

PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 65

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

19 June 1987

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
On behalf of the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn), who is busy on Her Majesty's Business in another part of the city this morning - he will be here later - I wish to inform the House of data released late yesterday by Noranda Exploration Limited and BP Canada, SELCO Division, on results of exploration in the Tally Pond area, Central Newfoundland.

Noranda, operator of a joint venture project with BP SELCO, have announced the results of drilling on the Duck Pond prospect in the Tally Pond Belt. Assay results have been released from three drill holes which intersected a base metals deposit which also contains significant amounts of silver and gold. Zinc is the most abundant of the base metals in the deposit, which also contains copper and lead. A copy of Noranda's release containing the precise data from the drilling is being distributed with this statement.

The Duck Pond deposit represents a significant new discovery in the Tally Pond Belt. The first discovery in that belt came in

1981 with the boundary deposit, about 4 kilometers Northeast of the Duck Pond site, which was subsequently found to contain approximately 500,000 tonnes with copper, lead, zinc and silver values. This new discovery considerably enhances the potential of the belt. A new development in the belt would be of great benefit, in particular to Buchans.

I hasten to add that not enough is known yet about the Duck Pond deposit to indicate whether it might be mineable. The metals are said to be present in "ore grade" but first a sufficient quantity of material must be proven. Drilling is continuing and visual results from two additional holes are very encouraging. We look forward to the results of further drilling and hopefully another new mine for our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to thank the Premier for making a copy of the statement available to the Opposition and to myself. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very positive statement. We welcome the statement, and I am sure that the people of Buchans and the Buchans area will welcome the statement.

We have always had fairly high hopes for the Tally Pond area, as

the Premier indicated in his statement, but up until this past year or so, it was based strictly on copper, lead and zinc.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT:
It goes back a long, long way.

Now the Premier's statement indicates that as a result of new finds there is a high content of gold and silver which will make the deposit a lot more attractive.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much one can say except to be grateful for the news. I am sure that the people in the Buchans area will, as I said, be very pleased. There is no question that Buchans stands in good stead to take advantage of that deposit if and when it is mined. There is direct access from Buchans to the Tally Pond site. Of course, most of the infrastructure that the American Smelting and Refining Company used is still in Buchans and that infrastructure, if indeed a mine comes from this deposit, is there and is available. Hopefully, it is that infrastructure that BP Selco and Noranda will use.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasant way to start the morning. I am pleased to acknowledge the announcement by the Premier and would hope that the deposit actually turns into a mine in the future. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, it is a little

difficult to respond quickly, having only been given a copy of the statement and not having had a chance to assess what the actual facts say. It is certainly fortunate that the discovery seems to be close to Buchans, which, as we all know, is a town that certainly could use a little bit of good news these days, and which, I think, brings us back to the whole question that we have often faced here in the House before of what we do with single industry towns and how we treat them in terms of making sure that their downturn is not completely on the shoulders of the people in the community.

We are fortunate if this deposit turns out to be a property that can be mined economically and can produce sufficient quantities of jobs for a long period of time. In the future we should be looking at the whole question of what to do with single industry towns the day a mine opens. I am hoping that either this provincial government here, or the federal government, will eventually get their act together and institute a single industry town policy so that we do plan for the closure of the mine on the day the new one opens.

The only other comment I would make is to be somewhat cautious. As the operators of the mine in my district say, it is only ore when you can mine it economically. Even if it is commercial grade, if there is not enough of it it is not worthwhile. You have to be able to mine it on a consistent basis and be able to make money on it in order for it to be a commercial ore deposit.

I, along with the government and with the official Opposition,

sincerely hope that this is a commercial ore deposit when the final diagnosis is done.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, today I am announcing the approval of ninety-three new projects under the Private Sector employment Programme. These projects involve a total provincial contribution of \$760,620 and will create 244 more jobs, seventy-two of which will be student positions.

Mr. Speaker, since May 15, 1987, 346 projects have received approval under this programme, for the creation of 773 new jobs, including 177 student positions. Mr. Speaker, when you combine that with the over 1,000 positions that we created in our Public Sector Employment Programme you will see that our programmes this year have created already close to 2,000 jobs. Of the \$5 million allocated for the Private Sector Employment Programme, \$2.3 million has been spent to date.

Mr. Speaker, officials in my department continue to receive positive feedback from many persons in the business community concerning this job creation effort. In keeping with government's commitment to approve projects as quickly as possible, we will continue to give top priority to the screening and approving of these applications so that the businesses wishing to take advantage of the programme will be in a position to get their projects in place and their

employees working at the earliest possible opportunity.

Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the Private Sector Employment Programme is one that we have commended before and we do so again. We think the idea is right. We believe, of course, that we are not going to solve the unemployment problem in the manner in which the minister is going about it, particularly when the House closes, in that he will not have an incentive for standing up to make a statement from time to time. We do not believe that we will solve it with the kind of misinformation he gave the House yesterday. I was appalled, I say to him, to sit here and to hear that he did not realize that in the budget brought down by his colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), there is a prediction, a prediction which the minister yesterday emphatically denied as not being there. He attacked my friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), dismissed the Economic Council as a fly-by-night operation, and proceeded to challenge the gentleman from Bonavista North that the prediction was not there. Well, I want to tell him that it is there and it relates directly to his statement. He will find the following statement coming out of the mouth of Minister of Finance on April 9: "Unemployment should fall slightly, to about 19.7 per cent." Mr. Speaker, when all the rhetoric is thrown aside and all

the speeches are added up and all the fancy tables are totaled, the net sum of what this government's overall objective is is .3 per cent, to drop the rate from 20 per cent to 19.7 per cent.

That is what all that paper means and nothing more. Now, the minister can couch it how he wants. - He can sit there and get the right semantics in the hope of projecting the most positive message, the bottom line is that this government has no concerted effort, no solution on a permanent basis to the problem at hand. And what is the problem at hand? The most disastrously high unemployment level anywhere in North America. And what is the solution from this government? Another little pansy statement in which the minister gets up and reads well, and that he does, but he does not perform very well where it matters: he does not perform for the young people of this Province, he does not deliver for the thousands of people out there whose lives are being savaged because there is no solution from this government, because this administration has abandoned its responsibilities to the people of this Province.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we encourage and welcome any initiative which makes any additional jobs available to the Newfoundland people, but we cannot get overly excited when we see how small a dent is being made in a very, very big problem. We cannot get very excited when we realize, Mr. Speaker, that this administration has no real understanding of the magnitude of the problem. If they did, they would not insult it in the way they have again this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) comes in with this statement in which he assures members of the House and members of the public that part of the Private Sector Employment Programme demonstrates a commitment to student and youth employment. I would say to the minister that his own figures again establish the fact that he is off his own target. He promised, when he launched this programme a couple of months ago, that youth employment would be a requirement of 40 per cent of the jobs created, and by my calculation what we have here is less than 25 per cent. The minister has not identified any distinction between student and youth, and if that means you are unable to monitor and to track the number of jobs for people under twenty-five, then it is an indication that you are simply not maintaining a commitment to this 40 per cent target. It is not being met, there is no evidence that it is not being met, and young people and students in this Province will continue to wait for some kind of commitment by this government to their particular needs.

I would also say that the minister describes his programme as a creation of new jobs and says that these are new jobs that will last

for a short period of time and that people this time next year will be looking for another programme to create more new jobs. It might serve the propoganda purposes of adding up new jobs created this year, but the problem is going to remain next year of the need for a real long-term job creation programme.

The minister informs us that less than half of the \$5 million available has been spent. Presumably more than half of the monies available are still waiting for applications to come in, so why does the minister not make some of this \$2.7 million available to the non-profit sector which is starving for public funds in this Province, which is suffering from cutbacks in social services, in transition services, and from the lack of available government support for public sector jobs? Make some of the remaining funds available.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I do not have a prepared statement this morning, and I am sure hon. members will understand why, but I thought I should take the opportunity to formally advise the House that in the early hours of this morning, as most hon. members may know, an agreement was reached on caplin prices between the fishermen and the processors. The goal of nine cents a pound by the fishermen in the 50 to 54 per cent category has been achieved, a settlement has been reached -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
- and the fishery is off and running this morning. We expect and anticipate that there will be a few days, probably two or three days for sure, left in St. Mary's Bay, five or six days, or more, in Trinity - Conception Bay, and certainly perhaps even a couple of weeks in Notre Dame Bay and White Bay.

The anticipated production that will be produced is 15,000 tons and both the federal government and the provincial government have committed to ensure that the production levels do not go beyond that agreed-on figure in order to protect our position in the marketplace.

The final thing I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that as soon as the Summer fishery is over, we will be moving on this with an open mind, but I have no intention of allowing this kind of situation, where you have one product for one market, to develop again next year, and we are going to be taking every action we can as a government to ensure that it does not happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I share in the hon. minister's pleasure this morning to know that the caplin strike is finally settled. I think the fact

that this \$30 million or \$40 million industry came so close to being lost this year - in fact, I suppose in some areas the caplin fishery was lost - demonstrates the need for the government to take some initiatives to develop a better marketing system to enable the caplin fishery to survive.

The minister's statement, Mr. Speaker, that he is determined not to allow this to happen again, I welcome that announcement, but I should remind him that a similar situation existed, I believe in 1985, and it seems to me that the minister should have acted then. I do not think this should have ever been allowed to develop to the point that it did without some kind of an organized marketing arrangement being put in place by the government.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose the chief reason for the dispute this year stems from the fact, as is often the case, that in our fishery we are too reliant on one market. In the case of caplin, I think we are totally reliant or dependent on the Japanese market. I think that, too, points out the need for the government, working with the union and the processors, to set their sights on other markets. For example, it might very well be that there could be markets existing in China, in South East Asia, and maybe certain European countries, where caplin could be sold.

Mr. Speaker, again we welcome the announcement. We congratulate the parties who worked long and hard to bring about this settlement, and we are happy that it appears now that both sides are reasonably well satisfied.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, we also welcome the news that there has been a resolution to the dispute. I am not saying it is totally successful, because I think everybody does realize that we are going to pay heavily for it with a reduced quota of 15,000 tons, and also, of course, as the minister has said, with the fishery almost disappearing in some bays as a result of the delay.

I join with the member for Twillingate in urging the minister to make sure that some mechanisms are put in place next year so that we do not have a repeat of the same process. I have heard a number of suggestions for attacking the problem, one of which is perhaps the single desk selling concept. That may be one answer to it. One of the other concepts I have heard from, I think the member for Twillingate, was the possibility of additional storage facilities so we are not reliant on having to catch the fish, package it, and sell it almost immediately.

So, on that basis, I think that we on this side are very much supportive of any efforts that the Minister of Fisheries, in conjunction with the union, can make in order to put a more orderly marketing system in place so that we do not end up with this cliff-hanger of a negotiated deal each year as we go through the caplin fishery, which, as everybody has indicated, is so

important to many fishermen in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

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 Premier concerning youth unemployment. Yesterday in this House, and over the last few weeks, we have asked a few questions concerning the youth unemployment situation in the Province, and specifically concerning the consistent figure of around 18,000 to 19,000 to 20,000 young people who have been walking around all year in the last number of years.

I would like to know will the Premier and his government be undertaking to bring in or implement some programmes specifically to deal with the problem? While we have seen one or two measures come in in the last year, the problem still exists and the rate is still up 36 per cent to 40 per cent officially, which is an unbelievable figure. So we would like to know are there new initiatives being planned specifically to deal with the problem in the short term and also in the long term, hopefully so that young people can see that at least there is a sign that

something is going to be there to help them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have answered that question I do not know how many times in the House over the last several weeks. I do not intend to go into a great verbose answer to the hon. member's question. We have initiated a range of new programmes this year to try to tackle the unemployment problem and we will be monitoring the situation over the next few months to see how successful they are, and then decide whether there are other new measures we can bring in, if, in fact, the success rate is not what we would like it to be.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, just one final supplementary to the Premier. The problem is still there, according to the Newfoundland Statistics Agency, involving some 19,000. While I am well aware you are monitoring the problem, the problem has been there for the last seven or eight years specifically, and the last four or five it has consistently remained high.

I think your government has done enough monitoring. Is it possible that you could give an undertaking that you will look at bringing some initiatives forward, over the

Summer period or for the Fall period, to deal with the major problem of youth unemployment in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member says 'you have done enough monitoring,' no, we have not. We have a new Youth Entrepreneurship Programme that we launched only a month of two ago. We want to see how that works, how that operates, and see whether it needs to be expanded or needs to be changed, just what we can do there, which is to tackle the problem in a more long term way.

The minister announced this morning some additional private sector job creation initiatives which involve the youth of our Province. We will have quite a few of the youth involved in the public sector employment programmes through Forestry and silviculture, through Tourism and Culture, Recreation and Youth as it relates to park developments, archeological development - a lot of which are student orientated - Fisheries, Rural Development and so on. So we are monitoring those new initiatives to see how they work. Then, during August or September, as we take a look at them and examine what has happened and what has not happened, then we will consider whether in fact certain things have not happened the way we would have liked them to, and then we can amend or change for the sake of improvement at that point in time. But you do not sabotage a programme when it has had only an opportunity of thirty or forty days to operate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). Again it concerns the plight of many thousands of Newfoundlander fishermen and fish plant workers who this year are severely affected by the shortage of groundfish in the traditional inshore fishing areas. I know the minister has announced that he has made representations to his federal counterpart with respect to the possibility of extending, maybe, UI benefits to fishermen. I am not sure if he has made a similar request for fish plant workers. I wonder is he able to report to the House now what the results of those representations are? Has he heard back from his counterpart? And if so, what is the answer?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, up to the last time I was in the office, which was really coming to the House for the session yesterday afternoon at 3:00 o'clock, up until that point in time I had not had any formal response.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I hope what I heard is not true, but I am informed by highly placed officials in Ottawa that the minister's request will not be met, to 1. they will not be acceding to his request to extent UIC benefits. I hope I am wrong.

But in the event, Mr. Speaker, that is the case - it is probably hypothetical, I know, but it is a serious problem - can the minister tell the House if he has a contingency plan to put forward to Ottawa to alleviate the problem facing these thousands of Newfoundlanders who are now suffering because of a poor fishery?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gravity of the hon. gentleman's question. I am sure he will appreciate that it is a bit early to have contingency plans worked out for every eventuality. There have been improving signs over the last three or four days in many parts of the Province, including areas of Labrador, where the inshore groundfishery picked up tremendously over the last day or two in some areas. Now it is still proverbially as flat as a pancake in a lot of areas of the Province yet.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is good in Lawn, is it not?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Excellent in Petit Forte, Lawn and that area, some parts of the Avalon Peninsula, even parts of Labrador. So it is starting to happen, it is starting to move..

So we have to continue to be optimistic.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman is aware is that those fishermen who are able to take part in the lump fish fishery have done extremely well. Now that there is a settlement in the caplin fishery, hopefully that will improve the economic activity of fishermen and they will be able to generate income for themselves and plant workers as a result of that. So to have a contingency plan in place on June 18 or 19 while we can be thinking in that direction I do not think we ought to move too quickly to try to cover every eventuality because there is still time to have a good inshore fishery. Let us be optimistic and hope that that will, in fact, happen.

MR. W. CARTER:
A very short supplementary.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
I appreciate what the minister has said, but he must also appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that a large number of fishermen on the Northeast Coast are not getting any fish and in many cases have not received a pay cheque since May 15. I ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, would he seriously think about coming up with a contingency plan in the event the situation does not improve and in the event that Ottawa will not come through with an extension of UI benefits?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, if the worst case

scenario, a very bad case scenario becomes the order of the day, I think our track record speaks for itself: We will be there in spades with all the help that we can deliver to the people who need it most. Last year we did not bat too many eyelashes or fool around waiting for any assistance from anybody in bringing in the \$1 million special Mackerel Assistance Programme. So the evidence and the action is there, loud and clear, that this Province will support the fishermen in every way possible, when possible, when we need to do it.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
I have a question for the Premier. It relates to Mr. Wilson's White Paper of last evening which projected that about \$6 billion less would be generated over the next five years under the proposed new income tax regime. He indicated that that \$6 billion revenue shortfall would be offset by a restructured sales tax at the federal level, which could well mean an overall increase in the tax burden for certain groups of people in the country. One of the possibilities the minister mentioned was a national sales tax with collaboration from the provincial governments or in collaboration with provincial governments. My question to the Premier, then, is: Will the Premier undertake that the Province will not enter into any agreements with the federal government on the matter of a national sales tax until such time as the House has had prior

opportunity to debate the issues, the principles that would be involved in such a collaborative national/provincial tax collecting effort?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I cannot give that commitment here today, it is impossible for me to do. There are a lot of variables contained therein that are not clear at the present moment. As a result of the tax reform initiatives last night on the income tax side, and I do not know if all hon. members are aware, there will be about 25,000 people in Newfoundland who are now paying taxes who will not be paying taxes as of next year. There will be 25,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who will no longer be paying any income tax.

On the national sales tax, there are three alternatives being proposed by the minister, and they are subject not only to discussion with provincial governments but also in collaboration and consultation with many interest groups around the country.

We have not completed our assessment. That is a very complex piece of business and that is why it has not been brought in as a finality right now. We are doing studies now on the three initiatives and how they would impact upon the Province and those kinds of things. I can assure the hon. member that we are not going to enter into any kinds of agreements with the federal government or anybody else which we think are going to be injurious to this Province in any way, shape or form.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
I appreciate what the Premier says about the fact that this is at the proposal, the White Paper stage, but my request to him was quite specific. I would submit to him that I think if he wishes he can give the kind of commitment that was asked, but perhaps my request was not clearly understood so let me put it in perhaps another fashion. One of the options, as he I believe implied, is this national sales tax. That, I submit, has a number of ramifications in terms of overall tax burden particularly. It has ramifications, of course, in terms of our existing sales tax, which is already the highest of any in the country. The overall point to be made, Mr. Speaker, is that it would represent quite a sweeping change, and I am not placing a value judgement as to whether it would be a change for the better or the worse, but quite a considerable change in the way sales taxes are collected in this Province and in the country at large. In light of that, because there are a number of issues and principles which flow therefrom, would the Premier give to the House the undertaking, before he and his administration lock this Province into any new sales tax collection regime, that those issues that are involved in that matter would be fully debated, the House would have the opportunity to fully debate those issues here in the House of Assembly before such time as the dotted line has been signed?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give that commitment at this time.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), and since it has been a theme of this whole session maybe it is appropriate that we close out on a question with regard to the joint project with the Sprung interests here in St. John's. I quote from the minister the Premier's press release of May 8: "This new company has invested upwards of \$35 million in extensive research and development over a ten year period." My question to the Premier is this: Could he give us some description of the kind of investment that was done and the source of the money that was used for this \$35 million in research since this seems to indicate a considerable amount of commitment on the part of this company for this kind of technology?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I thank the hon. member for his question. Over the next number of months there will be more and more information coming out on this whole matter, and I appreciate the hon. member's question in that regard. One of the reasons why

some of the information has not been forthcoming up to now - some of the information - is because we are still negotiating from heads of an agreement to a legal agreement and all that that entails. So, until the agreement is done, some of the information cannot come out.

Secondly, there are patents that the company has, and you cannot go giving information to competitors, to rivals who are trying to get as high technologically as this company now is.

Thirdly, you have commercial problems as well, relating to price and markets. As a matter of fact, I spent part of this week in Eastern Canada and the United States and had additional meetings on the whole issue of the question of markets, and I would just like to inform hon. members that, in the absence of a specific written something from this government on it, I can assure hon. members opposite that, contrary to what some of the competitors say, the markets are not only there but there are too much markets. We do not have enough facilities to meet the markets.

The \$35 million and ten years, as the hon. member might know, this company had been involved in buildings for quite some time, just buildings to be sold for recreational purposes, military purposes, exhibition purposes, and it was out of the kind of fabric that they were using in this building that they came upon this whole growing system. Then they entered into an agreement with a leading scientist from England, who was here in the Province about a week ago in negotiating part of the legal agreement, and it was in consultation with this scientist

and the Sprung Group of Companies that they did their experiments, and in consultation with the National Research Council of Canada early on. They did a lot of their experimentation in smaller buildings in Calgary with the scientist from England, who is also connected with other hydroponic operations in Europe. The \$35 million, specifically, was Sprung money. That is how much Mr. Philip Sprung's company is out for this research, \$35 million. So it was that company's own money. There was a small amount of money from the National Research Council for one of the components of the testing process. So some of the research was done in Europe in consultation, under contract with Mr. Michael Anselm, who as anybody who wants to check with anybody who knows will find, this person is very well thought of in the scientific community. So it was Sprung money almost totally and it was done over a ten-year period both in Western Canada and in Europe.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is: In the last number of years, up until the time that the P.C. Government took over in the Fall of 1984, there was a federal government programme called the Scientific Research Tax Credit. Could the Premier inform us how much of the \$35 million that Sprung has put into it came through what has been variously described by other people as one of the biggest boondoggles ever

existing? In other words, how much of the \$35 million in actual research money came through the Scientific Credit Tax Programme, which was so wide open and so open to abuse that virtually every expert who looked at it considered it to be a total ripoff?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I cannot answer that directly because I have not got the books of the Sprung Company and the flow-through of that \$35 million right before me. I will find out exactly, unless the hon. member has the information and he is trying to set me up with a question so that he can come back and say something else, which would not be uncharacteristic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
If the hon. gentleman is being honest and straightforward, then I am trying to be honest and straightforward in return. I have not got a copy of the audited statement on the \$35 million in front of me. But, as I remember it, that Scientific Tax Credit system only came into operation in the last three of four years.

