

PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 7

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

9 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Before calling Statements by Ministers I would like to bring to the attention of all hon. members that we are celebrating Commonwealth Day today. I have a message here from the hon. Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar, Speaker of the Lok Sabha, in India, and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

You may recall that he addressed us here last May and he says, "The Commonwealth family is a unique organization in terms of international co-operation and international living. Besides the United Nations and non-aligned movement, the Commonwealth is the largest and the most representative forum of nations. With its membership today spanning six continents and seven oceans, embracing more than a third of the world's population, it serves as a bridge between races, cultures, countries and continents. This voluntary organization of nations not only serves their interests, but also contributes towards the evolution of an international order promoting global peace, harmony and progress.

Over the years the Commonwealth has built up a network of institutions for mutual co-operation and consultation at all levels and in all spheres. At the parliamentary level the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association seeks to promote Commonwealth understanding and respect for parliamentary institutions. It provides a forum to the Legislators from the Commonwealth countries to discuss

and sort out the problems afflicting contemporary society.

Today, this Commonwealth Day gives us the opportunity of pledging ourselves to rid our world of poverty, ignorance and injustice and to do our best for the promotion of world peace and prosperity. We will continue to strengthen our fraternal organization based on mutual understanding and respect in order to meet the challenges of today's society more effectively.

The Commonwealth is worthy of our deepest commitment and our strongest support.

I will have a copy of that message sent to all hon. members.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform all hon. members that the Government of the Province welcomes the announcement earlier today by Petro Canada of major offshore developments on the Terra Nova structure. Since 1984 Petro Canada has drilled 5 delineation wells on that structure. The Government is pleased that Petro Canada has decided to drill two additional wells this Summer. I understand that they are now in the process of applying for the necessary authorizations to drill from the Canada Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board.

Petro Canada's decision is consistent with the policy of the Government that priority be given

to further drilling on the already discovered fields which have the potential for commercial development. Terra Nova is one of the several structures on the Newfoundland Offshore with the potential for commercial development.

The drilling of the two additional delineation wells this Summer will result in employment of approximately 100 people on the rig, SEDCO 710. This activity will provide a welcome injection of new activity to the Newfoundland Offshore related industries. It is Petro Canada's opinion that evaluation of the test results and preliminary engineering work should place them in a position to propose a development plan for the Terra Nova field in 1988. Petro Canada is further of the opinion that construction could begin in 1989 with oil production in 1991.

Petro Canada has stated that the Western portion of the Terra Nova Field contains over 70 million barrels and could be economically produced with a floating production system.

The company also feels that the drilling of the two additional delineation wells will prove-up additional reserves on the structure. It has been estimated that the upside potential of reserves could be in the order of 130 million barrels for the entire field.

Petro Canada is considering two options for the development of the Terra Nova Field - one, using a semi-submersible production system and, the other, a ship-shaped production system. It is estimated that the total development cost for the field

would be in the order of \$1 billion.

Under the Atlantic Accord the choice of the mode of development rests with the Government of the Province. We look forward to Petro Canada submitting a development and benefits plan to the Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board. The Government of Newfoundland will carefully consider the mode of development proposed by Petro Canada and in making its decision on the mode of development the Government of the Province will give the highest priority to the safety aspects of the system and, secondly, to maximizing the benefits accruing to the Province.

I wish to point out that the proposal of Petro Canada with respect to Terra Nova is totally separate from the development of Hibernia. They are both separate and distinct oil fields separated by about 35 kilometres and differing significantly in their reserves. The reserves of Terra Nova will approximate 10 per cent of those of Hibernia. Terra Nova has an estimated life of approximately ten years and Hibernia an estimated life of between twenty and twenty-five years. In terms of development cost, Terra Nova is estimated at \$1 billion whereas the development costs of Hibernia are in the order of \$4.5 billion.

In summary, therefore, the Government of Newfoundland welcomes this initiative which will bring increased exploratory activity with the very real possibility of early development of the Terra Nova field.

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador welcomes recent

developments on the offshore. The government, in co-operation with the Government of Canada and the companies, will do everything reasonable within its power to see that the hydrocarbon resources of the Continental Shelf offshore Newfoundland and Labrador are developed in the best interests of the people of Newfoundland and Canada, consistent with the principles of the Atlantic Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say and emphasize to this legislature that we of the Opposition welcome this announcement that was made this morning by Newfoundland's federal minister and the federal Minister of Energy, Mr. Masse, concerning the development of the Terra Nova structure. Anything that brings jobs and helps develop our economy is welcome, especially if it brings revenue to us to spend as a Province. It is vitally important to this Province that we see those things go ahead.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that there is some inconsistency, or at least a little inconsistency, in Mr Crosbie's statement as opposed to that of Petro Canada, in that Petro Canada is talking about delineation of its structure and Mr. Crosbie seems to indicate that it is more along the lines of Production. In any case, we welcome it. We do note, of course, that it is to be done with some sort of floating system and we note, too, of course, that the

Premier and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) have said that the decision on the mode of development rests with the Government of the Province.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, we want to note with some regret that it is our understanding that at the press conference, making this announcement this morning, we did not have a joint statement by both the Province and the federal government. Mr. Speaker, we wonder if, indeed, in this attitude the federal minister feels that because the Premier of this Province tells us that on Come By Chance he is going to blow our minds, it is more important to the federal minister that he, too, tell us that he is going to blow our minds with another announcement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this points out that there is a game going on in this Province, a game of political egos and a game of political brinkmanship, and our past history might indeed indicate that that is the case, that in making decisions on the mode of development the consultative process and the co-operative process that was promised by the Mulroney government and by the Premier of the Province when they signed the Atlantic Accord may indeed not be in place and may indeed minimize the economic effect that such an announcement could have on the economy of this Province.

We want to again, as I said, support the announcement, but we want to also -

MR. PEACH:

Are you scared?

MR. TULK:

No, we are not scared. We are

afraid, if you want to know the truth, that the antics of the provincial Premier and the federal minister could indeed jeopardize this very important development.

One other point that I could make -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:
By leave?

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

MR. TULK:
I want to ask one other question.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, do I have leave from the government House Leader to make a point on the privatization of - Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
I understand leave has not been granted.

MR. TULK:
Well, let it be noted that the Government House Leader has a revolt on his hands over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to express on behalf of my colleague and I our pleasure at seeing some activity in offshore drilling this Summer. I think we were all quite frightened that the activity was drying up and that nothing else would continue. I think it is quite indicative that Petro-Can is the operation that is going ahead, and we appreciate the fact that they are.

I have only one or two points to make on the statement itself other than those which the Opposition House Leader made. The proposal is obviously for either a modified floating rig or a boat-shaped structure. We have known, of course, that the provincial government has always had as its primary objective the concrete or gravity base structures, so we would like to hear at a future date what the opinion of the government will be on this particular mode of development. Obviously, we will hear that over the next little while.

The other comment that I would like to make, if we are going to be constructive about it, is if we do go ahead with floating rigs and modification of them, or a boat-shaped structure, which I take to be a boat, I am wondering what do we have currently in the Province to take advantage of this kind of modification or construction. In other words, how much of that work can we get? It is an area that I am quite worried about, because in looking at the

Environmental Impact Study by Mobil it did seem that there was very little of that kind of construction we could do.

One other point: I am at a complete loss on the reserves that are here, or the proven reserves. It is my understanding this is supposed to be 10 per cent of the Hibernia reserves, yet we are talking either 70 million or 135 million barrels. If that is the proven reserves, I am wondering how that jibes with 10 per cent.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Recoverable reserves.

MR. FENWICK:

That is the recoverable reserves?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The others are proven reserves.

MR. FENWICK:

My understanding with the Hibernia structure is that we are talking in the neighbourhood of about 500 million barrels of recoverable reserve, as well, so I am just wondering, 10 per cent of what? It just does not seem to jive very well, and perhaps at a later date we could get a little bit more clarification from government. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform hon. members regarding the lay-off of personnel from the operation at St. Lawrence Fluorspar Limited which was announced last week.

On Friday, March 6, 1987 the

management at St. Lawrence Fluorspar Limited gave notice of temporary lay-off to twenty-eight of their workers. The lay-offs were effective immediately. Some of the workers finished work on Friday, others on Saturday, depending on when their particular shift ended.

The layoffs were made necessary because of unforeseen problems in commissioning the mill at the operation. Delays in construction of the mill meant that commissioning procedures did not begin until late January and the severe weather conditions experienced since then have greatly inhibited the commissioning process. Therefore it was found necessary to cut back from four shift crews to two shift crews in the mill until such time as the operation of the mill has been optimized. Also, because less feed from the mill will be required some cutback in mine personnel has also been necessary.

The company has stressed that the lay-offs are temporary. It is anticipated that the twenty-eight laid off workers will be rehired as soon as it is possible to bring the mill up to full production. The lay-offs reduced the number of workers at the operation to fifty-one and no significant reduction in that number is anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that this is a temporary setback. St. Lawrence Fluorspar has contracted for the sale of its initial production of fluorspar and anticipates production and shipment to fulfill that contract as soon as the problems at the mill are overcome.

Thank you.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, a few brief points with respect to this statement. I am sure all members had great hope for this particular area, and we still do. If there was ever a bright spot for the government, Mr. Speaker, St. Lawrence was a bright spot, where we saw some \$6 million to \$8 million worth of public funds, I believe, infused into that particular mining operation. So we are saddened to see this lay off. We do hope it is temporary, although the last time we heard that word it was used in Daniels Harbour. We thought that would be temporary, and now we see, nearly a year later, 165 miners will have absolutely no source of income at the end of this month, when unemployment insurance runs out for them and their families.

But let me not detract. St. Lawrence is a bright spot. I think government did well to put money in there to help this mine get back on its feet, I just wish they had put public money in that other mine to help it get back on its feet as well. We hope these lay-offs are temporary, and we look forward to good things from this mining operation in that community in the very near future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I am today tabling an objection by the Comptroller General of Finance to certain expenditures charged to the 1986-87 financial year. I would like to explain the circumstances leading up to this objection.

Section 29 of the Financial Administration Act states, in part, that "The Comptroller General shall ensure that no payment of any public money is made (a) for which there is no legislative appropriation;...".

On 27 March 1986, a Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant was issued in the amount of \$715,330,900. The Comptroller General informed me that he was declining to issue money out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, pursuant to this Warrant, since there was no legislative authority for these expenditures, and with the understanding that a Supply Act had not been passed by the Legislature and that the House of Assembly had not been adjourned for more than thirty days which conditions appear to be required under Section 28.(3) for the issue of a Warrant.

Section 32(1) of the Financial Administration Act states, in part, "If the Comptroller General declines to cause an issue of public money out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund on the ground that there is no legislative authority then upon a report of the case being submitted to the Board, the Board shall be the judge of the sufficiency of the objections and may sustain them or order payment to be made".

On 1 April 1986, Treasury Board - and that was the board referred to

in the quotes from the Financial Administration Act - overruled the Comptroller General's objection and ordered payments to be made in accordance with the amounts authorized by the Warrant.

In accordance with Section 32.(2) of the Financial Administration Act, I hereby table the report of the Comptroller General of Finance on this matter.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) thought he was explaining here today. He certainly was not explaining anything very significant. I think the important thing here is he did not go into the details. Last year we raised the point that this could have been done within this House without having to go through the process of Special Warrants, and we also made the point at that time that government was abusing its right to Special Warrants. This was a third of the budget, as I recall, just about a third of the budget, and the House was open, if members will recall, and we could have voted these moneys before the House closed. I think what the Auditor General is stating here is that the government is certainly abusing its powers with respect to the issuance of Special Warrants. Every year we see an escalation in the numbers and in the amounts of money that the government had to use by Special Warrants, Mr. Speaker, and we have to make sure that we do not abuse the power of

this House. It is this House that votes the money and I would hope that the government would remember that and that they would certainly diminish their use, that they would lessen their use of Special Warrants. I think that is the salient point.

The other point is that it was not necessary in the first place because this House was open last year and the money that was gotten through special warrants could have been voted by the House before it closed. So, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very unsatisfactory explanation by the minister today and it shows that they are abusing and disregarding the right of this House to make decisions on the expenditures of moneys.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the very embarrassing position of having to echo the sentiments of the Liberal Finance critic and ask what the whole purpose of the Financial Administration Act is if, apparently, the government has a sort of super overriding clause of referring it to Treasury Board and being able to eventually do exactly what it wants. I think it points out a sloppiness on the part of government in not really getting its House in order in time. We were around, the House was sitting at that time, and there was no problem in terms of trying to address the problem. Quite frankly, to see government

use its vastly overriding power of appealing to Treasury Board is just really not an acceptable answer to the way in which the financial matters of this Province should be administered.

