



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 4

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Wednesday

4 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise this hon. House that the Province has arranged a Canadian dollar bond issue in the amount of \$75 million in the European capital market. The bonds which will be dated April 8, 1987 have a term of twenty years and carry an annual coupon of 9.5 per cent for the first eight years, with the interest rate to be reset at the option of the Province in 1995 and 2001. In addition, the bonds may be redeemed at the option of the Province or the bond-holder after eight and fourteen years. The bonds are priced at 101.5 per cent of their principal amount to yield 9.02 per cent on a semi-annual basis.

This issue will complete the Province's borrowing programme for the 1986 - 1987 fiscal year. The borrowing was arranged by the Province's European fiscal agents, Credit Commercial de France and Dominion Securities Incorporated with underwriting positions being taken by various banks from Britian, Germany, Switzerland, Japan, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, the United States, France, and Canada. I am also pleased to advise that the issue was well received throughout the European investment community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we thank the Minister of Finance for that information. I confess I do wonder whether that was the administrative detail that had to be cleared up in order to pay the vocational school instructors. Is this where the money is coming from, and is this why these instructors have been waiting for their pay, until the Province rushed out and managed to raise some additional money?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Sit down, boy, sit down. You are misleading again.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, there would not be any misleading of the House if we had full information supplied. When we have the Premier of this Province getting up and saying one day that the Province is bankrupt in two years, and the next day is saying no, the Province is not going to be bankrupt in two years, who is misleading whom?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the Ministerial Statement.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I think it is very relevant to the bond markets, and

the ability of the Province to raise money in the bond markets, that the Premier of this Province be responsible in the statements that he makes with respect to the credit position of the Province and the financial position of the Province. I think that is very relevant, and we intend to pursue that, Mr. Speaker, the direct relevancy.

Perhaps that is why the Premier backed water like a squid within a matter of two days. Perhaps the Minister of Finance called the Premier in and told him that this money was being raised in the capital markets of the world and that it could have cost us, and probably did cost us, an extra half per cent or 1 per cent. How do we know, how will we ever know what the interest rate might have been if the Premier of this Province had not come out in such an irresponsible fashion and said that this Province was going bankrupt in two years? I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I would want an extra half per cent or 1 per cent on any money I loaned the Province after a statement like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just two minor points on it. The Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) indicated that \$75 million was the final borrowing of the Province. We ask two questions on that, or

ask him if he could provide the information at a later date? One, what was the total borrowing of the Province in the last fiscal year and could he give us some indication of how much further in debt we have gone this year? And the second question is, is it on target, is it what we anticipated at the beginning of the fiscal year, or have we had to borrow more than we anticipated?

ooo

MR. SPEAKER:  
Before calling Oral Questions, if I may, I would like to welcome to the visitors' gallery fifteen Grade XII students with their two teachers Wade Pryor and Ellison Newport from Seal Cove Integrated School in Fortune Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

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

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance. Will the minister inform this House whether any Special Warrants have been issued during the last six or seven days?

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, there were some Special Warrants issued before the

House opened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Would the minister please inform this House as to when the House of Assembly is going to be informed of the substance of these warrants and the reasons for which they were issued? When is that going to be tabled in the House?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, there is a statutory requirement in regard to tabling warrants and, of course, that will be followed.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Do I understand the Finance Minister to say that these warrants were issued for new programmes or were they for ongoing programmes for money that was under-allocated in his budget of last year?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, when the warrants are tabled, which will be in the required period of time, all that will be clear.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The minister realizes, of course, that he has fifteen days in which to table them. Is the issuing of these warrants, I would like to ask the Finance Minister, the result of a 5 per cent cut in fixed salary expenditures that he made last year in his budget in an attempt to make himself look good at this particular time last year? In other words, is this the result of his cooking the books of this Province?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, that is one of those 'When did you stop beating your wife' questions, which I do not intend to answer.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for

the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), and it concerns the Workers' Compensation Board in the Province. Mr. Speaker, every member, as the minister is aware, can list numerous grievances with the Workers' Compensation Board, appeals to the Ombudsman and so on. But to illustrate to the minister I would like to perhaps table this brief, that came to us from a lady on the West Coast of the Province, which illustrates quite well the problems that we have been having with Workers' Compensation. She submitted it, I believe, to my colleague, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Aylward).

In spite of the fact that last June, eight or nine months ago, legislation was passed in this Legislature outlining the creation of an independent Appeals Tribunal for those people who feel, obviously, like this lady feels in this brief she has submitted here, it is my understanding that this tribunal is not yet operating. Could the minister tell us why this is the case? Does the minister realize the tragic, personal and financial burden of those people, who, since last June, have not had the benefit of this Appeals Tribunal? Does he realize the suffering that those people are undergoing?

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 39, which was an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act, was brought in in the Spring of 1986 and was proclaimed into effect on 16 February 1987, the day on which

the new Workers' Compensation Board of Directors were appointed. The question of the Appeals Tribunal, Mr. Speaker, is being addressed and has been addressed ever since the bill was passed. There were a number of administrative matters, Mr. Speaker, to be taken care of. These have been pretty well cleared up at this particular time and I am hoping to be able to announce the people who will comprise the Appeals Tribunal hopefully - I hesitate to give an exact time, Mr. Speaker - within the next ten days or so.

MR. TULK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, in a number of public statements the minister made one on January 11 and another on January 30, he had the same hope, that he was going to be able to make the announcements then. I believe in a letter to the member for Stephenville, my colleague, he stated he was going to be able to make those announcements within a week. If the negotiations are going on, will the minister name us an exact date as to when those appointments will be made, when the whole thing will be put in place? Will he also tell us perhaps how much it is going to cost the people of this Province - if he has any idea at all how much it is going to cost the people of this Province - to pay for certain patronage appointments that was made by the former administration and this administration?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member is asking a multi-faceted question, I guess, two or three questions rolled into one. I made statements toward the end of January about the appointment of a board. That has been accomplished within the time frame, Mr. Speaker, that I quoted at that particular time. I have just told him that there were certain administrative matters that had to be taken care of before the board could be put into place. The same goes for the Appeals Tribunal, Mr. Speaker. Up until February 16 the two commissioners, whose job it was to conduct hearings on appeals against decisions of the Commission were on staff. There will inevitably be a short period of adjustment, but no claimant will lose, Mr. Speaker. He asks what will it cost the people of the Province here. Any cost or any problems to any claimant will be addressed, because when the new tribunal is appointed and put into place it will look at current cases and they will be looked at retroactively up to some point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, retroactively is a very good word to be used by that government, but I would remind the minister that there are people who have been suffering, numerous cases are documented here in this brief by one person since last June and it is not good enough to say matters will be resolved at some point in the future. Let me ask him again to give us, and to give the working people of this

Province, the people who have been injured in labour related jobs in this Province, a specific date, which is long past due, as to when this legislation will become effective in the form of an Appeals Tribunal. Let me again ask him how much will it cost to pay off the patronage appointments, that were made by the Moores' Administration and by the Peckford Administration, of those people to the commission? Let me ask him this question: Is there any truth that it may cost us well over \$500,000?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is well aware of the fact that there are processes to be followed in all legislation with respect to appointments. I cannot give the hon. member an exact hour of any exact day of any week. I have already said, Mr. Speaker, that within the next ten days or so I hope to have the Appeals Tribunal put into place. With respect to his question, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the severance package for commissioners, I regard that as a personal matter respecting two people who have done no wrong, whose jobs, because of reorganization of the commission and a piece of legislation, have become redundant, and they have to be taken care of.

I am not prepared at this moment, Mr. Speaker, to respond to that matter because it affects the lives of a couple of people who, as I say, have done no wrong. The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, will come out in due course.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. The Council of Trades Unions, Mr. Speaker, have said to the Premier, you led us to believe in a private meeting in early June of '86 that all other related work, specifically the offshore platforms or work related to it, but also Come By Chance would operate with union labour, and you reiterated this when you appeared at the founding convention. Mr. Speaker, outside the Legislature a couple of days ago, the Premier indicated that he did not have anything to say about Come By Chance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. CALLAN:

I am going to ask the Premier this, Mr. Speaker: Is it implicit in the admission that he did not talk about union labour for Come By Chance that he did talk about union labour for other projects, and is the Premier still pursuing that same goal?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very much so.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

At the founding convention of the Provincial Council of Labour, the Premier, Mr. Speaker, said that he pledged support to the Council of Trade Unions and he also said, "My door will be open to you." Let me ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is his door still open and when does he plan to meet with these people? They have been waiting now for months, I understand.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the preamble to the hon. member's question is completely erroneous. There have been meetings established with the Cabinet committee, and the council has met with the Cabinet committee and had a full briefing. Because this information is coming out in dribs and drabs I have no alternative, even though I am breaking the confidence of one of the members of the council, except to say I have met with the President of the Council of Labour on two occasions myself, in my office, and I am committed to have a permanent liaison with that council in place. It is now in place and the ministers responsible have met with the council, and they have presented a detailed brief to the government which we are examining and we will be having ongoing, permanent liaison with that organization.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier, in answer to a question a couple of

days ago from the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk), said that he would be responding to the Harris Report in due course. We know, of course, the recommendations contained in that report. Now, in the Throne Speech of a few days ago, last week, the Premier says, 'My government feels that the current balance of protection of private rights and union rights in the labour legislation of this Province is fair and equitable.'

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

That is the second supplementary. There is no need for a preamble before a supplementary such as that.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, how does the Premier rationalize what was said in the Throne Speech and what the Premier plans to do with the Harris Report? Is he going to amend the legislation when he says in the Throne Speech he is not going to and, if he does not amend the legislation, how can he go along with the recommendations of the Harris Report?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I guess the hon. member will see the answer to that when we give our response to the Harris Report, Mr. Speaker.

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) and it concerns a meeting that is planned for London on this weekend between France and Canada to discuss the St. Pierre and Miquelon boundary. I wonder if the minister could tell the House if Newfoundland will be represented at that meeting?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, if the meeting, in fact, takes place Newfoundland will be represented at the meeting.

MR. W. CARTER:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, would the minister mind telling the House what strategy will be used by our representatives?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Do you want us to tell France our strategy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:  
No, no. Will their presence, Mr. Speaker, at the meeting be interpreted as approving of the so-called Canada/France agreement or are they going to be there to demand that that agreement be scrapped?

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



MR. RIDEOUT:

If, in fact, there is a meeting in London on the weekend, Mr. Speaker, the topic of discussion will be related to the compromise on referring the boundary to arbitration. On that question or others I do not intend at this time to send public signals on what our strategy will be.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Fisheries as well. Will the minister confirm that his department, in conjunction with the Department of Social Services, is constructing fish cages here in St. John's for the aquaculture project in Bay d'Espoir?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I know there was some discussion on that project. I do not know if actual construction may have been approved, but I am certainly prepared to take the question under advisement and find out for the hon. gentleman.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

I would like to table this document, first of all, a letter from a constituent of mine in Bay d'Espoir. He sends a picture. He

says, 'This is the cage -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

Well, I will table it, and I will ask a supplementary.

Is the minister aware that there are presently being constructed in Bay d'Espoir, under a Job Strategy Programme funded by the federal government, fish cages for this project? With 90 per cent unemployment in Bay d'Espoir there is no doubt that the necessary labour is available there. Also lumber for the cages available there. So I ask the minister, again, why his department is involved with those cages not being built in Bay d'Espoir?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, if it is a Canadian Job Strategy study, I have no indication what may or may not be constructed in any community around Newfoundland under the Canadian Job Strategy programme. I indicated to the hon. gentleman that I know there was some discussion with us and Social Services on that kind of project before. That is strictly a provincial matter. I undertook to find out for him and let him know as soon as I have the information.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

This question is to the Premier. The Premier is aware that the

Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council presented a brief to government in December which stated, 'The combination of political' -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please put his question?

MR. GILBERT:  
I am asking the question, Mr. Speaker. 'The combination of political apathy and bureaucratic aloofness has seriously handicapped the efforts of development in rural Newfoundland.'

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I think it is pretty well established that certainly for a second supplementary it is not necessary to have a long preamble. I would ask the hon. member to pose his question.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker, in that case, does the Premier agree that this would be a typical example of the political apathy and bureaucratic aloofness that the Rural Development Council was talking about in December?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, we are very proud of the fact that when we decided to build a salmon hatchery to get into aquaculture in the Province, we decided to build it in Bay d'Espoir. How many million dollars have we spent so far on it?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Two million.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
We have spent \$2 million in Bay d'Espoir, a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, to develop a very sophisticated salmon hatchery, which is working out very, very well, to breed the salmon to a smolt size and then they can be sold to farmers and so on in the area.

We are intent on developing not only a salmon hatchery in Bay d'Espoir but also to get into commercial productions so that individuals in Bay d'Espoir can buy the smolt and set up salmon farms and get into legitimate aquaculture activities so that we can help, through aquaculture, to eliminate some of the unemployment problems in Bay d'Espoir.