MR. FENWICK:
It ended in the Fall of 1984.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes. When did it come in?

MR. FENWICK:
In 1981.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
In 1981. So it was in from 1981 to 1984. I think most of that \$35 million of research that the

Sprung people did, at least a lot of it, would have been spent before that. So how much was left and how much they qualified for under that programme, I have not got a clue right off the top of my head, but I will find out for the hon. member.

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

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

MR. FENWICK:
Our information is, by the way, that the lion's share of it, the vast majority of it, did come through this programme. What I would like to ask the Premier is, since it is very likely we will not be sitting very much longer, would he be able to get the information for us? Because we do not have the actual figures and it is an honest question. Give us some indication, because I think it would give us a feeling for how much of a commitment there has been. If about \$25 million of it came from this programme, then I would suggest that the amount of commitment was not nearly the level that we were first led to believe when we were told it was \$35 million.

So if the Premier could give us that information in the future, we would certainly appreciate it.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I will try to get that information for the hon. member. I would just say to the hon. member that our position is the money that was spent was spent on good research for a new technology. It has

allowed for that new technology to be now the best in the world. Anybody who has got a grain at all, who has looked at this whole thing, cannot challenge the following statement, that there is nobody on this planet today who can do in hydroponics what the Sprung Group can do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What!

MR. PECKFORD:

That is a true statement; they cannot do it, it cannot be done.

So the research has been done. If they used the federal programme to access additional funds or whatever, so much the better. I mean, it is the NDP - is it not? - that is advocating all the time more public money for this, more public money for that, more public money for something else. And now when somebody else -

MR. FENWICK:

It is our money, taxpayer money!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, that is my understanding of it. But I am just theoretically now responding to hon. members who, because of their hypocrisy, will from time to time will get up wanting more public money on this, more public money on that, and then, when there may have been the possibility or probability that somebody got public funds, suddenly there is something wrong with it. Poof!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, obviously there is no company on the face of this earth who could suck in the Newfoundland Government like the Sprung group did.

My question is to the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). The two speech pathologists at Western Memorial Hospital have been given their layoff notices and there is every indication, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Public Health will take over those positions. There is some fear, which I accept, that the Public Health Division cannot match the present services which are being offered today, let alone increase - and there is a clear need to increase - the services being offered over there. So I ask will the hon. minister today assure the 140 people on the waiting list for speech pathology at the hospital in Corner Brook - people with cerebral palsy, the mentally handicapped, stroke victims, the hearing impaired, some with Parkinson's disease - that their chances of getting treatment will be enhanced as a result of the intended changes at the Western Memorial Hospital today?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot give you that assurance but I am sure speech pathologists, whether they are under the aegis of the Western Memorial Hospital or under the aegis of the Department of Public Health Services in Corner Brook, the service is going to be identical. I am sure, having done your homework, you realize there is a great shortage of speech pathologists not alone in this

Province but all across Canada.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

I did not hear someone else ask a question, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. minister must be answering someone else's question, certainly it was not mine.

Of course, the minister will not assure them, because he knows full well that there is going to be a downgrading of services in Western Memorial Hospital when there is clear need for an increase. Now I ask will the minister attempt to correct this mistake? Will he commit extra money? Because what happened was the hospital budget was cut, and that is why they have to drop those speech pathologists. And there is some fear that, when Public Health takes over, the terms of reference will create a problem, but that is another point. But will the minister attempt to correct this problem and commit a couple of extra salary units so that extra speech pathologists can be put in the hospital in Corner Brook - not a cutback, but an increase - so the needs of the people in Corner Brook can be met?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

I wish that I could wave that magic wand and say there will be \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000 or

\$500,000 to distribute among all the hospitals in this Province. There have been not really a cutback in any hospital in this Province. They all have at least 4 per cent over last year. I wish I could have all the money that you speak about and then I would have a Paradise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question was going to be to the Premier, but the Premier is not here so I will have to direct it to the President of the Council (Mr. Ottenheimer). This Province has several outstanding agreements to be signed with the Federal P.C. Government in Ottawa, such as the Secondary Roads agreement, the Agricultural agreement, the Coastal Labrador agreement, and the Small Business agreement. With a federal by-election coming up in St. John's East, can we expect any of these agreements to be signed, particularly the Secondary Roads agreement, which we have now been waiting for six years, and the Coastal Labrador DRIE agreement, because Labrador is being told by the departments of Municipal Affairs, Health and others that there is no sense applying to us for money because we are waiting for a new agreement with Ottawa? When can we expect some of these agreements to be signed?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

As soon as negotiations are completed.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). Mr. Speaker, first I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Minister of Social Services for the assistance he gave me yesterday in helping a young boy from the Boys' Home to have the opportunity of visiting his parents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

I appreciate that.

But in connection with that, Mr. Speaker, the minister is aware that a new chairman has not been appointed to this new Young Offenders Review Board since the resignation of Mr. Hickey. I would like to ask is the minister aware of a number of problems that have been presented because of the Review Board being set up and the problems that the young lads at the Boys' Home have been having in getting their cases reviewed? Would he now tell us if he is considering abolishing this Board, since we told him in the beginning

we did not agree with it, and that such cases would be better dealt with by the Family Court? Does he not see that the cases of young boys at the Boys' Home would be better and more efficiently handled at the Family Court than at this Young Offenders Review Board?

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I have to acknowledge there have been some growing pains with the Appeal Board, particularly with the resignation of Mr. Hickey, which really threw us for a loop. But we feel that once we get a permanent person in place then the system should work and it should be to the advantage of young offenders.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the minister's answer because I think there must be some problem, and the minister must recognize that there is a problem, since he promised us over a month ago, said publicly in this House of Assembly, that by the end of May he would have a new chairman of that Board. I believe the minister does see that there was a mistake there and that he should abolish the board.

The next question, Mr. Speaker, pertains to the fact that we had

two fires, one at Pleasantville and one at Whitbourne, and those young boys are now in two different places, in the Torbay Recreation Center and Pleasantville. From talking with the some of the parents and some of the people connected with the Boys' Homes, there is a considerable number of problems growing right now. Number one, they are not getting the proper counselling, number two, they have to travel to and from one building to obtain their meals, and they are not getting the proper programmes that they had at Whitbourne. What has the minister put in place, or does he have any idea of the problems at the Torbay Recreation Center and at Pleasantville?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of problems, so the hon. member is right. We are doing everything that we can to cope with it. He is right when he said we have had two fires and which have thrown the whole system into turmoil. We are doing the best that we can. We are moving them out during the day so they can get their programmes and their schooling, but it is far from adequate. Unfortunately, there is absolutely nothing that we can do any more than what we are doing. We acknowledge the many problems that are associated with that sort of thing. It is, of course, an emergency situation. All of this was brought on by the fire, but even if there had not been two fires, Mr. Speaker, the situation was still not what it should be with these old buildings we had. Of course, everybody in the House

is aware that we are moving it as fast as we can to start construction on our new institution. We will be picking the site very shortly for that and, if we are lucky, Mr. Speaker, we might even be able to start construction before the end of the fiscal year.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough for those young offenders at the Boys' Home at Torbay and Pleasantville to say 'We are doing all we can, but it is not good enough.' That is another admission on the part of the Minister of Social Services that he cannot competently do the job that is required of him. We have to take into consideration that those young boys need attention and we cannot have a lapse of six or seven months. I ask the minister will he not immediately put a plan in place to better improve counselling, improve services for those young boys? It could be a year, it could even be two years before those homes are built, and those boys are in and out on six month and ten month sentences. It is not good enough to say we got to wait for the homes to be built. We want something, we want it now and we want this minister to do something about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, a lot of what is

happening now is very, very temporary, because the fire at Whitbourne was not all that serious, mostly smoke and water damage, and Public Works has been in and I believe they have completed their assessment. We should be back into the Boys' Home in Whitbourne early in the Summer, probably in July month. I stand to be corrected on that because I do not know the exact date that they will be going back, but the most that has to be done at Whitbourne is clean up, painting and cleaning up smoke damage, and there is some minor electrical damage. So a lot of the problems that we have now will be overcome within a matter of weeks. Of course, we still have to cope with the problems that we have at the Recreation Center by having to keep boys there. But there is very little we can do, Mr. Speaker, any more than we are doing because there is no other suitable place in this city and, as a matter of fact, I do not know if there is another suitable place in Newfoundland. We looked at some adult correctional centers, but as the minister I do not look very kindly on that and I do not think anybody in the House does. We do not want to lock up those young offenders behind bars, that sort of thing, we have to keep them in a proper environment. So while we recognize the problems, the hon. member, I am sure, also recognizes that all of this is emergencies and we are doing the best that we can. Whitbourne will be back as it was very shortly, then we will still have to contend with the problem we have at the Recreational Center, and there is very little we can do about that until we get our new institution.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries Mr. Alex Snow, Mayor of Labrador City.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Notices of Motion

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I will give notice and I will just have a few words with reference to it.

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution:

WHEREAS the last review of the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly took place in 1979; and

WHEREAS all caucuses in the House of Assembly are desirous that a review of said Standing Orders be undertaken; and

WHEREAS it is beneficial to review periodically the parliamentary rules governing the practice and procedures of the House of Assembly;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that a Standing Orders Committee consisting of the hon. members for:

Lewisporte (Mr. Russell)
Fogo (Mr. Tulk)
Carbonear (Mr. Peach)
Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons)
Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford)
Menihek (Mr. Fenwick)
St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons)

be appointed to review said Standing Orders in order to

recommend to the House of Assembly at its next sitting amendments which will update the practice and procedures of the House of Assembly.

Let me just me say, by way of explanation, that this notice is given after consultation with the official Opposition and the third caucus, and obviously they nominated their own membership therein. Hon. members are probably aware as well that in our own Standing Orders it is stated that in the First Session of each Assembly - and each assembly is the group after an election - there is provision for the appointment of a Standing Orders Committee, and that in fact was not done, and that would have been in 1985. This fills in that gap.

I think it is fair to say, as well, that all interests in the House do wish to review the Standing Orders. I know there are certain matters there that the government feels could be updated, streamlined, improved, one being when we finalize budgetary matters there is a procedure where one goes in and out and in and out and in and out of Committee three times, and it is all pro forma. I think the usual procedure in Ottawa, and perhaps other places, is that the budget motion is that this House agrees with or endorses the budget of the government, something like that, whereas ours is that the Speaker leave the Chair, he leaves the Chair, and he goes back and forth about three times. So I am sure that the Opposition have suggestions and the third caucus as well.

So that is by way of explanation. Then, to make it operative, obviously we would need to vote on it today to have it established,

and there has been consultation on that as well. Others may wish to speak on it, in which case I will sit down, and then what we could do by leave is pass it here rather than going Orders of the Day and calling it, because it will then be done.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
We on this side welcome the resolution that the minister has put forward. I say to him that I want to make a couple of remarks on this, but before I do we have no objection to passing this resolution immediately because we think that it is long overdue. If you look at our Standing Orders you will see that in some cases the organization of them is piecemeal. For example, you can find references to private members' bills, for example, all over our Standing Orders anywhere you care to look. Besides that, there are many rules and procedures that we in the Opposition believe need to be modernized in keeping with the way that we would like to see this House run. So we welcome the initiative. We also welcome, I say to the Government House Leader, the consultative process that he used in putting together this resolution and in setting up this committee. I say to him it is a welcome change from what we have seen on many occasions from the government side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, on this side we would invite all of the members in the Legislature to make submissions to this Committee, to have an input into it, and perhaps it might be a

chance for the general public, who at times - I believe a lot of it is from misunderstanding - take a somewhat less than admirable stance about their politicians and the way they behave in this Chamber, to make suggestions and recommendations to us as well as to how they think we should proceed. Perhaps in the process the general public as well as ourselves might become a little bit more educated.

So, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the initiative by the government. We welcome the consultative process. I say to the minister, let us get on with it and let us get it done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, there are just three or four items we wish to see the committee address. Again I endorse the comments of the Government House Leader and the official Opposition House Leader in endorsing the committee. We think it is, again, a situation whereby in 1979 there were only two parties in the House and we now, through Your Honour's ruling, have three parties, three caucuses, yet we do not have a set of orders that really reflect that and define what the roles and responsibilities are. I think this is an excellent opportunity to do that.

The other things that I think the committee should address are questions about whether or not we should televise this House. Since the Standing Orders clearly do not call for it or allow for it, it would be, I think - I do not want

to prejudge the committee because it obviously has a wide mandate - appropriate for the question of whether we should televise the House to be seized by the committee and some recommendation come back to the House itself afterwards.

There are obviously some questions about Question Period. We now have a system whereby the first individual standing up should be recognized under our Standing Orders. Perhaps we should look at some other Legislatures where there is a natural roster in which the parties divide the number of questions, which is a more orderly procedure to have in place.

So, Mr. Speaker, we certainly endorse the resolution. We endorse the committee and we feel that we should be able to have a much better co-operative spirit in the House once we make sure that the rules themselves reflect the reality of the House here in 1987 rather than 1979.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Could I get the attention of the minister for just a moment? I would like the gentleman from Menihek to just give ear for a moment, too, because I think it is an important issue in how this committee does its work.

I understand that the mechanism exists to appoint the Standing Committee, albeit by leave, to increase the numbers from five to seven. I say to the minister that the assignment the House is about

to give to this committee is not your normal Standing Committee assignment. It falls more in the area of your Select Committee assignment. He will be aware, without my spelling it out, that the Select Committee, first of all, would have considerably more latitude. Because, I would submit to him, that the committee might want to do things, engage in activities, that a Standing Committee would normally want to and there might be some expenses involved in that.

I would ask him to consider making this a Select Committee for the reason I just gave in terms of the activities it might get into, but also because of the nature of its assignment, which really is beyond the normal Standing Committee assignment, I submit to him. It is an ad hoc function that once done hopefully will not need to be done for some time to come.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I have no serious objections to what the hon. gentleman is suggesting, but one of the reasons I did it this way is that obviously the Standing Orders do provide for such a committee which we do not have. I think if it is understood that this committee will have the wherewithal to do what it wishes and deems necessary to do, and that is really done in consultation with the Speaker and not the Government House Leader, then the objectives will be achieved.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is understood.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is understood.

If there is no further comment, I would move the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'nay'.

The motion is carried.

Orders of the Day

On motion, the following bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper:

A bill, "An Act To Establish A Community College System In The Province." (Bill No. 13).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of The Institute Of Fisheries And Marine Technology, The Fisher Institute Of Applied Arts And Technology And The Cabot Institute Of Applied Arts And Technology". (Bill No. 12).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University (Pensions) Act". (Bill No. 39).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973". (Bill No. 27).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Corporations Act". (Bill No. 38).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural, Agricultural

And Northern Development Act".
(Bill No. 37).

A bill, "An Act To Remove
Anomalies And Errors In The
Statute Law". (Bill No. 43).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Order 10. Bill No. 34.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order 10. Committee of the Whole
on a bill, "An Act Respecting The
Return Of The Business Of Fishery
Products International Limited To
Private Investors".

On motion, that the House resolve
itself into Committee of the Whole
on certain bills, Mr. Speaker left
the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, Please!

Shall clause 8 carry?

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Chairman, I really believe
that almost everything has
already been said about the FPI
Bill from our side, so if we can
we were going to stick to the last
two clauses, because we are
sticklers in regard to observing
the rules of the House.

Clause (8) says: 'The provisions
of this Act which apply to FPI
Limited or Fishery Products
International Limited shall also
apply to any successor corporation
of FPI Limited or Fishery Products

International Limited whether
formed by way of amalgamation,
arrangement or otherwise.'

The only comments I have to make
about the particular clause are
that what I think it does tell us
is how transient these
organizations are. I was
listening this morning to the CBC
radio when they had the ceremonies
up on Signal Hill, and it was
interesting in that there was a
gentleman there who was an expert
in the old merchant firms of
Newfoundland and was talking about
the old merchant firms that had
prosecuted the fisheries, the
flags that they had and so on, and
what was quite interesting is
there were only four firms dating
back to the last century that
still exist and, as near as I
could make out, none of them were
in the fishery. Most were either
insurance brokers or were into
supply companies, like Harvey and
Company which is in oil and
everything like this. So what it
tends to suggest to us, I think,
is there is a transient nature to
these businesses and indeed there
probably will be a transient
nature to Fishery Products
International in terms of where it
is going.

I would like to suggest to the
minister and to everybody in this
House that twenty years from now,
or thirty years from now Fishery
Products International may be a
company located in Panama, it may
be involved with dealing with God
knows what, and have nothing to do
whatsoever with our particular
fishery. And it is by way of
suggesting that we really are
unleashing this company, we are
unleashing it in a way that in my
opinion we have virtually no
control over. In looking at the
clauses I think we have adequately

shown that many of the provisions that we have here are subject to reinterpretation under the Charter of Rights, many of them are a violation of the economic union clause, and when we get to clause (9) we will indicate how we think that that one possibly is unconstitutional as well or could be challenged as being unconstitutional.

So I think it unfortunate that because we have had a prosperous fishery for a short period of time, which I hope, by the way, will last long, but because we have had that prosperous fishery over the last year or two that we are in a position to be able to sell Fishery Products International for a substantial sum and that having sold it the provincial government would make back the \$48.5 million - or is it \$48.7 million? I forget the exact amount - that it invested in it. But in essence it has at the same time given away the major instrument of control of the offshore fishery. I think that that is very unfortunate. We have made the point so many times that I am probably getting a little bit repetitive in saying the same arguments again, and I do not want to particularly go through them time and time again.

So what I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that it is unfortunate that we have done that, and eventually I think we will live to regret having made that decision. Indeed, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has already indicated he is quite regretful that he no longer has the good input to Fishery Products International he had. I think we will see in the future that we will have less and less control of it. That, Mr. Chairman, is a

major mistake and one that I wish we had not made but one which, when we form the New Democratic Party Government in this Legislature, we will quickly correct. We will revise this piece of legislation and buy back a suitable portion of the company to make sure we have that window on the industry and that we have some degree of control of it. So it is not an irrevocable mistake, provided we get an NDP Government in good time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question! Question!

On motion clause 8 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 9 carry?

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just a few more comments on that particular clause, Mr. Chairman. It says: 'A majority of the members of the board of directors of each of FPI Limited and Fishery Products International Limited shall be residents of the Province.' Mr. Chairman, this is, I consider, probably one of the weakest clauses we have there. As I understand our Canadian Constitution the concept of the economic union is paramount. This is a country in which you have the right to work from St. John's to Victoria, from the high Arctic down to Point Pelee in Ontario, the most Southerly point. We have that right to work anywhere in the country. Concurrently, we also have the right invest our money any place in the country, with very minor restrictions in terms

of affirmation action programmes and so on. We also have, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, the right to be a member on the Board of Directors of any corporation that is registered in this country, and that a provincial Legislature such as ours that says that you have to be a resident of a Province to be a member of a board, I would suggest to you, is open to challenge under the Canadian Constitution. Now, I should point out that I would hope that it would be upheld, because I think this is one of the very small ways we have of having influence upon this particular corporation. But given my experience and my understanding of the Constitution, and indeed the Minister of Fisheries' (Mr. Rideout) comments where he said that there is a division of opinion on whether or not it would hold up, I think we very clearly have a situation here where we do not know whether or not this particular piece of legislation will hold up.