Unfortunately, it seems the way the legislation is written there is virtually nothing we in the official Opposition, or in the Opposition, can do about it. Maybe in the future we should have a close look at that act and see if it is possible to amend it in such a way that the government can start complying with it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling Oral Questions I would like to welcome to the House the Seal Cove Community Council: Mayor Alvin Loveless, Deputy Mayor Max Loveless, and Councillors Rodney Forsey and Everet Simms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services. I would like to ask the minister could he confirm if it is the policy of his department, or the policy of the administrative department of the Boys' Home, that any boy being transported either from the Boys' Home to a hospital or any other area should have at least two security guards while in transportation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, whenever a child or juvenile is taken from one place to another they are always accompanied by one or more people - always.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I gather, from what the hon. minister is saying, that the policy is that at least two people should accompany one of these boys. Well, then, would the minister explain how it was, just very recently, how it was that in transporting a young lad from the Boys' Home to the Health Sciences Complex that he escaped and was in the woods, at this cold time of year, all night out in Georgetown?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I said that whenever a juvenile is being transported he is accompanied by one or more people, or however many is felt necessary. The youth in question, it is my understanding that his going into the woods had nothing to do with getting away from custody. As the hon. member knows, that happened at the hospital. The youth actually ran from his home into the woods, not from custody. After the boy got back home, it was there he then went into the woods.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a poor answer for such a serious question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we already witnessed sometime ago when a young lad lost his life in the woods because of the attitude that was taken by the Department of Social Services and the care that was taken by the Boys' Home. We all saw the suffering.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

What I am going to ask the minister is he going to tell us again that the way security is being carried on by the administration at the Boys' Home, that this is likely to happen again, as it possibly very nearly did happen just this past weekend with the young lad from Georgetown? The young lad was in the woods where he had a frozen thumb and a frozen finger and could have very easily lost his life, and it was through the lack of security. The question to the minister -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has asked his question.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I know what the question was. There was a lot of rhetoric, but I am not sure whether there was a question there or not. But I should point out that perhaps the hon. member should read The Young Offenders Act, because once a child escapes custody - a youth, I should say - the youth then becomes the responsibility of the RCMP and not of the Department of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in checking with the Administrator of the Boys' Home, she confirmed that the young lad escaped custody from the Health Science Complex and there was only one security person with him at the time, the other one was out aboard the vehicle. Would the minister explain the lack of co-operation or the lack of co-ordination between the Boys' Home and his department? Why would his department allow such a thing to happen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TULK:

What are you laughing at?

MR. BRETT:

I am laughing at the question, not the incident.

Mr. Speaker, there was no lack of security. As the hon. member just

said, there were in fact two people with the boy.

MR. EFFORD:
No, no. One.

MR. BRETT:
Well you indicated there was somebody driving the van. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, there was no lack of security. These things happen. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they will always happen, I guess. As long as it is necessary to incarcerate youths for whatever reason, I think these sorts of things will happen. It is most unfortunate, but I see no fault on the part of the department there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). I wonder if the Minister, in view of the fact that the Deputy Minister of Finance and the Comptroller General of the Province agree with accusations by the Auditor General that the Provincial Government broke the law in the setting up and administering of a bank account in Japan, a bank account in excess of \$100 million of taxpayers' money, I wonder, in view of this support by these two government officials of the Auditor General's accusations, what action has the Minister of Justice taken?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's

Report, which was just tabled last week, is being reviewed now by officials of the government and any action warranted on the part of the Justice Department will be taken in due course.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Seaker, in recent months we have seen labour leaders being jailed, we have heard of poachers paying a price for breaking the law, and I wonder if the minister can now say what action she has taken? Has the minister been party in Cabinet to breaking these laws of our Province, these financial administration laws and regulations? Does she believe that Cabinet is beyond the law of this land? Do we have two sets of laws?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, those questions do not deserve an answer.

MR. LUSH:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, there is the kind of attitude that we have. The Auditor General indicated that the government has broken the law with respect to \$100 million in a Japanese bank. Now, will the minister answer this? Does the minister condone the breaking of

our laws in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Of course not.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young). Why did the ministry pay \$325,000 for two building permits that he could have gotten for \$3.00?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure if the hon. member would look he would find the replies given by the department to the Report of the Auditor General.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, let we quote from the answer that is in the book.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

I would like to ask the minister if he agrees with his own ministry's statements that it is true the Crown is not bound by the City of St. John's Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is not relevant to the Department of Public Works and Services. It is all in the book.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

The minister's own statement, from his own department, is not relevant? Now, I will ask the question of the minister again. He did not have to pay \$325,000, he could have gotten these permits for \$3.00, so why did he allow such fiscal mismanagement in his own department to get out of hand?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

The department is not out of hand and the answer is in the book.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Aylward). His department was

originally going to provide capital funding for the Bay d'Espoir Salmon Hatchery Association, the Growers Association. I understand his department has now changed direction and they only intend to finance selected members of this association. Is this the case?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the government have not made their final decision on funding for the development of salmon farming in Bay d'Espoir yet.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

In that case, I wonder could the minister tell us what the status is? Because pretty soon those smelt are going to come out of the hatchery and have to go into the pens early in May. So I wonder what is the situation right now? The growers have not got the money, they are waiting on some decision from his department. When will the decision be made and what is the status?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the provincial government is now assessing other options for Bay d'Espoir so that we can get some private risk money in Bay d'Espoir for the

development of the salmon farming, along with government money, so that we may develop some type of a blended salmon farming industry for the Bay d'Espoir area.

MR. MORGAN:

Good policy. It is a really good policy.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. GILBERT:

Does the minister now say that all the members of this Bay d'Espoir Salmon Growers Co-op will be given equal chance for development, or that just certain ones from that association are going to be given funding?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, when our policy and funding arrangements are made public it will be quite evident to the hon. member who will qualify for funding in the Bay d'Espoir development.

MR. MORGAN:

He might not understand it but it will be there.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct a question

to my good friend, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). It relates to the Auditor General's Report, Paragraph 44. The Auditor General there has expressed some concern, which relates to the purchase of those 185 microcomputers for the College of Trades and Technology. On page 71 of his report he expresses some concern that "the use of public moneys to acquire microcomputers for private use is a transaction outside the authority granted by the Act." I say to the minister I have also read the response of the administration of the College. Would the minister indicate to the House whether he is satisfied with the transaction as outlined by the Auditor General and responded to by the administration of the college?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, obviously I am satisfied with what happened at the College of Trades and Technology. In dealing with the Auditor General or purchases or the spending of public money, there always is the intent to get full value for government money spent. In the case of the Cabot Institute there is the desire not only to, I guess, improve the teaching capacity of the school but also to get the staff and faculty fully involved. That was the reason for this transaction taking place in the way that it did. I am satisfied that there was not any abuse of power or any wastage of public funds at the Cabot Institute. I know it does not conform exactly to the method that the Auditor General would like us to use, in this case he

has said so and we have responded. But, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied with the transaction. There was no wastage, no misuse of public funds or public authority, and I am satisfied with what happened.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I thank the minister for his answer. It is not only a matter of doing what the Auditor General want, of course, because he points out that it is outside the authority granted by the Act. In particular, the concern was that some of the microcomputers, at least two, were re-leased at subsidized interest rates. Is the minister indicating, then, that this is the kind of application of funds that he would have no difficulty with, that we can purchase computers out of public monies for private use, that we can give a subsidized rate to suppliers, in terms of leasing, of government equipment? Is that is what he is saying to the House? If not, would he indicate to the House what steps he intends to take to ensure that this kind of thing does not happen again, to ensure that the college operates within the purview of the Act in these matters?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, as I said in my

answer to the original question, I am satisfied that there was not a waste of money or an abuse of the power of the Board of Governors of the Cabot Institute. They were trying to be somewhat novel in their approach to getting better equipment for the school, and to make sure that not only did they have better equipment for the school, but that their staff would be fully familiar with a type of equipment that they were going to use and, subsequently from that, of course, that the students and staff would directly benefit from having in the school equipment of a modern type.

I am sure that if we were to allow such things to happen on an ongoing basis we would make sure we checked with the Auditor General, explain why we are doing things, and get it done in that manner. I hope that we would not have to have this kind of statement in the Auditor General's Report very often, Mr. Speaker. It is not the kind of thing that we would like to see. But, again, it was a case of the Cabot Institute trying to do something for the benefit of their students and getting their faculty involved as well. They have done a lot of novel things at the Cabot Institute in the last few years. The other day we were over and opened a \$500,000 day care learning centre there, which really was not budgeted for, which they cut corners for, by using some of the students in their carpentry course and plumbing course to build the building and that type of thing, and did it in co-operation with the construction trades in the Province. So they do do novel things at the Cabot Institute. I hope they would not be found in the Auditor General's Report very often, Mr. Speaker,

and it would not be a normal course to have them there. But I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, of what happened at the school was for the good of the students, and that is the main purpose of it.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my friend, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt). Why will not the minister release the \$5,000 study in respect to the toxic waste at Come By Chance? Why will not the minister release that, especially in view of the fact that it was petitioned for under The Freedom of Information Act? Is the minister hiding something? Why will the minister not release it? And is it the minister's intention to release it in the near future?

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BUTT:
I thank the hon. member for his question, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter was that that was a very preliminary study that was done for Cabinet to ascertain on a very preliminary basis, like I said, what was at those two waste disposal sites in Come By Chance. Because it was used for Cabinet, for a directive, then it is not available to the public.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about a preliminary study. Does this indicate that there will be a more comprehensive study done by his department, and is that study ongoing on the present time? Is there toxic waste at Come By Chance that should be dealt with, and dealt with immediately?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

No, Mr. Speaker, and I indicated that to the mayor and the people of Come By Chance. What we found out in a preliminary study showed us that there was no great environmental threat that had to be dealt with immediately. Those two waste disposal sites have been sitting there since the refinery was started back in the early 1970s. In fact, to ascertain exactly what components are there, what chemicals are there, there will be a more comprehensive study done just as soon as this snow is gone, because we cannot go out there drilling right now and taking core samples of soil. We do not feel there is imminent danger to anyone. We do not feel that it is going to contaminate any water supplies or anything like that in Come By Chance. There is going to be a more comprehensive study done in the Spring. If, at that time, that study tells us that we have to spend a considerable amount of money to clean it up, then obviously we are going to do it. We feel at this time that is it a very minor job.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a new question, actually.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is a final supplementary.

MR. CALLAN:

No. I have a new question for the Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, I would like to recognize the hon. the member for Menihek now.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier, who just left, but I am hoping he will be able to come back in a second. It has to do with the imminent sale of Fishery Product International, or the putting on sale of its shares, which I understand will be progressing approximately the end of March.

My question to the Premier, or to whoever else can answer it, if there is someone else who wishes to, is that in the announcements of the sale there have been a number of features of the sale designed to make sure that the control of the operation -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech. Maybe he would ask his question.

MR. FENWICK:

My question to the Premier or his

representative is: What are the mechanisms that will be in place with the sale of FPI shares to ensure that the control of FPI remains within Newfoundland and within Canada? Do you want me to repeat that part of the question? The Premier just arrived.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think I understand what the hon. member is saying.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In the process of privatization of FPI, what mechanisms are being put in place to ensure that ownership stays within the Province?

MR. FENWICK:

Control.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Control. Well, as the hon. member knows, no doubt, the majority of the Board of Directors have to be resident in the Province. That is the key, because these are the people who are going to be making decisions from time to time on the company. So a majority of the Board of Directors have to be resident in the Province. Of course, as the hon. member also knows, there is a provision which prevents any major concentration of shares going to any one company, either in Canada or worldwide, because there is a share restriction of 15 per cent on it.

Those are the two main areas: One, the Board of Directors having to have a majority of their membership resident in Newfoundland; and, of course, the 15 per cent prevents any kind of concentration by a small group of people somewhere else.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I know a majority on the Board of Directors are supposed to be resident in Newfoundland. My supplementary question is: What is the mechanism for ensuring that? Is that the internal policies of FPI as a free company? Is it legislation that will be enacted? How is that going to be done?

My second part of the question, on the share limitations, is if we are trying to keep control of it, why are we trying to sell \$25 million of these shares in Europe?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know if we are trying to sell \$25 million in Europe. What FPI are doing, of course, is holding meetings. They had meetings here in St. John's for anybody interested, and in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver, and now they are in Europe, in London as of the weekend, as all corporations do when they are about to go to the stock market, presenting their story to raise funds. So I do not know how much FPI is going to raise in Europe versus how much in Canada versus how much in Newfoundland. So I cannot answer that question. I did not know that there was a figure put on it at all, so that is news to me.

The other part of the question was?