Now there were a lot of other areas of the Province that were vying for this salmon hatchery to have the first commercial production of salmon in the Province through aquaculture, Mr. Speaker, but we -

MR. FLIGHT:  
And National Sea got it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Would the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans be quiet while I am finishing the answer to the question?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
A short question, a short answer.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
We deliberately went to Bay d'Espoir, deliberately spent the \$2 million there, had Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro co-operate with the Rural Development Association, and now we are at the stage where

we are trying to put together the commercial application of aquaculture in the Province. We have the hatchery, now we want to get the smolts to a certain size and then to put it out to the community at large so that we have commercial production of salmon through aquaculture. That is a commitment that we have made to Bay d'Espoir and we intend to keep it.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the Premier is just missing the whole approach to rural development. It is obviously a waste of -

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You know a lot about it.

MR. TOBIN:  
How would you know anything about it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, when you control the members on the other side I would like to ask a question.

I would like to address a question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) or the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), whichever minister would like to respond to it. The Torbay Rec Centre was available to residents of Bell Island in previous years

when the ferry could not operate because of ice conditions. As you know, the Bell Island ferry has already been immobilized on a number of occasions because of ice, and it looks as though it is going to be a hard Spring as far as ice is concerned. We have commuters who have no choice but to commute back and forth to work in order to make a living, and many of them are making very low wages. I have written the departments on this previously, so I ask the minister is there anything at all that can be done to provide alternate accommodation? We realize it is not the minister's fault that the young offenders were moved into the Torbay Rec Centre, but is there anything at all that can be done in terms of providing accommodation to the residents of Bell Island who are stranded because of ice in the Tickle?

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

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. As he so rightfully said, we do have the young offenders now accommodated in the hostel at Torbay which before now we used to provide to residents of Bell Island when we had problems with ice.

The situation that we had, Mr. Speaker, was a crisis situation at that time when the young offenders had to be accommodated. Public Works and other departments were involved to try and find a place to move the young offenders to and the logical place to move them, I guess, looking at the kind

of facility that is necessary for young offenders, happened to be, I guess both fortunately and unfortunately, the Torbay hostel.

I understand the Leader of the Opposition, as well, Mr. Speaker, has been talking to the deputy minister on one occasion when I was out of town. We have difficulty in finding another building that would be suitable to accommodate the people from Bell Island. I think in the conversation with the Leader of the Opposition the deputy minister told him that if there was some way we could identify a building we could utilize we would be more than glad to do it, but as of today we have not been successful in finding another building that would be suitable to accommodate those people.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, there are possibilities. I have not had a chance to establish whether in fact some of these are suitable, but they may not even be government buildings. For example, I understand that maybe the Portugal Cove Town Council has an area which might possibly be made available, but again, of course, there would have to be some form of supervision or security in terms of accessing the building. Is the minister prepared to look at something along those lines in terms of assisting Bell Island commuters, probably only for a month or a month and a half? The expense would not continue for a lengthy

period. But even if it were a non-government building, is it possible to put some form of emergency assistance in place, a temporary hostel, whether it be for Bell Island commuters or other commuters who, as we see from time to time because of the blockage of the highway and so forth, become stranded, commuters who were moving back and forth to work?

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

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth I guess I have to be blunt and honest with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, because I do not really think that it is my responsibility to try and find accommodations for people that happen to be stranded in St. John's, whether they came from Grand Bank or Bell Island or wherever. In the past we have been very accommodating with the hostel, but the situation now is that we really do not have an alternative to the hostel in which to accommodate them. Of course, once we get into a non-government building, then you are asking us for supervision and what not, and then you are getting into a situation where we really do not have supervisory personnel to provide. Of course, if we did that we are also talking about costs that we do not have provided for in our budget.

MR. BARRY:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I realize the minister does not have responsibility directly for this, but in light of the fact that the accommodation was provided through the minister's department, I ask would he would have a request put out to the deputy ministers or ministers of other departments with a view to determining whether in fact some sort of programme might be put in place? Specifically, I ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), as another form of relief, whether in fact the minister's department is prepared to look at some form of subsidy for the travel costs which these commuters are running into to get back and forth by helicopter? I understand one airline is apparently charging \$20 one way, \$40 return, and the other airline, I understand, is charging a little less than that. Is the minister prepared to look at a possible subsidy to the commuters in terms of getting back and forth when the ferry is blocked by ice?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, it is not an unusual situation in this Province, whether people are travelling by air, by ferry vessel, or in fact, by road, at this particular time of the year to be stranded either going to or coming from work, or to be stranded from their home and so on. Where we have been able to assist, certainly we have done so. There are areas of the Province where this particular situation is a regular occurrence and the distances are rather large, particularly as it relates to air fare subsidies to the

various islands around the Province. We have, in fact, assisted where there is no regular service in place, and so on.

The fact of the matter with regard to Bell Island is that they are in close proximity to a number of air services, not only helicopters, but I understand that some of the private airlines are operating a shuttle service to and from the Island. It has not been the practice, of course, to get involved in that kind of a subsidy where there are services that can be provided commercially. We have been involved in subsidies in areas of the Province where air service would not be a regular occurrence or a private operator would not normally do it unless government stepped in with some sort of nominal assistance.

This is the procedure we have been following. Certainly we address it on an as required basis. We are looking at the situation, not only on Bell Island but in other areas, on an ongoing basis. Should the situation change or circumstances go beyond the normal, we will certainly look at it. But it is a difficult situation to address from a general perspective or make a broad statement of principle that we will assist or that we will subsidize. We look at all these situations on an individual basis and address them as such.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Social Services. It concerns the establishment of the Young

Offenders Review Board, which he announced something like four o'clock last Friday. He indicated it was set up in accordance with Section 30 of The Young Offenders Act. Having had a look at The Young Offenders Act, it is quite clear that the establishment of this board is optional on behalf of the Province. In checking around we now find that the work is presently done by provincial court judges in this Province. In fact, in nine of the ten provinces that we have been able to check on it is also done by provincial court judges.

My question to the minister is this: Is it then clear that this is an entirely optional board and that the work can continue to be done by the provincial court judges, and I assume by Family Court, rather than setting up what is another court, in essence, to handle these matters?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I take some pride in the fact that we are the first Province to set up a review board of this nature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the cases can be reviewed by the provincial court, but that is only done after a one year period. In our opinion the new Review Board will be able to review cases after a six month period. Hopefully the board, once it gets working, will be able to assist us in taking some of the juveniles we have in our overcrowded system out and

back into the community.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary is to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). Since her department is now currently handling the reviews, would she confirm to me that in fact last year that there were only eleven cases like this heard in St. John's and, since most of the facilities that take young offenders are in the St. John's area or Whitbourne, that that is likely to be the entire number of cases that were heard last year? Would she further indicate that the Provincial Court or the Family Court or the court that is dealing with these offenders will be laying off a clerk in the next couple of months? And would she further indicate whether or not this money, \$65,000 and the trappings that go with it, could have been better used to put together a Unified Family Court in Corner Brook, which is something that the provincial government has been committed to for years but has always said that it does not have the money for? And would she not admit that abolishing this board and allowing it to be done by the present court system is a much more efficient use of our resources?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

I will take the first couple of

questions in the series of questions posed by the member for Menihek as notice and get the statistical data for him within the next couple of days.

As to the question about staff of the Provincial Court in St. John's, I can inform the member that at the instigation of the Chief Judge and the Associated Chief Judge of the Provincial Court, one temporary worker has been reassigned from the Youth Court to the Traffic Court. As I said that change was instigated by the Chief Judge and the Associate Chief Judge without reference to me or the executive members of the Department of Justice.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:  
A final supplementary.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
I would like to raise a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that in the previous several days since this new session started there has been a practice by Your Honour to recognize a question from a member and generally two supplementaries. In the last three questions that I have asked you have always cut me off at only one supplementary. I asked Your Honour to check the record just to ensure that that is the case and

to make sure that inadvertently perhaps he may not be giving me the same treatment as he is giving to other members of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would draw hon. member's attention to our Standing Order 30, and in particular section (f): "The Speaker's rulings relating to oral questions are not debatable or subject to appeal."

The hon. the member for Fortune Hermitage.

MR. CALLAN:  
And you will be punished in future.

MR. POWER:  
You will get three slaps on each hand.

MR. CALLAN:  
And you will not get on the CBC tonight.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I think we have struck a cord here somewhere.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Take up your fight with CBC.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I have a question for the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) but I am prepared to wait until this wit passes, as I am sure it is a momentary thing.

A question for the Minister of Development and Tourism, who is responsible for the implementation and administration of the conflict of interest regulations insofar as employees of his department are concerned. Those regulations make

particular provision for situations where a conflict of interest might occur between employees' personal interests and their duties as public servants, including, for example, the matter of investment and management of private assets of employees, and it is that particular matter to which I have to direct the minister's attention. The minister might want to take my question under advisement before answering if he is not familiar with the case to which I am alluding. I do not want to mention names in the House but I am prepared to do so to him privately. Here is my question on the matter in principle. Can the minister assure the House that all senior public servants in his portfolio have met the conflict of interest requirements relating in particular to the holding and management of private assets?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will have to take under advisement the question as to whether a senior official in the department has, in fact, breached the conflict of interest guidelines. I can only inform the House and the member opposite that senior officials of the department are certainly aware of the guidelines. It is always difficult to stand up and be able to categorically say at any given point in time that every single person is rigidly adhering to them. One would hope that they are, but if the member has specific information that would suggest otherwise, then I think it would be incumbent upon him to let me have that information and I will be very pleased to

investigate it forthwith.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Question has elapsed.

I would like to welcome to the galleries a delegation from the Town Council of Greenspond, in the district of Bonavista North, as follows: The Mayor, Mr. Jim Duffett, Councillor Andy Burry, and Town Manager Mr. Derrick Bragg.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

Pursuant to Section 29 of the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) Act, I am pleased to say I have received the Eleventh Annual Report of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the calendar year 1985. I lay it on the table of the House.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, members opposite, especially my good friend from Gander (Mr. Baker), will be glad to know that I want to table copies of twenty-six special warrants a new record, from Executive Council, Finance, Environment, Development, Tourism, Fisheries, Forest Resources and Lands, Mines and Energy, Transportation, Career Development, Culture, Recreation and Youth, Justice and Social



Services.

MR. BARRY:

That is why the House was not opened before.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report for the Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services Limited for the fiscal year 1985-86.

#### Notices of Motion

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Veterinary Medical Act, 1971."

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a

bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973."

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act."

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Unimproved Lands Redistribution Act."

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

This is Private Members' Day, and the first motion to be debated is in the name of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is very appropriate that the second 'WHEREAS' clause in this resolution refers to "the economic situation in Newfoundland and Labrador and the financial position of the Province" because, from the arm load of Special Warrants which we just saw brought

into this House by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), we see the sort of games that are being played by the present administration to try to keep this Province afloat. We have an administration which deliberately delayed the opening of the House, Mr. Speaker, and then had to go out and obtain Special Warrants.

The Financial Administration Act sets out when Special Warrants are obtainable. It is when the amount appropriated by the Legislature is insufficient for a continuing service, when the amount that has been budgeted for a continuing service is insufficient to meet the requirements of that service during the year, or when the Legislature is not in session, it is for any expenditure not foreseen and not provided for by the Legislature in respect of a new service.

Well, we will be scrutinizing these Special Warrants, and I hope to have a look at them myself in a moment before I complete my speech. I think I have them here in front of me now, Mr. Speaker. What has happened before and what the Minister of Finance is trying to get away with again is a deliberate cooking of the books when he brings down his budget. He budgets under the amount that he needs in order to try and give a good picture to the Province when he brings down his budget. He cooks the books.

Indications are, Mr. Speaker, that the reason the vocational instructors were not paid on time was because there had been an arbitrary 5 per cent reduction in the vote for that particular department, that particular subhead, last year when the budget was being prepared. Departmental

officials told the Minister of Finance that the amount calculated was too low. The Minister of Finance went ahead regardless of that and cut 5 per cent, and then brought it in, Mr. Speaker, after the fact by Special Warrants.

The Minister of Finance is in breach of the Financial Administration Act by going for Special Warrants when the matters are matters that could have been foreseen.

Mr. Speaker, we will take a look at, for example, some of reasons for which these Special Warrants were obtained: Offshore Negotiations, Professional Services. Now there is absolutely no way I am sure when the budget was being prepared last year that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could have contemplated that there would have to be offshore negotiations. No, absolutely no question! The deal was put together with Mobil, Hibernia was going flat out. There were thousands of people unemployed, working on that Hibernia project, absolutely no need for any further negotiations. Obviously it is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that could not be foreseen. That we would have to negotiate in order to get the offshore going, no, obviously not.

Mr. Speaker, these matters are going to be brought to the attention of the Auditor General and we may have to bring them to the attention of the Newfoundland Constabulary, they are such a flagrant breach of The Financial Administration Act.

Let us look at another one here. There is all sorts of goodies. It is going to take days for us, Mr.

Speaker, to sift through these Special Warrants. Let us look at another one. We have Industrial Operations, Grants and Subsidies in the Department of Development and Tourism. We have Financial Services - salaries for a particular subhead, salaries for employees in the Department of Development. Obviously it was totally impossible to foresee the people in the Department of Development will be doing any work.

MR. TULK:  
Probably a Tory buddy.

MR. BARRY:  
Obviously the minister could see that the Province was replete with development and there was no need of any further development in the Province. There were too many jobs. Two jobs for every man, woman and child in the Province. No need to pay the salaries of people down in the Department of Development, 'a waste of time,' said the minister when he prepared his budget last year.