The other question I have to ask about it is: What do you do when you appoint these board members? Do we take the board members and we hold them down at the first board meeting and we take a branding iron and put a big N on their forehead and say you are now designated as a Newfoundland and Labrador Board Member and God forbid you should ever leave this Province and establish residence anywhere in the world or we will strip you of your rights as a board member? In other words, Mr. Chairman, do we actually allocate which ones are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians or is it just sort of a survey that we conduct every three or four months to determine who stayed in the Province, who has moved in from outside and so

on and so forth? In other words, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult from the reading of it to understand what mechanism will be involved in order to make sure that this provision is endorsed, even if, quite frankly, it does not fall down as a result of a challenge under the charter. So I believe it is the Achilles heel of the agreement and as a result of it being the Achilles heel it is the doorway through which control of FPI can eventually slip off to people who are not residents of the Province and who have not got the best interests of the Province at heart. So on that basis I think that it is a flaw that we should not have allowed to appear there, but quite frankly I do not see any other way that it could have been drafted. That is probably as strong a clause as you could put in there. I think anything worse would be even more easily challenged by the Constitution. In other words, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is there is no control of this company and, since there is no control of it, I do not see why we are putting in these petty clauses in order to make it look like we do have control.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and allow my colleague to have a few words as well.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a few brief comments to follow on what the hon. the member

for Menihek has said but to put the question of control in a different light and not in so much as this clause raises legal questions but in so much as this residency requirement of the Board of Directors represents, I would submit, a rather weak gesture of compensation in as much as the company is being privatized, the effort - to have the Board of Directors Newfoundland residents is to somehow suggest that they will in that way be bound to put the interest of the Province and the interest of the people of the Province before anything else. What I would say to the minister and to the government, Mr. Chairman, is that the problems that we have seen in the industry in the past is not a question of Newfoundlanders being involved in positions of power at the center of the industry, but a problem of the bottom line being the bottom line, the bottom line being a question of profits and the interests of shareholders. We saw FPI in the past, and the Lake Group of Companies, and the other companies that produced the downturn in the industry that forced both levels of government and the banks to come in with a restructuring agreement, these people were all Newfoundlanders. Their primary interest was not the questions of social protection of the industry; their basic, primary objective was to deal with the bottom line of profits and to protect the position of shareholders. So what we see, Mr. Chairman, is an attempt to try and suggest that the interests of the people of the Province and the public interest will be protected because these people are Newfoundlanders. But because these people are Newfoundlanders means little when the fundamental role that they are charged with,

as members of the Board of Directors, is to ensure the profitability of the corporation. That is what they answer to first and foremost, the shareholders and the bottom line. So it is an illusion to suggest that because the Board of Directors are, as in the legislation, obliged, required to be Newfoundlanders, that that is somehow going to protect the interests of the fishing communities and the people in the Province.

What we are saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the government is abdicating any public responsibility by handing over the corporation to private hands, and there is very little that the government can do in the way of trying to compensate for that, and that this residency requirement of the Board of Directors will certainly not make up for what is essentially a giveaway to the private sector that will allow no guarantee for public accountability.

There is only another clause or two remaining and the two schedules that we must pass. The questions that the member for Menihek has raised about this, and then the argument that I have been submitting, that making the majority of board members resident Newfoundlanders, will not guarantee any real degree of public accountability for the corporation, and these are the essential problems that we have with the legislation. We argued for some time during second reading that we were opposed in principle, not to present any argument against the importance of the restructuring of the industry and the necessary move to modernize and streamline and make more efficient the operations of

this corporation. But we would suggest that it makes little sense at this historic time, when the government has brought in an unprecedented budget with unprecedented deficits, unprecedented debts that everybody in this Province is having to cope with, that when we have a corporation that in a two year period - began to turn its operations around for various reasons - the industry began to turn around and very healthy profits were made last year, \$40 million - that the immediate response by the government is to take the corporation out of public hands and to give it to the private sector. Somehow, when profit is being made by an institution that is in public hands, then that is a no go, that is not the way for the government to get itself involved in the economy.

As we see in other ways, the pattern is consistent with cutbacks in social programmes. But essentially, Mr. Chairman, we are arguing that at this time in the Province's history, when we see this public corporation turning a healthy profit, it would have made a lot of sense to keep that company in public hands, to bring the profits back into the public treasury in order to allow the government to initiate its own programmes to try and regenerate the economy in the Province.

That is the essential argument in principle, then, that has been manifested in a number of the clauses that we have been through. In particular Clause No. 9 which is the one we are speaking now, the residency requirement, is a last fall-back attempt by the government to try and tell the people of the Province that this

company will be obliged to have, as its primary objective, the protection of the interests of the people of this Province, the fishing communities, and the fishing industry. We would say, Mr. Chairman, that that is simply not possible by a weak gesture of obliging these people to be resident in Newfoundland. It simply will not work. Their primary goal will be to protect the shareholders and the bottom line and not the industry, the people of the Province, or the fishing communities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, Clauses 9 through 10, carried.

On motion, Schedule A and B, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 34 without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The St. John's Fire Department Act, 1972." (Bill No. 2)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause 1 carry?

MR. FENWICK:

Clause 1, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I was listening to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) - by the way, if the Minister of Justice is within sound of my voice would she please return to her seat? - yesterday speaking on the second reading of the legislation and for

once I am willing to agree with the argument she has put forward. I think at that point she should probably also agree that the legislation should not be used to deprive the members of the St. John's Fire Department from something which they wanted, an Arbitration Award.

Just go back a slight bit and then indicate what the amendment is I am going to propose, she has indicated that there is a Fire Chief and there are two Assistant Fire Chiefs in the department. There are also now, or there have been, four shift superintendents, who were added in 1983. There is an indication several months ago that they added four additional shift superintendents, and when they did that they also asked for a piece of legislation to ensure they would not be members of the bargaining unit. But, of course, at the same time the Fire Captains were dropped, - I think eight of the fire captains are being dropped over the next couple of years - which would be an indication that the bargaining unit would be weaker, it would lose a number of members.

So what I am proposing here as an amendment is that, I believe that there is a compromise that would protect the integrity of the bargaining unit and at the same time allow the department to pass through legislation that would in fact correspond with what is being done now.

Clause 1 says: 'Subsection (2) of section 20 of The St. John's Fire Department Act, 1972, is amended by striking out the words "other than the Fire Chief and the Assistant Fire Chiefs" and substituting the words "other than the Fire Chief, the Assistant Fire

Chiefs" - and here is the amendment "and the shift superintendents".'

My amendment would be to add, after the word superintendent and such shift superintendents shall be limited to four.'

If there is a page here I can give you a written copy of the amendment.

The intention would be this, Mr. Chairman: It would not change at all the meaning of the legislation, but would just say that the shift superintendents who are outside of the bargaining unit, would be restricted to the four who are currently there. We would not increase the number of shift superintendents who are out of the bargaining unit. I will go back just a bit over the argument in case the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) -

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I do want to hear what is being said in this Legislature and it seems to me that there are conversations going on all over the place on all sides of the House. So, could we have some order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Just to summarize what I said to the minister, going back over the minister's comments when we spoke in second reading, there is a Fire Chief and two Assistant Fire

Chiefs and four superintendents who in the past were outside of the bargaining unit, and these were the management structure. Now, there was an intention to add four additional shift superintendents. This was being done over the last couple of months. This is the action, of course, that the firefighters in the local were objecting to, because they saw the positions of eight fire captains, who are in the bargaining unit, being abolished, and at the same time four additional positions as shift superintendents being created.

MS VERGE:
There will be mine.

MR. FENWICK:
Well, I remember there is a whole bunch more, but I am just concentrating on the parts in dispute here. My amendment would add after the word 'superintendents' and you have the wording there so I cannot exactly read it back, these shift superintendents would be restricted to four. The intention is you can have your shift superintendents, out of the bargaining unit, but you do not have the leeway to add twelve or sixteen or eighteen shift superintendents and erode the strength of the bargaining unit. So the intention there is that the four shift superintendent would be out of the bargaining unit but restricted to four in number. Whatever you call the other shift superintendents, maybe assistant shift superintendent, for example, it is perfectly all right with me as long as they remain in the bargaining unit. In other words, what I am saying is that this amendment would protect the bargaining unit and at the same time allow the department whatever

leeway it wished in order to say that these are the management people and they do not have to be in it.

So that, Mr. Chairman, is my amendment. Is it in order, by the way?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The amendment is in order.

Shall the amendment pass?

MS VERGE:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that before the Arbitration Award, which has been accepted, there were thirty-three senior officers of the St. John's Fire Department, out of a total complement of nearly 300, who were not in the bargaining unit, who were management. With this change, Mr. Chairman, there will be, following the increase in the number of shift superintendent positions from four to eight, eleven out of nearly 300 out of the bargaining unit as management. So there will be a reduction from thirty-three before the arbitration to eleven following the reorganization out of a force of 300 members who will be management and not part of the bargaining unit.

Mr. Chairman, the three ranks who will make up the eleven will be the same three ranks who always have been out of the bargaining unit, whom the arbitrator considered belonging out of the bargaining unit. Those ranks are Chief, Assistant Chief and shift superintendent. Mr. Chairman, anyone using common sense can see

that out of a force of nearly 300 members there has to be more than three members, more than just the Chief and the two Assistant Chiefs, out of the bargaining unit. We are maintaining the third rank in the hierarchy out of the bargaining unit and that has always been the case since that third rank was introduced in 1983. So, Mr. Chairman, there is no change from current and past practice that will result from this amendment. The amendment will simply make the act accord with past practice, the current act having come in before 1983 and before the rank of shift superintendent was added to the hierarchy of the St. John's Fire Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the amendment carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The amendment is defeated.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 2 without amendment, carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Order 12 Bill No. 6.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973." (Bill No. 6)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Order 13. Bill No. 23.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Canada/Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act." (Bill No. 23)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Order 14. Bill No. 17.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Day Care And Homemaker Services Act, 1975." (Bill No. 17.)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Order 15. Bill No. 26.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Energy And Other Matters Related Or Incidental Thereto." (Bill No. 26)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Order 16. Bill No. 40.

A bill, An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act And The Uniformed Services Pensions Act." (Bill No. 40)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause 1 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, on Clause 1, also on Clause 2 when it comes, there is an amendment to be made. This is the amendment that hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) referred to yesterday and explained yesterday, but he cannot

move it himself.

So I will move that clause 1 of the bill be amended by striking out the period after the word 'Plan' and by adding, immediately after the proposed section 14(5)(b), the following: 'where the effective date of the reduction is prior to age sixty-five the amount of the reduction as calculated under Subsection (3) shall be reduced by .5 per cent for each month the effective date as established under paragraph (b) is less than the date established under paragraph (a).'

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, you are only moving the one amendment at a time, is that correct, because there are two there?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is the same amendment.

MR. FENWICK:

I know it is the same, for both, but are we discussing both the same time? I assume we are.

Mr. Chairman, the question is how much of the damage that has been wreaked by this government does this particular clause repair? It actually is quite a tiny amount when you look at it. It is my reading of it - and the minister can get up and debate afterwards and clarify it if I am in error as he is so wont to do, or claims he is so wont to do - that if it is .5 per cent for each month prior to age sixty-five that is taken, that the earliest that you could

possibly use this is at the age of sixty, which would be sixty months prior, at .5 times sixty months, which would mean a 30 per cent change in the amount of offset that would occur.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, if an individual were to lose \$1,000, say, using the offset procedure, then under this amendment he would only lose \$1,000 minus 30 per cent, or \$300, for \$700. That is the most advantageous situation that I can find if a person takes retirement at age sixty.

So instead of losing \$1,000 through the actions of the government, 30 per cent less is lost and therefore they only lose 70 per cent of that which would mean a \$700 reduction in pension rather than \$1,000 reduction in pension. Now taking that same \$1,000 offset, if it were to occur half way between age sixty and sixty-five, instead of a 30 per cent reduction in the loss it would only be a 15 per cent loss. I am saying this because I want to make sure that I have the understanding correct. In other words, if you are half way between sixty and sixty-five, instead of having the thing reduced by 30 per cent it would be reduced by 15 per cent, in which case instead of the individual losing \$1,000 under the actions the government is taking, they are being generous enough in giving the individual back \$150 on a yearly basis. Of course, the closer you get to age sixty-five the more miniscule the actual saving becomes. If, for example, you at age sixty-four and you are losing \$1,000, since it is only twelve months times .5, which would be 6 per cent less, in that case it is only \$60 that the individual would get back by this generous amendment. In other

words, the sum effect of this particular thing is that in the best possible case an individual instead of 100 per cent of the loss that he is being nailed with now will only lose 70 per cent. The worse possible case, for a person a month or so before age sixty-five is he would lose one half of 1 per cent of it and he would lose 99.5 per cent of it. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is like somebody has come and pulled your wallet out of your pocket and instead of taking \$1,000 has taken anywhere from \$700 to \$999.50. In my opinion it is still robbing from these poor pensioners and from all the 24,000 people on pensions that are currently going there. So on that basis I cannot see how we can possibly vote for an amendment that still allows the theft of between 70 per cent and 100 per cent of the money from these poor individuals. I would also suggest that this is not exactly what Jake Epp asked for in the letter that he wrote to the minister. He said in there - let us see if we can find that particular letter and I quote from it, 'In general'

DR. COLLINS:
Where did you get the letter?

MR. FENWICK:
As a matter of fact I have five copies of it. Almost every pensioner who got a copy of it has been forwarding them on to me.

DR. COLLINS:
Where did you get the letter?

MR. FENWICK:
He sent it to the pensioners who initially asked for it.

DR. COLLINS:
He sent my letter to the pensioners?

MR. FENWICK:
No. He sent a copy of the letter he sent you to the pensioners who raised the issue with him, and they sent it on to me.

DR. COLLINS:
I see.

MR. FENWICK:
You thought we stole it out of Jake Epp's Office, did you, or out of your office?

What did he ask the minister to do? I quote: 'There are two ways that plans could co-ordinate their benefits with flexible CPP retirement benefits prior to age 65 without unduly penalizing pensioners. The first is to ignore the early payment of the CPP benefit and then make the same reduction at age 65 that would have been made in any case.'

That is the argument, that is the high route, that is the noble course to take, and that is what the minister and his government should have done. As a matter of fact, after we deal with this amendment we have a further amendment which will say exactly that and which will be introduced afterwards.

But what is the other way Mr. Epp suggested?

'The second way is to apply the reduction at the time the CPP benefit becomes payable, but modify the amount of the reduction to recognize that will apply for a longer period of time.'

So what the minister has done is say we will take this arbitrary formula of .5 per cent for each month earlier and we will use that to reduce the amount that we will take back from these pensioners.

In my opinion, if he wanted to do that he should have been much more generous; instead of taking .5 he should have taken something like 1 per cent or 1.25 per cent, something closer to the actual amount that has been taken away. And I am pretty sure that that is what Jake Epp had in mind when he wrote the letter, although quite frankly he and I are not on a conversational basis, although maybe the minister is and he can tell us exactly what Jake Epp had in mind. I suggest to you that he thought that somewhere more than 30 per cent at maximum was the amount of money that he wished to see returned to the pensioners.

So, Mr. Chairman, what I can say is that this is if anything an admission of guilt on the part of the minister. It is an admission that what he is doing is an exceptional action, it is the most mean spirited interpretation of the CPP changes and our own legislation of any government in Canada. He is not going to get away with it because we will continue to say to the very day I die that he robbed the pensioners of this Province and he took money from them that they legitimately earned in a manner which this government has no right to do. And I will still continue to insist on that, and more and more the pensioners, and the people who will be pensioners under that system, are beginning to understand that whole situation.

This is giving them back 30 per cent or less of what is being taken from them. It is not enough. We clearly are going to vote against this amendment. We will then propose our own amendment, which we intend to vote for, and if that is not accepted we intend to vote against the bill

in its entirety.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, what can you say to a load of garbage like that I wonder?

MR. LONG:

That is what you always say, you call it garbage.

DR. COLLINS:

It is a way of operating. I do not know how many people in this House, but I know that there are some, the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), for instance and some others, who remember what went on in the late 1930s and during the early 1940s when a gentleman named Dr. Goebbels was in the German Government, and he was following the orders of his leader, and the orders of his leader was to say something, it does not matter if it is true or not, as long as you say it and keep saying it and keep saying it, because you must keep saying it very frequently if it is a lie, if it is an untruth, if it is a distortion, if it is something that is unreal, unnatural, irrational, you have to keep saying it more and more and more. If you do that, finally you will have a number of people believe you and that will become, in their minds, truth.

Now there was a fallacy to it that we all know, that after a while that false truth comes out and the real truth goes in because the old expression that you can mislead some of the people all the time, all the people some of the time, but not all the people all the

time. And, of course, Dr. Goebbels and his friend, his boss, Mr. Hitler, they learned that to their detriment.

This has happened in other jurisdictions too. So what we have here is the hon. the member for Menihek saying, "I do not care what this amendment does, I am going to continue to the day I die putting out the distortion that I am now putting out, and I will continue doing that."

So, I mean, what can you say? I cannot ask them to stop doing that. He should stop doing it because he is confusing, disorientating, doing damage, causing hurt to pensioners who should not have that done to them, but I cannot stop them doing that unless I sort of muzzle him in some way, and I have no interest in muzzling, unmuzzling, demuzzling, mismuzzling or doing anything with the member for Menihek because he has this impossible ideology, this NDP ideology that does not look at truth. They have a fixation on a certain narrow perspective, a certain view of life, and the facts do not matter, laws do not matter. We saw that; the hon. member demonstrated that himself personally, to him laws do not matter, logic does not matter, consensus does not matter as long as they see something that is the way they are going to go.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what have we done here? As I explained yesterday the federal government brought in a change in CPP. They did not increase CPP benefits. The CPP benefits after January 1 are exactly the same as the CPP benefits before January 1. There is no increase. Over an actuarial period of time, if I can use that

expression, the pensioner gets exactly the same amount of CPP, but it is spread out longer. Instead of getting it in a chunk from sixty-five until the day he demises, say, seventy or whatever, instead of getting it from sixty-five to seventy he will now get it, if he elects to take early retirement, from sixty to seventy. It is the same amount of money spread out over a longer period of time. In other words, the CPP benefit for the early retiree, if he takes up the option, is actuarially reduced.

Now, if the federal government had come to us right at the beginning and said we would like to integrate this with your particular pension arrangements, that would have been the ideal way to go. Why this did not happen I cannot answer. Mr. Epp at some point in time may well answer publicly. He has not answered to me personally satisfactorily why he did have that consultation, but the fact is that he did not do adequate consultation. There was some consultation of a broad brush type, as does he wants to integrate this with pensions across Canada, but that was not sufficient. It should have been focused on each province, because each province's pension plan is different. I suppose I should not say that, but I know ours is different from any of the others. Whether they are different I am not even interested in. Not having done that detailed consultation with us, we immediately could see where this would damage our pensioners. So we put in place - Bill No. 40 unamended - a remedial measure immediately to take care of the clear damage we could see that this arrangement was going to do. We then continued conversation by

phone, by letter and so on, by visitation of officials with the people in Ottawa to further clarify what the federal government had in their mind precisely and how this would integrate with our plan.

We finally got that all straightened out and that is what this amendment does - an amendment to the amendment, shall we say. What the amendment to the amendment does is: As CPP benefits are going to remain the same although spread out actuarially, we are going to take a reduction amount, which is in the act - the hon. member does not believe acts, of course, but I can assure him that it is in the act; it has been in the act since 1967 and we have used it ever since 1967; there has been early retirement ever since 1967 and reduction factors have in place for these early retirees ever since 1967, nothing new - and we are spreading out that reduction amount, too, so that there will be a less severe impact of this reduction factor at sixty than it would be at sixty-five, but there would be a better benefit at sixty-six, sixty-seven, sixty-eight and sixty-nine. So, in other words, the provincial stream to the retiree will be exactly the same but it will be spread out because he is taking early retirement, and the CPP benefits will be exactly the same but they will be spread out because he is taking early retirement, so there is no robbing of the pensioner. This is the distortion, the big - may I use the term and I am going to accuse Dr. Goebbels of this now - lie that Dr. Goebbels perpetrated. Dr. Goebbels was a terrible, terrible man because he engaged in big lies.