MR. FENWICK:

How do we ensure control of FPI stays in Newfoundland?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is part of the agreement between the former shareholders, the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada and the Bank of Nova Scotia. There will be amendments coming into the House which will hopefully cover that. I think it covers that as well. So it is subject to legal agreements between the government and FPI. A majority of the Board of Directors will have to be residents of the Province through the agreement signed between the governments.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am confused because I have looked at the prospectus and that does not seem to be the situation. Is it not true that what we will be doing is amending the Corporations Act here, which currently would not allow for a majority of Newfoundlanders to be permanently on the board of directors, and the restriction of 15 per cent of the shareholders. Are we not just enabling the company to have its own internal policies such that will give these protections - in fact, there are really no legal provisions envisaged; when I say 'legal' I mean no legislative provisions envisaged - that would actually anchor down the control of this operation in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will have to check the particulars of it, Mr. Speaker, but at the very least there are agreements, which I guess are legally binding, between FPI and the governments, which will be legally binding, upon the company, as I understand it. I will bow, until I get additional information on it, to ensure what is the exact legal mechanism that is going to be used to ensure that the majority of the board are residents of Newfoundland. I will get that for the hon. member.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, could the Premier tell the House what provision is made, in the prospectus, for the privatization of FPI, to give Newfoundlanders some priority in the purchase of shares of that company?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, first of all - I will come to the question within ten of fifteen seconds - that the presentations that FPI have been making over the last week or so are going extremely well, and they went very well in Newfoundland. As a result of that, as a result of the interest both throughout Canada, and, no doubt, now in Europe, although I have not been talking to them since they have gone to Europe, the FPI management, the people who are doing the presentations, were becoming

concerned because the interest is so high everywhere, that they want to ensure that Newfoundlanders are given a fair opportunity, not only big corporate Newfoundlanders but the small investor. There are now initiatives being taken by FPI, which will become known after their presentations are done, which will ensure that Newfoundlanders have a very, very fair -

MR. W. CARTER:
Priority.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, somewhat of a priority. I am choosing my words very carefully, primarily because they are still on the road doing their presentations to investors around the world. I can talk to the hon. member outside the House. I can assure the hon. member, in no uncertain terms, that the people of FPI are making sure that not only big investors in Newfoundland, but smaller investors in Newfoundland, will have an opportunity to purchase shares in the company.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to bring the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, back to the mismanagement of funds, as pointed out by the Auditor General, by the present administration. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, does she agree with the way in which the Department of Transportation paid out almost \$3 million for goods that were not even received?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, the Auditor General's Report, tabled only last week, will be looked at in the normal course of work by officials of the Justice Department. Any legal advice that they may give to the Department of Transportation will be directed that way.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I clearly asked the Minister of Justice not what here colleagues were going to do in the Department of Justice, but does she agree with the fact that the Department of Transportation, as has been clearly stated by the Auditor General's Report, paid out \$3 million without receiving any goods? Is this the policy of the government, that you pay for goods before you receive them?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, the document speaks for itself, and the Auditor General's comments are there. The response of the Department of Transportation is there. My personal opinion does not enter into it. If there is a legal question it will be dealt with in the normal course of events and any legal advice given by the Justice Department to other branches of the government is not appropriate for questions in Question Period. I would refer

the hon. member to Beauchesne, page 133, citation 360, "Some further limitations seem to be generally understood. A question may not:

(1) ask a solution of a legal question, such as the interpretation of a statute.

(2) seek information about matters which are in their nature secret, such as advice given to the Crown by the Law Officers."

MR. DAWE:
The rules that we live by.

MS VERGE:
At any rate, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's Report and the Department of Transportation's response are public documents and speak for themselves.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Let me put the question to the Minister of Justice another way. As a minister of the government does she agree with the way in which the Department of Transportation paid out almost \$3 million?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, again the member for Port de Grave is violating the rules of the House. Clearly that question must be directed to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe).

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I come back to the minister again re this mismanagement with this \$100 million in a Japanese bank. The minister indicated to me in the last question that she did not condone breaking of the law. Well, now that the minister knows that the law was broken I am not asking her what she has done but I am going to ask her what she now intends to do?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated my reply when the member posed the question earlier.

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

MR. KELLAND:
I have a quick question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell). I will say that I have read his correspondence in connection with the increase on soft drink prices in Happy Valley - Goose Bay on old stock. I have read the correspondence and I would like to ask the minister if he has determined the legality or illegality of such a price increase by the manufacturers and not the distributors?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. We have referred the matter to the federal authorities under the Competition Act and given them all the information that we have on it, and they are going to determine, one way or the other, if there is any evidence to point to any charges being laid, or whatever. They have not gotten back to us yet to let us know what their decision has been. There is no provincial statute, under my department at least, that will give us any authority to take any kind of legal action.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I thank the minister for that information because we are still waiting to hear the final word.

I wonder perhaps would it be appropriate to ask the minister's personal opinion on that sort of an arrangement? Obviously it is quite unfair when you consider that the stock is very old, that it comes in in the Fall, the prices have been increased substantially, over \$2 a case, and people are forced to pay that increased amount. He knows all the details. Would he care to express a personal opinion on the fairness or properness of that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned on another occasion in this House that Ministers of the Crown are

not entitled to personal opinions. Certainly as the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs, I, as the hon. member may already be aware, have written the heads of the two companies involved, I have spoken to them by telephone within a couple of days of the incident taking place, and I let them know, reasonably strongly, that I am not, as the minister, happy at all with what I referred to as retroactive prices on old stock that has been in Labrador for some time, and that I was going to have the whole matter investigated by whatever means possible. I, too, would like to get the results of the evidence that we have presented to the federal people. I will check that tomorrow and see where it is.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before moving to the next item, I have great pleasure in welcoming to the visitor's gallery a former member of this House, Mrs. Ida Reid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Encouragement And Regulation Of An Aquaculture Industry In The Province," carried. (Bill No. 11).

On motion, Bill No. 11 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The School Attendance

Act, 1978," carried. (Bill No. 5).

On motion, Bill No. 5 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Order 1.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, there is something mysterious happening in this current Session of the House. We were led to believe this Winter that the House would open for a two day debate on this important fisheries resolution. Now, we had two days debate and now we have put it in abeyance. We were told that the Liberal Opposition was trying to hold up passing this important resolution so that the Canada/France agreement could be rescinded.

Mr. Speaker, while we want members to speak, we want to get this debate done and over with so that we can send this resolution, and hopefully an all-party delegation, unlike the other resolutions that we have had passed. The NATO resolution is an example. Last year we were suppose to send an all-party delegation to try and persuade certain parties to see that the NATO base went in Goose Bay.

We want to get this resolution debated and passed. It seems to me that the Premier must have been playing a few of his little dramatics again when he made the statement this Fall that he wanted the House open for two days, and

then wanted to close it down again to get the fisheries resolution out of the way. Now, here we are in the Address in Reply, which I am sure can wait somewhat, and the fisheries resolution is still on the Order Paper. Just what is going on here? Is the government going to live up to its commitment to get this resolution passed quickly, and to get onto Ottawa? Or are we just seeing another little bit of fooling around by the Premier and the government opposite?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no point of order there at all. The fisheries resolution was called for a number of days, and hon. members had an opportunity to speak on it. It can be called again. I am sure if we have not started on the Address in Reply, that was called last Friday, before long the Opposition would be saying, 'we have the Speech from The Throne and we have had no opportunity to debate the Address in Reply.' In any case, the motion has been called, Order 1, Address in Reply.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. CARTER:

This is absurd. It is wasting the time of the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not meant at all to be absurd. It is meant -

MR. PEACH:

Ottawa flicked you out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, is there some way of restraining your friend, I say advisedly.

Mr. Speaker, my friend for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) makes an excellent point. Here is an issue that goes to the very root of the Newfoundland soul and the Newfoundland economy. We want to have it debated. The provision is here, and I appeal to the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) to call Motion 1 or - if I may get his attention just for a moment?

MR. CALLAN:

You probably will not.

MR. J. CARTER:

We not only see you, we see through you.

MR. SIMMONS:

Could the Government House Leader indicate to the House if there is any particular reason why Motion 1 is not being called? If there is a housekeeping reason or some other reason why they are going to call it tomorrow instead of today, that is understandable. Is there some particular reason why it is not being called at this time? Or is this the end of this motion effectively? Is it going to die on the Order Paper?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am quite prepared to rule on

that point of order. There is no point of order. The business of the House is called by the hon. the Government House Leader.

The Address in Reply.

The hon. the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands adjourned the debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

He is not here.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only about half an hour that each of us gets to speak on the Address in Reply, and apart from saying that I think it was a good Speech from The Throne and it fairly put the priorities of the government in perspective, I would rather get on to some other matters.

I have one in particular I wish to raise during the brief time that members have to speak in this House. There are fifty-two of us, and if we each spoke for half an hour, that would be twenty-six hours.

Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to the CBC for notifying me that some particular legislation is supposed to be coming forward in this House in this session. The CBC programme Here And Now some nights ago indicated to me that

this legislation was of an urgent nature, and it was long overdue. The reality, I think, is something quite different. It is a particular piece of legislation that I am extremely alarmed about, and I think it is time that this concern was aired right now. The piece of legislation I am talking about is legislation to license chiropractors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that there is probably no more dangerous bunch of quacks loose in society today than chiropractors. Your Honour, of course, cannot take part in this debate, but I think any medical man will tell you that these people are the most fraudulent quacks that it is possible to let loose upon the public.

The experience of people who have suffered back pains and various other ailments, and the amount of funds that they have been stripped of at their hands, is quite substantial. There is nothing, as far as I know - and I have done some research into this - that a chiropractor can purport to do for you that a physiotherapist cannot do and does do every day of his or her working life.

I think the person who was being interviewed on this programme was speaking about the college of chiropractic study in Toronto. Now, it so happens, Mr. Speaker, that I stumbled upon that college some years ago while driving in the East End of Toronto, and it is approximately the size of two metrobuses. Hon. members are invited to make enquiries on their own. It is the most fraudulent institution that you could imagine. If a college can be that size, then I say that the science of miniaturization has progressed

a long way since I left school.

MR. CALLAN:

Was it side by side?

MR. J. CARTER:

One on top of the other, that is about the volume.

MR. SIMMONS:

Was it a two story building or one?

MR. J. CARTER:

It is two stories, I think, but two very small stories.

It is quite obvious what the chiropractors want. They want recognition so that they can get paid by medicare. Of course, medicare already is hard pressed for funds. If we add to the pressure on medicare, the pressure that this fraudulent practice will cause, then obviously we are looking at quite a substantial extra sum for medicare.

I have already said something against denturists, and I will not unsay anything I have said against them, but I will say this: I think that chiropractors are worse than denturists. At least denturists do some work, however inferior, but chiropractors do nothing more than mumble a bit of mumbo jumbo and rub their hands up and down your back and then suggest to you that you are cured, or about to be cured or will be cured if you come back every day for \$15, \$20 or \$25 a time.

Now I think it is high time that this House took the bit between its teeth and used its undoubted powers to look into the possibility of this practice being ended and these creatures being hounded out of our Province.

CBC suggested to us that we were

behind the times by not having these people here and licenced. I find it very hard to understand how anyone can seriously promote these, and I am not asking hon. gentlemen, or the press, to take my word for it. I say go and ask the medical profession, go and ask the people who do know, go and ask those who have to work with patients every day and find out from them.

Some years ago I was interviewed about the role of a person in the House of Assembly, and more particularly about the House of Assembly in general. I was asked what good does the House do and what powers does it have? After thinking about it for a while I concluded that the real value of the House of Assembly is that it enables the members to change public attitudes. But this does not happen quickly. It only happens after a long period of time. I do not expect those people who believe that chiropractors are good to change their minds overnight, but I do think that dragging this issue out into the open and perhaps initiating either a debate in this House or else a public debate, or else to put it on the front burner instead of leaving it on the back burner where it has been too long, I think that this may make for some change in attitude. I think it is a change that is long overdue, because hundreds of people, perhaps thousands of people, who are suffering real pain, will go to these creatures instead of going to their family doctor for proper medical attention.

Now I realize that in the past it has been hard to get in to see doctors and if you are in pain and you are suffering you want to go

and see someone and of course these people I think are preying upon that natural desire.

It would be, in my view, Mr. Speaker, a step backwards to licence these people, because I cannot see the essential difference between them and astrologers and various other medieval types, and if the medieval is so good, why do we not just step back into time? We are able to put men on the moon and yet we are not able to talk sensibly or deal sensibly with frauds like these. I would urge the House, and I would urge the members of the House and I would urge the public generally, to take a very long, hard look at these people and perhaps expose them.

Rather than take up more time of the House - I have said what I wanted to say - I think that this is the most important thing I could say. I do hope that any bill that comes forward will be a bill to run them out of the Province and not one to welcome them or to ease their way here. So I will take my seat and if someone wants to discuss it further, by all means, but if they do not, I am sure there are other positions that people want to talk about.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will try and return the debate to the question at hand, the response in reply to the Throne Speech.

In rising to make my first speech in the Chamber, I would like to take a few minutes in the beginning to talk about the district that I am representing, St. John's East, and to also make a note of thanks to the people of St. John's East, the many fine people that I have met over the last couple of years and am continuing to meet as I take my office and do my best to represent them.

St. John's East, of course, is known as a very historic area, and as an historic district it has made history once again in electing the first NDP member from the Island portion of the Province to the Legislature, and I am sure the people of the district will continue to play a part in making history in the political life of this Province. I think they not only sent the government a message on polling day, during the opportunity they had in the by-election to send a message, but have also, in me, sent a messenger to the Legislature.

I am proud to take my seat and to begin to learn the rules of the Legislature. I want to extend a note of thanks to many of the hon. members who made a point of making me feel welcome and comfortable. I might mention the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) who made special note of the presence of a second member of this party in his remarks in reply to the Throne Speech and say that not only will we, as he suggested, be bringing a new point of view to the parliament and making our contribution to developing more respect for rules and demeanor in the House, but that he, like most other hon. members, had better keep an eye over their shoulder because with St. John's East and

Labrador West we have, as someone said to me the other day, the book ends of the Province and over time we will be moving across the Province to develop more and bring more members from the NDP into the House.