Now let us look at another one. What else do we have here? What other sorts of goodies? We have one going to the Department of Fisheries, \$1 million for Market Development, Grants and Studies. Well obviously it could not be foreseen that we needed to develop markets for our fish when the budget was being prepared. Obviously there is no problem with selling every species of fish that you could catch off the shores of Newfoundland and Labrador. No, Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely no need to foresee that we would have to spend money on market development in the Department of Fisheries.

MR. TULK:

It is paying for all of his trips.

MR. BARRY:  
Yes, I wonder if it had anything to do with his trips.

MR. TULK:  
All his trips to Norway and Iceland.

MR. BARRY:  
Oh, here is another unusual one: Labrador Fish Plants, Salaries, nobody would have foreseen that they would open any fish plants in Labrador again this year to buy a few fish from people in Labrador.

MR. FUREY:  
Sure they gave away all the Labrador cod.

MR. BARRY:  
Yes, maybe it is because they were giving away the Labrador cod so they figured they would not need to put any money in the budget for that item.

Now here is one that is a shade legitimate I suppose, Forest Fires Suppression, okay, that is an example I would say, Mr. Speaker, of an unforeseen eventually. The Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) has skated by on that particular Special Warrant. We accept that this is an example of the type of thing for which a Special Warrant is justified. But, Mr. Speaker, on the earlier items that I referred to, how ludicrous it is for the Minister of Finance to try and get up - and he is going to have to when the Estimates come in or when the debate on the budget starts, he is going to have to explain to the people of this Province and to this House why he is ignoring, once again, the Financial Administration Act.

Let us see what else we have

here. We have the Hope Brook gold mine, Grants and Subsidies. Well, again, you know, I think it was well known that that mine was to be going ahead. There is \$500,000 there that is going to be spent. That is something that could have been foreseen and properly budgeted for last year.

Mr. Speaker, there are some good ones here like the St. Brendan's ferry service, the vessel Green Bay Transport, Special Payment of Legal Fees in connection with that one. That is going to be one that will be deserving of a few questions.

Mr. Speaker, here is an interesting one: Highway Maintenance and Repairs. Obviously they knew that they would not have to repair or maintain any highways last year, Mr. Speaker. That is one that was completely unforeseen when they were doing up their budget, definitely. They could not have foreseen that there might be a few potholes develop or that the highway would get thrown up or that the highway would get undermined through flooding. No! That was beyond the foresight of the Minister of Finance and his colleagues opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I think before I completely lose my breakfast and my lunch I had better leave this for a later time, because we have such - Ho, ho! Look what we have here, Mr. Speaker! We have found something here. Look at this one: Salaries, Fisher Technical College; Salaries, Bell Island Vocational School; Salaries, Burin Vocational School; Salaries, Carbonear Vocational School; Salaries, Clarenville Vocational School; Salaries, Conception Bay South Vocational School; Salaries,

St. Anthony Vocational School; Salaries, Grand Falls Vocational School; Baie Verte; Port aux Basques; Happy Valley; Placentia; Springdale; Bonavista: \$2,950,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure it was obvious that they would not have to pay twelve months salaries to employees of these vocational schools. There is absolutely no way they could have foreseen this. This is dated February 12, 1987 that the application was made for this Special Warrant.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why is it that the Premier, apart from the fact that he under-budgeted, apart from the fact he cooked the books, and the proof is here, why was it that they did not call the House of Assembly into session? Why was it, as of February 12, they knew they would need additional money and they would not engage in the democratic process of calling the House of Assembly into session to debate whether or not these funds should be approved for the minister to expend?

Mr. Speaker, I think we better get a copy of this and get it brought up to the press and identify the minor administrative detail, Mr. Speaker, that delayed the payment of salaries to vocational school instructors. This is the way, Mr. Speaker, in which the Minister of Finance carries on his budgeting.

Just look at the explanation of the minister. He says on February 12, "It is urgently necessary to incur expenditure to the sum of \$2,950,000 to provide additional funds for anticipated salary and student aid expenditures. A Special Warrant is required to meet expenditures for which insufficient legislative provision has been made. No cost-shared

countervailing savings are available within the head of the expenditure of this department."

Now, "insufficient legislative provision has been made" is what the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) was referring to when he said the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) cooked the books. He manipulated the figures in his budget last year to try and cut down the deficit. To try, Mr. Speaker, to make the budget look better, he put in artificial figures not based upon reality and, Mr. Speaker, that is irresponsible and a sign of incompetence.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:  
We all distinctly heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) accuse the Minister of Finance of manipulating his budget last year. Now that is equivalent to saying that an hon. member is dishonest. I would suggest that that is not parliamentary and that the Leader of the Opposition should withdraw that statement without any equivocation.

MR. TULK:  
It is probably the truth.

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

MR. BARRY:  
No, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to waste time with that.

MR. J. CARTER:  
Could we have a ruling, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Before the Leader of the Opposition gets up to continue. I am enjoying the Leader of the Opposition's remarks but for the sake of precedents in this House on Private Members' Day it has been abundantly clear in the past that a member speaking in Private Members' Day is speaking to a resolution. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has placed before the House - and I quite serious about this - has nothing to do with Special Warrants or anything else. He is asking for something particularly to be resolved.

MR. BARRY:  
He is cutting into my time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:  
No I am not, Mr. Speaker. I am raising a legitimate -

MR. FLIGHT:  
No, you are not.

MR. SIMMS:  
If the members want to keep shouting -

MR. FLIGHT:

It is a spurious points of order. You are killing time from the Leader of the Opposition and you know it.

MR. SIMMS:

Whenever they are ready, Mr. Speaker, I will continue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Silence, please.

The hon. the Minister of Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, it is a legitimate point of order in my opinion and I raise it seriously because otherwise, in the future, reference could be made to this particular debate today and it could be pointed out that what the Leader of the Opposition has said for the last ten or twelve minutes has absolutely nothing to do with the resolution that is on the Order Paper. Therefore, a serious and dangerous precedent, in my opinion, would have been set. I would like Your Honour to consider that matter and rule on it. I do not care if the Leader of the Opposition goes on for another ten or twelve minutes on it or ten or five or five or ten whatever he has got left, but it is an important matter that the Chair, I think, should take under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to please stick with the substance of the resolution.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would love to, Mr. Speaker, and

continue on discussing Special Warrants and showing how they relate to - you know they really do, Mr. Speaker - relate to the financial position of the Province as referred to the second WHEREAS of my resolution. I would love to, Mr. Speaker, go on pursuant to Your Honour's request and instruction, I would love to continue going through these Special Warrants item by item but, despite how much I like to accommodate Your Honour, I just do not have time to continue. I have other points I would like to make. I will however refer to a few more before I go on to my other remarks.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is the best example - the timing could not have been better if it had been planned - the best example of the financial incompetence and mismanagement and, in fact, duplicity, the cooking of the books by this administration to cover up their mismanagement and incompetence. Mr. Speaker, that is the whole essence of this resolution.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

What happened to the suggestion made earlier that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was less than straightforward in presenting his report and now he is being accused of cooking the books? Now, if it is a free for all, if we may say anything at all, I am all for that, I would support that, Mr. Speaker. If we might get up and just let her rip, I would not mind, I could accept

that, in fact, I could join in quite enthusiastically. But if we are going to have proper behaviour here, then we cannot accuse each other of underhand dealings. Now, which is it to be? I think, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that a clear ruling was made by Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order I will state once more that there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The member opposite is cutting into my time, wanting to take away time from this debate because they cannot stand the heat, Mr. Speaker. They know what we are saying is correct, that members opposite have completely mismanaged the finances of this Province and the best example you can get is this arm load of Special Warrants which we will total up shortly to see the extent of their mismanagement. But to see the Minister of Finance coming in with that arm load of Special Warrants shows better than anything else how incompetent he is as a Minister of Finance in preparing a budget where he under budgets to this extent. It shows the mismanagement of the funds of this Province by the current Premier and his administration. It underlines the point that I make in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that when the Premier seeks \$150 million from the Government of Canada, as he said is needed, in order to avoid financial collapse, in order to avoid a 1930s type financial disaster - that was his wording - then, Mr. Speaker, we should keep in mind that we need to have a

good state of federal/provincial relations. We need to Premier who is speaking with our representative in the federal Cabinet, whatever the party stripe.

When the Premier gets up and says it is something that establishes how much he cares for Newfoundland and Labrador that he is prepared to fight with a Cabinet minister or a Cabinet of his own political stripe, you know, Mr. Speaker, it only underlines that the Premier of this Province is prepared to fight with anybody on any issue at any time in order to try and save his own political skin. That is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker.

There are a lot of members of the Premier's own party who are coming to that conclusion and a large number of those, Mr. Speaker, have indicated that they are not all that happy, they are not very happy at all with the Premier of this Province attacking the federal wing of his party in that fashion because they can see, even within the party, that it is merely to try and salvage the Premier's political skin in this Province. That is what is proven, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you. I am sure members will, by leave, give me a few minutes to wind up my remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. BARRY:

I am getting a little too close to the bone.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I really am happy to get up and speak to this resolution that was put on the Order Paper in the name of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). I find it extremely strange that the Leader of the Opposition could somehow misconstrue the intention of this Administration when we take issue with the Federal Government of Canada over a question of the federal government secretly giving away fish to France, and somehow construe that to mean that we are trying to save our own political skin.

Mr. Speaker, how can any true-blooded Newfoundlander not stand up and be counted when at the same time as you lose 10,000 metric tons of fish to your own people, you see a secret commitment given to a foreign nation for additional amounts of that same cod stock? And the best the Leader of the Opposition can do is say we are out to save our own political skins. Mr. Speaker, I think it is shameful for the Leader of the Opposition to use those kinds of motives on any government, of any political stripe.

I mean, we remember very clearly, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition must be embarrassed to tears, how his own party over there kowtowed down to the Liberal Government on the restructuring agreement, how they were willing to see Burin closed, Grand Bank

closed, Harbour Breton closed, Gaultois closed; they said not one word on the other side when the fishery of the South Coast was going down the drain; how they tried to step on both sides of the fence in federal/provincial relationships over the offshore; how all they did was attack us - we are driving investment away - when we were trying to get the best deal for the Province. How can the Leader of the Opposition in conscience, forgetting the partisanship and all the rest of it, in conscience to Newfoundland and Labrador stand in his place and accuse us of only trying to save our political skins while fish are being bartered away to a foreign nation, Mr. Speaker? I do not understand it. I cannot understand how a man of the Leader of the Opposition's stature can stand up there and articulate those low motives on anybody, not only me but anybody, any person on this side of the House, or another political party, the Socialists, or whatever. How can he do it in true conscience?

What alternative did any Newfoundlander have in whatever political position they were in, Opposition, government or whatever? How could we take any other position than the one we took, I would ask the Leader of the Opposition. As I understand it, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland are out supporting our position that this was a bad deal for Newfoundland, the Socialists are out supporting our position that this was a bad deal for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and that is all the Leader of the Opposition can say. Here we were, able to stand up and be counted and get a good restructuring agreement so Burin becomes a model fish plant in the whole world, when it



is finished. When the modernization of Burin is finished, which is underway now, it will be the most modern fish plant in the world. It will be into secondary processing, which we fought for. We have had more resolutions on the Order Paper here over the last ten or fifteen years as it relates to secondary processing - why are we selling our raw fish away and letting somebody else get the jobs in secondary processing? And now we have a model plant in Burin doing that. We fought for that because it was legitimate and right to fight for that, Mr. Speaker, in the same way that it is legitimate and right for us to fight as it relates to the Canada - France Fish Treaty, and we make no apology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is the low kind of politics that the Leader of the Opposition plays which therefore sends out a signal to citizens in the Province that politics is not the kind of game to get into. That is the kind of approach that the Leader of the Opposition takes which downgrades his own newly-found profession of politics over law, it downgrades it by accusing a government or a party or a political leader of those low motives. That signals to everybody that all we are doing here in the House of Assembly is questioning everybody's motives every time we turn, Mr. Speaker. It is not fair for the Leader of the Opposition, it is not right for the Leader of the Opposition.

Now that the Socialists have status they are saying, 'but we are still the official Loyal

Opposition here', to give themselves some status. How can they utter the words 'loyal' and 'official' when every time any minister or the Premier of the Province gets up they are questioning motives and talking about mud and talking about down in the ditches, every single thing we do. When we defend the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, when we defend the rights of the inshore fishermen, when we defend our rights over a resource that we brought into Confederation, Mr. Speaker, how can they do it?

Sure they can attack us as it relates to our approach on it, we should have done this or we should have done that, but do not attack our basic motives. We did it because we thought it was right to do when we have 20 or 21 per cent unemployment and when that 10,000 metric tons would mean three to four weeks less work for the plants on the South Coast this year over last year because of that fish, which means less jobs this year than last year, which means less tax money for us.

Then the Leader of the Opposition talks about the special warrants. The hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker! The hypocrisy of it all! In Question Period the Leader of the Opposition wanted a special warrant for subsidies for people from Bell Island when they come over here because of the ice. He wants a special warrant for that. That would have to be a special warrant. That was not budgeted for. Then he turns around a few minutes later and gets up and attacks all the special warrants. Every day over there they are asking for more money for everything from top to bottom, from A to Z. Every single day

they are up asking for it. So, they are speaking out of both sides of their mouths at the same time.