MR. LONG:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Chairman, I let that go the first time but I have to rise on a point of order. The way in which the Minister of Finance is accusing my leader of being like Dr. Goebbels, and the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) yesterday talking about Hitler, is absolutely unparliamentary, should be withdrawn. Why do you not have some respect for the level of debate in this Chamber and stop getting down into the dirt and slime talking about Goebbels and Hitler? Why do you not deal with the substance of the argument and stop this name-calling? No wonder the high school students are shocked when they come in and see the level of debate that goes on in this Chamber. You should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, if you have a rather stubborn donkey and you want to lead him somewhere, quite often you first have to hit him over the head with a piece of two by four to get his attention, so that is what I have done here. The hon. the member for Menihek has perpetrated so much distortion about this matter going back several months, or at least a month, that he has confused the pensioners so much that I have to bring out in a very dramatic fashion what he is doing. He is

not doing a proper thing. He is confusing the pensioners unnecessarily. Pensioners will not lose, they will get their pension benefits spread out in a certain way. The CPP is actuarially changed, the reduction factor is actuarially changed, but the same benefits over that actuarial period are there. Now, the hon. member says, 'I do not like the percentage.' I could not care less whether he likes the percentage. Ours is given to us by an actuarial expert who says this is the right percentage to do this factor, to change the method and spread things out, so pensioners get the same benefits that they would get anyway. There is no robbing. It is all done quite straightforward. There was a delay in doing it, but it was not my fault the delay was there. I suppose I should take some of the blame, because I should have hopped on the plane the first time his came out and sat outside Mr. Epp's office and said, 'For God's sake, look at our plan down here, see what you are doing to our plan down here.' I did not do that and I could be criticized for it. Anyway, it is all straightened out now, there is no robbing. Pensioners should not be concerned. Their rights are preserved. What was in the act is still in the act but the method is changed. If they want further explanation from this of a very technical nature that I do not think the Committee would be interested in, they can go and visit our actuary, and he will be only too pleased to take their precise pension amounts and work it out for them and show them that over the period of time that they are expected, according to actuarially tables to live, that their pension rights are preserved. No increase in CPP, no

decrease in the stream from the provincial plan, exactly the same, but spread out a different way. Now, I do not for one minute think the member for Menihek will stop perpetrating his distortions on the poor unfortunate pensioners who will be misled by him. I do not for one minute think he will stop that. He should, but I do not think he will. I think there may be some people in the media who get taken in by the glib garbage that is put out by the NDP and say, 'Since there is a bit of smoke here there must be fire.' There is no fire. It is all smoke and mirrors that the hon. member is getting on with. There is no fire whatever. I am willing to believe that perhaps some people in the media may not look on it that way, but I cannot do anything about that. All I can do is I can assure the House on the advice we have gotten, the input we have had from actuarial experts we pay very expensive contract fees to exactly for this advice, that they assure us the right figure is in there. The spreading out that the Feds did we have now done, and everything is even-stein and the pensioners have a right to persevere it. That is all I can say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, our position is clear on this particular bill. From the beginning of this bill we

said we saw no justification for any reductions to early retirees of their pensions because they were receiving Canada Pension Plan. No reductions, Mr. Chairman. We have seen no justification, we still have not been convinced by the minister that there should be any reason or that there are no substantive reasons given why there should be reductions. Let me further state that we think that the decrease in reduction that the minister has given today by his amendment is too little as well.

The fact that the minister can give a reduction, the fact that he can start decreasing the reduction means that he is on the way to eliminating the thing entirely. Now if you only moved from .6 to .5, the minister could easily have gone, it seems to me, to .3 or to .2, and possibly could have eliminated the reduction entirely.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are two things: first of all, we believe that we have gained a victory, that we have been able to penetrate and permeate somewhat the intransigence of the minister, his tremendous inability to be able to conceptualize and grasp the need of the average Newfoundlander. So, Mr. Chairman, it seems as though we have been able to penetrate somewhat that very hard attitude that he has towards the average Newfoundlander by his very little concession to decrease the reduction.

So, Mr. Chairman, to vote against this bill today would be to vote against two improvements in the present circumstances, as an improvement, though a very small improvement. At least now people have the choice of whether to apply for Canada Pension and thus

have the reduction factor entered into their provincial plan, or not to take the Canada Pension Plan and receive full benefits. So that is a bit of an improvement over what was the situation when the reduction factor was applied to their pension regardless of whether they received Canada Pension or not. So it is an improvement. People do now have a choice. The choice might be the equivalent of dying by the hangman or by a lethal injection, it might be as narrow as that, but, Mr. Chairman, at least there is a choice.

We would not want to vote against that choice. We would not want to be seen to be voting against that choice that is now offered to people, although again we think there should be no reduction.

Secondly, we would not want to vote against the decrease in the reduction that the minister is now giving, albeit it is very, very little. So we would not want to be seen to be voting against these two measures. But we want to serve a warning to the minister that we are not going to let up either. We are not going to let up in this pension matter. We want to ensure that all of the pensioners in this Province, the public pensioners and other pensioners in this Province, receive the full benefits of pensions to which they have contributed.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder why the confusion right now? Were the pensioners of this Province ever aware that when they retired there was going to be a reduction in their provincial pensions? Were they ever aware of that?

MR. DINN:

At age sixty, yes.

MR. LUSH:

At early retirement. The pensioners who talked to me tell me they were not. Now, Mr. Chairman, if this were negotiated and became a matter that was decided upon through collective bargaining, one would believe that pensioners would be aware of it. So another hole in the argument that the minister is advancing is it seems as though this was not negotiated, that the minister is somehow manipulating the rules to the benefit of the Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, because we see two improvements here today - one, the choice of whether one accepts Canada Pension and either decides to have or not to have the reduction, which we see as an improvement as opposed to the carte blanche application of the reduction factor in the beginning; and, secondly, because there is a small decrease - we do not want to be seen to be voting against these two improvements, be they very, very small.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion, is we believe that we have somehow broken down the callousness and the insensitivity of the Minister of Finance and we believe that to be a victory too. The more that we can press him in this matter, we believe that we may in time get him to eliminate the reduction completely and entirely, the way it should be.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the amendment carry?

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Chairman, just by way of notice, we will be moving an amendment, after this amendment is dealt with, to another part of the actual bill itself. We will be getting to that, so that the Chair knows that we are coming to it.

There is one question I have for the Minister of Finance. I have looked at the pooled assets of the pension plans. If we look at the four plans themselves, there are two plans that are seriously in default on a current account basis. In other words, each year the premiums going in are not enough to pay out. Those are the Uniformed Services Pension Plan and the MHA Pension Plan. In other words, of the four plans we have, the Public Service one with 24,000, the Teachers with 8,000, the Uniformed Services with 1,000 people, and the MHA one with fifty-two of us in it, and I guess a few retirees, there are two plans that are seriously in default on a current account basis. In other words, the premiums coming in do not pay for the pension going out in the MHA one and the Uniformed Services one.

The Uniformed Services one is being reduced now, and the minister's major argument is that it is not paying its own way. So I have one question for the minister. Is he willing to get the MHA Plan and have it reduced whenever each of us takes our CPP at age sixty? Are you willing to have the MHA Plan reduced by the same several thousand dollars or so that you are imposing on the 24,000 public employees? If you are willing to do that, then I am going to take back what I am going

to say to you now. Because if you are not willing to do it, you are a hypocrit and you are actually saying that the public employees should live under a particular set of rules and we should not.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

MR. FENWICK:
Is that unparliamentary?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
That is.

MR. FENWICK:
I am sorry. I did not know that the words were unparliamentary although the actions were not. I certainly withdraw them.

DR. COLLINS:
You should be proud of yourself. You are learning something about parliamentary rules.

MR. FENWICK:
I have never, ever seen the Minister of Finance so rattled as he has been on this issue, because he knows he is standing on quicksand. He knows the pensioners, all 30,000 who are either about to receive pensions or who have, know in their pocketbooks that we are right, know in their pocketbooks that we have the goods on him this time, that he is acting like, as the member for Fogo used to call him, the Grinch who stole Christmas. And, quite frankly, he is, because there it was, a week after Christmas, and all of a sudden he was taking money away from our pensioners.

Mr. Chairman, we are right, we

know we are right, the pensioners know we are right and the media know we are right. It is only the Minister of Finance who, for some amazing reasons, thinks that taking \$1,000 to \$2,000 from each one of these pensioners is not reducing their pensions. How he can imagine that I do not know. But he is certainly living in a dream world on it, and on election day his own voters in St. John's South, who are in that plan, will be very happy to tell him what they think of his actions in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, as soon as we deal with this amendment we would like to bring up our own amendment.

On motion, amendment carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Shall clause 1 carry?

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Menihek,

MR. FENWICK:
I would like to propose an amendment to clause 1 in Bill No. 40. Before I read out the amendment, I would just like to tell you what the effect of it will be. If you have the particular bill, clause 1, section 5 says, "A pension of an employee shall be reduced under subsection (3) at a time which is the earlier of." That is the way it reads now. Our amendment would change that to, "A pension shall not be reduced under subsection (3) until the employee reaches the age of 65." That will be the change to it, and what it will do is protect all the pensioners between the ages of sixty and sixty-five.

I will read out the actual amendment.

Under Bill No. 40 delete everything from clause 1 and clause 2 after subsection (5) and subsection (3) respectively and replace with: "(5) A pension shall not be reduced under subsection (3) until the employee reaches the age of 65." Moved by the member for Menihek, seconded by the Member for St. John's East.

The purpose is quite straightforward. What it is saying is that the benefits which have accrued to our pensioners as a result of actuarial changes, and the Minister of Finance has been in total agreement with us on this point, there is no more that you are getting from the Canada Pension Plan as a result of the changes, all you are getting is less money earlier, and, by the time you die, you actuarially will have received the same. What we are saying is that we should not have tampered with our plan, and we are saying that the age of sixty-five is early enough to reduce the whole thing. I think we have hashed the arguments out enough and it is a matter now, I think, of just voting on the amendment. We certainly intend to vote for it, because we think that this is the right, proper and just thing to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The amendment is in order.

All those in favour of the amendment 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
All those against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The amendment is defeated.

MR. FENWICK:
Division.

MR. PEACH:
You cannot have a division, boy, you have to have three.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Call in the members.

Division

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Is the House ready for the Question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Ready.

AN HON. MEMBER:
One moment.

All those in favour of the amendment, please rise:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons), Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Flight, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Callan, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Baker, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Decker, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Long.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
All those against the amendment, please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), the Hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council

(Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the hon. President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt), the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett), Mr. Baird, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Reid, Mr. Peach, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Woodford.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The amendment is defeated, twenty-four to twelve.

On motion, clause 1 of Bill No. 40, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 2 carry?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment with respect to clause 2 on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Finance, which, of course, is required because it is a separate clause. It is of the same effect, but I think I am required to read it out.

I move that clause 2 of the bill

be amended by striking out the period after the word 'plan' and by adding immediately after the proposed section 22 (3) the following: "Where the effective date of the reduction is prior to age sixty-five the amount of the reduction as calculated under subsection (2) shall be reduced by .5 per cent for each month the effective date as established under paragraph (b) is less than the date established under paragraph (a)."

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The amendment is in order.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Just a word of explanation, Mr. Chairman. The reason why we have to do the two sections is the first clause deals with the Public Service Pension Plan, and we have already dealt with that in a very sensible, logical fashion, and the second clause deals with the Uniformed Services Pension Plan, so we had to bring in exactly the same amendment so that we are just repeating now what we have just gone through, by way of explanation.

In summary, again, pensioners get no increased lifetime benefits from the CPP change. Pensioners get no different lifetime benefits from the provincial stream. There is no change one way or the other. Lifetime pension is spread out a different way. If we conclude this in the House of Assembly here, we will be sending this information to all our pensioners, all our employees in a very concise way. They will all

understand it. They will know that it should not be distorted. There are no improvements in their CPP stream as of January 1, no improvements whatsoever. It is spread out, no improvements. There is no decrease in the provincial stream, no reduction. It is spread out but no difference. We will be explaining that to all our pensioners and all our employees after we finish this exercise.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 2 as amended, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 40 with amendment, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bills Nos. 34, 2, 6, 23, 17 and 26 without amendment, and Bill No. 40 with amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted bills ordered read a third time presently, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that it has considered the matters to it referred and has directed him to report Bill No. 40 with amendment. When shall the report be received?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Now.

On motion, report received and adopted, amendment ordered read a first and second time.

On motion, amendment read a first and second time, Bill No. 40 ordered read a third time presently, by leave.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, in calling these bills for third reading now I will have to, naturally, use the numbers that are on today's Order Paper, which are the numbers indicated in Committee. I will use those numbers.

Order 10. Bill No. 34.

On motion, the following bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper:

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Return Of The Business Of Fishery Products International Limited To Private Investors". (Bill No. 34).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The St. John's Fire Department Act, 1972". (Bill No. 2).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973". (Bill No. 6).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act". (Bill No. 23).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Day Care And Homemaker Services Act, 1975". (bill No. 17).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Energy And Other

Matters Related Or Incidental Thereto". (Bill No. 26).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act And The Uniformed Services Pensions Act". (Bill No. 40).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Motion 1, the adjourned Budget debate.

On motion, the House resolved itself into committee of the Whole on Ways and Means to consider the raising of supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has about five minutes.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is such a long time ago, I believe some time in April, since we last had a chance to talk about the budget that I cannot guarantee there will be complete continuity, except there will be a continuity of the concern we were expressing on that particular day. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps before I get into the substance of it it is worth drawing attention one more time to the way the parliamentary process, in particular the budget process, is being quite deliberately perverted by this administration. By way of example, to make my point, let me draw your attention to other jurisdictions. Could the table indicate what time I have?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Nine minutes.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I had better do something else first, because in

the normal course of events I only have nine minutes remaining. I submit that when I move the following amendment I will have some extra time and I will develop two or three themes at that particular point. But so as not to run out of time, let me come quickly to what I would like to have a little time to lead up to but do not, unfortunately.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that I gave in the first part of my speech, back in April, and other reasons I will give subsequently, to move the following non-confidence motion in the administration: That all the words after 'that' be struck and replaced with the following: 'This House deplores the government's failure to deal adequately with the disastrously high levels of unemployment and its failure to provide competent management of the Province's finances, public statements by the Premier that "we've got at the outside two years and then its 1933 all over again", and the administration's abandonment of its responsibility to manage the Province's financial affairs and stated intention to let the problems remain unsolved until the federal government takes responsibility for them.'

I was waiting for a signal from Mr. Speaker, I gather the resolution is in order so I shall proceed. I was making the point first of all, Mr. Speaker, that the process here is being undermined. Here we are now, on a day which may well be the closing of this House for a number of months, being asked to give comment on a budget that was brought into this House on April 2, more than two and a half months ago. If you look at the Ottawa jurisdiction -

MR. BAIRD:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Is there some particular problem with the gentleman for Humber West (Mr. Baird) other than the ones we know about?

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Ottawa jurisdiction, the federal jurisdiction, you will find that built into the Standing Orders is a provision that the budget must be debated, I believe for eight days or six days, before you can get into the estimates procedure. Here in recent years, particularly under the former minister, Mr. Marshall, and now under the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer), we are getting into the habit of bringing in a budget, immediately advancing the budget papers, and particularly the estimates procedures, and putting the budget debate on the back burner until the very last day or so of the Session. I want to flag that issue in passing, Mr. Speaker, because it is one that we might want to address in the new Committee on Standing Orders. I do not believe the process is very well served, and I do not believe the public's interests are very well served if we cannot have this general debate in which those who were elected to come here representing the people of Newfoundland can have a full opportunity to lay out why on the one hand they support the principles in the budget and why, on the other hand, there are those of us who will not support them. That is part and parcel of a proper debate in this Chamber.

We will talk about other indictments, and they are embodied

in my amendment, but one of the indictments of this administration is that it is absolutely callous and uncaring about anything that does not serve its own immediate ends, its own immediate pocket-lining ends, and that is what disappoints me about the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons). I watched him during his campaign, he put on a good campaign, he said all the right things. Where he fooled me was that I believed what he was saying. I believed what he was saying! I actually took him at his word. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a phrase that does not come to mind very easily but my clergy friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) may be able to help with it, and the essence of it is that first you will abhor something, then you condone it, then you embrace it. How quickly has the gentleman from St. John's East Extern gone through all the stages so that now he not only condones but he embraces what he once did abhor so recently. First abhor, then condone and now embrace because, Mr. Speaker, he realizes that his shaky, uncertain survival politically is linked - and this is to his misfortune - to the even more shaky, uncertain survival possibilities of the administration.

Who is in that administration, Mr. Speaker? Well, we have the gentleman from Green Bay (Premier Peckford) who made long-winded, high-sounding statements for many, many years about how he would clean up the process, how there would be no political pork barrelling, how the Province would be well run, how the youth of this Province would be well served, how their employment needs would be adequately met, how the education system would be streamlined and

functionalized. That was the Premier before he became Premier. Look at the record. A record of an administration that has only one bottom line, survive, survive, survive at all cost.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I read into the record the wording of this non-confidence motion. Just let me take it bit by bit. I am asking this House to join me in deploring the government's failure to deal adequately with the disastrously high levels of unemployment. Nowhere is the failure of this government more complete than in the area of employment. In 1979, the Premier wanted a mandate to create 40,500 jobs. He came to us as recently as 1985 for a mandate to create jobs. Mr. Speaker, sometimes, if you were inclined to be just a little too charitable, you would say he did not know any different. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, he is openly poking fun at the Newfoundland people, that he would even go to them and say, I need your permission to create some jobs.

Not only does he do nothing about the agony inflicted on those people by unemployment, but he is prepared to mock them in their agony, to mock them in their anguish, to mock them in their poverty. So unemployment has become a complete sick joke to this administration. Nowhere is the failure of this administration more complete than in the area of unemployment. And if you want to take a segment of that, Mr. Speaker, a segment of the total unemployment picture, look for a moment, will you, at the disaster, the tragedy that is youth unemployment. The figures hardly matter, because everywhere you turn, in your family, on your

street, in your cove, you know a person. I ask any person in this House now to reflect and he/she will bring to mind immediately a person whose life has been devastated because of the youth unemployment disaster that we have, a good part of which is the result of the lack of leadership, the lack of initiative by this administration.

So, is it any wonder why, Mr. Speaker, at the top of my list of indictments in this resolution I cite for hon. members' consideration the failure of the government to deal with the unemployment levels, especially, I add, as they relate to youth.

Mr. Speaker, there is another group whose concerns need to be addressed: So often, because of the emphasis we place on youth unemployment, a justifiable emphasis, an emphasis that we can never overdo, we often get accused of forgetting another important group whose concern is vital, who, too, are being devastated, are being savaged by unemployment, and that is that group of people, Mr. Speaker, in middle age and just passed middle age, the people between jobs, the people who do not have a lot of marketable skills, who are either in the labourer category or the semi-skilled category. Often, through no fault of their own, an industry collapses or closes, or a phase of activity concludes, and they are left hanging, they are left without a job opportunity to make the transition from the job that just concluded to some other, and they are caught in that no man's land, sometimes for years, and I know many of them, many of them are in my district. There are thousands of them throughout this Province. Those people, in

their late forties but more often in their mid-fifties to early sixties, usually male but not always, that large body of men and women, what I will call the middle-aged, unskilled, semi-skilled worker, very little attention is being paid to that group, and one of the reasons is that we spend so much of our time and effort talking about youth unemployment, and I do not want to undermine that either. That is crucial. Mr. Speaker, I make a plea, and it is embodied in my amendment, for that middle-aged, unskilled and semi-skilled class of worker to whom I have just made reference.

Mr. Speaker, I have also in the resolution deplored the failure of the government to provide competent management of the Province's finances. Now, Mr. Speaker, that part of the resolution the people on the government side in real terms should have little difficulty with, because their own Premier is saying exactly what I have said; their own Premier has gone out and quite publicly admitted abject failure on this one.

Back in February the Premier was saying that we were headed for a 1930 style financial disaster. At that time he was saying that if we did not get a new deal from Ottawa on regional development, on transfer payments, on fisheries jurisdiction, if we did not get all of that, then the Province would not be able to avoid a financial collapse. He said at that time publicly, Mr. Speaker, and this is the most astounding statement of all, "I say that we have at the outside two years and then it is 1933 all over again."

Now, Mr. Speaker, anybody making

that kind of a statement publicly would be accused of irresponsibility. To have the person who is heading the administration which controls the purse strings, which has access to the books, who can tell us what the bottom lines are, to have that person say it is absolute irresponsibility. There is only one honourable course of action for that Premier, having made that statement. Ignore the fact for a minute that it may be true, but if he, the leader of the administration believes it to be true, I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is game over for that particular Premier. How can he in conscience continue to provide the moral leadership needed by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador if he believes that to the point of uttering it. Not only thinking it, not only uttering it, but uttering it publicly, that we are just a year or two away from that devastating experience, for so many of the older among us, of 1933 - 1934.

My resolution indicts the government for its failure to provide management and, I submit to you, my allegation is proven by the words of the Premier himself.

Mr. Speaker, talking about the Premier, you watched him this morning during Question Period, and a fair sight it was actually to watch the Premier during Question Period this morning. I am not sure exactly what was motivating him, if he was unduly under the strain of other events or what, but he gave one of those garbled performances that has become his trademark. Sometimes when his notes are all written for him and he is properly prepared, he can give a half decent performance, at least in academic

terms, he can make it sound plausible, he can string sentences together, he can tend to read them all and pronounce them and so on. But set him loose, as he was this morning, and he comes up with one of those embarrassing garbled performances and I feel for the guy. I find myself, as a human being, wishing that we would lay off him. I have to admit to this House that I have known the guy as a friend for many, many years and I sometimes do not have the heart to go after him, and this morning was one of those mornings.

I heard him on another occasion, and I refer hon. members to April 14 when he was on CBC radio one evening, and that was one of those days when he was giving an absolutely incoherent, garbled performance. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the transcript of it here but it does not read very well. There ought to be some sentences here somewhere but I have difficulty finding them.