To talk about my district a little bit from a new and democratic perspective I would like to just say that I think the people I am representing in many ways comprise a composite picture of the population of our Province with the attendant issues and problems that can be found across the Province. There are two areas in the district of St. John's East that are fishing communities, that have problems similar to people across the Province who are working in the fishery. In particular, the fishermen out at the Battery have, for a long, long, long time, been working on both levels of government to get some support in their efforts to have a breakwater put in there. In my conversations with them in the last couple of weeks, when I went out to have a look at some damage that was done by an avalanche of snow from the hill and the stages which they had made themselves over the years were damaged by ice, I got a real sense of the history of frustration that they have experienced in trying to work with the federal and provincial difficulties of jurisdiction of getting support for a breakwater. That is something that I intend to take up, if not in this Chamber then through the federal officials.

There is often a romantic view of the fishermen out at the Battery. Tourist pamphlets and tourist promotion love to talk about the fishermen in St. John's, but when it comes to actually giving them

any kind of institutional support, it is non-existent.

The Village of Quidi Vidi, which is also a very historic part of my district, I took a drive through in the last couple of days because I was getting repeated phone calls from people who are facing incredible difficulty with snow clearing. I was made aware of another jurisdictional problem that I have to do my best to make sense of, and that is issues that are the responsibility of the municipal government. Again, people love to talk about Quidi Vidi, the fishing village that it is, and to go and visit there, but for people who might want to take a drive through there these days it is very difficult. This is a problem that I am sure many small fishing villages throughout the Province are facing. So there is the problem of the romantic notion versus the reality that people are actually facing.

There is another problem of the landscape in the district that I represent, concerns that people have been bringing to me. With the proposed development of an East End Arterial, which is slated to come right through the heart of the East End of St. John's, there are concerns not only for the displacement of people, although of course that would be a primary concern in a development of that kind, but also what will happen to the face of the downtown of this City.

The problems of housing and development and new development in downtown is something that I intend to watch very closely and, where appropriate, will bring to the attention of the provincial government and provincial departments concerns about such

developments.

There is in my district a very strong, vibrant Arts Community which I am proud to represent. It is difficult sometimes to deal with the irony of members and ministers of the government, and, indeed, the Premier himself, presenting the view of the Newfoundlander with accent and mannerisms for National TV and presenting Newfoundland and Newfoundland culture to Canadian audiences, but, in the meantime, I know personally of many, many individuals who live in my district and who are struggling to survive as creative artists, artists who are essential to the development of an identity for this Province, for the people of this Province. I intend to take the cause of the Arts Community to this government and to demand some meaningful action on their behalf.

There are numerous groups in my district who represent what might be called the 'Women's Community.' There is a Transition Centre, a Women's Centre and there are many concerns being brought to me week by week, in the last couple of months, by women in my district who represent women's concerns across the Province.

There is the Janeway Children's Hospital, the General Hospital, the DVA, three major medical institutions in my district, and I have had concerns expressed to me, in particular by nurses, about the working conditions they are facing and the difficulties that anybody working in the medical profession is having to deal with on a day to day basis in this Province. The Premier rose in the House the other day and talked about the lie of people talking about cutbacks in health care and said that every

year there is an increase in the government's expenditure for health care in this Province, and the same with education, and that it is false to describe the situation as one of cutbacks. Well, you talk to people who work in the medical profession in this Province and they will tell you that if you have a 2 per cent or 3 per cent operating increase from year to year and that does not keep up with the rate of inflation and that accumulates over a period of time, it is not simply a matter of calling a spade a spade, it is actually dealing with the incredibly destructive situation that cutbacks are creating in medical institutions in the Province.

I might mention, as I have DVA, the situation of senior citizens that I met with down there who have been unable to get any support in getting a fire escape in that building housing the veterans from the Second World War. One of the concerns of senior citizens is that they are not taken seriously by governments. Certainly, the concerns that people are raising about new legislation by the federal government that will open the door to drastic increases in drug prices is a concern of senior citizens.

I would also like to mention that in my district there are some of the most developed recreational facilities in our Province: the Stadium, Quidi Vidi Lake, the site of the Annual Regatta, and the King George V Field. There are many, many people in the district who have concerns about the lack of support for amateur athletics in this Province. There is always great hype around sending teams away to the Mainland whenever an

annual sporting event comes along, but through the course of the years there are many people volunteering their work to develop amateur athletics in this Province and getting very little support from this government.

I might also make personal mention that in my district one of the other institutions worth noting is the House of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province adjacent to one of the largest parks in the city, Bannerman Park. There are real concerns about the maintenance and upgrading of open spaces in the district. I would like to personally make a note of my own support for the efforts of the Lieutenant-Governor in undertaking the work that he is doing with his family foundation.

If I may come to the Throne Speech and some of the specifics that are mentioned and also some of the general issues facing the Province, I was a bit taken aback to see that the Throne Speech began by articulating a single theme, and that was jobs, and I thought, here we go again. It is hard to believe, actually it is hard to take seriously that a government which has been talking about jobs, as this government has and the way it has for the last seven, eight years or nine years, can come in with a straight face and have the Lieutenant-Governor read a speech that has as its singular theme 'jobs.' When we move through the Throne Speech we can see that there is actually very little, once again, that is going to meet the expectations that the government invites people to have about job creation in this Province, because we are actually going to see very little in real, meaningful economic development

that is going to put people to work.

Shortly after the Throne Speech was read we had another patronage appointment, which is still the topic of much discussion on the street and in corner stores in St. John's, Mr. Hickey. People remember Hal Andrews and Joe Goudie going off to get jobs. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I was taken aback the first day I took my seat, before the Throne Speech was read, and the man who had represented my district walked in front of me in his judicial robe. I thought I was seeing a vision. It just struck me, the irony of this man, fresh from the government front benches, going into the judiciary. The next thing was more patronage appointments. It was very clear to people who were watching the opening of this House and the government's presentation of its business that the government really is providing jobs only for its own, and taking care of its own, and when it talks about jobs, it talks about jobs for its own friends.

The Throne Speech goes on to review some of the successes. I would think the description of some of the projects that are outlined in the Throne Speech as successes is a very dubious one to say the least.

Kruger in Corner Brook: The infamous Bill 39 which was brought in as a license to entice another multinational corporation into the Province, with special amendments to the Labour Standards Act, is something that workers of this Province have become very familiar with in the pattern of giveaways to corporations to come back and save face for the government.

The opening of the mine in St. Lawrence is being billed as another great success for this government, but if you go to St. Lawrence it is not very hard to be reminded of the history of that community, the graveyard being the most prominent site in the community. The new company, Minworth, that is coming in is coming in with absolutely no protection for the workers. The question of health and safety and basic protection of the workers there will remain a question for some time to come.

The Premier stood and here with great pride and gusto, rising on any occasion, to talk about Come By Chance. The promise of blowing our minds has now actually come full circle. We see the real meaning of what the Premier was saying back just a few short months ago. What we have at Come By Chance is a social disaster, a fiasco that the government has the nerve to call a success story.

The Premier said that we have no stake in Come By Chance. Well, I think the question must be asked, what would be the return on the dollar? We have paid a dollar for this thing, and what we are going to get back for it in the end is certainly an open question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

It would be greatly appreciated if all members would be silent while the hon. member for St. John's East is making his maiden speech. Could we have silence, please?

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question about Come By Chance, and I think it will be put again by many people around the Province, is what are we getting for the return on the dollar when the Premier says we have no stake in this thing?

The local preference obsession of this government is being made a farce of out there with people coming in from outside the Province, outside the country, being given retroactive immigration permits to take jobs that should go to working people in this Province. It is a scandal that continues to unfold, and the government continues to clean its hands of the situation.

There are also all kinds of questions about Cumberland Farms. The CBC documentary that was aired last week raised many good questions. With the scandalous environmental record of this company that is being brought into our Province, if they are going to be transporting oil in and out of Placentia Bay, one of the prized fishing areas of our Province, who is to be accountable for any potential environmental disaster that might happen there when you have a corporation of this kind that is famous in the United States for disregard of environmental regulations?

Another success story that the government every day in the House is bringing before the House and the people is the sale of Fishery Products International. Mr. Speaker, indeed there are many questions to be asked about the sale of FPI. For so long now we have been hearing about the fish situation being the most important question facing the Province - the

other resolution which presumably some time will come back for further discussion - and the insistence by government on this question has been a priority of control; where and when does Newfoundland have control of its own resource? At the same time, the government is about to sell off Fishery Products International. That has to raise the question what does the government mean when it is talking about control?

There is basically at work with this deal an ideology which says that only free enterprise, private corporations have a right to run profitable institutions. Any time that government has hold of an institution that is acting in the public interest and actually making a profit, then it makes no sense for government to hold on to that because that is not in the interest of the motor, the machine that drives the economy, the institutions of free enterprise and private corporations.

We are now being invited as individual Newfoundlanders to buy shares in this company and, of course, the question must be asked, what happened to the share we already had? As taxpayers, did we not already have shares in this? Now we are being asked, on a second go around, to buy shares in a different form where, in fact, there would be absolutely no public accountability to this corporation; it would be another licence to a multinational corporation to do as it will with the fishing industry, and we will give up our control, we will give it over to a corporation that has no public accountability because the government is going to say, the marketplace will dictate. And I would add to some of the

concerns that are being raised about this sale some of the concerns that were brought out recently in a report on technological change and questions of health and safety in the offshore and in the inshore and ask what measures will this government introduce to ensure that with a newly privatized corporation - FPI going into private hands - will be responsible for any of the terrible situations that are existing? The working conditions, the projected technological change that is going to happen in the trawlers and onshore, where is this corporation going to be accountable to on questions of health and safety, and when is this government going to call upon its federal counterparts to introduce labour standards legislation for health and safety in the offshore? There are many questions that remain to be asked about the sale of FPI and we in this party, on this side, are not going to let the government appear to have another success in the making because we believe that actually most of the people in the Province do not believe that this is a success story, to be selling FPI when we should be keeping it, the Province. The irony of the sale of FPI, Mr. Speaker, is to see the Premier one day in the newspaper talking about the government being virtually bankrupt, and then in the same newspaper, on the same day that the Premier is talking about the government being bankrupt, we are going to sell off this profitable corporation and the taxpayers go further and further in debt.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

MR. MITCHELL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
On a point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:
Does the NDP condone that stand that the hon. member is taking here today on Fishery Products International? I wonder if he could answer that, instead of giving us all of the garbage that he is giving us on that particular issue?

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

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

MR. FUREY:
Before the hon. member answers that, perhaps the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) could respond to why his government gave away the 25 per cent back-in which was the shares in the offshore due to our children?

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

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

MR. LONG:
I do not know if that is a point of order, but I would simply say that a representative of the Fishermen's Union is on record as saying that the sale of FPI represents a missed opportunity, that there are alternatives to private ownership that should be pursued in this Province given the history of lack of control over the industry, and that worker ownership and mixed forms of

control are something that we should pursue in the industry.

I would finally say that the only thing the government seems to be calling the people to look forward to is gold, the Hope Brook gold mine. The next chorus we are going to be hearing is that there is gold in the hills. We have gold in the offshore, now we have gold in the hills. We had a story in the newspaper the other day talking about the workers there also threatening to go on strike, and the word 'strike' in this context may take on a different meaning and that would simply reflect the reality of workers across this Province in whatever industry, in whatever sector, working for government, working for corporations, working for Crown corporations, being forced to take a militant posture, in the face of a government led attack on the rights of ordinary working people, to protect the interest of working people through their trade unions and through labour legislation. That is something that we are going to see for a long time to come.

I am not sure how much time I have left, but to begin to close on a more positive note, seeing that there is very little that the government has given us in a positive way to look forward to in turning the Province around, we in this party, on this side, will be continuing to present imaginative alternatives, imaginative proposals for what a government of this Province might do to begin to get the Province on the road to recovery - putting people back to work, taking care of people in this Province - and we, in many ways, will take our cue from the theme as articulated by the government's own Royal Commission

on Employment and Unemployment, which the government seems to have had very little to say about it in its Throne Speech, and that is one of building on our strengths.

The so-called successes that I have referred to that were brought out in the Throne Speech, move in the opposite direction of building on the strengths of the people and the communities that make up this Province.

Until and unless we begin directing institutional support to ordinary people where they are, in their communities, we are not going to see any kind of real, meaningful change in the problems that affect this Province. The syndrome of relying on multinational corporations from the outside, of mega projects, the shimmera of oil, and now gold, the big capitalists that are going to come in and bring us into the international economy, even though, at the same time, we always say that Newfoundland does not have much space or room to move because we are affected by international forces - then we ask the largest multi-national corporations in the world to come in and assist us to be integrated - it makes very little sense to continue that path and we, indeed, will insist on calling for more support for people where they are.

One example I would like to mention, that has been raised in the House, is the situation at Bay d'Espoir. We have a very exciting opportunity there and the real concerns will continue to be brought forward. We are going to turn it over now to National Sea when we actually have an opportunity that is almost a living example coming out of the pages of the Royal Commission

Report where people themselves are saying, "We would like minimal support from the government to do what we can do in our own community with our own talent, our own resources." Instead, the ministers stand up here in the House and say, Nat Sea - another corporation, this is who we take our cue from - they will lead us on the road to recovery." We will be calling for building on our strengths. We do not support some of the tendency that is throughout the Throne Speech to emphasize business, entrepreneurial skills. There is an inconsistency in saying in our schools we are going to have a Newfoundland awareness programme when actually what we are calling on young people to do is pick up their straps and go on and become young capitalists.