If you look at all these special warrants here, there are good reasons for them. Baie Verte Mines is the second one there under Finance, \$3,300,000, because the management of Baie Verte Mines Incorporated were able to accelerate the amount of earth overburden. Management of Baie Verte Mines did a prediction for the Minister of Mines who gave it to the Minister of Finance, which said, 'We think in the next twelve months we will take x tons of overburden of rock off the hill so that we can get at the asbestos.' Lo and behold, six months later Baie Verte Mines Incorporated come in happy, delighted with themselves and say, 'Mr. Minister of Mines, we have done better than we told you, we have more overburden out of there quicker than we thought, than we told you' - we are not miners, we depend upon Baie Verte Mines management to tell us. They did it quicker and they were proud to come in and say it. - therefore we are going to need more money if we are going to continue that accelerated programme, so that we will get to the asbestos quicker, so that, therefore, we will get more asbestos out of the ground, so that, therefore, we will be viable quicker.' That is a special warrant, Mr. Speaker.

Flood control for Rushoon: I can the members opposite now over there if there is a problem in Rushoon. 'What is the Government of Newfoundland going to do about the flooding in Rushoon? Three or four houses on the river are being flooded. What are you going to do about it?' Sure! we are supposed

to be able to predict floods, Mr. Speaker. We have to predict floods now. That is the next thing we have to do.

How do you know for sure how many people are going to be in class welding in the Bay Verte Vocational School? We rely upon the principals of the vocational schools to give us their best numbers, and they give us their best numbers. Lo and behold, three or four months later there are this many more students in this vocational school, there might only be two here, four here, six there, and all of a sudden you need a few more vocational instructors. Then, if we do not supply them the Opposition will say, 'You are not trying to educate the young people of this Province for jobs out there. You will not give them the vocational instructors. What is wrong with the Government of Newfoundland? We have students going to Baie Verte Vocational School, St. Anthony Vocational School, Bay St. George Community College, Fisher Technical Institute who want to get in that class. They have called me up in my office, as their M.H.A., and said, I cannot get in there and take this course this year because there is no instructor.' Who do we rely on? Is the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) supposed to go around to every vocational school and say, You are fired, Principal, I am going to be the principal of all vocational schools in Newfoundland, and I am going to predict how many students we are going to have this year? Is that the way you operate? Is that what the Minister of Career Development is supposed to do, or is he supposed to rely on the expertise and projections given to him by

the principals of the vocational schools, all of whom are doing legitimate work and giving the best estimate that they can?

MR. SIMMS:  
Forest fires.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Yes, forest fires, or the one on Development and Tourism dealing with the cover carrying costs from September 1986 to September 1987 on Hull 37. Marystown Shipyard: We went to Marystown Shipyard to keep the jobs in Marystown Shipyard, to keep the expertise there, and we guaranteed the money to Marystown Shipyard to build Hull 37 in the hope that they would be able to sell it. And they built it and it kept the jobs going in Marystown. Then we went out to the marketplace to try to sell it and we negotiated with the Canadian Coast Guard, and it took them months and months. They said, Well, it is a pretty good ship, but we already bought one from Marystown Shipyard and we have to give the other places in Canada a chance. So they had to go look at a boat in Port Hawkesbury, somewhere.

MR. TOBIN:  
It was a secondhand one that was built in Marystown.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Pardon?

MR. TOBIN:  
It was a secondhand one that had been built in Marystown.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Now, Port Hawkesbury Shipyard wanted to sell to the Coast Guard this ship. They said, Do not take Hull 37 from Marystown, take this one from us. We are a shipyard in Canada, too.

So, by the time they got around to doing all of that, we had to pay the carrying costs on Hull 37 because it was not sold. We did not know for sure when it was going to be sold, it could have been sold sooner or it could have been sold later. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) just told me that the total here is \$29 million. Guess what? In countervailing savings we got \$27 million. So, while we spent more, we also saved \$27 million. So what is the difference? Two million dollars on a \$2 billion budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I would like to know of anybody in this House today who manages their own personal budgets any better percentage-wise. We spent another \$29 million but we had countervailing savings of \$27 million. Not bad! Pretty good stuff, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see.

Inshore Mackerel Assistance Programme: Here we were last Fall and the inshore fishery from Cape John South had failed miserably. It might have failed in other places further North, but North of Cape John, right up to Nain, it was relatively good in comparison to what it was South of Cape John. Now who knows if the fish are going to swim in or not? Blessed Moses, Mr. Speaker, can we predict that? So, come September, when you get into the mackerel, when the mackerel starts coming in and the federal government and the other agencies say they have an opportunity to sell some mackerel to Nigeria or Angola, wherever it happens to be, and everybody is out there howling, and all the

members opposite, 'Oh, the inshore fishery has been a failure. What is the government going to do about it?' - government has to do something about everything when something fails. We have to do it about this now - 'you have to do something', the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) comes to Cabinet in September and says, "Can I get \$1.5 million to put into a mackerel assistance programme so that those people who did not catch cod and were going to go on welfare might have an opportunity to catch mackerel and stay off welfare?" and, Mr. Speaker, that is somehow condemned here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Hope Brook Gold Mine, another Special Warrant, \$500,000. When the budget was brought down last year we were negotiating with Hope Brook Mines, we were negotiating with BP-Selco, and they were negotiating with the federal government. Were we going to show our hand, how far we would go before we knew how far the federal government would go, Mr. Speaker? We could not do that, so we had to wait until the deal was struck, long after the budget was brought down. And if there is some Newfoundlander around who wants us to take our money out of Hope Brook Gold Mines and stop the gold mine from going ahead well, fine. Is that what the Leader of the Opposition is saying, we were being irresponsible because the negotiations had not been completed? Is that what the Leader of the Opposition is saying, "Close down Hope Brook Gold Mine, because you needed a Special Warrant?" If that is the way you are going to operate you

will never operate a government, Mr. Speaker. You will never operate a government.

I remember the Leader of the Opposition coming to Cabinet with things long after the budget was down, Mr. Speaker, many, many times. He was not worried about Special Warrants then.

He talked about road repairs, but the Leader of the Opposition did not go on to say, anybody in the gallery who was listening, 'You should be able to predict on maintenance.' It goes on to say, "Road repairs resulting from severe flooding." Now, predict which road is going to be flooded in the Province. Predict it, Mr. Speaker. If the Leader of the Opposition is no better at predicting floods than he was at predicting politics, Mr. Speaker, he is going to do an awfully poor job, I can tell you that right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Justice: "Additional funding for the hiring of a defence counsel; various expenses resulting from the fire at the Unified Family Court." That was a fire. We lost the Unified Family Court Building down by the stadium there. Now we have to predict fires.

Emergency Measures Organization: Funds needed "to alleviate flooding conditions in various locations throughout the Province." More money for the royal commission to get their report printed. What control did we have over that? They gave us their budget back in the Spring and we put in what they said they would need. They came back later for more for a whole bunch of

reasons which were fairly legitimate, unless you want to go and tell Dr. House and Dr. Inkpen and Harold Lundrigan and the rest down there that they are poor managers and that, you know, it is all half fraud, they did not need this money at all. You have to go on to say these things if you are going to make what the Leader of the Opposition says legitimate.

Social Services: You cannot predict that accurately. You do not know. If the fishery is good in rural Newfoundland, there will be less money for social services. If the fishery is bad, how bad? Where bad? Where good? How can you tell how much you are going to need exactly. You cannot do it. It is an impossible task. You look at your last year's budgetary figures and put in an inflation factor of 2 or 3 or 4 per cent, or whatever it is, and go with it. Then, if the Minister of Social Services finds his budget going down because the inshore fishery was bad, he has to come back. And these are all legitimate expenses. There is nothing unusual about any of this.

You can go through all of them here the same way. You cannot accurately predict within 1 per cent or 2 per cent. You cannot do it. It is impossible, the way the world is now, in all of these special warrants.

The Leader of the Opposition said and I suppose it is a good political point, somehow or another, 'You fought with the Liberals, now you are fighting with the P.C.s. You are only picking for a fight.' Now, if the Leader of the Opposition could go beyond that, and here is where his law experience should help him and where it has failed him badly, and

if he could demonstrate by the production of evidence that this was so, then I would say he would have a case and I would have to come back with more evidence than he had. But he has not produced one shred of evidence. Every minister here in this government, including myself, have, from the first time the Mulroney Administration got elected right up to this day, been in constant contact with our regional minister, which is not to say that if his government - and he is one of forty-two in it - goes and does a secret fish deal that we are going to kowtow and do nothing about it and not stand up for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. But we completely and absolutely inform.

As a matter of fact, I can produce all the evidence on that, and a lot of it was made public during the Canada - France deal, when it was at its height. I produced a lot of that evidence, all the letters and all the meetings and all the rest of it. In addition to that, we even made a special presentation to the caucus in Ottawa. So, there is no evidence, the Leader of the Opposition is only using political rhetoric. He has no evidence, so all he is doing is just blowing a broadside with nothing under it to give it some sense of credibility. We have consulted, we have co-operated, but on basic, fundamental issues like regional economic development, like the Canada - France deal, and like other initiatives that have been undertaken by the federal government, if it is not in the best interests of this Province I ask the people of Newfoundland, do you want me to just to cow down? Do you want me to do nothing? Do you just want me to be a loyal party faithful, even though we are

losing fish, even though we are losing money on regional economic development? Do you want me to be that kind of a Premier for Newfoundland? I think if I asked that question to Newfoundlanders generally, or held a plebiscite on it, the answer would be a resounding 'No, no, you are first. We elected you to protect and advance Newfoundland's interests within Confederation. That is what we elected you to do', and that is what I am going to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Then the Leader of the Opposition, in these 'WHEREASES', talks about fiscal mismanagement, Mr. Speaker. This government that from 1979 to now has been on restraint every year, restraining here, restraining there, and the first cry out of everybody is, including the university and the hospitals, Mr. Speaker, when we give them a 6 per cent increase and they want 12 per cent is, 'That is a cutback.' They got a 5 per cent increase but it is a cutback. We went through a year there when the Opposition and others outside this House, other organizations, kept talking on Open Line and in the papers - even some of the more knowledgeable press people would put headlines in - about 'Cutbacks on Hospitals' when we could prove, and the numbers were there that they read, that they had already gotten a 5, 6, 7 or 8 per cent increase.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. Premier's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
No, Mr. Speaker, there has been enough damage done on the Leader of the Opposition already.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
I take great pleasure in joining in this debate, as well, Mr. Speaker. It is extremely interesting to listen, as I have for the last year and a half, since I have been elected, to the Premier's same speech which he gives time after time, again and again, pulling hair out off his head, shouting, bawling and screaming. If there was a fairy tale, Mr. Speaker, which was synonymous with this Premier and his administration it would have to be "The **Emperor's** New Clothes, because, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing as each day goes by this administration standing naked, politically naked, and getting on with its empty, silly rhetoric, day after day, week after week, month after month. But people are starting to see clearly, Mr. Speaker, and finally, that this emperor and this administration - and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, Premier Moores was right. He surrounded himself with incompetence. Perhaps he is right. That is arguable, but we will argue that one later - that this administration has no clothes, Mr. Speaker.

Now, after all of that polygab and

bafflegab that the Premier left hanging in this Assembly we are still left with this, Mr. Speaker, a year later, and I am sad to report that we are still left with this, we are still left with April 14, 1986, the cover of Maclean's magazine, "A Province in Despair. Newfoundland's failed vision." Now, that is really said, Mr. Speaker, because they were elected on a mandate to create meaningful work. And what does that article say? If you review it, if anyone on that side has the courage to review it and go back to twelve months ago, you will read in there that unemployment in this Province stood at 21 per cent a year ago. Well, where have we come in twelve months? Has unemployment been tackled properly by this administration? I do not think so, Mr. Speaker, because a year later, twelve full months after the meaningful job mandate, that hoax was brought upon the Newfoundland people, which the tricksters there used to get re-elected, we see unemployment at 21 per cent.

Let us look at my particular region, and the regions of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) and the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), that particular Western region. In December of 1986 unemployment in Western Newfoundland, Northern Newfoundland and Labrador was at 21.1 per cent. It is now at 26.5 per cent, an increase, a jump upwards of 4.4 per cent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting as we listened to the Premier shout his tirade, his repetitive speech, his same old jingoism, his tired empty rhetoric, this emperor with no clothes, is it not interesting that he did not touch at all on

the very important resolution put forward today by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition Leader (Mr. Barry). Where did he talk about, for example, Mr. Speaker, that "Federal-Provincial relations have never been at a lower ebb"? Where did he really deal with the serious economic crisis that our Province finds itself in today? From his own lips we are two years away from the Dirty Thirties, and we know who created the Dirty Thirties because we know where that great line 'Tory Times are hard times' came from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, most interestingly he did not deal one iota with the final portion of this resolution and let me read it to you:

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that when the next Federal General Election is called this House unanimously seek the defeat of the present Federal Administration." It is interesting there is a by-election coming up in St. John's East. He did not go on record to tell us where this crowd of traitors from Ottawa on the fish deal, where is he standing on this? What is his position on this? Will he come clean and tell us either he is with him or agin him, for him or he does not want any part of him, or whatever?