For example, Mr. Speaker, just to give you an idea of the degree to which the Premier was garbled, listen to this. This is an answer to a question put by the reporter. Here is his answer: "Because I think they" - I presume that means Ottawa - "because I think they still thought that we might, because we were not going to get anything from slush." That is his answer. That is the Premier's response to a question about Ottawa's involvement in assisting him on financial matters, right after he made his outstanding and astounding statement about us being on the brink of financial chaos. Let me read it again for the record, because I am sure all members who support him will almost want to stand and salute it. Now this is

the Premier as a school teacher, the Premier who thinks himself the intellect, the Premier who is the inspirational leader of this hon. crowd, the Premier who is going to lead us to our promised land through offshore, the Premier who is going to provide full employment, and now he has a mandate to do so, the Premier who is going to save us financially if we can avoid a 1933 style crisis, here he is now at his eloquent best, quote, 'Because I think they still thought that we might because we were not going to get anything from slush.' Now that is as clear as mud.

MR. TULK:
From what?

MR. SIMMONS:
Slush. S-l-u-s-h.

MR. TULK:
Read that again.

MR. SIMMONS:
'Because I think they still thought that we might because we were not going to get anything from slush.'

MR. TULK:
What is slush?

MR. SIMMONS:
Now, it loses something in the translation if you do not have the hands going when you are explaining yourself, you understand. Given that it was done on radio, I would get the feeling that not many people saw the hands as they were moving anyway, but I am sure they were moving nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, because they thought they might get something from slush. Now, you understand that, Mr. Speaker. That is why we have the problems we have. That is exactly why we

have the problems we have, because our number one problem is the Premier. The Premier has lost touch with the realities he knew. I know it is an old phrase, I know it is a cliché, but it is the truth. Our number one problem is that the Premier has ceased to provide the kind of leadership that he was capable of. I knew him.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that in an earlier incarnation he was a teacher and I was a teacher and we worked in the same school. As an individual, I know him quite well. His problem, Mr. Speaker, and therefore the administration's problem, is that that man has lost touch with the realities that used to motivate him. As a result, he comes up with that kind of garbled statement that I just read there. We can poke fun at it and we can have a bit of partisan glee at it, but the sad fact is that the person who mouthed those words is running this Province. That is the sad truth. That is the tragedy that the gentleman from St. John's East Extern contributes to by sitting there, that the affairs of this Province are in the hands of a person who is a babbling incompetent. It is not, Mr. Speaker, only that we disagree with his philosophy, with his approach to matters, and we will come to that, but in addition to all of that we have a person who has no grasp. If he had a philosophy we could argue with that would be a good starting point, but what is the philosophy, Mr. Speaker? Take this insulting case of the past three weeks with the Minister of Social Services. Nowhere else in the parliamentary world would a minister survive under those circumstances. Nowhere! So they write their own rules as they go. There is no

accountability anymore. The only way now, Mr. Speaker, the public can have input, have any say as to who will be the Ministers of the Crown is for the public say to happen to coincide with the Premier's personal whim on the subject. Until that time, it is status quo all the way.

Mr. Speaker, I want hon. members to particularly keep in mind the resolution because I feel, and my colleagues who will be speaking in the debate feel, very strongly that the government has failed to deal with unemployment, it has failed to manage.

I come to my third point here, which I was just talking about, and that is the Premier's statements, the Premier's utterances, which belie credibility. I mean, how can he as the Leader of this Province be out babbling like he has been doing in the past two or three months and still expect in any way to maintain the confidence of the Newfoundland people? I suppose he maintains the confidence of the troops around him, because they need to lick his boots to get what they want.

That is what surprises me so much about the gentleman from Ferryland. I knew him when we were together on the Public Accounts Committee, and in those days he was his own man, in those days he did not mind going down to Hanger 3 and counting the lights, whatever the consequences. I suggest today that if he went down in that same exercise he would insist the lights be turned off so that he could not count them too accurately, so he would not know too much.

Mr. Speaker, I single out the

gentleman from Ferryland because the story was all Spring that he had had enough and we had looked to his getting into the federal campaign or otherwise asserting his independence of the present administration. For that he would have gone up considerably in the estimation of many people, but that is another subject.

Mr. Speaker, down in the corner are a couple of empty seats. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope they are within the hearing of my voice because -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The roadrunner just opened the door.

MR. SIMMONS:

They are still around, are they?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is good, Mr. Speaker, because these two never cease to amaze me. I was hoping they would be here to help us deplore the government's failure on these matters. Mr. Speaker, the thought that perhaps they had skulked out of here again, as they did on the NATO matter, kind of upset me. This is the crowd that was going to keep this place going all Summer. At least that is what they have been telling people in the press they were going to do, and now, all of the sudden, we see them itching, chafing at the bit to be gone.

Well, we have news for them, Mr. Speaker, and we have news for the administration. If they insist on having the budget debate on the last day of the House, so be it. They could have had this one in the middle of April as common

decency dictates, as is done in other jurisdictions, but if they want to have the debate on the last day or so or the House, and I say 'day or so' because it is only Friday yet, well, that is their funeral more than ours.

We have been co-operative in facilitating the passage of legislation. We have had, I say to the Government House Leader, fairly adequate opportunity to debate the legislation. Without telling him how to do his job, there was a more orderly way to do it than having to do it last night; if the House had been called a little earlier, or if we had returned to the Premier's thesis about how you need a Fall sitting to deal with legislation. That was his great discovery two years ago. He suddenly forgot it last year. My point is that had we been given time up-front, either last Fall or in January or February when this House was shut down, to debate the legislation, we would not have had the rush that we had last night and the falling over each other trying to get the thing through.

I am not sure that the public interest is completely well-served by the process that we have been through in the past few hours, but having said that, we do not have as legislators any real complaint with the Government House Leader. He has been co-operative and we have had reasonable time in which to debate the legislation.

The budget is another matter. The budget is a matter that ought to have taken priority. The government, if it was being fair to the Newfoundland people and to its representatives in this House here, would have called that debate at the appropriate time and

would not have put us in the situation we find ourselves in today, the 19th. day of June. But we are here and we will deplore, and we will take as much time as is required to deplore, the actions of this administration: Their failure to create the jobs that are needed, their failure to manage the unemployment, and the scatterbrained approach of the Premier out there. Make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, he needs a bodyguard. Perhaps he needs another kind of guard, too. Perhaps he needs a kind of a mouth guard, somebody out there to guard him so he does not say too crazy things on given days. And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that is the real assignment of the bodyguard. Who knows? Perhaps the administration itself, his colleagues over there, have come to the conclusion that this man has been running off at the mouth so much, as witnessed by The Sunday Express article of a couple of months ago, as witnessed by the CBC item that I made reference to earlier, they will not let him out of their sight too much.

Mr. Speaker, I come now, then, to the last part of my non-confidence motion, and that is the administration's abandonment of its responsibility to manage the Province's financial affairs and its stated intention to let the problems remain unsolved until the federal government takes responsibility for them.

Mr. Speaker, if you reflect, and again I say it has been such a long, long time, back to April 2, and you might have disagreed with the freeze on municipal funding - I know I did - the freeze on hospital construction, on capital works generally, and the pittance

being put into the Youth Entrepreneurship Programme. It is a good programme, but how far does a half million go? Think about the youth out there unemployed, divide it by \$20,000 or so per job and you are talking maybe twenty-five jobs, a programme that is good in concept but a mockery in practice because of the pittance that is involved.

So my point was that as you reflect on that budget in terms of municipal grant funding, in terms of capital grant funding generally, in terms of the pittance for road construction, there is one important detail that hit you smack in the face that night as the budget was delivered and that was the strategy more than a detail, the strategy of the government which said basically, and I do not think I misquote the minister, We have a lot of bills, we cannot pay them all, we are going to run the deficit from \$42 million to \$175 million, and to get the extra money, we are going to ask Ottawa to solve our problems. Remember the rhetoric of that day?

MR. FLIGHT:

The cap-in-hand rhetoric.

MR. SIMMONS:

Exactly! The cap-in-hand rhetoric. We are going to say to Ottawa, We have tried it, we failed, it is your problem, and we are going to keep saying that in as many ways as possible, provocative and otherwise, to the point that we will give you the black eye, we will shame you, Ottawa, into providing some extra handouts to us.

Mr. Speaker, the outstanding, if that is the term, item in that particular budget of April 2 was

the government's strategy which is no strategy at all; it is a strategy to throw up your hands, a strategy to say, Ottawa, we give up. We quit. The problem is beyond our ability to solve.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk for a moment about Ottawa, federal/provincial relations. I have never seen such a Jekyll and Hyde approach to a matter as I have seen in relation to this administration on federal/provincial relations. The stuff the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) gets off with, and he is one of the men in that administration whose ability I particularly admire, but his tactic, his rhetoric on federal/provincial relationships has to be one of the less able things he does. I guess he is getting it from his Premier, because one day it is a love-in, and that is used as a justification for all things, and the next day there is a division between the two on some issue, maybe Canada/France or maybe FFTs.

MR. TULK:
A third world war.

MR. SIMMONS:
It is like a third world war, as my friend for Fogo says, and that is justified, as we who are fighting for the people, no matter what the partisan label. There is no overall strategy. It seems to me that if you are going to aspire to lead a Province, let alone the fact that you have been elected to lead it, certainly, goodness, there must be some overall strategy, there must be some systematic approach to the problems, and it has to be a different approach than saying, Ottawa, we are going to give you a black eye, we are going to shame

you into it. I heard the Premier, and I think it was the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, in response to a question in the last day or so talk about the implicit fairness of the federal government of whatever political stripe and that is the very point, of course, that we were making to him in relation to the Meech Lake proposals earlier. I will not get off on that particular tangent except to say I wish they would make up their minds as to whether this Ottawa government is fair or unfair, because within hours of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs standing there - what is he these days, Government House Leader?

MR. TULK:
Yes. It has been passed back to the Premier now.

MR. SIMMONS:
He used to be Intergovernmental Affairs, but the Premier has that one.

MR. TULK:
Yes, he has taken it over again.

MR. SIMMONS:
I watched the Government House Leader talk about fairness and then I watched the Premier talk about this duplicitous crowd in Ottawa who cannot be trusted to do anything. Which is it? I hear the Minister of Fisheries talk about Tom Siddon by implication, never by name, mind you, as some nefarious schemer who has taken the family jewels and sold them, then I turn on the TV and there they are, out having a cocktail party at my expense, out there in a boat that should be doing surveillance of the 200 mile limit. And who is it? Tom and Tom, old buddy and old buddy, the very fellow he was castigating.

The same individual he was castigating in the House in less than twenty-four hours has become his bosom pal. Then they tell us, Mr. Speaker, that the word hypocrisy cannot be used here and the word hypocrite cannot be used here. Who needs to use it anyway? The average mind in Newfoundland is capable of putting a name on it. We do not need to categorize it and put chapter and verse on it. The average Newfoundlander out there has the mentality to know what it is, Mr. Speaker, When you see the Minister of Fisheries in one mouthful castigate the guy in Ottawa and then flick on your TV that evening and see the two being wined and dined together, what name would you call it, parliamentary or otherwise?

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have said almost enough to persuade members on all sides of this House that the jig is up. This government has failed abominably.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Would the hon. member give leave for one moment?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, it has been agreed that we would stop the clock and continue.

MR. SPEAKER:
It is agreed that we stop the clock at 1 o'clock.

MR. TULK:
Of course.

MR. FUREY:
What time will we reconvene?

MR. TULK:

We stop the clock.

MR. BUTT:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
I say to the gentleman from Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) not only is he from Conception Bay South, he is going back there soon. And, I say to him, none is so deaf as he who will not hear. Let me tell him something else before he turns off his hearing aid completely, let me tell him that we might have made history in this House today in a couple of ways. First of all, my good friend, the gentleman who is now the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Wells, will be sitting right here when next this House opens. That is my first prediction.

MR. TULK:
Hold on now. He might be over there when the House opens. It depends on what the Premier decides to do.

MR. SIMMONS:
The problem with my Fogo man, you see, is he is so bright that he is always a step ahead of me. But it is not my lack of brightness, I say to him, it is that I want to put it out in chewable chunks for the gentleman from Conception Bay South.

MR. TULK:
So he can understand it. I understand.

MR. SIMMONS:
That is the idea.

The gentleman who is now the Leader of the Liberal Party will be here when next the House opens, and the only other possibility is that he will be over there. He will not be out there. Here is

the one I wanted to him to keep his hearing aid on high for, and it is this: Whether or not the gentleman who is now the Leader of the Liberal Party will be over there or not, I will make a prediction for the gentleman for Conception Bay South and he can hold me to this one. The gentleman who will not be over there - and I am assuming they are not going to have a Fall sitting and all that nonsense - when the House opens, whether or not there has been an election, even without an election, the gentleman who will not be over there is the gentleman from Green Bay (Premier Peckford).

AN HON. MEMBER:
You are hoping.

MR. SIMMONS:
Not hoping.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You are hoping.

MR. SIMMONS:
No, that is not the point. Our problem is this: We are trying to find ways to keep him there. Not to keep him in that Chair, but to keep him at the head of that mad group that calls itself a party. Would you keep him? Please, would you keep him?

AN HON. MEMBER:
We will be quite happy to keep him.

MR. SIMMONS:
Again, this morning, we watched the captain of a ship which was the - what is the term in ship terms? - victim of a mutiny. He has been shanghaied, to say it differently.

DR. COLLINS:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain that this is something they want to hear. As I said, none is so deaf as he who will not hear. I am going to get off that subject, but I just want to repeat for the record that when this House opens, the gentleman from Green Bay will not be sitting in the Premier's Chair. The writing is on the wall and it is so clear.

MR. MORGAN:

He does not have to call a leadership convention.

MR. SIMMONS:

If an election is called, he will not be there for sure. But I am not even addressing that issue. I am saying I agree with the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), of his own free will he will not call a leadership convention.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not the issue.

MR. REID:

Methinks he has a lean and hungry look.

MR. SIMMONS:

I know what you want, but I am working on having either this seat or that seat vacated so the gentleman, the leader of the Liberal of Party can take over, and we do have a preference. We would like him to be in that seat, but that is not in our hands, in the sense that the Premier will not call the election. But that is another issue.

MR. MORGAN:

Do you want to bet?

MR. SIMMONS:

I would say to the gentleman from Bonavista South that the

application will be considered by people present so he should be very kind to them. It will be considered, it would be considered kindly, and a fair decision will be given.

MR. MORGAN:

Is that an invite?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the prediction has generated a certain excitement, but I think more of concern over this thinking, perhaps he is right. What will I do without Brian? That is the question. What would most of them over there be doing without him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that when all the levity is cast aside, what we have in this Province are thousands of Newfoundlanders who cannot afford another day of this Premier. Whether he will be there or not is a matter of prediction, but they cannot afford another day of that particular Premier with his inconsistent approach to everything, from job creation to the dealing with matters so called womens affairs.

I see the lady who is the Minister of Justice just walked in. I remember being in Corner Brook in 1971 and sitting at a table with her, and I admired her so much for her unfettered, unbridled stand on matters of concern to equality of women. Then I watched her squirm last week, I watched her bite her lip, I watched her swallow her pride and I watched her jettison her principles in the interest of staying in a Cabinet beside the gentleman who is the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, I would have absolutely insulted the woman if I had predicted in 1971 that a day

would come when she would sit in the same room with a person who would say the problem in this Province is that mothers are out working, creating juvenile delinquents. If I had told her in 1971 that she would sit in the same room with a man who said that without poking him in the face, she would have poked me in the face, and rightly so.

It is the same old thing as I said to the gentleman from St. John's East Extern. She too has gone through the stages of what she once abhorred she then condoned and now she embraces. She sat with me and others in Corner Brook and talked about a government that was paying -

MS VERGE:

Embraces?

MR. SIMMONS:

I am talking about embracing principles.

MR. FUREY:

How many principals did you embrace?

MR. SIMMONS:

My person-to-person relationship with the minister has always been cordial and we will not discuss it here.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What was that?

MR. SIMMONS:

Cordial! Cordial!

Mr. Speaker, I believe that before this House sitting ends the Minister of Justice should do what she wanted to do about two or three weeks ago. What is it she has to do? She has to go to the Premier and say, 'Premier, either me or him. Both of us cannot sit

in the Cabinet together. Our views are not reconcilable. They are two mutually exclusive sets of views.' She knows that to be the case. You only have to take what she said and what that minister said, and they are mutually exclusive views.

Mr. Speaker, if she is going to live with herself on this one, she has to do that. She has to go to the Premier and say, 'Premier, it is either me or Charlie.' If she allows the other possibility, of both of us, she has jettisoned her principles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that might be considered tangential to the budget, but it is very important to the way this administration conducts its affairs. It is duplicitous on everything. From women's issues to the management of the Province's finances, to the way it handles that Sprung affair, to the way it distributes grants, to the way it does hiring, it is duplicitous, the end always justifies the means. That is the code of ethics of this particular administration, the end always justifies the means. I travel around this Province and I see people suffering because of the duplicitous nature of this government, this administration. It is a ship without a rudder, it is gone, it has no direction any more.

MR. TULK:

It has no captain.

MR. SIMMONS:

It has no captain any more, nobody in charge over there. The only way, Mr. Speaker, for this Province to get back on an even keel is to get rid of that particular administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can make the first step today. We can begin living with ourselves again today by voting for a resolution that recognizes the failure of the government to deal with high unemployment. A person who votes against this resolution is saying I am satisfied with 40 per cent youth unemployment. A person who votes against this amendment today is saying I am satisfied that we might go down the pipe in two years with a 1933 style recession, as the Premier said back in February. A person who votes against this resolution today is condoning the Neanderthal attitude of the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Exactly. Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

A person who votes against this amendment today is condoning the two-faced approach of the Minister of Justice to the matter of women's issues, the absolutely two-faced approach to women's issues. Is there any kinder name to put on it than that?

MS VERGE:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the allegation made by the Leader of the Opposition that I have been two-faced in my positions and my statements on women's issue is totally false and I call upon him to withdraw that remark. The record will show, and my actions will indicate, that I have been totally consistent over a great number of years on my position on women's issues. I have been consistently working to

improve conditions for individual women, as well as women as a group in this Province.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it really is not a point of order and I should not dignify it with a response. The fact is, in case the minister wonders how I can characterize her actions as two-faced, as I understand the expression two-faced, one connotation is that they are doing two things which are quite contradictory and that is the context in which I mentioned it. If the word 'two-faced' upsets her, I can put kinder euphemisms on it. But the point is that she has, on the one hand, been a very strong advocate of women's issues, and I think she will agree to that.

Secondly, and I find this contradictory, she sat there in silence and allowed one of her colleagues, the Minister of Social Services, to insult every mother in Newfoundland who works outside the home, every spouse of those mothers, and every child of those mothers, and I find that at complete odds with her lifelong advocacy of equality for women. Now, she may be able to reconcile that. She has not done so yet, and that is why I have characterized her as two-faced. As I say, if the term 'two-faced' is not as gentle a euphemism as she would like to hear, I can just use the term contradictory.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am saying in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I invite hon. members to consider supporting this non-confidence amendment, because in voting non-confidence in this government we will, as members, be sending a signal to the people of Newfoundland that we have had enough of the failure of unemployment, we have had enough of the mismanagement of the Province's economy, we have had all we can take of the insults to the mothers of this Province, we have had more than we can take in terms of the patronizing way that municipal grants are being handed out, we have had more than we can take in terms of the partisan way in which jobs are being allotted in this Province. We have had all of that. We can identify with all of that, Mr. Speaker, by voting for this non-confidence motion and I invite you to do so.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the amendment. The amendment, as I read it, makes four valid criticisms: It criticizes the government for its failure to deal adequately with the disastrously high levels of unemployment, it

criticizes the government for its failure to provide competent management of the Province's finances, it criticizes the government for the silly announcements about it being 1933 all over again, and it criticizes the government for its abandonment of its responsibility to govern.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, you could find outside this Chamber three people in Newfoundland who would not support this amendment. I say outside the Chamber, because no doubt there are a few members on the other side who have a vested interest in not supporting the amendment and, therefore, they will not support it. But people who can think freely and clearly, without political interference, will agree, I am sure, that this amendment is very accurate, that this amendment speaks the truth about the present administration.

I want to speak to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, but I only want to zero in, I want to rifle in on one particular part of the amendment, I want to zero in on one criticism, I want to zero in on the national disgrace which is perpetrated upon Canada by Newfoundland. I want to speak about the national disgrace, I want to speak about the provincial disgrace which is the high level of unemployment that we, in Newfoundland today, find ourselves in.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that history will not speak too kindly about this government when it talks about its record in creating jobs. History tends to remember Prime Ministers and Premiers for some outstanding event which they might have done. History remembers Prime Minister Pearson for bringing medicare into Canada,

history will remember Trudeau for the Constitution, history will remember Mr. Smallwood for bringing Newfoundland into Confederation, history will remember, history will despise and history will curse this Premier for what he did with his fellow Newfoundlanders with the unemployment he inflicted upon them, with the insult he inflicted upon them when he asked on two different occasions for a mandate to create jobs. That is what history will remember this Premier for, Mr. Speaker.