There is a reality in this Province that we have to bring to young people, that the entrepreneurial mode of development is not necessarily the best thing for this Province and there are basic contradictions that this government must confront. It is not going to go away and we, for our part, will continue to put in front of the government the contradictions that it would like to wish away, that day by day in communities across this Province people are seeing in their own terms the need to develop alternatives to tired old approaches that are simply not working.

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PEACH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess it would be in order to congratulate our new member of the Legislature on his fine maiden speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:
It was good to see him get up and stand on his own two feet there and say what he wanted to say. It is not necessarily in agreement with what his party would want him to say, but, however, I guess he said it.

Mr. Speaker, I would, at this time, make a few brief comments on our Throne Speech. It was great to see such a very positive Throne Speech being given by our new Lieutenant-Governor of the Province. It was indeed one of the most positive Throne Speeches that I have heard since I came into this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker, it was such an excellent Throne Speech that we have heard very few comments other than the very positive ones from the business community, from the education community and from, indeed, the entire media community. Basically, there have been no negative comments. The only negative comments that I have heard are those that came from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). Mr. Speaker, it is a very sad day in this Province when we see the leader of a political party coming in with a prepared

response to a Throne Speech. He got up and indicated clearly to all of the people who were present, not only to ourselves as members of the Legislature, but all of the community that was invited in here on the opening day of the House that he had his Throne Speech response prepared in advance. He did not know what was going to be in it, so he got up and made all of the negative comments that he had written down.

I think he really got quite a surprise when he realized, as the people who were sitting here in the Legislature, as politicians and as people from the outside community realized that it was not a negative Throne Speech at all. In fact, it was, indeed, a very positive one. He blew his chance again of trying to show his leadership to the party that he is supposed to represent. According to many of his friends in caucus, I am sure that is questionable. It is very sad, Mr. Speaker, that we have such negativism coming out in a response that was not at all seen that way by the people of the Province.

I had the privilege last week of visiting three of four schools in my district. It was surprising that so many of the students during Education Week commented on the positive upbeat of things in recent weeks in the Province. It is surprising how many students, particularly those now doing the new democracy classes in Grade XII, pay attention to what is happening in our Legislature. Just to see this negative thing come out from our Leader of the Opposition is sad indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I would have to commend my two friends and

colleagues -

MR. TULK:

The students walked out, I heard.

MR. PEACH:

No, Mr. Speaker, the students did not walk out. As a matter of fact, I received a petition from one of the schools concerning the Canada/France fish agreement which I will hopefully get a chance to comment on in the continuing debate on the resolution that is on the Order Paper.

My good friends, the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) and the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), did an excellent job indeed, one of them being newly elected, of course. I have to congratulate him on his great victory. He is newly elected and has spoken already, Mr. Speaker, on a couple of occasions in this hon. House and has spoken well. I am sure that the people in St. John's East Extern are very proud of the contribution that he has already made, and I am sure it is a contribution that he will continue to make to represent the people in that great historic Tory district of St. John's East Extern.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Humber West did a very good job indeed on making his views known on, I guess, the other part of the Province, the West Coast. It is a little unfortunate that he is not here today. I would have made a few probably more positive comments on him. I guess he is home following the Corner Brook - Stephenville hockey game tonight. So, he is not here with us today.

Mr. Speaker, the highlights of the Throne Speech are many really. I would just briefly want to make some comments on a few in my

somewhat limited time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave.

MR. PEACH:

Well, I would gladly go on to six o'clock, if the hon. members would want me to.

The theme of the Throne Speech itself is that of job creation, and creating meaningful employment in Newfoundland and Labrador. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Opposition were very saddened today to learn that, as a result of an announcement today by our minister in the federal Cabinet, that another 150 or so jobs will be created in the offshore. That is not something that I am sure the Opposition likes to hear. It is something that is not positive to their ears. I am sure to all of the other Newfoundlanders who were listening today it is positive indeed.

The recognition, Mr. Speaker, of the small scale developments and the service industries that we have in this Province is something, I am sure, that is long overdue. We cannot, as the Premier has said many times, put all of our eggs into one basket. We have to realize, Mr. Speaker, that apart from our fishery and apart from our offshore development, apart from our mining and apart from our forestry, in many of our communities throughout this Province that the small service industries, the small community-based industries, are the ones that provide a great deal of employment. Quite often we do not realize the numbers that we are talking about in small industries in communities in rural Newfoundland. So it is good and

very positive indeed that this new initiative to finance and to encourage the smaller industries in our Province to become involved and to take on a role themselves in creating employment was recognized in the Throne Speech.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the new post-secondary education system with the five regional colleges is something that has been commented on, of course, when the White Paper was released on it and since then with the actual set up as a result of feedback and as a result of comments from the educators in the Province. Now this new system that was designed and accepted by all of the educators will come on stream in this year. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all look forward to some more positive things in our budget in the next short while which will see the actual funding put in place for the continuation of the reorganization of the vocational school system, now the college system.

Also, Mr. Speaker, another highlight of the Throne Speech was the expansion of the Rural Development Authority. I am sure we all realize that funding was provided through that Authority for a processing and manufacturing only, really, but now, to see that it is expanded to take in the service sector, is indeed encouraging. Over the last week since the Throne Speech was read here in the House, I have had a number of calls from people who are indeed encouraged, people who are seeking some, I guess, direction as to where they should go with regard to establishing and creating some meaningful employment in the Province.

As well, Mr. Speaker, last, but by no means least, as a thrust out of

the Throne Speech is the new youth entrepreneur programme because we have to realize, of course, that our youth are the people who, I suppose, are suffering the most in this Province. It is not always easy for students out of university and out of the various other post secondary institutions to find meaningful employment. Over the past several years we have had downturns in our economy not only, Mr. Speaker, in the Province but in the whole of Atlantic Canada and, indeed, the Western World. Mr. Speaker, now that some new thrust has been put forth, it is indeed encouraging.

In just looking at some other brief parts of the Throne Speech, I notice there, Mr. Speaker, and welcome the news that over the past few years the prospects of development of our offshore resource has been sort of beyond our grasp. In recent weeks, as was indicated - and indicated by the Premier as well - negotiations between both levels of government, the federal, provincial, and of course the business partners in the Hibernia field have proceeded well. We all hope, I guess, as was indicated, that before long that some positive fiscal arrangements can be reached and that a permit to start this project will come on stream.

Mr. Speaker, it is not related, I suppose, or not an announcement on the Hibernia field, but it was only today an announcement was made on the Terra Nova oil field production potential.

This year we will see the Sedco 710 drilling again. It is presently, I understand, tied up in my friend's district in Marystown. It is one of the three oil rigs that is in there being

serviced in our own Province with some 150 jobs being created. The cost of this development as announced today is somewhere between \$500 million and \$1 billion.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is also very positive to note that this type of development was indicated in our Throne Speech of last week, and just a week after we have something positive on our offshore development. Of course, the drilling of those two delineation wells will not only provide work directly within the offshore, but there is much more work for the service industries; there is much more work for the catering, and for the helicopter companies. I am sure that this, in itself, will indicate clearly that the offshore oil and gas development is on the brink of starting. Something such as this, in what the Opposition have hoped would not become a reality, to me, Mr. Speaker, today is a step closer to becoming a reality.

I am sure, as our federal minister said today in his news conference, Petro-Canada's decision to go ahead with the Terra Nova development probably, Mr. Speaker, should serve as a signal to Mobil Oil that the development of the Newfoundland offshore is just around the corner. I am sure it will probably make the negotiations run somewhat smoother in the few weeks or months ahead until we get some positive announcement on that.

Mr. Speaker, as well, of course, if we just continue to look at the offshore development, I noted in the Throne Speech that the development fund in keeping up with the terms of the manner in which it was established under the

Atlantic Accord is also being used to defray some social and economic infrastructure costs as it relates to development. Mr. Speaker, it was only last week, just a few days after the Throne Speech, that we found that some \$66 million was allocated in a joint agreement between the federal and provincial governments to put some of our infrastructure, to put some of our education programmes in place so that our young Newfoundlanders will have some meaningful employment created over the next number of years.

MR. TOBIN:

It keeps people in his own district working. Tell him.

MR. PEACH:

It is all very well, Mr. Speaker, for the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to squirm in his seat there. He is not prepared to get up and tell the people in the Come By Chance area, to tell the people in the Bellevue district, that he is against them finding employment. He has not taken a stand, if he is for the union workers or if he is against the union workers. I am sure that many of the people, Mr. Speaker, out in the Bellevue district who have found meaningful employment would like to hear what the member for Bellevue's stand is. He is not for creating 300 jobs in Come By Chance. He would just hope, Mr. Speaker, that it would close down.

I will stand up any day, Mr. Speaker, and let my views be known on the way I feel about workers in this Province. Workers, Mr. Speaker, from my district have travelled all around this Province and many of them are members of unions and many of them are not. I am sure that they all have found employment, Mr. Speaker, when they

wanted to. They all have equal rights. If they want to take employment with Marco Construction or if they want to take employment with Newfoundland Energy or if they want to take employment with some other company who is or is not unionized, that is their own God given right and their own choice to make. It is not for a government, and this government, I am sure, will not dictate to them what they should do. So probably the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) should get up and give his stand when he returns to the House.

Mr. Speaker, to continue on and not be sidetracked by the insignificant representative that the people from Bellevue are getting from the present member, it was only a short while ago, or a few years ago that he has his brochure out outlining what he was going to do when he became Transportation Minister. Well, Mr. Speaker, since then we have had a couple of elections and unfortunately, I guess, for the people of Bellevue, he was re-elected. But I get my equal coverage, Mr. Speaker, through all the media in the Province, through CHVO, through Q Radio, through The Compass, through The Evening Telegram, and I do not have to put in paid ads like the member does.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

VOWR included.

MR. PEACH:

VOWR included, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I did notice as well an area that I have been very closely associated with since day one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, could I have some silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. member for Carbonear is debating.

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, it was indicated very clearly in the Throne Speech that -

MR. TULK:

They are laughing at you over there 'Milt.'

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PEACH:

- this government in this session would introduce legislation providing the re-organized post-secondary system and that this system, Mr. Speaker, would be in place come September of 1987.

Now this new system with its three institutes and the five regional community colleges, of course, along with our Memorial University and the Cabot Institute, will bring more access to the youth of this Province, Mr. Speaker, so that their education opportunities will be more accessible to them out in rural Newfoundland. I was very pleased indeed of course that the headquarters for the Avalon community college system which serves the member for Bellevue's area, serves it well, will be located not only in the Carbonear district but in the Town of Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very positive step for things happening on the Avalon Peninsula, not as members would like to see everything happening 'inside the Overpass,' as they say, but as a matter of fact the new Avalon Community College headquarters office, which will take in the old District Vocational School on Bell Island, the Topsail Road campus, the Seal Cove District Vocational School, the one in Placentia, and the one in Carbonear.

So, Mr. Speaker, all of those former district vocational schools now will become regional colleges with their campuses is a great positive step. I hope over the next few weeks, as a matter of fact, Memorial University will see fit to introduce a first year programme into some of those colleges at least. I am looking forward to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) before too long announcing the advisory committees and the boards of governors for those institutes, as well as the chief executive officers because I am sure that many of our students out in the Province and our educators are waiting for this thing to get fully onstream and to provide an education system that is long overdue and was long overdue for a change.

As well, Mr. Speaker, it was only last week that out of that development fund some \$21 million was allocated for training programmes and for education programmes, not only at the university, but for training and for equipment in all of our post-secondary institutions around this Province. So just short of a week after the Throne Speech with this direction, many of those

things were and have been since done.

Mr. Speaker, as the Throne Speech put its direction into job creation, I was indeed very pleased that very clear reference was made to what we have I guess called the ten week syndrome. I am sure any person in the Province today must realize the fact that many of our people have had to rely on finding some make-work programmes for ten weeks. It is a sad day when we get into a syndrome where we rely on only ten weeks work. As I said, the government of the day, will, during this year, introduce a comprehensive package of programmes that are designed to improve our effectiveness in creating some meaningful jobs so that we can rid ourselves of this ten week syndrome. Of course, the long-term job creation is the thing that I refer to. The short-term is okay as it is meant for in the short-term, but we have to look, Mr. Speaker, to the long-term.

I am sure with the recommendation that came from the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment and the indication by our government in the Throne Speech that the private sector should become involved on a cost shared fifty/fifty basis now means that many of our small businesses will be able to participate in the job creation process. I am sure we realize the fact that for months and longer, as has been clearly pointed out in the Throne Speech, we will hopefully now be rid of this ten week syndrome that we have unfortunately become accustomed to.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, one of the highlights

of the Throne Speech was expanding the mandate of the Rural Development Authority and the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation with some new initiatives. I think that those new initiatives indeed were ones that are new and ones that, from the response that I have gotten around my district in particular, are welcome.

The Rural Development regulations are to be amended so that an expanded lending programme will include now many of the service sector enterprises which, as I said earlier, were the groups that were left out before. A lending programme from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation is to be broadened into the service sector as well. Apart from providing some start-up grants and loan combinations, we do need a longer term lending programme so that the service sector and the service industry, the smaller ones of rural Newfoundland, can plan themselves and look at a long range plan rather than the short-term.

Of course, the Venture Capital Programme of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation again is to be expanded. The New Business Equity Programme will, of course, make conditions such that the chances of success of some smaller service sector groups will be enhanced and it will, of course, in that way reduce their borrowing requirements.

The Youth Entrepreneurship Programme will, for the first time, provide young entrepreneurs with access to risk capital and a substantial business support system. I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to realize that this is the first time ever that we have made

this opportunity available to the youth of the Province so that they can now, I suppose, take on some entrepreneur type development that fits into their education.

Of course, one of the other things that I am sure will have a great of attention focused on is what has been referred to in the Throne Speech as one stop shopping. I think, Mr. Speaker, hopefully, this will cut down on much of the red tape and much of the frustrations that we all realize our people have to go through when they deal with the bureaucracy. Mr. Speaker, the one stop shopping thing, I am sure, will add greatly to the accessibility for our business community to take part in many of the investor opportunities that we do have out there. In all, Mr. Speaker, it is a very positive Throne Speech.

We cannot forget, of course, our fishery.

Reference was made to the Canada/France fishing agreement. I would not want to go on with this this afternoon in the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech because I want to allocate some time to that over the next few days and make my views known on the way that I feel that the deal has been handled, not only by our federal government, but by the federal M.P. in the riding that I am part, Bonavista - Trinity - Conception.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it was summed up very well towards the end of the Throne Speech when it said that the theme of the address, and the preoccupation of the government is jobs, meaningful employment for our citizens. This must be the most sought after goal. I think that is the very

positive thing that has come out of this Throne Speech, the creation of jobs. We have seen them already over the last few days with the co-operation that we now have between our federal and provincial governments. Of course, with our new minister responsible for the development of the offshore, I am sure that with his expertise, with his great negotiating ability, with his great compromising ability that, over the next number of weeks, we will see many positive things happen. I am sure that the people in the Province, Mr. Speaker, will appreciate those things and as time goes on that we will get due credit for it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) certainly is quite capable of reading out what he is told to say because, if he was at all a bit constructive and a bit concerned about the people of the Province, he would certainly said something against what his administration is doing because it is certainly not doing anything to boost the morale or any thing else in this Province.

MR. PEACH:

Name something, name something!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, as one of the members of the Opposition, welcome the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) into the House I congratulate him on his maiden speech, but at the same time, there are two questions on my mind. Everytime he said the word 'capitalist' he put a special emphasis on it as if it were something that is dirty, and that we did not need. So I would like at some time, possibly sometime in the very near future, that the gentleman could explain his feelings about capitalism and exactly what he is talking about?

The other question, Mr. Speaker, at the same time, I would like to say very clearly that in all of his thirty minutes he condemned the government which is rightly so, because they certainly need that, he did a fine job in point out where the government is falling down on jobs and where the government is not doing the proper thing. But one of the things concerned our fishery, vital to the whole Province, inshore, offshore. We all know the fishery is the backbone of our Province. Without the fishery, Newfoundland does not exist, rural Newfoundland or urban Newfoundland does not exist.

The very thing that his party nationwide has been very vocal on and very supportive on, and I have not heard him yet comment on it, is Greenpeace. We know from all evidence shown that Greenpeace has destroyed the future of the Newfoundland fishery. They stopped the seal fishery in this Province. The whole party provincially and nationally have

done this, and we know. I would like to at sometime ask both members of the party, the leader and his colleague, to comment on where they stand personally on our seal fishery. If they can condone what is being happening, if they can condone the destruction of the seal -

MR. FENWICK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

The point of order is, the hon. member has called into question there and asked about our policy with regards to the seal hunt. The answer quite simply is that our federal council just a month ago passed a new resolution supporting the seal fishery and putting in place some of the positive aspects of the recent federal inquiry. If the member wishes, we will be glad to send him a copy of the resolution that was adopted about a month ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I would ask the member -

MR. SIMMONS:

Are you on the point of order?

MR. EFFORD:

No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

At the same time, I would ask the member, at some time in the future would he put forth a resolution condemning Greenpeace -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

- and would he explain to this House why the members of his party have contributed very large sums of money to the Greenpeace organization?

MR. FENWICK:

Why do members of the Liberal Party contribute to it?

MR. TULK:

They do not.

MR. FUREY:

Name one.

MR. EFFORD:

Back to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. I think one of the most serious things that is happening to our Province today when it comes to the lack of jobs is the morale. That is one thing that the members of this government are not recognizing, the morale that is being caused by the government and the morale that is being spread through this Province. The thing about it is, Mr. Speaker, as long as we have this situation in this Province, we are going to have a lowering of the morale of the people and when we have have that happen, Mr. Speaker -

My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, are whispering in my ear and it is

very difficult to speak when you have people whispering in your ear.

Getting back, Mr. Speaker, to the morale of this Province, it is at the lowest possible ebb it ever could be. We have constantly heard the Peckford administration tell us every time that we stand and every question that we ask in this House they will always make reference, 'well, it was the former Liberals who done it, it was the former Liberal who caused all of these problems, it was the former Liberals who made the agreement with Ottawa, it was the former Liberals who signed the fishery restructuring agreement.'

The former Liberals have not been in power in Newfoundland since I think it was 1971 and this is now 1987. For approximately sixteen years we have had a former Liberal government out of power in Newfoundland yet everything that takes place in the Province, every mistake the Tories have made is blamed on the former Liberals. That speaks to the ability of the ministers opposite and the Premier of this Province to do anything about what is happening in this situation that we have where almost 80,000 people are unemployed.

Now, you can put a Throne Speech on paper. In fact, I think it was easiest Throne Speech they had ever written because they just copied the previous one. The only mistake was that they went to the printers. They should have just went to a photocopier because it would have been a much cheaper process. When you spend all this money in printing, for a government that is near bankruptcy, instead of just photocopying, then we see exactly what is happening, a waste of

funds. In fact my desk right here now is so cluttered with expensive literature, thousands upon thousands upon thousands of dollars gone in printing, but then again I guess probably some of our Tory buddies are in the printing business. It is not unlike the Tory administration to pay out a few patronage fees and to give their buddies help in boosting up their business profits or boosting up their jobs. Of course, that do not happen very often, probably once a day we are getting a patronage appointment.

One time when an appointment exceeded \$20,000, I thought that was an enormous amount of money. Now we see that they are taking into consideration the poverty line and they do not want any of their buddies to exist on that menial amount of \$20,000 to \$25,000. Now we see that they have to secure their buddies in a position exceeding \$100,000. A \$62,000 appointment to the Young Offenders Board where, possibly the board may meet, well, in the year 1986 I think there was about eight or nine meetings. Let us say they meet ten times this year. That is approximately \$6,200 for each meeting that could possible last - let us give it two hours, three hours maximum - a three hour meeting.

We are paying our hon. friend \$150 an hour, that well known lawyer downtown, Mr. Cabot Martin. Then that great revelation of all oil barrons out in Alberta, that magnificent brain that we had to bring in from Alberta to put us in the situation where we have absolutely no development of Hibernia at all, we thought that he was going to be paid \$40,000. Naturally he had to have a few expenses, like probably \$30,000 or

\$40,000 worth of hotel expenses, and another \$30,000 or \$40,000 worth of meals and cocktails. That would not have been too bad, \$100,000. Out of a treasury that we have overflowing with bankruptcy threats, \$100,000 from that would not be too bad.

But no, our Tory buddies, God help us, we have to look after our buddies. Just think about the buddies, \$40,000 goes to \$100,000. Now we find out it is \$440,000. Now, through the grapevine we found that out, no public announcement by the government. How much more is behind the scenes? How much more that we have not even heard of? How much more have they paid this gentleman? We have found out about \$440,000. Possibly another \$400,000; possibly \$1 million!

Then again, if you look at the Auditor General's Report and see the mode that the Department of the Transportation took where they paid out \$300,000 before they received goods, they have possibly got Mr. Lougheed advanced \$2 million for what he is going to do next year, or possibly the year 2020. That would be more like it.

I am a small businessman. I would love to deal with a company who would pay me for my goods before I deliver them to them. My problem is I have to send somebody out with a club to try to get the money out of them. But this government says, 'No, do not give us any goods.'

MR. TOBIN:

You are foolish, boy, you are.

MR. EFFORD:

Well, the Auditor General must be foolish too, because he is the man

who printed it. So are you calling the Auditor General foolish, that \$300,000 would be paid out by a department in the government without any goods received, and are not going to be received possibly for another four or five months? So, Mr. Speaker, for a government that is near bankruptcy, we have an awful lot of money to throw around.

Now, the Minister of Public Works beats all. He is the man who can stand up and answer a question - you talk about blowing somebody's mind. That could blow your mind, the way he answered those questions. But for the minister to put out over \$200,000 for a permit that the Province could have obtained for \$1.50. Now you talk about abuse! I should rephrase that. You talk about a man having knowledge of how to run his department! There is an administration that could really put the Province on its feet! We would rather not give our \$1.50. No, be kind to the gentleman. Give him \$200,000. What is a couple of hundred thousand dollars to this government? We do not have bankruptcy creeping down around our ears. We are not in debt \$4.4 billion dollars.

MR. W. CARTER:

'Haig' must have thought he was Santa Claus.

MR. EFFORD:

Yes, possibly. It was possible when he told us where he got that jacket the other day he got the idea that Santa Claus was coming all the way.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we have to recognize that there is something seriously happening in the Province, and has been happening since the Tory administration came

into power. We saw in the former Liberal days where the population of this Province enjoyed a decent income, where they took pride and went to work. It was there all up through the years, from Confederation right up to the end of the Liberal era. But we saw the people of the Province wanting a change, and possibly rightly so. You get tired of looking at the one face over and over. But the projection and the image that was set forth by the Tory administration was to tell us that things were bad and things were going to get better.

We, as the people of the Province, thought that things were pretty good, but we agreed that possibly they could get better. Then we saw the erosion move in, the erosion of peoples' minds, peoples' morale, peoples' pride, where now you see the young people of this Province come out of high school, come out of trade schools, and the first door they have to knock on is the Department of Social Services. Mr. Speaker, that is a complete shame for any economy. It is a complete disgrace for any administration and yet they stand up in the House of Assembly and they say, "The former Liberals did it." The former Liberals made the young people go to the Department of Social Services. The former Liberals have caused the young people not to have any employment. The former Liberals have caused the situation where approximately 40,000 young people between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five are unemployed in this Province today.

There have been sixteen Throne Speeches since the Tories have taken over power and still, after sixteen Throne Speeches, they

still blame it on the former Liberal Government.

MR. WARREN:

But it is true.

MR. EFFORD:

Oh, it definitely is true, and there is a former Liberal talking over there. We all know about the former Liberal over there. We know, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province now realize the answer. I say to the member opposite and I say to all members, call an election and see the message that the people of this Province -

MR. WARREN:

Will you take me on?

MR. EFFORD:

Gladly, Sir.

MR. WARREN:

In my district?

MR. EFFORD:

Anywhere, Sir.

MR. WARREN:

Okay, I am ready.

MR. EFFORD:

I would take anyone of you on, Sir, after. I have great pride and great confidence in myself because I have great confidence in the people of Newfoundland to realize that you people have failed and that you people are gone.

MR. MITCHELL:

The NDP are going to take care of you fellows.

MR. EFFORD:

Oh yes, the NDP will win the great district of Port de Grave. I know all about that. I know all about what is going to happen out in

Port de Grave. Why do you not come out there and meet a few of the NDP voters?

Mr. Speaker, what this Province needs is a sense of direction. What we need is a sense of responsibility when deciding exactly where government dollars should be spent. Taxpayers dollars have to be spent in an area where it is going to best benefit the youth of our Province and it is not going to be in the way in which the Tory Administration is putting forth its patronage, in securing their friends in jobs. We can total up, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands, I suppose if we were to get the calculator working it would be possibly in the millions that have happened over the last two or three years. It has been a blatant waste of money.

MR. MITCHELL:

Read The Sunday Express, Ray Guy's column.

MR. MITCHELL:

What is your platform?

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), the only thing he probably knows about a platform is one of those that you put on the back of a boat when you put out a seine. On the Coast they put this seine out and they do a bit of dragging. That is about the only platform he knows because if he has had any input, his ideas into what the Peckford Administration has put forth as far as the platform for the future, then that is about his intelligence, that type of platform.

Now a platform to your knowledge is a piece of wood, approximately

eight by eight, and placed on the stern of a boat. That is about your knowledge of a platform.

A platform for any government with any responsibility would address concerns for the people, concerns for the jobless in this Province, concerns for our natural resources. On consultation, we just saw a prime example of our natural resources being given away by our federal government and our provincial government.

MR. WARREN:

Are you finished yet or what?

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, gentlemen. It is nice to see that you are so attentive and that your concern for the Province, as it has in the past, will continue in the future. This is exactly the reason why the Province is in such a mess as it is into because you just do not know any better. Do you? You have not the ability to recognize what is happening around you.

Experience is what counts. I do not disagree with anybody having ambition. A little bit of ambition does not hurt anybody.

Mr. Speaker, what we have to do for this Province is to set a goal, a goal that we -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Could you sit down the two cronies over there.

Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province enough natural resources at any one time any less than 10

per cent of this Province unemployed. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not have control, we do not have any say, we do not have any input into our natural resources. One of the natural resources that we have is our fishery. Until the Tory Government in Ottawa and until the Tory Government here in this Province recognize that control and more input and less regulations and less rules placed on our fishermen -

MR. PEACH:

Let everyone catch fish and you will be complaining.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, again a prime example of our problem is the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), Mr. Speaker, who just said that.

We give freedom to the foreign countries, but put all the regulations on our inshore fishery and the member for Carbonear agrees with it.

MR. PEACH:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Again we hear the same thing as I have been saying throughout the last ten or fifteen minutes, the former Liberals did it. For sixteen years the power has been there in your hands, and what have you changed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

The power has been in your hands to change the problems that the former Liberals created according to you. It took you sixteen years to recognize that the former Liberals did it! What a low mentality.

MR. FUREY:

Is that why unemployment went up 30 per cent?

MR. EFFORD:

It took you sixteen years to recognize the problem. You had all the opportunities. Did it take you sixteen years to go to Ottawa and explain your situation? Did it take you sixteen years to recognize where the problem lies? Did it take sixteen years to get your friends up in Ottawa? It only took you two years to have a friend in Ottawa and destroy the friendship. You are really good at it.

MR. MITCHELL:

You can have a little family quarrel.

MR. EFFORD:

Oh, a little family quarrel. Who suffers at this little family quarrel? The people of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Nobody! We saw an example of nobody suffering this morning. We saw an example of the co-operation between both governments. We saw an example when our federal Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) was sitting down and the members of the Provincial government were sitting down side by side. When they got up, they shook hands and said, 'Gentlemen, this is good for the Province.'

MR. MATTHEWS:

So it is.

MR. EFFORD:

We saw an example of the co-operation.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It is good.

MR. EFFORD:

Not as good as we would like to see it, believe me.

MR. MATTHEWS:

It never is.

MR. EFFORD:

It certainly never is with 80,000 people unemployed. You would have to bring a lot more ideas into the Province than you are bringing. Of course, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) very calmly said, 'Great, one hundred jobs.' With 80,000 unemployed, one hundred jobs is going to blow your mind. We have 79,900 people competing for those one hundred jobs, and all these minds are going to be blown.

MR. LUSH:

We need 800 more projects like that.

MR. EFFORD:

We need 8,000 more projects like that in order to come close to curing the unemployment situation in this Province. But the members opposite say, 'no, that this not a problem.'

There are somethings, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech given in the right way and handled in the right way, are going to be certainly good for the young entrepreneurs of this Province. But, what I am scared of, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the input of money into the local small businesses through rural development is the attitude, Mr. Speaker, that the present administration is going to take in

paying it out to their friends. Again, the policy has been evident in the Peckford Administration over the last several years. If you are a Tory, you will get help.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, that is not true.

MR. WARREN:

No way.

MR. EFFORD:

If you are Tory you will get a job. If you dare utter a word towards any other party, or if you dare utter the words 'freedom of speech', then you are out in the cold.

Now it is fine, Mr. Speaker, to see the 1987 Throne Speech highlights about where we are going to see an influx of money into local initiatives, local small businesses, and the young people of this Province given the opportunity of starting up a programme with provincial assistance. But the sad thing that will come of all of this is if it is acted upon in the way the Department of Municipal Affairs has acted. We could see they would never give out money to their Tory buddies. We saw that very clearly in 1986 when capital programmes were put out and all the Liberal districts were well looked after. Of course, the Peckford administration did not give out money last year, only to the municipalities where there were Progressive Conservative constituents.

The district of Port de Grave, for example, with four major town councils with one of the best reputations in all of the Province, one of the best reputations as far as income and expenditure and loan payments are

concerned, yet in 1986 the Tory administration saw fit not to give them one dollar. They did not do that because they had a Liberal member elected. No, no.

So we can realize again if there are any young entrepreneurs from the district in Port de Grave or any Liberal district, we can feel assured that that will not be held against them and they will be given money.

MR. PEACH:

Most of them come to me.

MR. FLIGHT:

Oh, yes. I am sure.

MR. PEACH:

Do you want a list of them?

MR. EFFORD:

Yes, I would dearly love for the member for Carbonear to pass over a list. I will, at the same time, pass him a list of some of the people from Carbonear who have called me.

MR. PEACH:

Here look.

MR. EFFORD:

Bring it over. Would the member for Carbonear table that?

MR. WARREN:

It is confidential.

MR. EFFORD:

He is saving that. Again, the member for Carbonear is blowing hot air and nothing is coming off.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the future of 1987, with the present administration, does not look any brighter than it

did last year. We are not seeing a fair, equal distribution of the money available. A system for distributing money must be put in place without party recognition. We must not have the situation as we have seen this government condemn the people in Come By Chance -

MR. PEACH:

Where do you stand on Come By Chance?

MR. EFFORD:

I believe everybody in this Province has an equal right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that everybody in this Province has an equal right. But the administration put forth by the Peckford people and the administration of this government is not displaying that. You are displaying that in this Province with your distribution of funds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

What equal rights are being displayed by your government when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) has very clearly stated, 'If you are a Liberal, I will help you. If you are not a Liberal, stay home.' Is that what he said?

MR. PEACH:

He never said that in Come By Chance.

MR. EFFORD:

He said very clearly, 'If you are

Tory I will help you. If you are a Liberal, stay home.' That is exactly what he said.

It is the same thing with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). You go into his department and he sits you down with a nice rosy smile and makes you feel good, makes the mayors of the town feel good. When they walk out, he slams the door. 'Good-bye, gentlemen.' No help for the Liberal districts. Is that what they call equal rights for equal people?

MR. PEACH:

I am after meeting with two of your councillors.

MR. EFFORD:

I am glad you did, and I hope you do a good job.

MR. PEACH:

They told me you could not help them.

MR. EFFORD:

That is true and no more I cannot help them, not while we have an administration like we have over there. But I would never stoop as low -

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

I assure the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) I would never stoop as low as to crawl across the floor and try to get out that way. If I could not have pride and stand on my own two feet, then I would step down and hide my head in shame.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion we would like to see a different attitude put forth by the government members and by the

government ministers in the distribution of funds. We would like to see it done on an equal and fair basis. We would like to see the government recognize that the problems are not only in the Tory areas and that it is not only Tories that need jobs so that a more open and fair policy will be put forward for all the people of the Province. Mr. Speaker, if we see that attitude put forth, then possibly we will see some light at the end of the tunnel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the hon. new member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) on the masterful job he did here on Throne Speech day in moving the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and, of course, my colleague from the great Humber Valley (Mr. Baird), from Humber West who seconded that motion. Of course I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome the member of the socialist party in the House. As the new member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), I cannot, Mr. Speaker, in all conscience, wish him a long stay but, nevertheless he ran a good campaign in St. John's East, he won the election and for that I congratulate the hon. member.

I was not impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member's maiden speech.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:
I think he ran a good campaign in St. John's East as a matter of fact. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is interrupting. I would prefer if I could have an opportunity to say my few words on the Speech from the Throne in relative quiet as I listened attentively to the hon. member.

The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), I want to congratulate him on his speech. He did a very good job on his speech the other day in the House. That is all the congratulations I have, Mr. Speaker. I want to address some of the issues.

When you speak on the Throne Speech one of the obligations you have is reporting to your constituents some of the things that are going on in your district and some of the plans you have for your district. In the district of Pleasantville, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform people through you of some of the things - and I have put it in a little brochure and sent it out to my constituents, I have gotten a lot of calls on it - and I would just like to go through some of the things that have been done in the past year and some of the things that are not quite yet completed but will be done in the next year.

Mr. Speaker, we gave to the City of St. John's a grant of about \$9 million for roads. Many of the roads were done in the district of Pleasantville. Partly, of course, some of them were done on the bordering district of St. John's East Extern where, over the past

few years, we widened the road and put in new pavement from the old city boundary out to the new city boundary on both Logy Bay Road and Torbay Road. We are now doing Portugal Cove Road.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I had a little bit of influence with my colleagues and I want to thank the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) for providing that \$9 million. It was \$9 million over three years, I believe. Part of the ongoing work of that \$9 million will be, of course, an upgrading and paving of the East White Hills Road which will be a start, Mr. Speaker, of what we call the Outer Ring Road which is one of the things as a member for St. John's that I will be pushing for over the coming years. That was \$1.9 million that will be spent - the contracts are ready to be awarded on that - and that will start this Summer.

Mr. Speaker, we also upgraded the Higgins Line, the five lanes between Nagles Hill and Ridge Road and that cost \$632,000. The signaling of Higgins Line, of course, when you put in these major roads, you have to put in the proper lights and signals and that cost \$34,000. We constructed a connector between Higgins Line and Portugal Cove Road for \$260,000 and we are going to upgrade the Ridge East Road from the St. Thomas' Farm Access. That road will cost \$209,000 and a construction of course of an acceleration lane for right turns off Higgins Line onto the Parkway, that little bit of construction cost \$55,000. We constructed to left turn lanes on the Parkway at Higgins Line that was \$130,000, Mr. Speaker, and I could go on.

The total amount, Mr. Speaker, for

some of the construction that was concluded over the past year, and the contract that had been let and will go on this Summer, have cost - I noted in my little brochure to the constituents - \$5,591,340. Mr. Speaker, the smaller projects that we got approved in the Pleasantville district, some of these are done by the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, some by Social Services and some are done through the federal/provincial programmes.

The Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth acceded to my request to grant Mary Queen of Peace \$50,000 for a sports complex over on the Mary Queen of Peace grounds. We intend to spend a few more dollars on that this year, Mr. Speaker. It is something that is very badly needed in the Northeast of the City of St. John's, and we intend to continue that this year.

Social Services, under the Community Development Programme, provided \$12,672 for eight jobs at Mount Scio Community Center. Mount Cashel Orphanage received \$18,240, Glenbrook Lodge received \$3,168 under the Community Development Project for the senior citizens over there, and Mount Cashel Orphanage, \$17,820. These, Mr. Speaker, were done under the Community Development Programme of the Department of Social Services and I want to take this opportunity to thank the Minister of Social Services for acceding to my request that these projects be approved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mount Cashel is in the hon. member's district, but it is a very worthy cause. They came to me last year and asked me if I would intercede on their behalf. I did and, as a result,

the monies were approved. But they had a very good project, anyway. Mr. Speaker, the former member at that time, by the way, was resigning. The money is approved and they are doing it now, as a matter of fact. It was \$17,820.

Social Services, Mr. Speaker, also provided for other projects in the district. The Mount Cashel Orphanage - again it was last year that this was approved - \$22,800. The Salmon Association of Eastern Newfoundland for the restoration of Virginia River in my district, Mr. Speaker, received \$54,416 under the same project, created twelve jobs in the district of Pleasantville, and they did a very good job on the Virginia River last year. They will be asking, I understand, Mr. Speaker, for more this year. As a matter of fact, we had a contribution from the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies for \$22,000 for the restoration of Rennies River, which is not in my district, but, of course, I approved that because I think it is a very worthy and worthwhile cause.

Mr. Speaker, Glenbrook Lodge, under this programme, received \$31,668. Of course, the Salvation Army officers had a programme last year of \$4,160. It was only a one job thing, but I spoke to the Captain at the Lodge over there and we got that \$4,000. It was one job; they were doing some research and needed a person to do it.

Community Services Council, who are now stationed in my district, down in the Plaza, received \$19,204 under the Community Development Programme.

Now, under Challenge '86 I also managed to wrench a few dollars. Under that programme Glenbrook Lodge again received \$5,928, and Mount Cashel Orphanage, again, \$15,808. The people over there always communicate with me, Mr. Speaker. Some of the background that you may not know is that two of my brothers attended Mount Cashel when they were growing up. I was a little bit more fortunate in that I was half adopted by my grandparents. My two brothers spent some years in Mount Cashel.

MR. TULK:

You are aware that the member for St. Barbe was in there, too.

MR. DINN:

Yes. There is nothing wrong with Mount Cashel. I was a little bit more fortunate. They were adopted by Mount Cashel, and I was adopted by my grandparents.

The Mount Scio Community Association received \$9,484, and the Salvation Army College again, for three jobs, \$5,928. These are just some of the things that we go through. Now I have not listed all of the things here in the brochure.

MR. FENWICK:

Who paid for that?

MR. DINN:

I paid for that, as a matter of fact, out of my own money. I got it through the Hub. They do a very good job. I forget what the exact cost was, \$300 or \$400. It is fairly cheap and they do a masterful job. Now, most of the layout was done by myself, and it is not a bad layout.

MR. TULK:

Show us some.

MR. DINN:

I do not have a lot of copies. There is a great demand for copies, Mr. Speaker. On my next brochure I intend to pass one or two copies along to the hon. member.

MR. LONG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

The hon. member has taken so much time to talk about this pamphlet and also Mount Cashel Orphanage, which is in my district, I would just like to let him know that during campaigning to win my seat I found copies of his brochure in my district.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is out of order. There is no point of order.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, there are some copies of my brochure in the hon. member's district. As I say, there is a great demand for copies of the brochure and, of course, anybody who wants one, if I have them I will certainly pass them out.

Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member broke the rules and interrupted me in full stride, I will attend to some of the things that the hon. member talked about in his maiden speech. He talked about multinationals - we should not have multinationals. Well, what that means, first of all, is you cannot deal with the multinationals, they are all crooks and they should not be

dealt with. That is a socialist view, a view that the hon. member has, and what that means is the first thing we have to do is get rid of the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Mines because the hon. member does not believe in these organizations; they should not be in our Province, they should not be developing our potential and therefore, Mr. Speaker, they should go. There is no question about that. So, Mr. Speaker, that closes down Western Labrador.

MR. FENWICK:

(Inaudible) policies?

MR. DINN:

Now, I am getting a little bit of input from the other half of the wit in the new socialist party in the House. I would prefer that the hon. member waited and when he gets an opportunity he can have a few words to say, and I promise the hon. member that I will not interrupt him.

Mr. Speaker, we can move from Western Labrador because the socialists have just closed that down, and we will move to Goose Bay. Mr. Speaker, they are not in favour of NATO, so we will have to close down Goose Bay. That is of no use.

MR. FENWICK:

But we are not sure of that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are relatively sure of that.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

They are sure of it, but they will not admit it.

MR. DINN:

The New Democratic Party in the House, the Socialists, have a resolution on the Order Paper and they just do not want NATO in Goose Bay, so we have to close down Goose Bay. Now, Mr. Speaker, the only thing we have left is a little bit of hunting in the Mealey Mountains, which is illegal, so that is Labrador closed down.

Now, moving down to the Island part of the Province, obviously if we close down the multinationals that is Corner Brook decimated and there is nothing left in Corner Brook, that is now finished. So because we have another multinational out there - and lo and behold - what? - this government even modified the labour rules so that they could move in and that is a terrible thing.

MR. FENWICK:

Kruger is not a multinational.

MR. DINN:

Oh, Kruger is not a multinational, Mr. Speaker. So you are in favour of Kruger? Mr. Speaker, I just hit one that they are in favour of. Of course, now, Abitibi Price is a multinational, so we have to close down Stephenville and we have to close down Grand Falls. Now, let us deal with the Come By Chance refinery. That is another multinational. Is that a multinational? Are you in favour of the Come By Chance refinery? That should not be open, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member believes that the Come By Chance refinery should not be open. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a few little statistics on Come By Chance. There are 200 people out there and four of them from the hon. member's district. He does not

want them working at Come By Chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? No!

MR. WARREN:

Name them.

MR. DINN:

I will tell the hon. member there are thirty-nine from Sunnyside. The hon. member is not in favour of that opening, so we should fire them and get Newfoundland Energy out of there. Close that down, we do not want it, there are only 200 jobs. The hon. member has just closed down Labrador, he has closed down the Westcoast, he has closed down Central Newfoundland, and now he want to close down the refinery before it starts. We should not have this dirty company coming into Newfoundland and investing its money. It is not the way it was done before. Now, the hon. member for Bellevue, I know he does not want the Come By Chance refinery open. Mr. Speaker, more than half of the people working at Come By Chance are from the hon. member's district so I know the hon. member does not want Come By Chance open.

MR. CALLAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Pleasantville is attributing motives to me, motives that I do not possess. If anybody in this Province wants the Come By Chance refinery open any worse than I do, then I would like for that person

to come forward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

He is saying that I do not want it open. He is attributing motives which, of course, he is not allowed to do.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. DINN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said, there are thirty-nine from Sunnyside working at Come By Chance, there are six from Long Beach, there are fourteen from Arnolds Cove, there are four from Hatchet Cove, there are eight from North Harbour, eight from St. John's, and four from the hon. member's district. There are 200 people now working at Come By Chance, and the Socialist do not like it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG:

Heave it out of you, 'Jerry'.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, and it is a small point. As the member is quite aware, the rules of this House very clearly state that if he is to read from a document he must be prepared to table it, and I would ask him to table the

document?

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I am reading from all kinds of documents. There is no point of order. You are allowed to have your copious notes spread out in front of you so that you can make sure that you do not make any mistakes in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

Table it.

MR. DINN:

It is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order. The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, that is three times now that I have been interrupted in full stride, when I am trying to get going here, because this is my only chance, on the Throne Speech. The hon. members will have all kinds of chances to get up here and speak. The hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), I think what he should do is take a copy of his speech right out of Hansard and send it to all of the people in St. John's East, because he does not want any multinationals in here, he does not want any jobs in here, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member made a speech in here today that is a complete disgrace to the people of St. John's East, it is an insult to the people of St. John's East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to develop this Province on the expertise that we have

within this Province.

MR. LONG:

You are selling out.

MR. DINN:

We are going to sell it out, Mr. Speaker. We are going to get gold mining companies to come in here and start gold mining operations in the Province and the hon. the member for St. John's East, the new socialist in the House, is not going to stop us from getting Hope Brook gold going.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

The sixth largest gold mining operation in the country of Canada, Mr. Speaker, another multinational organization, deigning to come into this Province, who have given us 275 jobs so far, and the socialist from St. John's East does not want it. Why is it the socialist for St. John's East does not want Hope Brook, does not want IOC, does not want Wabush Mines, does not want Abitibi Price, does not want any of these people in? Why? Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why, and this, Mr. Speaker, is attributing motives to the hon. member, it is because people who are in misery vote for the NDP. Mr. Speaker, we, as a government, are going to take the people out of misery. We are going to give them jobs, Mr. Speaker. We are going to invite people to come into this Province and invest in mining operations, in newsprint operations, in gold mines, in fluorspar mines, in Baie Verte, Mr. Speaker, and wherever we can get people in here. Down in Bay d'Espoir, \$2 million now, and more. And, Mr. Speaker, we are not just going to give it to National Sea. The hon. member

gets up and says, we are going to sell it out to another multinational. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are so many interested in spending money to develop Bay d'Espoir; they are going to get part of a farming operation down there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Even if a multinational wanted to build another hatchery, they would not be in favour of it.

MR. DINN:

And, Mr. Speaker, there are individuals down in Bay d'Espoir who want to get into a fish farming operation.

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) had the wisdom and the sticktoitiveness to badger his Cabinet colleagues to get \$2 million to put into a hatchery in Bay d'Espoir. He is looking for input from private individuals in Bay d'Espoir, and he is looking for companies from outside to come in and invest in Bay d'Espoir so that he can create jobs in Bay d'Espoir. Mr. Speaker, the minister has a good idea and I support him 100 per cent. He will get jobs for the people in Bay d'Espoir, Mr. Speaker, and it will not be all government money. Now, that is the thing about the socialists. You see, socialists believe that you cannot do a thing without government money, government has to control everything. It is the old big daddy principle; daddy owns it all and he will dole it out the way he sees fit.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Big brothers.

MR. DINN:

The big brother syndrome, that is what it is. We will not have any companies in here, we will not have NATO in here. Hon. members of the official Opposition in this House have been crying for years, and we have been, to get a share of the defence dollars spent in this Province. We are trying to get a little expansion up in Goose Bay and what do we hear? We hear the socialists knocking something that we have been trying to get for years. Why? Because if there were no jobs up in Goose Bay, if there were no jobs at IOC, if there were no jobs by Abitibi-Price in Stephenville and in Grand Falls, well, they would be on the hook then; they would have it all, everybody would vote for them then. Because what are they promising? They are promising the moon and they produce nothing. Mr. Speaker, one of these days, and I hope I am gone, I hope I am not here in the Province, if they ever get more than two half-wits in this House, then, Mr. Speaker, we will really be in trouble. I believe that the people of St. John's East and the people of Menihek, in the next election, will see the light, will see that you develop this Province on the basis of the resources of this Provinces, on the basis of the expertise of the people, on the basis of making sure that they have the education, Mr. Speaker. And that is why we have two Departments of Education now, so that we can prepare our people for jobs, and two great ministers, one the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, a minister who, of course, everybody in this Province has a lot of respect for. I do not think there is anybody who will deign to say that that minister has not performed since he became Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

And, of course, the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) is respected throughout this Province not only as a previous educator but, since he became minister, for the enlightenment that he has brought to the Department of Education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to go through all the jobs that are created but I would not want to rub it into the socialists over here. That would be a little bit of overkill for the socialists and they would probably rush off to their office, hide in the back somewhere and never return back to the House. I want to hear the hon. member say a few words in this House because -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I tried to look up certain comments that were made to other hon. members. I do not see half-wits as such mentioned here, but idiots and that terminology, I do not think that is really acceptable. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

MR. DINN:

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for bringing me back, but hon. members are interrupting periodically over there and it throws me off my game. The cut and thrust of the debate has caused me to sin in this House and I apologize to you and to the House and to the hon. members for straying off my points.

MR. YOUNG:

They are nitwits.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into that. I think I have said enough on that.

Mr. Speaker, what is the theme of

this Speech from the Throne? The theme is jobs. Is there anybody in this House who disagrees with having a theme? Mr. Speaker, I went through the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment and I believe that something like 65 per cent to 70 per cent of all of the recommendations made by the Commission on Employment and Unemployment are either done or in the process of being done. I think that is a record, Mr. Speaker. That report was given to us just last Fall and I think that is a record.

We appointed that Commission on Employment and Unemployment and I think they did a fantastic job and should be complimented. Mr. Speaker, 65 per cent to 70 per cent of the recommendations of that Commission are either done - and I will stand by this - are either done now or are in the process of being done.

Mr. Speaker, how do you do that, how do you create these jobs besides what we are doing here, which is everything within the power of the government, under the financial restraints under which we operate? Everything that is possible to be done we are doing, I believe, Mr. Speaker, in this Throne Speech, everything that is possible.

What else do you do? Well, Mr. Speaker, you go out and you talk to the mining companies, you go out and you talk to the entrepreneurs of this country, and you get them interested. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that there are 32,000 - It is over 32,000 now. I will say this, but it is inaccurate because it is too low - claims in good standing in this Province of over 200 companies

that are here exploring in this Province. And it is not just gold, Mr. Speaker, although there are twenty-one companies and groups involved in gold exploration throughout the Province, at Cape Ray - I call it Cape Ray, but the hon. member knows it is Burnt Island Pond - there is West Field Minerals down in the Bay d'Espoir area, there is Sop's Arm, Jackson's Arm, Ming's Bight, the old Tilt Cove mine, and the Gander River. Mr. Speaker, twenty-one different companies are exploring for gold in twenty-one different areas in this Province.

There are proposals every day. There is marble on the Great Northern Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, that we have companies interested in developing. Now, they are not going to develop them tomorrow, but you have to promote these things in order to get companies and groups in here to invest their money, unlike the hon. member, but they have to invest their money so that we can employ Newfoundlanders. And I challenge any hon. member to suggest some other ways that we can get into the private sector and help out students and help out the young unemployed in this province. I would welcome their recommendations to this House. I have not heard one yet, but I would welcome hon. members, when they get up, to say, 'Look, we should not have assisted Hope Brook in trying to get that mine going, we should have done something else here.' Mr. Speaker, that is what I would like to hear. That is what Oppositions are all about. They should not always be negative. We should not stand up like the young socialist from St. John's East and just talk about throwing out the multinationals. We need

investment in this country, and we need investment in this Province. If we do not get investment we die in this Province, Mr. Speaker. If we do not have people to catch the fish, to process the fish, and sell the fish, then we do not survive. If we do not have people to cut the logs, to produce a market for the newsprint, if we do not have companies in here doing that, we die, Mr. Speaker. socialism just does not work. It does not work in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, it does not work in Canada. As a matter of fact, lo and behold, in Russia they are even starting to get back into capitalism; they are even starting to get back into private enterprise, Mr. Speaker, they are starting to join the successful of this world, they are starting to come into the Twenty-first Century.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what else could a government do but go out to the companies of this world and bring them in and show them what we have, show them the expertise we have. I mean, look at that company down in Boston, in the New England States, when they saw the Come By Chance refinery. We did not call them in and say, 'Hold on a second, we will give you \$100 million to develop the Come By Chance refinery.' Mr. Speaker, hon. members might not know this, but I am going to give them a little fact. On the Come By Chance refinery, if we had not changed the deal that was in place when we came to power in 1972, this Province would have been on the hook for \$600 million. Now, we changed the deal and it took us off the hook and now we are on the hook for \$49 million. With one fell swoop the Moores' Administration changed that one little thing when he renegotiated with John Shaheen and brought it

from \$600 million down to \$49 million. Mr. Speaker, just that one stroke.

And, yes, we are still correcting the errors of the past; the Linerboard Mill in Stephenville, where \$117 million was given to a man to go out and build a mill. That day is gone, Mr. Speaker. In Hope Brook we are providing a little power, we are providing a loan guarantee, and we are providing \$6 million in a total investment of over \$150 million, Mr. Speaker. That is the kind of thing we have got to do. We do not take the entrepreneur, take the investor and bring them in here and say, 'Here is all the money, go and invest it for us,' we take them in here, Mr. Speaker, they tell us what they want to do, we make sure they conform with the laws of the Province, the environmental concerns and all the rest, they tell us that they are going to invest and ask us for some assistance with respect to power, etc., we provide that, Mr. Speaker, and that is the way this Province will succeed.

Over the next few years, Mr. Speaker, you will see success in Newfoundland. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping to get into a nice ranting and raving

rebuttal to that fine speech, but
I will wait until next day.

I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for
Stephenville adjourned the debate.

On motion, the House at its rising
adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday,
March 10, 1987 at 3:00 p.m.