A simple history lesson now, Mr. Speaker. Let us step back in history to August 24, 1984 where the Premier is speaking Province-wide at a press conference. Here is what he said, and I quote: "There has been a growing sense in Mainland Canada over the past two weeks that a real change in federal politics is

desperately needed in this country. People are now realizing that this real change can only occur if the Conservative Party of Canada is elected the majority on September 4.

"In my view, two overriding developments have happened." Listen to this: "Number one, Brian Mulroney is now perceived to be a competent, credible, charismatic leader." The Premier of Newfoundland two short years ago called the current Prime Minister competent, I would substitute corrupt, credible, I would substitute corrupt again, and charismatic, I would substitute corrupt yet again for a third time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, these words were stated by that Premier about this Prime Minister and what have we seen? A string of resignations, one after the other, after the other for corruption.

He went on to say, Mr. Speaker, in August of 1984, this Premier, about that administration, he said the following: "It is not only that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador should see that real change can only come from a Conservative victory, important as that is, it is not only that the people should see Mr. Mulroney in his true light as a competent leader, as important as that is, it must also become fully known far and wide that it is only - and he underlined this - only Mr. Mulroney and only the Conservative Party of Canada that have pledged in writing a prosperous future for us here in Newfoundland and Labrador." End of quote from this Premier about that Prime

Minister. Then, did they not go hand in hand, the two Brians together, on a public stage in Stephenville where he sanctified these remarks. Yes, he did that, he sanctified them. He said, "Good for you Brian Mulroney," when Mr. Mulroney said, 'I will not be afraid to inflict prosperity upon the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.'

Well, was the reduction in quotas to the offshore fleet by 10,000 metric tons an infliction of prosperity? Was this secret deal in the dark with the French an infliction of prosperity? Were the cutbacks from DREE, the Department of Regional Economic Industrial Expansion cutback by \$45 million in the latest estimates out of Ottawa, aimed at Newfoundland, aimed at the poorer parts of the country, cut with a clever from the federal budget, was that an infliction of prosperity? I hardly think so.

Let me go on, Mr. Speaker from the Premier's own words. I want him to listen carefully, as he is I am sure he is down in his office to his own words, "What is at stake in this election is very simple, it is our future. Whether that future has opportunity and jobs and a chance for us to be equal to other Canadians," he said, "it is an irrefutable fact that Brian Mulroney and the PC party have offered this chance and no other political party has done so."

He went on to say, "We will get long-term jobs from Mr. Mulroney." Sure, we have really gotten them have we not. He said, "A vote for a PC candidate on September 4 will be a vote to ratify the Mulroney/Peckford agreement. It will be a vote for thousands of jobs. It will be a



vote for lower taxes and more money for everyone. It will be, in short, a vote for property and a future for our children."

Mr. Speaker, all of which made me believe, as I watched this federal election and this provincial Premier - unheard of, never done by any other provincial Premier to get involved like that in a federal election, cross the barriers, unheard of - start a crusade for prosperity. Rent a bus in Port aux Basques, head across the Province, sing about how everything was going to be rosy. He pegged his political future, Mr. Speaker, to the coat tails of Brian Mulroney and his prosperity crusade makes this evident and clear.

Mr. Speaker, it is just unbelievable how many reams of quotations we could rip from the history books, from the Premier's own words where he singled out for praise the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney.

Let me just deal again here, Mr. Speaker, with the resolution. It is interesting to see the Tory House divided. It is interesting to see a Premier, a First Minister, attack so viciously a regional minister in Ottawa of his own stripe. It is interesting to see the counterattack come from Ottawa. Unheard of, the same stripe, cooperation, consultation, a new era of prosperity, a crusade for prosperity.

Quite clearly in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, we are calling for all of this loud and empty rhetoric to cool off, to settle down, to start establishing a sense of political maturity and to start saying we ought to take responsibility where

responsibility lies with us. We have never seen this Premier nor this administration ever, ever, take responsibility for anything. They are always, Mr. Speaker, fixing the blame and never fixing the problem. It is about time they start standing up to their own responsibilities, looking in the mirrors and seeing themselves and saying to themselves; 'We ought to start acting responsibly, fiscally be responsible, and be responsible with peoples' lives.' We have not seen that. It is time to cool the rhetoric. It is time to get on and be politically mature and deal in a sensible way. Let me deal with an illustration here to show what I mean.

Mr. Speaker, in the recent federal budget we saw a fuel tax rebate offered to certain citizens in Canada, across this great sweeping land. We saw tax relief of three cents a liter extended to farmers, to fishermen, to loggers, to miners, hunters and trappers. We saw this rebate for gasoline and diesel fuel anywhere where this particular sector of the mixed economy uses gasoline or diesel for off highway commercial purposes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is it not interesting that British Columbia managed to get seven point five cents per liter for the farmers out there in the Okanagan Valley. Is it not interesting that the farmers in Alberta managed to get seven point five cents a liter for the farmers of Alberta. Is it not interesting that the farmers of Saskatchewan managed to get seven point five cents a liter for the farmers in Saskatchewan, and the farmers in Manitoba.

But what do we see here? We see three cents per liter rebate still applies to fishing, logging, mining, hunting, and trapping, three cents a liter, while the farmers out West, where they are consulting with the central government, where they are being reasonable with the central government, where there is a sense of political maturity - I say that about the Tory Premiers out in Western Canada.

There is not the raving lunacy, the shouting, that we are seeing from this side of the House. You cannot go and punch all the time. There comes a time when statesmanship must take over, where political maturity has to take over. I think this is a good example: Seven point five cents a liter on off highway commercial use for machinery in the farming sector; three cents for the fishermen.

There is a four point five cents differential, and I would say it is brought about because of the incompetence, the absolute arrogance and the absolute shouting going on from that side of the House to their own political stripe counterparts in Ottawa.

MR. TULK:

How many administrations has he had a row with in Ottawa?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, that is a good question. The member for Fogo asked me, How many administrations has this administration in Newfoundland dealt with in Ottawa? Does anybody in the House know the answer to that piece of trivia? The answer is five administrations. Since Mr. Peckford came to power in 1979, he

has dealt with five federal administrations. In 1979 Mr. Trudeau; the tail end of 1979 with Mr. Clark; in 1980 with Mr. Trudeau; in 1984 with Mr. Turner; and currently with Mr. Mulroney. Can you fellows talk to anybody? Can you talk to anybody?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Five successive, different striped administrations you shouted and bawled at.

All of which brings us back to the original premise of my thesis and my argument, there has to be political maturity. You have to start saying to yourself, 'The buck stops here.' You cannot be lashing out and blaming everybody for your own silly, nonsensical incompetence and we saw incompetence in full technicolor today from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

Mr. Speaker, let me go back to this article, very briefly, of a year ago and let me point out something. A year ago the article said, "Thirty-seven years after joining Confederation, Newfoundland, with a population of 524,000, remains a have-not Province, bearing no resemblance to the prosperous new Newfoundland which Peckford promised when he succeeded Moores in 1979." It is wonderful for our Brian to steal from the pages of Eva Peron in Argentina and run around and say, "Some day the sun will shine and have-not will be no more." But have-not is still here, that is the sad reality after eight years of absolute, total incompetence.

You see this particular manager of our economy has forgotten

something, that when you are Premier of a Province there are two hats that you wear, the hat of the political leader to fight campaigns, and the hat of the chief executive officer of this company called Newfoundland and Labrador where you have to administer. He has never put on the hat of the chief executive officer, he is Mr. Politician.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, Hear!

MR. FUREY:  
And, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province know that this emperor is naked. They are going to tell him, Mr. Speaker, next time around that, "Mr. Premier, sorry pal, it is time that you stopped putting politics before people." That is what we continue to see.

Mr. Speaker, this article went on to say that former ministers, ministers who did not get elected in this current administration, previous ministers, lambasted this current Premier with criticism as well.

It said, "If he wants to form the next government," said a former Tory Cabinet Minister, Joseph Goudie, "he has to have a better relationship with labour. It is as simple as that." He is even getting advice from former Tory Ministers. And I understand recently there was another piece of advice from a former Tory Premier.

Mr. Moores told him that he missed a wonderful window of opportunity on Hibernia. But Hibernia was not important, getting re-elected was important, taking these trained seals with him to get re-elected was important. That is what was

important. People were not important - politics, politics, politics. "It is in me blood," you have often heard him saying. Yes, boy, it is in your blood, politics is in your blood but people ought to be in your heart. That is the difference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
And finally, Mr. Speaker, let me take from the article one final quotation: "Premier Peckford directs the Government of Newfoundland from a suite of offices on the Eighth Floor of Confederation Building. In contrast to the spartan decor elsewhere in the building, the 6,000 square foot suite is done up in tasteful shades of cinnamon, blue and red, renovated last year at a cost of \$450,000." And you wonder why we need Special Warrants. You wonder why we need to swell the deficit. We swell the deficit to swell his ego.

Mr. Speaker, one final comment. I will be very, very interested in seeing how Mr. Peckford and the Premier and his administration vote for this resolution which calls upon them, not just to have a slap at Ottawa about fish, important as that is, but to also look at the severe cutbacks in DREE, the cutbacks in EPF, Established Programme Financing, the hurt that is happening in hospitals, senior citizens, single parents.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave!

MR. FUREY:  
Can I conclude?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, finally let me say people are more important than politics.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I have read this resolution with some care, and one would hope you could vote for it, because other than the fisheries one, it is the second resolution in this House, the first Private Members' Resolution, and it would be nice if you could vote for a resolution in that case.

However, having read through it, it is a resolution that cannot be supported. So I can answer the hon. member's question right off in that regard. With very close study you can see there are a few little things in it that are halfway sensible, but the main thrust of the resolution is totally off the mark, it shows a basic misunderstanding of what governments should do, and particularly the government of this Province should do. It really shows a bit of a

misunderstanding of what Canada is really all about.

Mr. Speaker, the first part of the resolution deals with what caused the low ebb of relations between ourselves and the federal government. Now I think it is instructive to look. Where did this view come from? A year ago was there talk of the low ebb of relations? No, there was not. It was not mentioned. The whole time this House sat last Spring there was no comment on that whatsoever. In the Summer there was no comment on it. When did this come about? I suggest it first came about after the five year renegotiation process that went on in regard to fiscal arrangements.

Every province goes into those negotiations with the federal government with a particular attitude in mind related to their own needs. For instance, Ontario went into those negotiations looking for some improvement in EPF. They do not get equalization. They get EPFs. I do not think that many people understand this, that the richest provinces in this country get fiscal transfers. It is not only the have not provinces that get handouts, if you want to call them that, from the federal government. Alberta, in its hey days, when it was building up a heritage fund, was getting fiscal transfers from the federal government. So, during these negotiations, Ontario went in and looked for increased EPF transfers, but it did not push very hard.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

No, I do not want to do it now. Would the minister permit a question?

DR. COLLINS:

No.

MR. BARRY:

At the appropriate time when the minister -

DR. COLLINS:

No, I have only got fifteen minutes.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order then.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have to bring to the attention of the House what appears to be a serious matter of illegality. Maybe the minister will be able to explain, but the Special Warrants are dated February 26 in some cases, if not all. I have not had a chance to go through them all. The House of Assembly was open on February 26. The section under which the Warrants were sought provided -

DR. COLLINS:

Is this Question Period, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

A point of order.

MR. BARRY:

- provided for Special Warrants being obtained when the House was closed. Would the minister care to explain before we carry it further to the attention of the

House?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition got up and he said, 'Would you entertain a question?' I declined. He said, 'Oh, well, I make it a point of order. Now, that is quite improper. If he had a point of order he gets up on a point of order, he does not get up on something else and then, when he is refused on that, turn it into a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I say there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, continuing with my interrupted but very interesting address, Ontario went into these negotiations over EPF with demands for increases in that particular transfer, but they did not go in very heavily.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why?

DR. COLLINS:

Why? Because they were doing quite well, thank you very much. They liked the money, but it did not matter too much if they did not get it. We went in there, as did the Maritime Provinces, as did Quebec, as did Manitoba, the other have not provinces, and we went in there hammer and nail and said,

Look, the equalization formula is inadequate for purposes for which it was intended because the equalization formula is supposed to relate to comparable levels of public services at comparable levels of taxation. And we, like some of the other provinces, said, We do not have comparable Canadian average standards of public services and we do not have comparable levels of taxation, we have had to have heavier taxation. So we say the equalization formula is not working, you will have to do something about it. It is not a minor point, it is a very, very important point. We fought hammer and nails on that but, unfortunately, a Fiscal Transfer Act is a federal act. All you can do is push and remonstrate and argue and complain and try to get your point, but ultimately it is a federal decision.

Now, that is where I would suggest the first suggestion of a change in relations came about. Prior to that there was no talk of poor relations with the federal government, but people began to say, something is wrong with the relations there.

Now, what is the next thing that happened? The next thing that happened was the fishery dispute that we are all very familiar with, and I will not go into it in any great detail. That, of course, exacerbated this comment about poor relations. Suppose we did not complain about the equalization formula, suppose we did not complain about the fishery thing, would there be any complaints about poor relations? Of course there would not. It would be nice. We would have been patsys, we would have been doormats, we would have let down

the people of this Province, but, nevertheless, everyone would say, Oh, the relations are great. Now, I put it to hon. members, do you have good relations with someone else when you are being a doormat to someone else, or do you have good relations with someone when you stand up for your rights and they know you are standing up for your rights and they respect you for it?