It will remember this Premier for causing, and I quote Statistics Canada, 20.3 per cent unemployment. But even as I quote 20.3 per cent unemployment, Mr. Speaker, I put it in parenthesis because nobody knows for sure the full number of Newfoundlanders who are unemployed in this Province today. There are thousands of Newfoundlanders who have come to the conclusion that it is utterly useless to even go out and consider looking for a job, so the figure of 20.3 per cent is totally unrealistic. I would not even venture to offer a figure. Anything, Mr. Speaker, not over 100 per cent might not be unrealistic. Certainly if this government is not thrown out of office and if this trend is allowed to continue, then I will be truthfully able to say that all of us, all Newfoundlanders, will be unemployed.

When I talk about unemployment I want us, for a few minutes, to reflect on the human cost of unemployment, what it is doing to us as a people, what it is doing to Newfoundlanders. Just think, Mr. Speaker, what unemployment is doing to the average Newfoundland family today. Just think what

unemployment is doing to the food that is supposed to be on the table. There are many, many of our fellow Newfoundlanders today who go to the supermarket or the grocery store once a week, or whatever the case might be, and they have to be extremely aware of every single item they pick up and put into their grocery cart. For a large number of our people, all they can ever expect to do is look at the section of the supermarket where the meats are displayed, look at the T bone steaks and look at the various cuts which make up the roasts, then pass by the T bone steaks, the sirloin steaks, the filet, and go to the hamburger section. That, Mr. Speaker, is what is happening.

And the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) can smile and grin and think it is funny.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is just a happy minister.

MR. DECKER:

Yes, he is a happy man, but I can guarantee him that out there in Newfoundland today a lot of people who, at this very minute, are picking up their groceries for a weekend, and just this minute passed by the T bone steak section, will not be barbecuing Sunday evening. If they do, it will be hamburgers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They cannot afford hamburgers.

MR. DECKER:

They cannot afford it. Now, this is the human cost of unemployment, this is what is happening in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker. What is happening to a human being's self-worth? What is happening to the way a person perceives himself or herself,

human self-perception, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this travesty, as a result of this curse of unemployment which this administration is inflicting upon this Province? Think about what is happening to self-perception.

For years in this Province, Mr. Speaker, every boy looks forward to the time when he becomes a man and every girl looks forward to when she becomes a woman, and they see that part of that responsibility is to get a job and raise a family. Think of the beating self-perception takes when the man or the woman realizes that he or she no longer has the ability to bring home the bread, there is no longer a breadwinner. This is happening to 20.3 per cent of our people, Statistics Canada says. This, Mr. Speaker, is happening probably to 45 per cent or 50 per cent of our people at some time during the year.

The human cost of this curse which this administration has inflicted upon us is unbelievable. Think about what is happening in Newfoundland today.

Mr. Speaker, we are just nearing the end of the time when graduations take place in our schools. Many of us attend those graduations and we see the young men and the young women dressed in their finest. When we look at some of the graduation dresses that the girls are wearing, for many of them this was a sacrifice on the part of their parents; that gown which the graduating student is wearing could mean that there will be three or four days in this month when the meals on the table will be even less. That is what is happening in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. The cost of a graduation gown is totally disrupting the

meals a family is going to eat for the next month. That is what is happening, Mr. Speaker. That is the human cost of a government that is more bent on posturing than on performing. That is the human cost of a government who spouts off about a mandate to create jobs and then commences to make sure that everybody becomes totally dependent on the government and that everybody becomes unemployed.

The human cost of this government's treatment of our people, of this government's forcing unemployment, will be remembered by this generation for years yet to come. I am told, Mr. Speaker, and some of the medical doctors on the other side will be able to contradict this or to agree with it, that in some cases a person who has had tuberculosis could carry a scar on his or her lung until the day he or she dies. I do not know if that is true or not, but it is a good illustration, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is true.

MR. DECKER:

My hon. friend says it is true, the scar can stay there until the day he dies. The blight, the scar this unemployment is putting on the lives of our fellow Newfoundlanders will be with them until the day they die. It is a scar. It is a memory which can never be erased.

All of us, Mr. Speaker, have talked to people who came from the Great Depression. I remember my own father, who is now dead, could never, even in his latter years when he became reasonably well off, throw out a pot of tea. He always felt badly about discarding

a plate of dinner that might have been left over. I believe the reason he felt this way, Mr. Speaker, was because he went through the Great Depression, and he knew how difficult it was to put food on the table and clothes on his back.

Mr. Speaker, this Premier is forcing the people to live almost as bad as those days. They would have been just as bad if it had not been for the benefits of the great nation of Canada, like Unemployment Insurance and the various forms of social welfare. If it had not been for that, we would have been right back into the 1930's. Even so, the Newfoundlanders, who today are suffering this blight of unemployment, will remember the 1980's. They will remember the days of the Peckford Administration just as vividly, Mr. Speaker, as my father and yours can remember the scar of the Great Depression.

Mr. Speaker, while I am talking about unemployment -

MR. POWER:

Keep it down.

MR. DECKER:

The hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) says, 'Keep it down.' I would totally agree with what he is saying if I stood where he stands, because he wants to keep it quiet. He does not want Newfoundlanders to know what I am saying. Mr. Speaker, if I had the power, I would yell loud enough that every Newfoundlander and Labradorian today would hear what I am saying because this deserves to be brought to the light. Newfoundlanders need to know.

While I am talking about unemployment in general, let me zero in on youth unemployment, if the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies wants me to talk about something, because that comes under his department. Let me speak about the nearly 20,000 young Newfoundlanders today who cannot find a job. Statistics Canada says it is somewhere around 36 per cent. As I question the 20.3 per cent for unemployment in general, I question the 36 per cent, because there are thousands of young Newfoundlanders who have given up hope and who no longer believe that it is possible to ever hope to get a job today.

I am sure all hon. members in this Chamber have attended some graduations over the past number of years, either university graduations or high school graduations. I am sure hon. members will agree with me about the optimism of young people who are graduating, Mr. Speaker. We have all had the opportunity to talk with them on an individual basis. Their talk is about jobs, buying a new car and making a contribution to society. Those are among their dreams and the member for Corner Brook laughs at their silly dreams. He laughs at the young people who are unemployed, Mr. Speaker. Decorum prevents me from giving him what he deserves when he laughs at young people who graduate and join the 40 odd per cent who cannot get a job, who will never get a job, and joins the group of people between eighteen and twenty-five years in this Province who have never worked, Mr. Speaker. As long as we keep this administration in there, they never will work, Mr. Speaker, and the member from the West Coast laughs.

MR. BAIRD:

I would like for you to be (inaudible) forever.

MR. DECKER:

Yes, he laughs. We have all attended graduations and we have seen the optimism, but we have all seen the actual results of what happens. For the thousands of young Newfoundlanders who go out and look for a job, the results are this: They end up on make-work programmes.

My first experience with make-work programmes was shortly after Confederation. I forget what they were called then, but it was the same old idea. You give a group some money to put a fence around a graveyard, or you give a group some money to dig a hole and fill it up again. Then the federal government did not like that so they said, "Let us call it a Local Initiatives Programme." The Liberals did that. They said, "Let us call it a Local Initiatives Programme."

Then the Tories said, "We do not go along with this so we are going to call it," what is it, "Enterprise '86", or something or other. All that ever was done was the name was changed. It was the same old useless work, digging holes and filling them in again. This is the heritage we are giving; this is what this government is giving our youth, a job digging holes in the ground and filling them up again, work which a machine could do better, cheaper and faster.

Mr. Speaker, work must have meaning and when this Premier and the Minister for Career Development and Advanced Studies gets up and spouts off about \$1,000 for a make-work programme here, or \$300 to make a make-work

programme there, it is totally meaningless. It is what they rightly criticized years ago. Now what do they do? To quote Winston Churchill, they go back and lick their vomit. They change the name of a phrase and they think they have changed the programme. The old programme is the same as it was just after Confederation, an excuse to put money in people's pockets without giving them a job worth doing. It is having a detrimental affect on our people and it will leave a scar that they and all of us will carry to our grave.

Mr. Speaker, here is where the problem lies. We are now entering into a new age. We have been approaching this new age right from the late 1950s and into the 1960s. We are entering into a new age. In the early days of the machine, when the industrial revolution began, jobs were displaced or changed around. The young man on the farm left the farm when the thrashing machine, the combine and the tractors came in. What did he do? He sold combines, he repaired combines, and he manufactured combines. Jobs were shifted around.

Now what has happened is the machine has finally caught up and today jobs are being displaced. That is more to the point when we consider the computer. The computer has taken away jobs. That is a fact of life, Mr. Speaker. I remember some years ago when there was a rifle invented called a .222 and in the advertising for that gun it was pointed out that she was designed by a computer. It was a little trick of advertising. It was quite possibly true that the gun was designed by a computer.

I understand today, Mr. Speaker, that computers are designing computers. No longer is it the man for the computer is designing the computer. We are practical giving the machines a mind of their own and this is what is happening. We are evolving as a people; we are living in the 1980s; we are living in a new age and we have to come up with a new approach to solve the old problems that we are dragging from the past into today. We have to have a new approach to this curse of unemployment.

When I talk about developing an innovative new approach, I look across the corridor, Mr. Speaker, and what do I see? I see a tired, I see an old, I see a run down crowd. I am not talking about the chronological age of my friends on the other side because junior there, Mr. Speaker, is by no means an old man. I am talking about the tired, old, run down machine. It is a force that has been spent. It is a political machine which still tries to stand on Nineteenth Century philosophy to deal with problems that truly belong, not to the Twentieth, but to the Twenty-First Century. They are trying to solve the problems of tomorrow with the solutions of the Nineteenth Century. They have a great task. A worn out machine.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what they say? I have heard ministers get up in this House and say it time and time again. 'We are doing the best we can.' I totally agree with that. They are doing the best that they can, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that their best is not good enough. There is nothing personal in this whatsoever. I am solely and simply commenting on the political machine which, like

a dog in the manger, will not allow anybody else in there, but they are making darn sure they are going to keep it. They do not know what to do with it. They cannot eat the grass themselves, but they are going to make sure nobody else is going to get in there who can do something with it. I suppose it is talking about new wine in old wine skins and I suppose it is talking about teaching old dogs new tricks. They say they are doing the best they can and I agree with them, but Newfoundlanders will agree with me that their best is not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to take all day on this speech, so I will conclude my remarks by giving some good news for members opposite. My good news is this: Newfoundlanders today have come to realize that this old, worn-out machine is no longer going to be required. We have no more need for it.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, when we used to have dog teams at home. When the poor old dog was no longer any good, we took him out and we shot him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:
I have good news for members opposite. Newfoundlanders are not going to take you out and shoot you, but we are going to put you out to pasture. I say to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), you can piddle around in your garage or in your basement and do a few things with your hands. I say to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt), the great world traveller, you can go on down to the Southern States or

somewhere in the Caribbean and buy yourself a condominium. I say to the great scholar, the great writer, the man who has given so much to the literature of this nation, the Premier, with his great book, go and write your memoirs. We are putting you out to pasture. That is the good news that I am concluding with for members opposite. It is a message from Newfoundlanders. You are about to be put out to pasture.

In closing, I also have a few words of encouragement for Newfoundlanders. The encouraging words I have for Newfoundlanders are these: I see Newfoundlanders like a fellow who fell through the ice. For those of us who came from rural Newfoundland, in the Spring of the year it was quite common that someone would fall in the water. You would shout to that fellow, 'Hang on, hang on until I get a ladder, until I get a rope, until I get a dory.' My last encouraging words to Newfoundlanders, who are out there suffering the unemployment, 20.3 per cent according to Statistics Canada, perhaps 30 per cent, if we really knew the facts, to the 40 per cent of youth unemployed - maybe it is 50 or 60 per cent - are these: Hang on a little longer because what you are going through now cannot last any longer than April, 1990.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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 want to speak for a moment or two with respect to the budget and the debate on the budget. I regret I did not have an opportunity several months ago to participate in the debate, but there were other matters that were very pressing.

I have listened with great interest to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition and particularly my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle who, as always, was very eloquent. I am not so sure that I can agree with the content in his comments, but I did listen with some interest. I hope that perhaps by the time that the next session of the House sits and he has an opportunity to speak in a freewheeling debate such as this, he will have had a better and closer look at some of the positive things that this government has done for the people of this Province, and there are many.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Such as?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I do not want to go into them now. It should be evident, unfortunately, it is not always. We do not want to go into all that detail right now.

I just wanted to take the opportunity, really, to commend the Leader of the Opposition and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle for the excellent comments that they just made.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to spend a few minutes commenting on the amendment put by the member for Fortune - Hermitage. I would like to say, first of all, the amendment is self-evident. It is an axiom that this House deplore the government's failure in a number of areas having to do with the management of the finances of this Province. I think it is axiomatic because of comments we have heard from ministers in the government itself, especially comments made by the Premier sometime ago about how this Province's fareing in this Confederation. The Premier has pointed out that we are headed for and we are in the midst of very difficult times.

As a matter of fact, I suppose in his style of exaggeration he says, 'We have at the outside two years, and then it is 1933 all over again.' Now that is the Premier's style. However, I do not disagree with him that we are experiencing very, very difficult times. When we question members opposite about these hard times, as we have over the past few months, we are told this is a problem in the economy of the world; that the world over unemployment rates are up and the world over they are having problems with the Gross National Products and so on. This is a world wide problem and what can we do about it?

I would like to point some things out, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the budget and the amendment I am now speaking to. I would like to point out to the Premier and members opposite that there may be some world wide problems, but the problem in this Province is much

more severe and the Province has reacted differently to the world situation than other parts of Canada. If we look at even just the budget itself and some of the very colourful pictures that were put in here, especially things like per capita Gross Domestic Product at market prices, what we see there, if we compare Newfoundland with the nearest part of Canada to us, the Maritimes, we find that up to about 1979 - I do not know why I am picking that year - but up to about 1979, the green line, which represents Newfoundland, is gradually getting closer to the yellow line, which represents the Maritimes. Since 1979, well 1980, around there, if I can see properly, the two lines start to diverge. The per capita Gross Domestic Product in Newfoundland at market prices increases very, very slightly, but in the Maritimes it increases at a much faster rate. Whereas up to 1979/80 we were gradually catching up with the Maritimes, not nearly up to the Canadian average, not nearly up to the Ontario figures, but we were gradually catching up, however, since 1979/80 we have been getting further a part.

The per capita earned income is an interesting graph, Mr. Speaker, coming again from the budget document. Again, we see, with fluctuations, the per capita earned income in Newfoundland way below the Maritimes, way below the Canadian average, an astronomical amount below Ontario, but compared to the Maritimes, it has stayed fairly constant. However, Mr. Speaker, if you look at this document you will see in the last five or six years there has been a divergence. The per capita earned income in the Maritimes has taken a turn for the better and in Newfoundland we have gone the

other way.

Mr. Speaker, that tends to destroy the argument that what is happening in Newfoundland is somehow tied to what is happening in the rest of Canada. I could use some other documents that also are significant. For instance, in Newfoundland, and this is not in comparison to the Maritimes, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the real value added output in the goods producing sector. In order for the economy of a Province, an area, a region, or a country to progress, we have to have greater value added output in the goods producing sector because the goods that are produced and then sold are what makes the economy work. In Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 the real value added output of goods in the goods producing sector was about \$1.8 billion in 1971. You might wonder why I picked 1971. These were the figures that were provided, but it is also a significant period in our history.

If we move to 1979, Mr. Speaker, we find that this real value added output in the goods producing sector was still at \$1.8 billion. There were some minor variations in between but it was still at \$1.8 billion. In other words, we were hold our own. However, since 1979, the trend has been the opposite so that by 1984 this real value added output in the goods producing sector fell to \$1.5 billion. There has been a drop since 1979.

If we look at unemployment we find, again, picking 1979, at that point, according to the Royal Commission Report on Employment and Unemployment, there were roughly 30,000 persons unemployed in the Province. I would like to

remind the Premier that was the time that his 40,500 jobs was going to create a surplus of 10,500 jobs.

MR. SIMMS:

How many in Grand Falls?

MR. BAKER:

We will get to that shortly. In 1979, 30,000 people were unemployed, according to this particular source. With the promise of the jobs and dealing with the performance of this government in terms of job creation by 1985, and I am using 1985 because that is where the graph ends in this particular document, it had gone up to 48,000, an increase in unemployed of 18,000 persons. At that point, instead of creating 40,500 new jobs, we had an increase of 18,000 unemployed persons in the Province. This is what the amendment deals with, the performance of the government with regard to employment and unemployment.

It is interesting if you then look at the nature of the unemployed in the Province and the causes of the unemployment. There is another figure, Mr. Speaker, in that same document dealing with the flows into unemployment, in other words, the sources of the individuals who are unemployed and what caused them to be unemployed. They have divided them into three categories. Obviously, there are new entrants and re-entrants into the labour force, because if you have new entrants and re-entrants then, all of a sudden, the number of people looking for work goes up. There are also the people who, of their own volition, leave jobs, and they contribute to the number of unemployed. Mr. Speaker, there are also the job

losers, the people who have lost jobs because the jobs have ceased to exist.

If we look at 1979 compared to 1984 in the categories that have contributed to unemployment in this Province, we find it is not as members opposite say, that there are a lot of new entrants coming in and that is what contributes to it. In 1979, there were 8,000 new entrants and in 1984 there were 9,000, a slight increase in new entrants into the labour force creating unemployment. So, it is not the new entrants that are contributing to the flows into unemployment.

On the job leavers, members opposite would say people leave jobs voluntarily because they have worked long enough and they leave the jobs and are unemployed because they do not want to work. It is not that. In 1979, there were 6,000 job leavers and in 1984 there were 6,000. The figure remains constant through the years.

However, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the job losers, the people who are unemployed because jobs have ceased to exist, that is where the real story is. In 1979 there were 17,000 job losers, but five years later, in 1984, there were 31,000 job losers, 14,000 more job losers in 1984 than in 1979. That is performance.

One of the indicators of the performance of an economy is also the exports as a percentage of the gross domestic product because the exports create the new dollars. These are largely resource dollars creating new dollars coming into the Province. That is one of the things we need and it is one of the things that this government

could be measured on in terms of performance. If you look at exports as a percentage of gross domestic product, in 1979 exports made up 48 per cent of our gross domestic product. That is not high but it is a lot higher than now. In 1984, just five years later, the exports as a percentage of gross domestic product dropped from 48 per cent to 31 per cent and that is a scandalous figure. All of a sudden, we are not exporting; we are not selling things somewhere else and getting new money coming into this Province. All of a sudden the exports as a percentage of our gross domestic product dropped to a seriously low percentage.

This may be one explanation as to why the economy since 1979 stagnated, and stagnated to a much greater degree than the economy in the other Maritime Province or the rest of Canada. When the recovery was on there, it did not happen here because we stopped producing.

The unemployment rate has risen since 1979, in spite of the fact that we have heard announcement after announcement concerning the numbers of jobs created, and we heard some here today, Mr. Speaker. It seems to be an anomaly. If a lot of jobs are created, every now and then the Premier takes great pride in announcing more new jobs, and more new jobs. His Cabinet ministers do that all the time, announcing all the new jobs that are being created. It seems to be a contradiction because if all these new jobs are being created, if there is not a tremendous surge and input of new entrants into the job force and the unemployment rate still goes up and we still have high unemployment, how can

that be?

If you look at the nature of the work force, there you see the answer to that. If you look at the ratio of jobs created in job creations programmes to persons employed at sometime during the year, the total employment picture, what percentage of that is a result of the job creation programmes? Another way of saying it, before I go any further, is what percentage of the total people working are actually part-time workers?

Mr. Speaker, you will find in 1979 one out of twenty-nine individuals were working at a job creation project, one out of twenty-nine. So we round that out to one out of thirty or a little over three out of 100 were working at job creation programmes or were employed in job creation programmes. In other words, these were the people who got their ten or twenty weeks or whatever because of money put in here generally by the federal government.

If you go to five years later, to 1984, you find that there has been a remarkable change that has taken place in our work force, a tremendous change, a complete change, an upheaval, a turnaround in the work force. In 1984, one in nine jobs in this Province were the job creation jobs. That is astounding. If we did not have the job creation programmes, in other words, Mr. Speaker, we would have had a real disaster years ago. In fact, it indicates that the job creation that has been going on since 1979 has, by and large, been these ten week and twenty week jobs. That is the explanation to the conundrum I started with. All of these jobs

being created and yet still a high unemployment rate because all of these jobs that are created are, by and large, the ten week and the twenty weeks jobs.

Mr. Speaker, to condemn the government for its failure to deal adequately with the disastrous high levels of unemployment is very easy. I can easily condemn the government for that because, as I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, even the jobs that have been created are part-time jobs. We are turning this work force into a work force of part-time workers and unemployed workers. If we were to really look at our work force we would find that well over half the work force is either unemployed or underemployed, working at ten or twenty week jobs.

