mr. Speaker. Secondly, I am a federalist and thirdly, I am a Liberal. It is in that context that I work for the people of Newfoundland and for the people of Bonavista North. My position on the large issues facing Newfoundland today are not contingent upon the political stripe of the political party in

Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. I stand for universality of our social programmes, irrespective of the political party in Ottawa. I stand for the constitutional rights of Newfoundland, irrespective of the political stripe of the federal party in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I did not want to get diverted but the point must be made. Back to my resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

Tell us 'Tom'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have voted for every important issue in this House, whether this government initiated the action or whether it was initiated by this side. I have voted for our fisheries, I have voted for hydro power - Churchill Falls - I have voted for the offshore, as have all hon. members on this side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we do not think that these measures affecting the business community and the consumers of this Province will have the effect of completely ironing out or solving all of the economic problems of this Province, but we believe a move in that direction will restore confidence with the business community, will restore confidence with the consumers of this Province, and, Mr. Speaker, it will also show that this government have the political will, they have the political courage to deal with the economic problems of this Province. And, by doing this, they will have reached down a long ways towards

solving the three largest problems facing this Province, namely, economic stagnation, inflation and high unemployment. These two measures of tax reduced zones and reducing the retail sales tax, will have the effect of helping to alleviate, helping to solve. That is what we suggested, Mr. Speaker, that they will assist, that they will help. And certainly no hon. member can disagree with that. No hon. member can disagree.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most non-political resolution ever put before this House. There is no deep-rooted political philosophy involved, no ideology, it is just a simple straightforward economic policy that would be adopted by any innovative and aggressive political party. Any political party would be proud to be able to legislate these two measures.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of small business in Newfoundland, for the sake of stimulating and expanding the economic and financial growth of this Province, for the sake of giving our consumers a break so that we will have more money in the economy, for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would expect a unanimous vote on this resolution. I would expect that it is going to receive total acceptance among all hon. members. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that nobody can find it in their hearts to vote against these proven measures adopted by the federal government with respect to Cape Breton, and adopted by other provincial governments. Obviously, gentlemen opposite, since they think that a reduction of income tax will not have any positive effect on the consumer, must think increasing it will not hurt either. Or do they think we are at the maximum level now, we

cannot go beyond here?

They do not believe, obviously, Mr. Speaker, that heavy taxation is self-destructive. Well, we will let the people of Newfoundland judge that. The party that has the innovative ideas, the party that is willing to experiment with proven economic ideas, that is the party of the future. That is where we are bound, Mr. Speaker, and we are not going to stop. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the motion please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the motion defeated.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Divide.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the motion please rise:

Mr. Callan; the hon. Mr. Simmons; Mr. Lush; Mr. K. Aylward; Mr. Baker; Mr. Furey; Mr. Kelland; Mr. Gilbert.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the motion please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge); the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms); the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey); the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell); the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall); the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe); the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard); the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett); Mr. Baird; Mr. Patterson; Mr. J. Carter; the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt); Mr. Hodder; Mr. Warren; Mr. Mitchell; Mr. Woodford.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I declare the motion defeated.

It now being six o'clock, the House stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday.

Division