So I think our relations with the federal government - I do not care whether you call them good or what, - are at a very healthy state now. They know where we stand, and they know we are serious about the rights and the needs of this Province. And you can be sure of this, that they will hesitate the next time before they ignore cases we put forward that are grounded in real truths and real reality, not the sort of garbagey stuff that we heard a little while ago: 'You must be statesmen and go up there and not say anything, just sort of bow your head and say everything is nice, thank you very much, I do not care what you give me.'

So, this resolution from that point of view is very much off the mark. It suggests that they do not know what real relations should be between competing aspects of government. That is another point where this resolution is unrealistic. Canada by being a Confederation inevitably has a tension between the federal government and the provincial orders of government. That is the essence of Confederation and it is well recognized. No one worries or wonders or is in consternation about it. It is the nature of the beast that the federal government feel that they have certain things

to do. Sometimes they overlap with the interests of the provinces and the provinces cannot be expected to bow their heads and say, 'All right, I will surrender any desires I have or any needs I have. You have your own way.' No one expects that. They expect that when these two forces collide there will be, on occasion, tension, controversy and even shouting at one another, and I say God bless it for that case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, one looks for good things in this resolution. There is a WHEREAS here which refers to the need for the federal government to be sensitive to the needs in Newfoundland. I say amen to that. I fully agree with that. That is the one part of this resolution that I agree with. I would hope that the federal government would show greater sensitivity to this Province. Again, I am not saying anything that is very weird or wonderful or something that has not been said before, but we are far away, we are small, we are new to Confederation, we are somewhat unique and therefore our problems are a bit unusual in the Canadian context and we tend to get overlooked. They do not understand us. When we make complaints about fish, they say, 'Fish? Is that not that sort of smelly stuff? Who wonders about fish anyway? Is meat not better and chicken not better and that sort of thing?' So there is a lack of sensitivity in the Canadian psyche towards the needs of this Province and it is something that has to be changed around, and it is changing and it is changing very largely because of the issues put forward with such clarity and with such persistence by our Premier and by

our other approaches to the federal government. There is a new attitude emerging, but it has a long way to go yet. So I say there is not sufficient sensitivity in the federal government, and I bracket with the federal government there, Central Canada and, indeed, many parts of Canada.

Now, I am not saying that your average Canadian is not sympathetic towards Newfoundland. They very often are, and frequently, if you just meet them in the street, they really show a tremendous interest in the uniqueness of Newfoundland and in the particular characteristics we display. But sympathy and sensitivity are not the same. Sensitivity requires an understanding, sympathy requires a liking. I think we are liked in the rest of Canada but I do not think we are understood in the rest of Canada, and this is where there is an insensitivity, a lack of understanding of what our real needs are. So there is one good point in this resolution, but that is the only one I can see.

Now there is also a comment in this resolution about burning bridges. The suggestion is if you stand up for your rights you know you are going to get clobbered, therefore do not stand up for your rights, give it all away. This is typical, characteristic, historic, traditional Liberal political philosophy, give it all away. I mean, there is a motto which should be put over the common rooms of the Liberal Party and it should say, "Give it all away." Now, our view on this side of the House is that you make your case. Let the chips fall where they may, but you make your case and stand by your principles. And talking

about giving it away, sometimes you need to go beyond what is reasonable in the hope of getting something. Hon. members may be interested in this, a little clipping that I cut out of **The Globe and Mail** recently, just the other day. It does not refer to Newfoundland, it refers to Nova Scotia, and specifically it refers to a minister in Nova Scotia, the Minister for Revenue, Elmer MacKay. Now the article says, and I will try to paraphrase, that he has federal funds for a provincially operated courthouse. In his quote he said, "I tried to get this." He is not bashful about it. He says, "All ministers from Atlantic Canada go to bat for things." And then the article further on says, "A Treasury Board spokesman called the federal contribution unprecedented, but Mr. MacKay came back and said, 'I think it was a very good precedent.'"

In other words, Mr. MacKay was not afraid to stand up for his rights. He even went beyond his rights and he got what he felt was needed for his province. Now, you might say it is a little bit strange that the Feds should contribute to a courthouse, and who can cavil with that point? Nevertheless, even though he was going beyond what was reasonable, he was not afraid to go beyond it. Therefore, you cannot expect this government to draw back from going after something that it has every right to go for. You will never get anything unless you go for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will finish shortly. There is also blame in this resolution that the Premier has not managed to get the Prime Minister to do something about the Upper Churchill. Mr. Speaker, as

everyone knows, you can take a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. I agree we have not gotten the Prime Minister to do something about the Upper Churchill and the Prime Minister should do something about the Upper Churchill. We have tried our best to bring this about. We have some sort of commitment that at some point in time he will do something. We will hold him to that commitment and we expect him to deliver on that commitment, but it is not from want of trying that that has not happened.

As everyone in this House knows, this is one of the reasons why we do have financial problems in this Province. Quebec is making a fortune out of exporting power, Ontario is making a good buck out of exporting power, Manitoba is exporting power, or if it is not exporting now it is shortly going to do so, and in huge blocks. They do this because it is required for their economic benefit. What about this poor old Province here? We have power to develop and we have power to export, but we cannot do it, there is a block in the way. It should never have been put there. When the Upper Churchill was first put in place there should have been arrangements made at that stage of the game that there would be an ability for us to further develop the power and export it as a sort of quid pro quo for the arrangement that was put there but, of course, that was not done. And who was in power at that stage? What administration was in power at that stage? Anyway, we have put forward our best efforts in trying to unblock that obstacle and we have not been successful. We have failed miserably. We admit it. The only way it will come about now will be



for the federal government to get involved, and we at least got some sort of commitment from the federal government now that they will take a part.

Now, this resolution also says we are to blame for the Hibernia delay. In other words, this administration brought down the price of oil, this administration here has prevented the companies from going ahead with development, and so on and so forth. I mean, it is so ridiculous! It is so ridiculous!

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it say here somewhere about getting our federal representative on side in this, and I fully agree. We want to have our federal representative on side, we have made representations to him time and time again about the positions we would like him to take with the federal cabinet, and we will do it again. We have some difficulties sometimes in having him take the approach we would like him to take, but all you can do, again, is put forward your case. We feel that he will, and we feel that if he does we will get a reasonably good deal for this Province. Because let no one forget there is no federal administration better than the PCs. Do not tell me about the Liberal federal administrations. We know what we get out of Liberal federal administrations.

I hesitate to lay too much approbation on the NDP because we really have not experienced them yet. But, on the other hand -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

A point of order. The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
I just want to correct something that the hon. member said, and the administration seems to be inconsistent in once again. I am sure the hon. gentleman recalls the Premier on public television some two weeks ago saying that he had had better co-operation with the former federal Liberal administration in their last two of office than he has had with this federal government. Now, how does he square that with the fact that he has just said that any Tory government in Ottawa is better than any other government in Ottawa? You are contradicting the Premier.

MR. SIMMS:  
That is hardly a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

That is no point of order.

The hon. minister's time has just elapsed.

DR. COLLINS:  
By leave! I am sure hon. members opposite will give me all sorts of leave.

MR. BARRY:  
Of course! By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Leave has been granted.

DR. COLLINS:  
I will use a couple of minutes to cover two points, actually. We say without any shadow of a doubt in our minds, give us a PC Government any time. That is not to say that there will be times,

and we are expecting that there will be times, when the waters are a bit rough. That is to be expected. This is the real life we live in. We do not live in a dream world. But in the aggregate give me a PC Administration every day of the week and we will be much further ahead than with any other administration.

The other point I will just deal with very briefly, Mr. Speaker. The leader of the Opposition did bring up a point about the Special Warrants. Let me clarify that. There is a requirement in The Financial Administration Act that if Special Warrants were obtained when the House is not sitting there has to be a tabling of the Warrant within fifteen days, I believe, it is, before the House. But if the House is sitting, there has to be a tabling within three days.

MR. BARRY:  
But there are other requirements, too.

DR. COLLINS:  
The three days is today, and they are tabled.

Now, the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) asked me in Question Period if there were Special Warrants issued since the House sat. I stated to him -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:  
I should clarify the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) misstatement that he inadvertently made, obviously.

MR. BAIRD:  
That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:  
I am simply correcting a misstatement, Mr. Speaker, and I am assuming I am allowed to do so.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
The question I asked was if in the last six or seven days, not since the House opened, because I am quite familiar with the minister and the restrictions that he is operating under. And I would say to the minister that he has broken one of the provisions of The Financial Administration Act with some of these Warrants.

MR. SIMMS:  
No, he has not.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! That is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
I am speaking by leave. As I say, the point is that I did say we had Special Warrants before the House sat and that is where I finished with my comment. And I reiterate that some of these Special Warrants were obtained before the House sat and were tabled today, although they could have gone a few days longer, but other ones were obtained since the House sat and they were tabled today and they were tabled within the restricted time.

MR. BARRY:  
On a point of order. Just briefly without delaying the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I think the minister missed the point that was being made. If the Warrants are obtained when the House is in session, then it is under Section 28 subsection (3) of The Financial Administration Act and it requires that it be on an expenditure that is unforeseen, not continuing, as in Subsection 28 (2), where it contemplates when the House is not in session and it is a matter of a continuing service and the amount is just too low. But Subsection 28 (3) contemplates that the expenditure had been for unforeseen matters, and some of these are on items such as social assistance which seems to be clearly something that could be foreseen. Does the minister have any explanation for that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! That is not a point of order.

MR. BARRY:

No, by leave! By leave, if the minister wants to answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

I did not hear you.

MR. BARRY:

It is a serious matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader

of the Opposition thinks he has a point. I do not think he has any point whatsoever. I will look at his remarks in more detail and possibly comment on it later. But I can assure him that, in our view, the Warrants were done totally within the provisions of The Financial Administration Act.

MR. BARRY:

No, they were not.

DR. COLLINS:

I believe we have Justice on side in our interpretation in that regard.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this debate.

MR. WARREN:

Here it comes, the Come by Chance hospital.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member opposite, my former friend and former colleague, but neither now, suggested I am going to talk about the Come By Chance hospital, and well I might. I will talk about that later on, if I get an opportunity. If not, I have my own resolution on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that I have I want to comment in particular on what the Premier had to say in his charade. That is what it was, Mr. Speaker, it was a charade. The Premier goes through these sorts of charades when he is getting ready for elections usually. I am not sure if that is

what he is heading for, but I noted, Mr. Speaker, that in his remarks the Premier talked about us, on this side of the House, being hypocritical. In other words, Mr. Speaker, he called us hypocrites.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the weekend before last I had the opportunity of appearing on the CBC Provincial Affairs programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

The Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) saw that and he thoroughly enjoyed it, as I thoroughly enjoyed broadcasting it.

I led off my five minutes on Provincial Affairs by quoting from the scriptures, and I was happy to note a couple of nights later when Mr. Crosbie was in town attacking the Premier for his misbehaviour and ungentlemanly conduct over the last three weeks or more, that Mr. Crosbie used the same line. He made a small mistake. He is probably not as familiar with the Scriptures as I am. He made a small mistake. He said that the Premier should take the mote out of his eye.

MR. BAIRD:

The what?

MR. CALLAN:

The mote, the speck, but in the correct quoting of the Scriptures, of course, it is the Premier who has the log in his eye, and it is the log that he should remove.

Mr. Speaker, let us look and see who is being hypocritical in this Legislature. The Premier this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, talked

about the things that the Special Warrants were brought forward for. He talked about the Baie Verte mines, Mr. Speaker, and he talked about the need for a Special Warrant there.

Mr. Speaker, so much taxpayers' money has been poured into Baie Verte mines - I have not added up the figures lately - but it is well over \$20 million in federal and provincial money to try and keep Baie Verte alive. I have said in this Legislature before, Mr. Speaker, if Baie Verte mines was in a Liberal district, the shafts and the doors would have been shut long, long ago. Mr. Speaker, who is talking about being hypocritical?

Mr. Speaker, the Marystown Shipyard, the Premier talked about Hull 37 and he talked about other hulls. Of course yesterday, when bawling across the House, the member for Marystown (Mr. Tobin) talked about seven new hulls that will be built for FPI in the near future and that will guarantee his re-election.

MR. TOBIN:

I never said that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

It was implicit in your remarks that you would get re-elected because there would be seven hulls under construction for FPI when the next election rolls around. I guess that will be in the Fall.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are other hulls at Marystown that the Premier failed to mention. He did not mention - I am not sure, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) can help me with this - I am

wondering how many hulls there are tied up at the wharf in Marystown which cost the taxpayers of this Province millions of dollars, ships that we bought across the Atlantic and brought over here to be used as ferries in the ferry service and never worked properly. After losing millions of dollars on them they were sold to the Marystown Shipyard for a dollar. I think The **Lowland** is one of these ships. Perhaps the member for Marystown can tell me how many of these unusable ferries are tied up in Marystown after millions and millions of dollars of taxpayers' money went into them. He forgot to mention these, Mr. Speaker. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, in his remarks was very hypocritical indeed.