We have seen more failures, Mr. Speaker. We have seen the ultimate failure, to start with, of a government throwing up its hands and saying, 'There is nothing we can do; we have got to be bailed out by Ottawa, we cannot do a thing. We deal with billions of dollars a year but there is nothing we can do with our problem. We have to be bailed out by somebody else.'

Mr. Speaker, what kind of an effect do you think that kind of statement has on the people of Newfoundland or on the individuals in this Province who, under some circumstances, might be willing to get into job creation, might be willing to start a business or start an industry and so on? What kind of effect do you think it has on these individuals? Does it buoy up their confidence and give them confidence? Does it make them say, 'I want to be part of this renewal of our Province?' Does it make them want to say that

or does it tend to make them too throw up their hands in despair and say, 'There is nothing we can do about it?'

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that the kind of attitude that there is nothing we can do tends to destroy enterprise in this Province and it contributes to the part-time ten or twenty week syndrome. I would suggest to you that there are people in this Province, if properly motivated, could go a long way to our renewal, could go a long way towards creating jobs, providing they had the confidence in themselves and the confidence that the government believed in this Province.

I think that is where the major failing is. The government has given the impression that it no longer believes in this Province, that the rhetoric and the fighting and all of this we see, sometimes the bursts of publicity and so on, are really only posturing. You can only get burned so many times.

There was posturing, we found out later, on the FFT issue. The Premier admitted he was just posturing in his statements. There was certainly posturing on the railway issue. There was recent posturing on the fish dispute with the French. You can only do that so many times; you can only go to the well so many times. It does not help when you are saying to the federal government, 'That is it! We are bankrupt. Everything is over. We cannot do a thing unless you bail us out.' It does not help if they already know that there have been so many other instances where there have been drastic and extreme public positions that were

merely posturing. It does not help. So the relationship has somehow to be changed. That is another failure of this government.

I could go on to reiterate a lot of other things. I could talk in terms of financial management. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows there are a number of problems I have with the way some things are done. We got into earlier in the year the way the government uses Special Warrants.

I could get into another reason why there is a lack of confidence in this government. I could get into the management of the renewable resources like forestry, under the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), and the fishery, the lack of real effort in these basis areas. I could get into that, but I will not.

I could get into the fact that the government seems to have lost confidence in itself, then it wonders why the feds have lost confidence in them, we have lost confidence in them, and the people of the Province have lost confidence in them, because they have seen their polls. They know at this point. Just a word of advice to them, they have to build that confidence again. They have to have confidence in themselves and they have to give the people of this Province confidence in themselves. That is what they have to do. They have seen their polls. They know where the confidence have been lost.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a couple of minutes left and I have to fulfil an obligation. I would say to the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands, I have to fulfil an obligation in this

Budget Speech. It ties in with confidence and how to develop a spirit in this Province.

We recently saw a Fitness Day held across this Province in various communities. Mr. Speaker, you know there always has been a great deal of rivalry between Grand Falls and Gander, and to try spice up this particular activity, which really was to get the people in the community to develop community spirit and to get out there and do something as a group, which ties in with what I am talking about, we decided that there be a contest between Grand Falls and Gander.

I would, at this time, report to the House that in that contest there were 8,100 people in Gander who participated in the event, and there were about 7,400 in Grand Falls who participated in that event.

MR. FLIGHT:

Windsor helped them.

MR. BAKER:

Yes, but they did not include Windsor in their numbers. So when this was transformed to percentage, because the Town of Grand Falls has a much smaller population and because of input from perhaps some of their neighbours in Windsor, which I hope they will get together with some day, their percentage was slightly higher than the percentage in Gander. As a matter of fact, the Town of Grand Falls had a 78 per cent participation factor which was absolutely amazing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

There was an agreement between the

minister and myself, because we were very active in this endeavour, that the losing town would give a very brief thirty-second commentary on the other member's town, prepared, of course, by the other member. I would like now to do that.

Grand Falls is the industrial base of the Exploits Valley and it is the largest town in the valley with a population of slightly over 9,000. The major source of employment is the Abitibi Price pulp and paper Mill. However, there are other forms of primary and secondary industries employing a great number of people. The town has easy access to road, rail, air, and sea transportation and, indeed, major firms, such as Day and Ross Transport and Terra Transport have designated Grand Falls as their major distribution terminal for all of Central Newfoundland.

Of course, one of the greatest attributes that Grand Falls has is that it is less than 100 kilometers away from the town of Gander. The town has an abundance of serviced residential, commercial, and industrial building lots and the area has a number of parks, camping sites, and playgrounds, as well as other recreational facilities and has all the major services such as a hospital, although slightly reduced at the present time, shopping, banking, schools, library, media and churches, and they are all centrally located. Indeed, Grand Falls is one of the most modern and fast-growing communities in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have paid my penance. It was, in a way, a very difficult thing to do. But I would just like to get back to the main point.

The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands knows that this was an exercise where people in two communities had confidence in themselves built and they worked together for a purpose. Energy can be mobilized in this Province, Mr. Speaker, to help get us out of the mess we are in. The energy can be mobilized and I would suggest that this government has given up on trying to mobilize Newfoundlanders to help pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps. They have given up on the people of this Province. They have thrown their hands in the air. I would say that this is more than enough reason for everybody in the Province to have lost confidence in members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, what we are debating here is a motion of non-confidence in the government, non-confidence in the Premier and his twenty-odd Cabinet Ministers -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Odd!

MR. TULK:
And the Premier is the odd one, is he? - twenty or so Cabinet Ministers that we believe, and I would suggest to you that a great

many people in this Province believe, have failed to develop the economy of this Province, and following from that, the social and cultural aspects of this Province because it has failed to manage our economy in the way that it should.

Mr. Speaker, what the motion says is that this government should no longer stay in office because it has failed to do the things which it should have done, and I suppose one could say, has not done the things which it should have done, and has done things which it should not have done.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues on the other side that they are now part of an administration which has in no way, we say on this side, lived up to its responsibility for governing this Province. Mr. Speaker, we would be remiss, as Opposition members and as Newfoundlanders, if we did not, before this Legislature closes, whether it is today or next week or whenever, point out to the government its failings and also point out to them the reasons why we believe they are failings.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are continually told, and our people are continually told by the government, by economists and by financial people, that we have great natural resources in this Province, one has to ask why we have the highest unemployment rate in the country. I suppose it is the highest unemployment rate in North America and perhaps one of the highest unemployment rates in the Western world. Why is it that we have the highest taxes in this country? Why is it that this Province of Newfoundland, with 560,000 people, has the highest

taxes in Canada? We have to ask our Finance Minister, and this is part of the resolution, why it is that this year we have a \$173 million deficit on current account.

Unlike the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), I know there is a difference in current account and capital account, because if you have a deficit in capital account perhaps you can make the excuse that you are investing your money in an asset that is worth some cash. As the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) knows, when you are talking about current account, you are talking about money that you need to pay your light bill, so to speak at home, to buy groceries, and to pay for a car which, in the final analysis, will not be a capital asset. So there is a difference in current and capital account.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that this Province of ours, Newfoundland, is this year going to have a current account deficit of \$173 million? Why is it that we have the highest unemployment rate in this country?

The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) in this Province must have the worst and the most tormenting department in government because as unemployment goes up, the number of social welfare recipients in this Province also goes up and the number of social problems that are being created in families by alcohol, drugs, and so on, goes up. That in itself is a story which should be told and will be told about the number of young people in this Province in junior high school, for example, in Grade Seven, that are drinking. I think my friend from Port de Grave (Mr.

Efford) has the statistics on the number of young people in this Province who are experiencing alcohol related problems. We have to ask those questions. Why?

Why is it that the Minister of Social Services cannot find the money that he says he needs for day care in the Province? Why is it that the Minister of Social Services has to go out in a resource rich province, rich in natural resources, and create what he knows and what I know are, by and large, just make-work projects to get our people off social assistance, paid for by the Province of Newfoundland, and put them on unemployment insurance, paid for by the Government of Canada? Why does he have to create those projects? Why do we have to carry on in that manner? Why is it that of the 114,000 young people between the ages of fifteen to twenty-four in this Province that only 34,000 of those young people are working? Why is it that 19,000 of them are unemployed and why it is that 61,000 of them are either discouraged workers, part of that was in school I grant you, but why is that there are so many discouraged young people? Why is it that the young people in Fogo district, thirty-seven years of age, and I can point them out to the government, more than one, not through any fault of their own, I do not believe it is any fault of their own, why is it that those young people, thirty-five, thirty-six, thirty seven years of age have never worked on anything in their lives only a Canada Works programme. Why is that? Why is that in a Province that is supposed to be so rich in natural resources?

Mr. Speaker, I say to the

government, insofar as it can influence what happens in this Province, I say to the ministers opposite and I say to the members opposite, the reason is very simple. I believe that the reason is very simple insofar as the government can influence what happens. I grant the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) that he cannot solve all of the problems in Newfoundland. I grant the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that it is not entirely his fault that we have a deficit of \$173 million. I will be fair to him, but they do have to accept the responsibility for their actions. I will tell them that the theme that runs through their government is primarily the cause of their difficulties and has caused a great deal of the difficulties that we experience in the Newfoundland economy. The theme has continually run through this government.

I have been here since 1979. When the Premier became Premier of this Province, I was elected as a young member in this Legislature, a lot younger than I am now. When the Premier was elected in 1979, I came into this Legislature, like the member Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) and the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), I believe did at the same time, and the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) who at that time, I believe, came in as the Minister of Education responsible for the Status of Women.

MS VERGE:

The Premier was responsible for the Status of Women then.

MR. TULK:

I know you had a great deal to do with it and I commend you for it.

The point that I want to make to this government today and the point that ministers opposite and members opposite would do well to keep in mind is that it is not the economic development of this Province which has been uppermost in their minds, it is getting re-elected and it is the politics of the game. I know they are politicians. We are all politicians but there comes a point - and I say this to the Premier and I say it to the member for Bonavista South - there comes a point when you are elected and you form the government that you give up playing your politics at least for the time being and become statesmen and do what is right and proper to be done. Mr. Speaker, that has not been done.

There was a time in this Legislature where if you questioned, if you even dared to question what was being done by the government you were considered a traitor. The words were used by the member for St. John's North (Dr. Collins) when he was speaking to the former member for the Strait of Belle Isle, Mr. Ed Roberts. That is the prime problem that this government has had.

Hibernia is not being developed. Are we sure today on a factual level in this Province that the deal that was about to be struck by Chretien and Marshall was not a good deal? Are we sure?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, sure.

MR. TULK:

Was there an objective examination in the Houses of the facts, in this Legislature? The answer is no. The mode operation of this government was, if you asked them

a question, they questioned your patriotism or nationalism and whether you were indeed a Newfoundlander. What do we see today? We see the Atlantic Accord and if you look at the bottom line, it may very well be a worse deal than was going to be signed between Chretien and Marshall. The Atlantic Accord was signed in 1984. The Premier, I would suggest to you, without any analysis of the facts at all, played politics once again. It became far more important to him to get rid of a fellow by the name of Trudeau, who he despised, and to get in a fellow by the name of Brian Mulroney.

We were supposed to be inflicted with prosperity in 1984. Oh, we cannot stand any more of the infliction, Mr. Speaker. This is the sad part, and it is contained in the resolution. A sad spectacle of irresponsibility came through this Spring when the Premier appeared on television and in one of the local newspapers to tell us that we were going bankrupt. If the federal government, he says, does not step in, we are looking at the dirty '30s. I say to him, inasfar as government is responsible, he has to bear the responsibility for the last eight years as the Premier of this Province in terms of its economic development. He has to bear the responsibility for what we are seeing this year in the budget in terms of \$173 million debt on current account. He has to bear the responsibility for the fact that we have close to a \$5 billion debt in this Province. He has to bear part of the responsibility for the fact that when he came into office every man, woman, and child in this Province owed, I believe, something like \$3,000 each per

capita, and today they owe something like \$8,000 each. He has to bear the responsibility for the fact, insofar as government is concerned, and his mode of operation has to bear part of that responsibility, that we have the highest unemployment level in this country.

Mr. Speaker, how dare this Premier get on television and tell the finance markets of the world that we were going to be bankrupt! How dare that same Premier, who has shown us no plan of economic development. Yes, I say to the Finance Minister, in 1979 and 1980 he put a plan on paper. It was a blue book and it had a five-year plan in place for the development of the Province.

DR. COLLINS:

It was called **Managing All Our Resources**.

MR. TULK:

Managing All Our Resources was the name of it. I have kept it and I have read it so many times. There was a plan on paper.

DR. COLLINS:

Have you kept all my budget speeches to date?

MR. TULK:

No. In terms of his budget speeches, Mr. Speaker, you only need to keep one, because they have not basically changed since 1979 except the projections of the deficit of this Province have gone higher and higher since he has been the Finance Minister. Then again, those projections are like, as we used to say about the weather forecast, if he says it is going to rain, then get up the next morning and enjoy the sunshine, and if he says we are going to have sunshine, then get

up the next morning and put your rubber clothes on. That is how accurate his projections have been. I do not keep all of his budgets. I only kept the one and it was written in 1979. You can take his speeches, his projections of grandure, and you will either see them fighting Canada, no real plan of action contained in them, and if they cannot get Canada, they will take a run at Quebec, and if they cannot do anything with -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is this the one?

MR. TULK:

No, that is not the one. It is the 1979 one. Read either one of them and you will get the same message. If they cannot take a run at Quebec, they will take one at Nova Scotia. The Premier governs this Province by trying to set up situations for him to fight about.

For example, I can tell you, just as sure as I am standing here, that we are now brewing for another fight with Nova Scotia over jurisdiction in the fisheries. He has set the stage for his next fight. Is there any rational planning? The answer is no. Is there a reasoned approach? Is there a plan? The Minister of Finance is going to Ottawa to look for \$173 million to cover his deficit without laying out any plan except to have the Premier of this Province say, 'Newfoundland is going to be bad enough that we are going to give Canada a black eye.'

I say to the Minister of Finance, I am a Canadian and I do not want the Minister of Finance to have me part of a Province that proports to give this nation a black eye.

That is not good enough. I say to the Minister of Finance, show us a plan of development for this Province. Show us a plan that has something to do with development of our forests and with the maintenance of our forests. Show us some plans to have the federal government bring the Tail and Nose of the Grand Banks under its jurisdiction. Show us your plans. Lay them out. Lay them out in a reasonable fashion. Go to the federal government with a reasoned approach to economic development.

I say to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) what you have done is great, but to stand in this legislature and say, 'I have created 2,000 jobs for young people' in view of the figures that I have just given him of some 19,000 being unemployed, of some 61,000 being either discouraged or in school, built in there somewhere, probably about 40,000 of them discouraged for a total of perhaps 59,000, is just a national disgrace. If you want to give Canada a black eye, there is the black eye. Between 50,000 and 55,000 young people, let me be generous and say between 40,000 and 55,000 young people are unemployed. You want a national disgrace, well, there it is. To come in and say I created 2,000 jobs, if he thinks that that absolves him of his responsibility to the other 38,000 to 53,000, I say to him that he is sadly mistaken and that he should buckle over.

He should follow some of the recommendations of his own Royal Commission, the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment. I say to him and I want him to listen very closely. I ask my

friend for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) to have him listen. I say to him that Recommendation 113 - does he follow it? - the provincial government should establish a young Newfoundland conservation core. Has he given any thought to it? Are they going to do anything about it? The answer is no.

I say to him that stretching between Musgrave Harbour and Gander Bay, in my district alone, this Summer there are 500 jobs for people in a core of that nature and it would be a good investment, one of the best investments he could make, to thin out a forest that was burnt in 1961 and is now growing at a reduced rate such that maybe my son, who is now seven years old, when he is my age might be able to cut a stick of wood. I say to him that is the way he could use 500 young people and use them well. Teach them that they have to farm a forest.

I do not believe that this is the nature of the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), but instead of kowtowing to members on the other side who are more interested in getting themselves re-elected, by taking ten people from their district and sending them to Windsor - Buchans to work in the park, instead of that, if he could convince his colleagues to put their effort into implementing Recommendation 113 of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment, his efforts would be well expended, far better than they are now.

Today, I have to say to him, he is using the public purse for a purpose for which it is not intended and that is to help his colleagues on the other side, like

the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr Simms), to buy their way back into power. There he goes and well he should walk through the door, turn back on and walk out. He should do it in shame. To use his influence over the public purse, to take ten people -

MR. SIMMS:
He has not read that.

MR. TULK:
I have read it and it is done by a Tory editor, I would say to him. I do not mind saying it to him because it is the truth and I know what I say.

If he could convince that minister to use his efforts to create 500 jobs in the district of Fogo to do some silviculture work in a forest that was destroyed in 1961, if he could do that, rather than allow him to use the funds of the taxpayers of this Province to increase his votes from forty-one to a safe majority by taking ten people out of one district and hoisting them on another district because it is Liberal, then I say to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, I will work for him in the next election.

MR. BAIRD:
I am going to do some thinning when I go to Fogo.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
That is where our problems lie. That is why we see an irresponsible Premier and why we see this headline, 'Peckford says, Province facing financial chaos'. That is why we see that headline. That kind of attitude on the part

of this government.

MR. BAIRD:
Tell us about the press conference at 2:30 when the member for Stephenville (Mr. Aylward) will be resigning.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, "In a wide ranging" - let me read to him - "interview with **The Sunday Express**, Mr. Peckford said, 'Newfoundland needs a new deal on regional development'." Mr. Speaker, I say to him that the Premier is right. But we need a Premier with a new approach to politics and economic development in this Province. We need a Premier who is not satisfied to try to scare us all to death and to scare Ottawa to death by making that kind of statement and then backing off with a budget that says nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address one other thing that is wrong with the government opposite before this Legislature closes. Let me say to him that I think it is this: We have another little syndrome over there that developed. No odds what we fail at in this Province, we have to blame somebody. It can extend from the regional minister, the minister for the Province, the hon. John Crosbie, it can extend from him, it does not matter whether it is Bill Rompkey, John Crosbie, whether it is Mulroney or Trudeau or who it is -

MR. FLIGHT:
The Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. TULK:
I cannot say that. The hon. gentleman is right. The gentleman that he spoke about now was in office. I will not repeat his name. He is not there now. He will probably be here some time

today. I cannot use his name, but we have to find somebody to blame.

MR. BAIRD:

Clyde will pay Rex out of his extra money.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

The Premier will find somebody to blame if the hydroponics project in Mount Pearl goes up the spout. I do not know who it will be in this case, but he will find somebody to blame.

MR. PEACH:

You will be up the spout in the next election.

MR. TULK:

Oh, my threatened, threatened, threatened.

MR. PEACH:

That is not a threat, it is a fact.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentleman that he should be more concerned about what is happening in the Province today than the next election. The hon. gentleman is a disappointment, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach).

AN HON. MEMBER:

A good man.

MR. TULK:

He is a disappointment. The Minister for Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) is a person who is very much concerned about what is going on. But the hon. gentleman for Carbonear is satisfied with a couple of things, if he can sit in his seat and throw insults across the House and get himself re-elected, that is the measure of

his success. That has got to be a disappointment to everybody in this Legislature, I say to the hon. gentleman. If he wants to get up and speak when I sit down, he has the opportunity to do so and he should take advantage of that opportunity, but otherwise he should be quiet.

MR. PEACH:

Carbonear will stay Tory.

MR. TULK:

I want to pose a question to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in particular, who is now trying to again lay the blame on Ottawa. The question is when are we going to take our destiny in our own hands, look inside ourselves, find our own faults and then say, 'Let us develop this Province?' When are we going to do it? That is the question hon. gentlemen have to ask themselves. It is no good for the Minister of Finance this year to walk up to the federal government and say, 'Give us \$173 million to cover current account,' because by the time he gets the cash, he is going to have to come in here and do the same thing all over again. Is that management over financial resources? Is that the extent of the management of this government? Is it any good if he cannot get a deal on Hibernia out of Mobil Oil? That is a year overdue now, at least one year overdue.

We were told last year this time, just before the Legislature closed, that by the end of June there should be an agreement signed. This year the Minister of Energy, the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) is standing in his place and saying the same thing, the same words.

MR. MORGAN:

He is working for the best deal for the Province.

MR. TULK:

I am not arguing about the best deal for the Province. Sometimes you have to take the only deal you can get, as the hon. gentleman knows.

MR. BAIRD:

You had a different leader then.

MR. TULK:

The matter of judgement as to when the time to sign a deal is also important, and I say to him that it is important that it is important that this government take its politics out of signing its deals, that they act like statesmen on more occasions than they do, and not necessarily just playing raw politics. That is where we are at.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason. We did not put a motion of non-confidence in the government this morning just for the sake of putting one down. We put it down because we believe that the high level of unemployment in this Province is, to some extent, the responsibility of this government. The fact is we have such a huge public debt and we have such a deficit has to have something to do with this government, otherwise they have no reason to exist. They cannot sit over there, Mr. Speaker, and say, "It is not our fault. There is nothing we can do about it." If they do, I say to him they should walk to Government House this evening and tender their resignations because if they cannot govern then there is no place for them in government, and they should tender their resignation and save the Province at least their salaries.

Mr. Speaker, the irresponsibility of a Premier that says, "We have at the outside two years and then it is 1933 all over again," and their trying to absolve themselves of any responsibilities in this whole matter is just not acceptable to any of us.

Mr. Speaker, having said those few words, I want to implore the government to pay heed and I would implore a lot of people on that side, if they can reach down deep enough and find the courage to stand up and vote for this non-confidence motion. It is time that the people of this Province replaced the present government with a new one.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I am pleased we brought in the amendment taking the government to task for the high unemployment and the Premier's comments that we are going to go back to the 1930s. We do not have to go back to the 1930s, we only have to go back to 1979 and there is more unemployment now than in 1979. The administration promised 40,000 jobs and there are less jobs now than there were in 1979. We have had an outward migration of 5,000 people. Our population increased in the past five years by only .05 per cent. We have seen a deterioration in our post-secondary education. The

President of the University points out that salaries are now at such a stage that we have the potential to lose our top international professors, and we are also having problems attracting them. We have problems getting doctors and nurses into remote areas of our Province. We have great problems with our juvenile programme here in the Province which is not being properly funded. We have problems in our other social sectors. People who are in mental institutions, once they get out, they find out there is very, very little support. The same thing for transition houses, once they get out, again there is no place to go.

MR. BAIRD:

The Liberals had no transition houses.

MR. HISCOCK:

Quite true, the Liberals had jobs. There was no need for them, there were jobs.

MR. BAIRD:

Oh, they did not beat their women.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad he pointed this out because I can go back to the social fabric of our Province.

The social fabric of our Province is falling apart, and it is falling apart for one reason only. There is no employment in this Province. As a result of the high unemployment in our Province, families are being torn apart from each other. They are wondering whether they are going to spend money on clothing for their children or whether it is going to

be spent on food. Children are putting pressure on their parents for things like sports equipment, VCRs, and bicycles, like any other children. We find husbands and wives arguing. We find people turning to alcoholism and turning to drugs. The fabric of the family is breaking down and support is not being carried on for families because of purely economic reasons. The reason why we are having an increase in juvenile delinquents is not because of women in the work force. It is because there are no jobs, and as a result, Mr. Speaker, we find out there is a strain on the social fabric of the Province.

The main reason why I wanted to get up was just to go through some things, and again point out the high, tragic level of youth unemployment. Since 1979, I can say I know at least 1,000 people, personally - and I do not exaggerate and I do not believe in stretching the truth in any way - who have left this Province with degrees, doctors, nurses, teachers, accountants, and agricultural people, to find jobs in other parts of Canada. That is the most tragic thing, seeing my friends who I went to university with, seeing relatives that I grew up with, seeing people in my district who I represent, having to move out of this Province. They are going to other parts of Canada and luckily we are part of Canada.

I think, as our House Leader (Mr. Tulk) pointed out, it will be proven that the Chretien deal would have been much better than the Atlantic Accord. We would have had work on the go now. Also with regard to the Atlantic Accord, one of the things that the

former leader of our party, the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry), will get credit for in this Province in history is the legislation that was brought in giving us, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, 45 per cent of all wells. We could buy in to 45 per cent of a well. The federal government went on and took that legislation, brought in a National Energy Programme and Petro-Canada was set up so we would have 25 per cent of any wells in the offshore of our coastal provinces. What did the federal P.C. Government do once they got in? Because of pressure from Mobil and because of President Reagan in the United States, they turn around and wipe out the 45 per cent, wipe out the 25 per cent, and we now have no right to buy into anything although it is our birthright.

With regard to Churchill Falls, ever since 1971, since that contract has been in place, where is the provincial government on re-negotiating that? Not only that, what about the Lower Churchill?

With regard to our fisheries, it took the federal government to bail out our offshore, deep sea fishery. Luckily we had the compassion of the Liberal Government at that time.

With regard to our forestry, again, I want to point out that our silviculture industry is not up to par. Alberta and other provinces in Canada are the leaders.

With regard to our environment, very, very poor marks.

With regard to education, we see our Department of Education in a

complete state of flux where we started Grade XII and finally worked our way down. Post-secondary education is the same thing.

If we take the Department of Health, they are closing down beds and creating waiting lists for patients.

If we also take the Department of Finance, any budget that was brought in was continually revised. This year, which I think is a most disturbing trend, they borrowed almost \$500 million and out of that \$500 million, \$172 million of that was to just pay our light bill, gasoline for the trucks, and paper and pens for our civil servants. That is a very, very disturbing trend, Mr. Speaker, because we are borrowing on the future of our younger people. We are not giving our younger people any chance of jobs now and yet we are putting our younger people, who have no chance at jobs, further in debt in the future.

Looking back at when we did have a Liberal Government up to 1971, we did have employment. Sure there were problems, sure there were mistakes, but nobody blames the government for making honest mistakes. At least present the facts and not ram Sprung down our throat and say, 'Okay, this is a nice idea and we will try it.' If it is a good idea, why do we not try it on a smaller basis, see if it works and have the architecture and the engineering arranged in such a way so we can build on that.

This year, Mr. Speaker, I brought in a motion. I want to go back to the former Premier of this Province, Mr. Smallwood. A great sense of compassion went across

this country - not this Province - this country when we saw a great man, who brought Newfoundland into Confederation, in tears as a writ was served on him. With that, what happened? The Canadian nation, the Canadian media rose in sympathy and said surely this is not dignity, surely this is not the compassion we should show our politicians, no matter what stripe, no matter what mistakes they did in the past. He wants to continue to publish books to pass on our history as a birthright to future generations. All we have to do is just look around this room here and see the pictures of the former Speakers in this House.

All I am saying to the Premier and I am saying it to this government is this House will be closed soon and we will probably not sit again until there is a new government. I believe we will be over on that side and many of the people that are smiling now will be over on this side and some people will not even be here. I will say to the government, show some compassion to the former Premier of this Province and allow him to have dignity. Hopefully this government will allow him to have his House back which he turned over to the government for one dollar. Hopefully, instead of having people come across from Canada, walking across Newfoundland, instead of having young people in universities all across Canada raising money for the former Premier, surely this government can put aside partisan politics and give the former Premier some dignity so that he can die in dignity when he does - and I grant him long life, even longer - but at least give him that so that the people of this Province and this government will

say, no matter what the political stripe was, this administration, who said that we were near bankruptcy, showed compassion. Now, after seventeen years, we find out we have a \$5 billion debt. We find out the Premier is saying that we are going to go back to the '30s. Hopefully, as I said, this government will show some compassion and sympathy and show some leadership for the former Premier and give the man his dignity and some compassion that he deserves and not have other people in other parts of Canada doing it for us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
If the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I suppose just a few summary remarks are all that are required. I would just like to cast my mind back a little bit to 1979 when one of the youngest, if not the youngest Premier took over the reins of power in our Province. He gathered the dynamic team around him and there was a new lease on life in this Province.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Dynamic Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
Youngest Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:
Several dynamic Speakers.

Mr. Speaker, it was tough luck that just as this dynamic group took over power in the Province and set about putting plans on paper and putting programmes in place that we were hit with the deepest, longest, most severe economic recession the Western World has seen since the 'dirty '30s'.

MR. WINDSOR:

Caused by twenty-three years of Liberalism.

DR. COLLINS:

In this Province, we were hit by the recession harder than anywhere else. We had the least means of withstanding the blow. We were hit harder, but we survived. Mr. Speaker, we did not only survive.

I just jotted down, as the last few members were speaking, a few of the things that have happened in this Province under this administration. Remembering that the youngest Premier in the country, in our history, the deepest recession -

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear, the youngest Premier in our history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

- and despite all of that, what accomplishments! Just listen to a few of them. I am just going to rattle off a few of them. Kruger in Corner Brook; Bowater went down the tube and every man at the time said, 'She is gone. Corner Brook will have to close down.' What do we have today as a result of this administration's effort? We have one of the most modern and modernizing paper mills in the Province and in the country.

Mr. Speaker, what do we have out at Come By Chance? When we came to power, Come By Chance had a few rusty pieces of steel out there. We now have an oil refinery out there that people are amazed could be put there.

What about our offshore fishery? What was the state of our offshore fishery in 1979? Pretty dismal, eh.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about our inshore?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

What do we have now? We have now one of the largest, most modern offshore fishing companies in the world.

What was the state in Happy Valley - Goose Bay in 1979? Pretty dismal, hey. What is it like up there now? How many more German aircraft are training up there? How many more Dutch aircraft are up there? What is the attitude in Happy Valley - Goose Bay? I was up there a little while ago and I was speaking to a couple of suppliers up there, and they said, 'We cannot keep building supplies in the place, there is so much activity going on around here.'

Mr. Speaker, what has happened to our hospital system? Remember we had a cottage hospital system put in place in the early 1930s, small wooden places. What has this administration done? It has put in place modern regional hospitals, strategically dotted around the Province.

Mr. Speaker, what about our educational system. What did this administration do for high school education? We put in place an expanded high school education that brings us on par with the rest of the educational systems in Canada. Not only that, we have expanded the opportunities for education throughout the Province much moreso than has ever happened before.

Mr. Speaker, does anyone remember the old Fisheries College over on the Southside? If you went into it, you would be afraid you might go down through the floor and end up in the harbour. What have we got on the hill up here now? What is this large modern sophisticated well-equipped institution up there?

Mr. Speaker, what have we done in terms of community colleges in the Province? Have we not just put in place a community college system the like of which the Province has never seen before?

MR. SIMMS:
Right on.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, what have we done at our major professional educational institutions, Memorial University? Is there not a Music School up there that was not there when this administration came into power? Is there not a Library up there, a modern, \$14 million Library that was not there when we came in? What about the Business School? Is that not expanded now? When I go by there now, do I not see a new Business School going up there? For what is the foundation being dug? Is that a new Earth Resources building?

Mr. Speaker, what have we done in pensions, by the way? Was not our

pension scheme a total disaster with no planning whatever? What was one of the first things this administration did? Did we not start to fund our pensions, trying to make up for things that have been neglected for twenty-five years?

MR. BAIRD:
Damn the previous, previous administration.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, what about my friend's mill out in Grand Falls? Is that not now a modernized mill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, has there been anything radical done in the fishery generally? Yes, I think so. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), who is very knowledgeable in the fishery, shakes his head. You have never heard of aquaculture? Aquaculture is the new thing. It is in the Province now: mussels, salmon. There is even cod fish aquaculture in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, what is the other thing coming on the horizon? Something you may not have heard of. Do you know there is going to be Sprung hydroponic technology come into this Province?

Mr. Speaker, what happened offshore? Was not the offshore situation a disaster until this administration took over and put in place a proper federal/provincial management arrangement?

Mr. Speaker, what about Baie Verte? What about the new gold mine at Hope Brook? What about

the fishery guarantee programme that saved innumerable companies and plants dotted around our Province, in all areas? What about all the road paving we have done? What about the municipal development we have put in place on a vastly expanded scale?

MR. DOYLE:

A 176 per cent increase.

DR. COLLINS:

A 176 per cent increase, and my friend is being very modest.

What about all the interties in the PDD, diesel and other areas. And, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. What about silviculture? It was totally neglected by the Liberals for thirty years. They did not plant a single, solitary tree in this Province. What have we done? We have a silviculture programme underway in this Province that is a model to the rest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am utterly amazed that in the short period of time, since 1979, with the youngest Premier in the country at the helm of the government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

- with a vicious recession, the like of which has not been seen for over fifty years, that we have been able to do these things in all areas. It is amazing! With that, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to close the Budget debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We will deal with the amendment first.

All those in favour of the amendment 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the amendment please say 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The nays have it. The amendment is defeated.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee on Ways and Means rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means is pleased to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have received a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER:
"Government House, St. John's, May 28, 1987.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending 31st day of March 1988, by way of further supply and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act 1867, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

(sgd) _____
Lieutenant-Governor."

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I move that the message be referred to Committee of the Whole on Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

Motion, that the total of the estimates contained in the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be carried and a resolution be adopted to give effect to the same, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Whole on Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the amount of \$1,576,516,100,000 contained in the estimates of supply, and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the Committee of the Whole on Supply with respect to the estimates of 1987, together with a resolution and a bill consequent thereto, be referred to a Committee of Ways and Means and that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Resolution

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the

granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1988, the sum of one billion five hundred and seventy-six million five hundred and sixteen thousand one hundred dollars (\$1,576,516,100,000).

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Eight And For Other Purposes Relating To the Public Service". (Bill No. 36).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matters to them referred and report having passed a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of

March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Eight And For Other Purposes Relating To the Public Service", read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 36).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest we recess for about five minutes while we wait for the Representative of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II to grace us with his presence.

Recess

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER:

Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

It is the wish of His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor that all present be seated. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her Faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour a Bill for the appropriation of Supply granted in the present Session.

A Bill For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Eight And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service.

HON. J. A. MCGRATH
Lieutenant-Governor:

In Her Majesty's Name, I thank Her

Loyal Subjects, I accept their benevolence, and I assent to this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present Session passed certain Bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Summary Proceedings Act". (Bill No. 1).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The St. John's Fire Department Act, 1972". (Bill No. 2).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act And The Uniformed Services Pensions Act". (Bill No. 3).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Development And Tourism Act". (Bill No. 4).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973". (Bill No. 6).

A bill, "An Act Respecting Occupational Therapists". (Bill No. 8).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act". (Bill No. 9).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Veterinary Medical Act, 1971". (Bill No. 10).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Encouragement And Regulation Of An Aquaculture Industry In The Province". (Bill No. 11).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of The Institute Of Fisheries And Marine

Technology, The Fisher Institute Of Applied Arts And Technology and The Cabot Institute Of Applied Arts And Technology". (Bill No. 12).

A bill, "An Act To Establish A Community College System In The Province". (Bill No. 13).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Rehabilitation Act". (Bill No. 15).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Day Care And Homemaker Services Act, 1975". (Bill No. 17).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Occupational Health And Safety Act". (Bill No. 18).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Emergency Measures Act". (Bill No. 19).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act". (Bill No. 20).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Companies Act". (Bill No. 21).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Corporation Capital Tax Act". (Bill No. 22).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act". (Bill No. 23).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Act". (Bill No. 24).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Government-Kruger Agreements Act". (Bill No. 25).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Energy And Other Matters Related Or Incidental

Thereeto". (Bill No. 26).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973". (Bill No. 27).

A bill, "An Act Respecting And Increase In Pensions". (Bill No. 28).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957". (Bill No. 29).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957". (Bill No. 30).

A bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province". (Bill No. 31).

A bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Between The Government Of Canada And The Government Of The Province Respecting Reciprocal Taxation Of These Government And Their Agencies". (Bill No. 32).

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Seven And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service". (Bill No. 33).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Return Of The Business Of Fishery Products International Limited To Private Investors". (Bill No. 34).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1978". (Bill No. 35).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural, Agricultural And Northern Development Act".

(Bill No. 37).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Corporations Act". (Bill No. 38).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University (Pensions) Act". (Bill No. 39).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act And The Uniformed Services Pensions Act". (Bill No. 40).

A bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law". (Bill No. 43).

HON. J.A. McGRATH
Lieutenant-Governor:

In Her Majesty's Name, I Assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER:

I just want to take this opportunity to wish each and every one of you a very good Summer, and to thank all of you for your cooperation during the year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I am now going to move the adjournment motion. Before doing so, I would wish, and I am sure I speak for all hon. members, to thank you and other hon. members who share with you the responsibility of presiding over meetings of the House and its Committees, to thank the Clerk of the House of Assembly and the other Officers at the Table, the Sergeant-at-Arms and others who

are involved with him in providing security in the House, the Legislative Librarian and her staff for their dutiful work during this session, the Editor of Hansard and all who are on the Hansard staff for their hard work, and, of course, the Pages who play a very important role in this House. I understand that they are finalizing their term of service to the House of Assembly and I think we will all agree that they are fine young Newfoundlanders and they have been very helpful to all of us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I would also wish to thank all hon. members of the Opposition, and the hon. member with whom I have had the most contact, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk), and also the leader of the other caucus in opposition.

DR. COLLINS:

The Socialist.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I am not saying 'Socialist' today, no. I am not one bit nasty.

DR. COLLINS:

The communist.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is even more nasty.

So, I thank these hon. gentlemen and I thank colleagues on this side, as well, and all hon. members for their cooperation.

DR. COLLINS:

The Queen's Printer.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I am told I should also, and indeed I am please to do so, send

our thanks to the Queen's Printer. No doubt on certain occasions, like today's Order Paper, nobody knew until after 1:00 a.m. exactly what should be on today's Order Paper.

Let me say in a kind of personal way that a Legislature is an adversarial forum where people's political philosophies differ and where there is hard debate and where there is a certain amount of cut and thrust, but it is my personal belief that on the whole we have exercised that necessary responsibility without personal kinds of abuse. I, personally, have always felt that a person's political views have never interfered with, and should never interfere with, one's personal relationships; one can have totally different political views but that does not interfere with one's relationships.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

In summary, therefore, I thank all hon. members for their cooperation and if I personally have said anything offensive to any hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps even moreso on this side, it certainly was not my intention to so do. Having said that, I now put the motion.

I move that when this House adjourns today it stands adjourned until the call of the Chair. It shall be understood that the call of the Chair shall be conclusively evident when it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, or in the case of his absence from the Province the Chairman of Committees, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government that the House shall meet, the Speaker,

or in his absence the Chairman of Committees may give notice that he is so satisfied amnd thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated by this notice, and I also move that this House now adjourn.

Essentially that is an adjournment to the call of the Chair. When public business requires it, we shall be back. We do not know when public business will require it.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
If I may on behalf of my colleagues in the official Opposition join the expression of good wishes from the Chair and from the Government House Leader that all will have a very pleasant and enjoyable Summer as you get your respective bailiwicks ready for the coming fray.

I sense not only the usual generosity in the words of the member for Waterford - Kenmount but can we suggest that also there might have been a swan song there? I thought he was unduly intimate in his remarks today, and may I express the hope that he not see fit to leave us, in a parliamentary sense, yet.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, on behalf of my colleagues would want to be associated with the expression of thanks to the various individuals and agencies that serve us so well in this Chamber. I will not name them, because the minister has already done that. I would want to add to his list, and I am sure that he would be the first to add

it to his list, the press for their forbearance during the session, particularly during those sittings which took place late in the evening.

Finally, we are going to miss the Pages. I suggest to all four of them that their absence will be but a temporary one; they will not be sitting in those seats when they come back, but do come back and sit in some of the other seats.

MR. TULK:
Sit with us on the government side.

MR. SIMMONS:
On the government side with us.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had as a leader of a party that is recognized in the House to extend my thanks to the other members of the House for the cooperation we received.

It has been a sort of a teething time, I think is the best phrase to use, a time of trying out what exactly the roles will be when there are three parties, and I cannot honestly say that it has not been without at least a little degree of tumult and uproar, and so on. Hopefully, with the Committee we have struck, over the next couple of months we will be able to regularize our relationships and so on. I just wish to say on behalf of my

colleague, and our ever expanding caucus, that we look forward to either a Fall sitting, if that be in the cards, or to coming back next Spring to again deliberate the business of the Province. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I wonder if I might be allowed just a brief addendum. I recognize the hon. gentleman's optimism, and I have always said that optimism is good for one's health.

And the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I have frequently been called a strange bird, but never regarded as graceful as a swan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

You have all heard the motion. Those in favour 'aye'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the motion.

The House stands adjourned.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. P.J.McNicholas, Speaker

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. Roger Simmons, P.C., Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (Lib)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Flight, Graham (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi
Long, Gene (NDP)	St. John's East
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2...

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Matthews, Hon. William (PC)	Grand Bank
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)	St. John's Centre
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)	LaPoile
Morgan, James (PC)	Bonavista South
Ottenheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)	Waterford - Kenmount
Parsons, Kevin (PC)	St. John's East Extern
Patterson, William G. (PC)	Placentia
Peach, Milton (PC)	Carbonear
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)	Green Bay
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Ferryland
Reid, James G. (PC)	Trinity - Bay de Verde
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC) ,	Baie Verte - White Bay
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)	Lewisporte
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)	Grand Falls
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)	Fortune-Hermitage
Tobin, Glenn (PC)	Burin - Placentia West
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)	Fogo
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)	Exploits
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)	Humber East
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)	Torngat Mountains
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)	Mount Pearl
Woodford, Rick (PC)	Humber Valley
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)	Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Social Services
Hon. John Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Finance
Hon. Ron Dawe	Transportation
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines and Energy
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Education

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. William Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Energy President of the Council Government House Leader
Hon. Charlie Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
Hon. Len Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Health
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	President of Treasury Board
Hon. Haig Young	Public Works and Services