Let me talk about, Mr. Speaker, some of the other hypocritical things that the Premier has done in his eight years as Premier.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) earlier this afternoon stood up and he was very proud of the fact that this Province led all provinces in Canada with this review board under the chairmanship of Tom Hickey. He was very proud of it. Everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, that it was a patronage appointment. The job was created. It was unnecessary, as was pointed out by the Leader of the NDP Party (Mr. Fenwick). Mr. Speaker, it was a political patronage appointment, that is all it was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, does this Province lead all other provinces in Canada with the new Election Act? Do we have a new election act in this Province that the Premier promised eight years ago? No, Mr. Speaker, even though the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) was slapped in the face because he was chairman of a committee that cost thousands of dollars, at least thousands, and travelled to other parts of Canada and held dozens and dozens of meetings over several years. The chairman, St. John's North representative, brought in a report. It went to Cabinet and it ended up in the garbage, Mr. Speaker, it ended up in the garbage heap.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:  
I think we have clearly established in this House that when a member gets up and gives misinformation to the House, or doubtful information, that if another member has accurate information he is obliged, not only is he allowed to, he is obliged to give proper information.

One of the things about this Election Act is that it is incredibly complicated. There is no easy way that I know of - I would be very interested if the hon. member had a suggestion - to deal with PAC men, that is political action committees, for example. Now, if the hon. member decides to run in the next election, and I hope he does, and suppose -

MR. CALLAN:  
In St. John's North?

MR. J. CARTER:  
Wherever he wants to run. And suppose Brian Davies of Greenpeace gets on the wrong side.

MR. TULK:  
This is a speech.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:  
Just a moment, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to explain. I need a moment.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Just shut up, he is making a bit of sense here.

MR. J. CARTER:  
Suppose Mr. Brian Davies gets on the wrong side with him, well, he is going to need far more than a few thousand dollars to fight that kind of an election. Now, the hon. member knows this and I would be very interested if he could pose an answer to this very difficult question. That is only just one of the difficulties we came up against.

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

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, they managed to get around that severe problem in other provinces. Why can we not do it in our Province? That is my simple answer to that. Other provinces have Election Acts which are up to date and why can we not have one? The Premier promised it eight years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have another hypocritical action of the Premier. Eight years ago he talked about a new act for the Auditor General and, here we are, the only Province in all of Canada where the Auditor General does not have his own separate act.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
That is not true.

MR. CALLAN:  
That is true. That is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, in the recent Speech From the Throne we had reference made to one stop shopping where you make a phone call and somebody directs you to somebody else and so on. Now, Mr. Speaker, a rose by any other name.

Anybody who looks at this knows that what we have is the Bob Cole Action Line reinvented or gone full circle. We should get Bob Cole back, by the way, because the Premier of this Province wonders why we are in debt. Remember the millions upon millions of dollars wasted in ferries for this Province, and Mr. Speaker, Bob Cole's cancelled contract because the Premier wanted to separate himself from the former administration, the Moores administration. Now, eight years later, bankrupt of ideas, back comes the Action Line, and perhaps Bob Cole to finish working out his contract, because I understand it was a very healthy settlement that he got from this present Premier for breaking the contract and bowing out.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) earlier alluded to the fact that the Premier has three jobs. He is naturally an MHA, a member of the House, and, of course, he is the Premier, a

member of Cabinet, the First Minister of Cabinet, and he is also Leader of the PC Party. As my friend for St. Barbe alluded to, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier spent one quarter of the time doing the job that he is getting paid for as Premier, if he was doing that instead of spending 90 per cent of his time, Mr. Speaker, playing the role of Leader of the PC Party at taxpayer's expense, we would be better off.

MR. J. CARTER:

What about the Opposition Leader?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

I understand that he also gets a stipend from the PC party for playing that role as well. So he has three salaries. This, Mr. Speaker, from a Premier who contradicts himself.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Prove your remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

It is on the public record.

Mr. Speaker, we have in this present Premier the most expensive and least productive Premier in all of Canada. There is no question about that. I am not attacking the man's personality, I am attacking him in his role as the Premier of this Province. He is the least productive Premier and most expensive. There is no question about the most expensive. Do you see the contradiction of that, Mr. Speaker? Do you see the contradiction and the hypocrisy in that? A man who stands there

ranting and raving and talking about how poor this Province is when he is the most expensive Premier in all of Canada. He surrounds himself in his offices on the eight floor by twice as many political appointees as the Premier of Ontario which is a province - how many times? - ten times population-wise the size of this Province. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we saw the Premier move into Mount Scio House and then he had a problem and so he put around a chain link fence, electrified I believe.

MR. LUSH:

But it did not work.

MR. CALLAN:

I know it did not work. How much did that cost, that electrified wire fence? I think it was \$150,000. After two months the Premier leaves behind him Mount Scio House and the electrified wire fence and he moves into another place, paid for by the taxpayers.

MR. WARREN:

Why do you not go back to the Come by Chance?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

What I will do, Mr. Speaker, is talk about the hypocritical way that this Premier accuses others of things that he is far, far more guilty of himself.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) asked me just now or suggested that I was going to talk about Come By Chance. Just look at the contradiction, just look at the hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker.

The Orsborne Royal Commission which was published on February 15, 1984 said in Chapter 4, recommendation No. 9, "When the new regional hospital opens at Clarendville and the new regional hospital opens on the Burin Peninsula, at Burin, then the Cottage Hospitals at Grand Bank, St. Lawrence and Come By Chance be closed as in-patient facilities." That is a direct quote.

What happened? Mr. Speaker, for two and a half or three years this administration that the Premier leads - and the Premier was one of the chief spokesmen because he had lots of questions from me to answer about the future of the Come By Chance Hospital - they gave us an argument for closing the Come By Chance Hospital, the Royal Commission report by Judge Orsborne and the recommendation that I just quoted.

What happened last week, Mr. Speaker? What did the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) who is the Cabinet Minister on the Burin Peninsula, what did he announce last week during a time, Mr. Speaker, you will note, when this Province is on the verge of bankruptcy in two years, what is happening? The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth announces that the two cottage hospitals at Grand Bank and St. Lawrence will remain opened after the regional hospital opens this Fall. If that is not a contradiction, Mr. Speaker, I do not know one.

Come By Chance was closed in adherence with the Royal Commission report by Judge Orsborne and the other two hospitals that I just mentioned are kept open in direct opposition to that very same recommendation,

in the very same sentence, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), in a feeble attempt to justify what they did say, and I quote, "Well, the reason we are keeping these two cottage hospitals open, even after the new one opens, is the general economic growth on the Burin Peninsula."

Mr. Speaker, look at Come By Chance. At a time when they were talking about closing down Come By Chance out of one corner of their mouths, they were saying that Dor Chemicals will reactivate the refinery and perhaps put a petro-chemical plant next door. There will be 2,000 or 3,000 jobs at Adams Head, a mile or so from Come By Chance associated with the fabrication of concrete platforms. And, Mr. Speaker, we have National Sea, the fish plant in Arnold's Cove, a twelve month a year plant, with 200 or 300 people, and Port Enterprises in Southern Harbour, and Smith Seafoods in Chance Cove, and dozens of other businesses, Mr. Speaker, in that area. Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about the population now. Why did he not talk about the population in his press release last week?

You can twist it and turn it, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, what we have here is an administration which contradicts itself at every turn. We saw earlier - and it is also in the resolution that the Leader of the Opposition put forward - you know, put us back in power, because now that we have a P.C. Government in Ottawa, the Premier was saying in April of 1985, everything is going to be hunky-dory and rosy, because we have two parties of the same



stripe.

What do we have happening now, Mr. Speaker, if it is not a contradiction from the Premier? He admits, Mr. Speaker, that he has to publicly contradict himself, that the road to prosperity, promised by Mulroney in Carbonear in 1984, has turned out to be a road of misery. This was the same Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, who was going to help the Premier with Quebec and the Upper Churchill. What has happened? Nothing, they are not even talking to each other, Mr. Speaker. What a contradiction!

MR. TOBIN:

Tell us about your caucus meeting after the by-election in St. John's East?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Marystown (Mr. Tobin) will get a chance to speak in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

Our caucus meetings, Mr. Speaker, thank God, this year are secret because we do not have the member for Marystown and others able to put a glass up to the wall and hear what is happening in our caucus rooms. Because, Mr. Speaker, that is why it was planned in the first place. We have a different caucus room now, Mr. Speaker. It is no bigger, but at least there is no opportunity for the member for Marystown to put a water glass up to the wall.

Mr. Speaker, in the last thirty seconds that I have, I hope that I

never see the Premier put on such a display as he put on today. The people in the galleries who were here, I wonder do they realize how much it costs to have a man like the Premier of this Province travelling around, as my colleague talked about, on this prosperity crusade across the Island, and down the Burin Peninsula? "What is that up ahead, Glenn? What is that? Is that the telephone workers on strike? No, no, that is the fish plant workers."

I hope that the people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, realize how expensive it is to have that man holding on to office just for his own edification, not because he cares about the Province, but because he puts his own politics and his own political party ahead of his job, which he is getting paid for, Mr. Speaker, which is being the Premier of this Province.

MR. HODDER:

You are gone, boy.

MR. CALLAN:

I am gone! You are gone! When Mary Hodder gets after you, you will be gone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It always amazes me that the Opposition continues to fall into their own trap. Continually, when an issue comes forward, a substantive issue like we have

been dealing with over the past number of weeks with regard to the Canada-France fisheries issue, other items have come up, Mr. Speaker, and I guess the resolution is an example of the kinds of things they try to do to camouflage the issue and to talk around it, over it, anything but talk to the issue.

The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) who was on his feet some time ago and began by accusing the Premier of rhetoric and shouting. He reverted to his old school days as a teacher and got into the dramatization of his speech. He used every cliché and every known high school phrase that he could use. He manipulated different adjectives in such a way that it became ludicrous to listen to, but at no point in time, Mr. Speaker, did he address himself to the resolution.

Now, very quickly I would like to pass over the resolution and perhaps deal with some of the issues that were brought forward by members opposite. But I mean the point to make is that the Opposition continuously avoids addressing an issue, particularly one that is important to the people of this Province by verbage, by sidetracking, by accusing this administration of doing anything but what it is doing and it is defending the people of this Province, defending the integrity of this Province, and Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, with the Canada fisheries issue, trying to defend the integrity of Canada. Obviously there are people unable to do that, as the Minister of Fisheries indicated in his speech the other day to a government resolution on the Canada fisheries issue. There seems to be an absolute

unwillingness for Canada to put forward a position internationally that will cause other countries around the world to recognize Canada as a sovereign nation. But that is another issue, Mr. Speaker, and another resolution that we will be dealing with as the days go on.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, "WHEREAS Federal-Provincial relations have never been at a lower ebb and the promised great new era of co-operation and consultation has never appeared." That is not true. First of all we can wipe away that one. That is not true.

Now there is some truth in the next "WHEREAS", some, but it just goes on too far. "The economic situation in Newfoundland and Labrador and the financial position of the Province calls for the closest possible co-operation and consultation between the Federal and Provincial Orders of Government." That is true. That part of it is true.

The third "WHEREAS", "AND WHEREAS the Premier has not been keeping our representative in the Federal Cabinet adequately informed on Provincial issues and the Province is suffering as a result." That is not true. Another "WHEREAS" gone. That is not true and records can prove that. Facts can prove that, not the rhetoric of the Opposition, or the rhetoric of others. Facts prove that that is not true.

"WHEREAS fiscal mismanagement already demonstrated by the present administration causes it to need every friend it can get in Ottawa." That is not true. There is no mismanagement. This administration has the best

Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), not only in this Province - not only in - I was going to say previous administrations, but in the whole country, the best minister -

MR. SIMMONS:  
The world.

MR. DAWE:  
Well, perhaps in the whole world. Thank you very much, I accept that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:  
The best Minister of Finance in the whole world. So that "WHEREAS" is not true.

"WHEREAS the Province needs a Federal Government that is more sensitive to the need for greater regional development funding, better formulas for equalization payments and more appropriate economic policies." That is true. That part is true. So far we are batting 500. No we are not, we are only batting 450.

"AND WHEREAS the Premier has, in an attempt to excuse his own mismanagement and incompetence, passed blamed to and burnt bridges with five successive federal administrations." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. That is absolutely untrue.

It was somewhat curious that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) would stand on his feet and say, 'how many federal administrations has the Premier and this administration fought with?' And he went and listed them. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that came to my mind when that was being said, is how many successive Liberal leaders of the Opposition

have been done away with in those years since 1979?

MR. TOBIN:  
One to go.

MR. DAWE:  
The Leader of the Opposition, when the election was called in 1979 quit, he just ran away and hid. He would not even fight the election. Then Mr. Jamieson came along, gone; Mr. Stirling came along, gone; Mr. Neary came along, gone. The present Leader of the Opposition tried to fight one election, and lost. So the record of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest is excellent when it comes to dealing with other groups of people, particularly members of the Opposition. There is probably, from what I can hear about caucus meetings on the other side, a couple of more leaders to go through before the next election is called as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:  
Mr. Speaker, "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED," two of them, shows the kind of mentality of the people opposite. It just shows the kind of mentality of the people opposition. Just listen to it and see if anybody on this side of the House or on that side of the House can draw any sense to this, on one hand they are saying "that the present administration be instructed by the House to establish, until the next federal election, a civil relationship with the present federal Liberal Administration."

Do you know what the next WHEREAS says? But on the other hand you have got to say "that when the

next federal election is called this House unanimously seek the defeat of the present Federal Administration."

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all, we have to say we are going to be buddies with you, but at the same time now we are going to beat you in the next election. Now how silly, how silly. When they stand on their feet and talk about the rhetoric, the lack of planning, the lack of foresight from this particular administration, they only do it, Mr. Speaker, very superficially. They use the clichés, the adjectives, the phrases that sound good, when they are reading Hansard, as they all runaway and get Hansard, they will be able to read it and it looks good in print, but substantively there is nothing to it.

The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Fury) got on his feet and talked about the lack of facts and lack of information. Well very recently, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. Barbe indicated that money was being spent by the Department of Transportation in some kind of a politically biased way. In that statement to the press he said, 'look at all of the money that is being spent in St. George's district when my district is three times the size and has three times the kilometers of roads.' Mr. Speaker, let me point out that that is not true. The great historic district of St. George's has eighty more kilometers of road in its boundaries than does the district of St. Barbe.

Let me also point out, Mr. Speaker, that since 1972 and unfortunately for the Opposition, you cannot take individual years, as you cannot quote from time to time actually from the Bible

unless you take things in context. They want to be able to pull little extracts and try to develop a very large argument from them, and that is not possible, particularly as it relates to highway spending in the Province.

Since 1972, Mr. Speaker, in excess of \$66 million has been spent in St. George's district, \$66 million addressing the road concerns.

MR. TOBIN:

How much was spent in St. Barbe?

MR. DAWE:

I am glad you asked. How much was spent in St. Barbe since 1972? Mr. Speaker, \$71 million was spent in the district of St. Barbe, so it is cheap politics for the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) to pull an individual year, to pull an individual short period of time and to try and indicate that somehow the administration is not carrying out its mandate effectively for the people of this Province. That is just not true.

Mr. Speaker, people opposite, not only when they make public statements to the press, not only when they make public comments ridiculing, trying to get their political kudos by falsely representing the truth, they try to do that in the legislature as well.

Since 1979 when I had the good fortune and the privilege of representing the people for St. George's district -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

- I have had an opportunity to sit in this legislature and listen to debate, to listen to the style of

debate, to listen to the substance of debate, and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I can see why, trying to sort of be a dispassionate observer, which is difficult to do, but I can see why this particular administration and this party consistently forms the government. I can see why, Mr. Speaker, since 1949 the Liberal Party of Newfoundland has consistently gotten less votes than it got the election before. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) brought this point out last year. The highest number of votes the Liberal Party ever got in any provincial election since 1949 was 1949. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, they have been going downhill. It is the reason this party is in power and will continue to be in power; it is the reason the new party in this particular legislature is on the climb. Both are at the expense of the Liberal Party, not at the expense, but because of the Liberal Party, in St. John's East and St. John's East Extern the Liberal Party came third and nobody remembers third. Very few people remember second but certainly nobody remembers third.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

That is incisive political wisdom.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, this group over here, as this resolution clearly demonstrates, is doing the same thing that it has continued to do, surely since 1972, but from my observation, certainly since I have been in the legislature since 1979. They continue to do the

same thing day in and day out as it relates to their debate and as it relates to their questions in Question Period. At least last Session they started to ask question during the Late Show. There was a time when they would not even do that. But it shows from their questions and from their debate that they have not changed one little bit.

It is very important to have an effective Opposition in our particular democratic system. The unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, about the official opposition is they have never provided effective opposition, they have never articulated a position that defends the interest of this Province. They are too busy, as the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), as the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), and others will in this debate as they stand up, they are too busy personally attacking, trying to put politics on a level that generates some public distrust or public cynicism of politicians and politics in general. They feed on that particular kind of attitude and they will continue, Mr. Speaker, to always be in opposition, that is provided they get enough people elected the next time to even form, maybe not even the official opposition, but to at least have the party represented in the legislature of this particular House of Assembly.

MR. CALLAN:

Would you permit a question?

MR. DAWE:

No.

MR. CALLAN:

It is not a real hard question.

MR. FLIGHT:

My God, he (inaudible).

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, the partridge from Buchans, the man who, when I was the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, consistently the only question he ever asked in this Legislature to me as minister was, 'Boy, when are you going to open the partridge season?' Either in this Legislature or behind the screen, the biggest concern for the people of Buchans on his mind was when the partridge season was going to open.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I realize for many Newfoundlanders that is an important issue. It provides an opportunity to get in the country and to participate in an activity they enjoy. It is important, but, Mr. Speaker, I would think that there were other issues concerning the district of Buchans, like where the hon. member would like the penitentiary to go, Windsor or Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, if the minister is going to cast aspersions or indicate motives, he will know that the only question I asked him was, why he was not concerned about the safety of the people travelling on the Trans Canada Highway that was flooded year after year, that he shows no regard for. That is the kind of question I asked him. He still shows no regard for them. That,

Mr. Speaker, is the point of order. That is what my concern was, not partridge. Mr. Speaker, people are still in danger on that strip of the Trans-Canada Highway thanks to his incompetence. That is my concern and not partridge.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

I would like to point out to the hon. member, and to every one of the gentlemen, if anything that I can point to in years that go by, when I am sixty and still Minister of Transportation and decides to resign or quit -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

- if there is anything that I can point to and be proud of it is the safety record, the things that this particular administration has done, the Department of Transportation, over the years to improve the safety of Newfoundlanders driving on the roads. Not only in the condition of the roads, Mr. Speaker, but legislation in seat belt use, and in the introduction that we are coming up with of the point system.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that in a ten year period, in 1974, the fatality rate on the roads in Newfoundland was 117 people. Ten years later it was fifty-seven.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, the point of order reminded me of the safety record that we have in this Province. I would just like to point out that in a ten year period the fatality rate on the roads in Newfoundland, from 1974 to 1984, decreased from 117 fatalities to some 57. From the ten year period, from 1975, where there were 104 fatalities on the roads in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, ten years later there were 63. You can do that for any ten year period.

The things that we have put in place in this Province with regard to highway safety in improving road conditions - Mr. Speaker, since 1979, 2,200 kilometers of road have been built at a cost of \$234 million.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. minister seems to be straying from the motion we are debating.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to point out that the resolution puts forward that there has been a lack of co-operation, and it calls for this kind of co-operation to be put back in place. I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that what I am talking about now with regard to funding is a direct result of the kinds of co-operation that this administration has been able to develop with, not only this particular administration that is in Ottawa, but in previous

administrations.

A strategy, Mr. Speaker, in any kind of a contest does not deal with one way of doing something. It does not deal with just sitting down and being very nice and smiling. Sometimes you have to get angry.

If you are driving along the highway, sometimes you can coast, sometimes you have to lightly apply the gas to the accelerator. When you are going up a hill sometimes you have to apply the gas more vigorously. I would contend, Mr. Speaker, that the strategy that the Premier and this administration have used is just that kind of a strategy. When it was necessary and important for this Province to co-operate and to do things on a co-operative basis, to get along and to do things together, then that is what was done. When there was an issue that came up that perhaps the federal administration did not want to do for this Province, then it was necessary to step on the gas, it was necessary to put the car in higher gear, to make sure that you, if necessary, caught up with or bypassed the person in front of you.

I think the kind of strategy that was used is the kind of strategy that has resulted in many, many improvements in this Province through federal - provincial co-operation and federal - provincial agreements, in forestry, in highroads, in ocean industries and in a whole range of regional development issues. It is the kind of strategy, Mr. Speaker, that we will continue to use.

As the Premier indicated when he spoke on this resolution, we will

continue to co-operate and to work with the federal administration that does things in the best interests of this Province and the people of this Province. When we are faced with a situation where that does not happen, then we will break away from that kind of co-operation and do what we have to do.

If that will be arguing or discussing or forcefully putting forward our point, we will do that as well. We will do whatever we have to do, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the people of this Province are getting their just rewards, are getting the kinds of representation that we were elected to give them. We are provincial members. We are provincial MHAs. We are not an administration who lay down and were doormats to a federal administration. We will continue to fight for the people of this Province in whatever way best suits the needs and the requirements and the aspirations and the legitimate concerns of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. SIMMS:

Here it comes.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister for Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) can get into

the debate next Wednesday. It will give him lots of time to make sure his hair is properly fixed and so on. I am sure we will not mind listening to him.

In speaking to this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, there are an awful lot of things that I have in my mind and had in mind. Some of them were pushed out of my mind by some of the statements made by the previous speaker, the Minister for pot holes. Some of it gets me a little bit upset, Mr. Speaker. He talks in terms of the strategy of the government of this Province over the past few years, the strategy as related to this Province and how it is always in the best interest of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about that strategy for just a few minutes. First of all, the strategy seemed to be a few years ago that the louder you shout and the more you complain then the more votes you get, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, their strategy is tied not to what is good for the Province but what is good for the Tory party in this Province. Their strategy is tied to the polls. And what do the polls tell them? When the minister talks about this resolution being at odds with proper strategy for the Province, an indication, Mr. Speaker, of how serious that minister is is when he dealt with the resolution and when he actually read the resolution. I wondered if the hon. gentleman could read properly. I am sure all hon. members have read the resolution and know that the previous speaker the, Minister of Highways, if we can call him that, was not reading it properly. He said that the resolution was that when the next federal general election is called



this House unanimously seek the defeat of the present federal administration. He said that is what it was. Mr. Speaker, as you know and as all members opposite know, that is not the case. He failed to go on and read the qualification that came after that. The qualification that came after that was 'unless in the interim we see significant new approaches by that administration to meet the real economic needs of this Province.' Now, do not forget, Mr. Speaker, this comes at a time when the Premier of this Province has said that the federal administration in Ottawa right now was harder to get along with than the administration he claimed was the very worst in the world, the Trudeau administration. At one point he was saying that was the worst administration in the world, and now he is saying that the Trudeau administration was a lot easier to get along with, a lot easier to get things from than the present administration in Ottawa right now, the Tory administration. This comes at a time when that is what is being said, that is the impression all over the Province and, obviously, that is the impression of government members unless the Premier is Johnnie who is out of step, unless the Premier is out of step with the general trend of thought in members opposite. So it comes at a time when the administration in Ottawa has been branded by their present action as being the worst that we have ever seen.

MR. BAIRD:  
George Baker is even worse. He is humorous.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
At least, Mr. Speaker, I am not reading my speech.

Now, then, if this administration is the worst that we have ever seen, by the Premier's own admission, then how can we offer support to that administration unless they change their attitude, unless all of a sudden they start acting in the best interests of this Province? The rest of Canada can look out for themselves. Unless they start acting in the best interest of this Province, what is wrong with saying, "We will not support in the next federal election a government which is the worst that this country has ever seen." What is wrong with that? I do not see anything wrong with that.

The Premier of this Province tries to excuse his inconsistencies and his recent flip-flops and fluctuations and posturing. He tries to excuse that. I am sure my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) could come up with an awful lot of adjectives to describe the Premier's recent activities. He is excusing his activities by saying, "Well, we have to stand up. When the federal government, regardless of their political stripe, is doing something that is bad for this Province, then we have to stand up and fight."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:  
The Fighting Newfoundlander again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Come on over, boy.

MR. BAKER:

He has been a lap dog for a long time, now he is the Fighting Newfoundlander.

Do not forget I mentioned the government by polls and the action depends on the polls. As long as the Mulroney Government in Ottawa was leading in the polls and had 60 per cent support in the country, and as long as they were thought of as the most popular government, then they could do no wrong as far as members opposite were concerned. At that point they could do no wrong.

And the reason, Mr. Speaker, is because they were riding high in the polls and politically it is good to get tied to somebody who is riding high in the polls. But what happens as soon as Mulroney slips, as soon as his Cabinet Ministers mess up their departments, as soon as the scandals come out and so on? As soon as people in this country begin to realize that Brian Mulroney is front and polish with nothing behind it, as soon as people start to realize that and his popularity slips in the polls, what does his good buddy Brian do? Out with the knife; the knife in the back.

All of a sudden it is not politically popular to support that federal government, therefore, members opposite start shouting and screaming. All of a sudden it is popular to do that. What is it they are concerned about? What do their polls tell them? Their polls tell them that to try to survive politically they have to do this and they go ahead and do it. They posture to the Newfoundland people, try to explain their inconsistencies, try to explain why they made no representation at all after the

the Nielsen Report was made public, which, if carried out, would be devastating for Newfoundland. We told them that it would be devastating for Newfoundland, but they made no representation to the federal government at all.

Many times in this House the question was asked and the answer was, 'Well, that is not really government policy.' But that is not the point. You have to make sure it does not become government policy.

Members opposite were willing to accept that as long as Mulroney was riding high in the polls. But as soon as he drops what do we see? The knife in the back, Mr. Speaker. It is no longer politically popular for members opposite to support him.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that maybe I should adjourn. I would like with permission to go on, but I know members opposite are getting a bit tired. They look a bit dragged out and discouraged. And make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, they look discouraged. They should be discouraged after what has been happening in this country, and what is going to happen to them sometime within the next two years. Mr. Speaker, I will continue next Wednesday. I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! It now being 6:00 o'clock the House stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow.