



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 43

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
***(Hansard)***

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

15 May 1987

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, there is one matter I would like to deal with. On Tuesday, May 5, I reserved ruling on several points of discussion which arose from a point of order relating to parliamentary secretaries, the point of order having been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons).

Although I shall refer only to parliamentary secretaries, I include in that title the parliamentary assistant to the Premier as well.

The House agreed unanimously that in future parliamentary secretaries will be allowed to make statements on behalf of their ministers and may also respond to questions on behalf of their ministers. There is no need for me to make a ruling on this particular matter.

However, following this agreement the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, supported by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), submitted that parliamentary secretaries should no longer be considered private members and as a consequence should be prohibited from sitting on or chairing committees and should not be allowed to present private members' motions.

It is not necessary for me to rule on whether a parliamentary secretary is or is not a private member. The legitimacy of certain practices carried out by parliamentary secretaries under the procedures of this House has

been called into question and it is on those questioned practices upon which I shall rule.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition pointed out that parliamentary secretaries receive a stipend from the department with which they are connected and he suggested that this makes the person a part of the administration. As parliamentary secretaries have now taken an oath or affirmation of office as a member of Cabinet and cannot attend Cabinet meetings as of right and, as they are not privy to all Cabinet documents and materials, I cannot agree that receiving a departmental stipend effectively constitutes a parliamentary secretary as part of the administration.

Our Standing Orders and Beauchesne are silent with regard to parliamentary secretaries sitting on or chairing committees. Therefore, under our Standing Order No. 1 we must look to, but not necessarily be bound by, the practice in the House of Commons.

Under new Standing Orders of the House of Commons, parliamentary secretaries may no longer chair committees as they were allowed to previously but, they may sit on committees except ones which are examining their particular departments. Parliamentary secretaries in the House of Commons may present private members' motions.

My ruling on these matters has taken into account the past practice of this House and the relative sizes of our House and the House of Commons. The practice of this House has been to allow parliamentary secretaries to serve on and chair committees. To

disallow this practice would be a disservice to the House and to the public as, unlike the House of Commons, we do not have the luxury of a large number of members from which committee members may be drawn.

Therefore, it is my ruling that the practice of this House in relation to parliamentary secretaries serving on and chairing committees is reasonable and should continue. I further rule that, in keeping with the practice of this House and in concurrence with that of the House of Commons, parliamentary secretaries should continue to have the privilege of presenting private members motions.

I would like to thank the hon. the Leader of the Opposition for raising these questions and for his thoughts and suggestions on these important matters. I also thank the rest of the hon. members on both sides of the House who contributed to the debate.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, really it should probably be a point of privilege, but I do not like to over-use that particular parliamentary device and, therefore, I will content myself with raising a point of order.

I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that last night on CBC-TV the Leader of the Opposition was most uncomplimentary towards your person. I did not see the programme myself, it is hearsay,

but I think it would be very easy to check and see exactly what was said. It showed, as far as I am told, great disrespect for the Chair. I think it is a matter that should be looked into further and certainly should be deplored, because the respect for the Chair is the foundation of this House of Assembly. We have seen the Leader of the Opposition tax Your Honour's patience many times in this House. And, perhaps, it is one thing to do it in the House, but to do it outside of the House is utterly disrespectful and shows great contempt for this House, contempt for your person and contempt for your office. I think it is utterly disgraceful and should be investigated.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) for raising this matter. Apart from making a fine speech, as usual, and an irrelevant speech, as usual, I thought he was quite interesting this morning.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, contrary to what the gentleman has just entered into the record, the Leader of the Opposition was not on CBC-TV. I believe what he is referring to is a third person report in which CBC said that other people said certain things. I was not on in any clip. There was no first person, no voice report at all, I submit to him and to the House.

Secondly, I will tell the House

that yesterday I was part of an interview with a reporter from CBC in which one of the statements I very carefully said, Mr. Speaker, that if I have any criticisms or any comments - I did not say criticisms - if I have any views to express on the subject of the Speaker I shall do so in the House to Mr. Speaker's face and I refuse to do so otherwise. That was the essential substance of what I said to that reporter.

MR. J. CARTER:

I must take your word.

MR. SIMMONS:

No. Mr. Speaker, I would not even want the gentleman to take my word. I want him instead to reflect on what I just said in light of what he saw last night, because what he saw last night -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

I had that fear, too, that he saw nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He probably did not see anything.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am telling him that what was aired on CBC was not an interview or quoting me in the first person or me a talking head, as we say in the business, it was a third party report in which it said certain things: Mr. So and So said this, and the Opposition did this, and so on and so forth. It was that kind of report. I cannot take any responsibility for that. What I can say is what I said to that reporter - and I do not even have to say that. It was a private conversation at the time - but I am telling you that I said to that reporter if I have - and I did not

use the word criticism - if I have views to express, I think were the words, I will say so in the House, I think I said, face to face to Mr. Speaker.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, I have always had the utmost respect for the Chair, I have always had the utmost respect for the institution of Speaker. From time to time -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, there is Guy Fawkes again, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I have been known to express my views, but that is not the point of order here. I have been known to express my views and if the views have been unparliamentary, I think I have done the correct thing and then withdrawn them. But the point is that the institution of Speaker is an institution we must respect. If I have gotten hot under the collar here sometimes it is because I have seen the institution being eroded in this particular Chamber, and that is quite another issue, too. But the issue the gentleman raises may well be a point of order, that is for Mr. Speaker, to decide, I just wanted the House to know my role in it insofar as there was a role yesterday.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members of this hon. House are glad that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has clarified this matter, because I did actually see that report and I agree with the hon. leader opposite that he was not shown on the picture, there was no voice clip. But certainly the message came through quoting him, quoting his name in a very, very derogatory fashion towards this House and towards this Chair.

Now, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that that was not the tenor of his remarks and obviously we accept his word on it. But that does not get away from the fact that that was a disgraceful public report, reflecting on the integrity not only of this House but the integrity and the authority of Your Honour. And I would strongly suggest that under - and this is merely a suggestion. It is obviously up to Your Honour to make the decision - the authority you have as Speaker this matter should be investigated further, that the report be reviewed, that the accuracy of the portrayal of that interview as it reflected on this House be investigated in detail and the necessary steps taken.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would want that done.

DR. COLLINS:

I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would want that done and if there is to be further action taken to alleviate and to prevent any further such disgraceful reports about this House, that that appropriate action be taken. I think it is most important. If this is

allowed to continue, there will be a deteriorating aspect to the public mind on what is going on in this House.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Finance takes issue, really, with the particular medium that reported the facts that happened in this House, and I think he ought to take issue with the media in question. I also submit to Your Honour that what happens outside this Chamber certainly is not within Your Honour's jurisdiction. However, if the Minister of Finance wants to take issue with facts that are reported by various media, he ought to approach those media to find out what exactly happened. We submit, Your Honour, there is no problem there.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am forced to comment on this matter, or address the point of order at issue here. We have a public report alleging certain things that the Leader of the Opposition said about this Chamber and about your person and your office.

Seeing the Leader of the Opposition did not appear visually, it was not his own direct speech or quotes, well, one can only conclude from that that the Leader of the Opposition is

saying he was misquoted, that he was taken out of context. But what went on the public airwaves last night was a degradation of this institution called the House of Assembly and of the office of Speaker, Mr. Speaker, and it should be investigated. Because it is referenced back to the Leader of the Opposition and he does not want the people of Newfoundland who listened to that programme last night - the clear impression as a result of that was that there are members of this House, including one of the leaders of this House, who are putting down this House and putting down the office of Speaker and surely that has to be cleared up because we cannot have that kind of information going out to the public and thereby degrading your office, your person, and all of us in the bargain.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final observation by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Now that this has escalated into an Armageddon type issue, I ought to make a couple of points. First of all, I share fully the Premier's concern about the degradation of this institution. That is why I have, on occasion, Mr. Speaker, made some statements in this House that have not found favour with certain corners of the Chamber, but I made them anyway. My difficulty, being an ordinary human being, is that sometimes I say them in unparliamentary ways. But the concern is very deeply felt that this institution is being badly eroded, that it is ceasing to be a place where a member can come -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not the point though.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is very much the point. If the Premier is going to pontificate about degradation, I agree with his concern but I do not agree with his analysis of why it is being degraded or who is degrading it. The gentleman, at five-thirty yesterday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, my friend for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), tried to make a speech and he was jeered by the gentleman for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) and the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) consistently.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, you do not want to hear this now. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I will start saying some more things that everybody agrees with and in this way I will have the floor, right? Because as soon as I say something that does not find favour -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member will speak to the point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

The point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I am responding to the Premier - I did not see you cut him off, but that is coincidence, that is just a coincidence. Degradation in his mouth is okay, but there is something wrong with degradation in my mouth. We are demonstrating right now, Mr. Speaker, why that report ever got aired, because a reporter sat up there, a good

reporter, and saw what was happening down here and went and reported it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member will confine his remarks to the point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is right, Sir, I will. That reporter reported what she saw. That is her sin, she reported what she saw and she reported that the degradation is going on. That was okay as long as we kept it in this Chamber, but now it has gone out to the Province, the truth is out, the boys over there are all worked up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that reporter reported what she saw in this Chamber. That is her sin. She did her duty. Now, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:

Protection, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- I said a couple of things to that reporter which are instructive in terms of what we are trying to establish here, as to whether there is a point of order. The first thing I reported to you a minute ago. The first thing I said -

MR. J. CARTER:

Sit down!

MR. WARREN:

Sit down!

MR. FUREY:

Order! Order!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Ridiculous protection.

MR. J. CARTER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I said, first of all, if I have views to express I shall do them face to face to the Speaker in the House. I was asked to compare this Speaker with the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer), and some other Speakers and I said, 'I think it must be well known to everybody in the Chamber and anybody watching the Chamber that I think the conduct of the Chamber is less than perfect.' That was the phrase, "Less than perfect". That should come as no surprise to anybody in this institution. Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I made no particular criticism because any criticism I want to make or any praise I want to give I will give face to face, which is my practice.

Mr. Speaker, members of this Chamber, including the member who raised this point of order, would do well to go back and look again and, for his case, look a first time, because he admits now that he has raised a point of order on a matter that took place outside this institution, on a matter that he did not even see first-hand. So it is hearsay evidence he is giving the House. I invite him to go out and look at the tape to start with, and I would ask the other people to look at the tape and, when they are through getting all upset with me, ask themselves if the real signal that was sent out last night by that CBC

reporter is not just a case of that person doing her job and doing it well and reporting what she saw here. We might not like what she sent out, we might not like the message, but do not make the mistake of shooting the messenger.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, just one last point.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
There have been a lot of words said and I do not think we should allow those words to confuse the central issue here. The central issue was that a point of order was raised, that the hon. leader was quoted publicly in such a way that it brought dishonour on this House. Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated that that was not an accurate reflection of his remarks and we must accept that. But, in actual fact, as the Premier has pointed out, as the original raiser of the point of order pointed out, the issue remains that in the public view there is a report which casts tremendous dishonour on this House and it cannot be left at that, it must be investigated further.

No one is accusing the hon. Leader of the Opposition, at this point in time, of saying anything untoward. We are saying the report is untoward and it claims that it is based on the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Simmons) remarks which he says 'is an inaccurate basis for that report'. Fine, we accept that, but that does not get away from the fact that that report must be

investigated or it will be left in the public mind that this House is a House of dishonour.

MR. SIMMONS:  
There you go again. Mr. Speaker, this business of inaccurate, I have never said the report was accurate -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! The hon. member may speak if he wishes, but -

MR. SIMMS:  
You just do not stand up.

MR. SPEAKER:  
- he had not been recognized, and the hon. member has been in the House long enough to know that he should be recognized before he speaks.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) has used the term 'inaccurate'. I carefully stayed clear of the issue, since I am not the CBC producer. I do not report to this House for the accuracy or otherwise of the CBC reports. What I have said is my role in it. And my role in it I assume is twofold, one, my actions in this Chamber, and I assume that was part of the reporter's story, and my comments to her in an interview. And I did not have any obligation to do this, because it was a private conversation, but I have given you a couple of indications of what I said to that lady just to show you the tone of where I was coming from in terms of that interview, that I will



make my views known in this House, and one of the views, that is already known, is that 'I think the conduct of this Chamber is less than perfect.' Now, those are the two things I said.

I do not even know whether I was quoted accurately or not because I was on the telephone at the time the report was on. I saw it, but I did not pay attention. I cannot even say if I was quoted at all, or accurately or inaccurately. I really do not know. I know the report was on. I was in my office with a member of my caucus and I was on the phone at the time. The TV was on, I saw the picture, and that is all I saw. Somebody said, That is the report on the Speakership, or something to that effect. So I cannot make any undertaking to the House as to the accuracy of what was in that particular report. I can only say, from reports I had after from the gentleman sitting in my office, that, in my view, my judgment reflected a fair view of the current degraded state of the institution of Speaker in this Chamber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

To that point of order, I am going to reserve my ruling on that. I would like to see the tape. I, of course, accept the explanation of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, but I would like to compare what was said in that particular report last night.

O O O

MR. EFFORD:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege arises out of the Ministerial Statements read by Minister of Social Service (Mr. Brett) yesterday afternoon and the Late Show yesterday afternoon. What the hon. the Minister of Finance said a few minutes ago about the reputation of the House of Assembly being brought out in public, I think, is going to be brought out in my point of privilege.

Yesterday afternoon when I stood in my place and continuously during question period, every time I got to my feet, Mr. Speaker, I was continuously heckled and mocked and had to put up with name calling from the other side. In this House you do not get a chance to put forth any questions you need to ask ministers on the other side. The same thing occurred, Mr. Speaker, when I was responding to the Statement made by the Minister of Social Services. Just as I started responding to the statement, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), and other ministers, never gave me, as a member of this House, a chance to do what I was sent here to do by the people who elected me to this House. I was elected by the people of my district to represent them in the House of Assembly and we do not get the opportunity to do that at any time. Then, when we ask for protection from the Chair, the heckling just gets louder and

louder. As a member of this House, I need the protection of the Chair to be able to carry out my duties.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You need protection from yourself.

MR. EFFORD:

You see, Mr. Speaker, that, again, is a prime example.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not making a point of privilege.

MR. EFFORD:

My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, has to do with exactly what is happening over there now. When we stand in our places in this House of Assembly during Question Period and in making responses to Ministerial Statements, we do not get an opportunity to do that in the manner in which we should because of continuous interference from ministers of the Crown and members on the backbenches.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for protection from the Chair. That is the point of privilege I am trying to make.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, to the point of privilege. It is not a point of privilege, certainly. It may be a point that the hon. member wishes to raise in the Legislature, and that is fair ball. But, certainly, to use the guise of a point of privilege to

raise that matter would not be the appropriate mechanism. If the hon. member was to travel to any other Parliament in the Commonwealth he would see that the British Parliamentary practices are such that they provide for a certain amount of give and take back and forth the House. You cannot have a mute Legislature. I mean, it would be impossible. That is what the hon. member is suggesting, that when he gets up to speak, everybody should be mute and quiet. That is not the British Parliamentary system. The hon. member should perhaps familiarize himself a little bit more with that kind of system, because that is a fact.

If it becomes excessive and too intense and all the rest of it, then it is the Chair's responsibility, of course, as Your Honour knows, to ensure that members are given protection. But to expect that there should not be any give and take or any comments back and forth, I mean, that is just silliness, because that is not the way the British Parliamentary system works.

Mr. Speaker, overriding the point of privilege that the hon. member has made is what I consider to be an even more serious factor with respect to what is happening in the Legislature. May I just quote from Beauchesne for hon. members, if they would be patient enough, several references to the Speaker as the presiding officer of the House of Commons or of this House.

MR. SIMMONS:

No.

MR. SIMMS:

Now, three of four times I listened to the hon. Leader of the Opposition make some points. I

would like to make a point, if I could, with respect to what is the overriding problem. This is what I consider it to be:

Let me just read a few quotes, Mr. Speaker, from paragraph 117 of Beauchesne: "When the Speaker rises to preserve order or to give a ruling he must always be heard in silence." Now, is this the practice in this House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SIMMS:

I suggest not. "No member may rise when the Speaker is standing." We frequently see that being overlooked. "Reflections upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege." Does that sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? "Confidence in the impartiality of the Speaker is an indispensable condition of the successful working of procedure, and many conventions exist which have as their object, not only to ensure the impartiality of the Speaker but also, to ensure that his impartiality is generally recognized. The presiding officer, though entitled on all occasions to be treated with the greatest attention and respect by the individual Members, because the power, dignity, and honour of the House are officially embodied in his person...."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you the overriding problem in this whole issue is because certain members of this Legislature do not follow what Beauchesne suggests should be followed with respect to respect for the Chair. And that is something that hon. members who do these sorts of things should be embarrassed about, as far as I am

concerned, and that is the point of privilege.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

That is quite a rebuttal, Mr. Speaker, from the minister who did not think there was a point of privilege.

Beauchesne, Section 17 says, "A genuine question of privilege is a most serious matter and should be taken seriously by the House."

The member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) stood in his place to make a submission to the Chair that when he is speaking in his place in debate or Question Period he feels that his privileges are being breached. Of course there is give and thrust in any parliament in Canada, of course there is the odd heckling and thrust back and forth, but the behavior yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I submit, was totally out of whack. I mean, we had people shouting and screaming. I witnessed it myself.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. FUREY:

It is starting again.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe, would you carry on?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, this is the earlier point which the minister failed to refer to. I think the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) came to the House with two statements yesterday, if I am not wrong, fairly lengthy statements, and we

were asking for equal time. I think my colleague from Port de Grave had a chance to make two or three points. We would ask Your Honour to look at the transcripts for yesterday to see just exactly how much time and how much space was used up by the Minister of Social Services in both those statements and compare it to the actual time given my colleague from Port de Grave, who I submit is allowed 50 per cent of the time that the minister is allocated, and compare it to the time given my good friend, the socialist in the corner, who is allowed 50 per cent of the 50 per cent of the total time committed by the minister. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will see that there is a clear discrepancy there and unfairness to the hon. member for Port de Grave. He just was not given equal time to speak.

To the other issue, Mr. Speaker, yes, there is give and take in this Chamber and there ought to be give and take in this Chamber, but not when you see behavior like a nest of jackals, because that is the behavior we saw yesterday from that side when my hon. colleague tried to speak in the Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege there is no prima facie case. I think the point made by the hon. member is a good one. There is an awful lot of interruption from both sides when a question is being asked and when an answer is being given. When a question is being asked, I would ask hon. members on both sides to keep reasonable silence. I do not expect everybody to be completely silent on either side. I think that goes both ways, and I would ask hon. members to remember that.

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this morning, on behalf of the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) and on behalf of government, to announce the first phase of our programme of creating jobs with the private sector whereby government and the private sector share fifty/fifty in the cost of any new incremental jobs; in other words, any business in the Province can apply under this programme and, if that business is going to create one, two, three, four, ten or fifteen or whatever number of jobs over what they had last year in their business, then government will share in the cost of those jobs fifty/fifty with that industry or that business, and it is open to all businesses in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, whilst the ones I am going to announce today only amount to 13 jobs, 297 weeks, and \$33,000, government's share of these jobs, this is the first launching of it. These are the first jobs. Next week we would hope to have two or three announcements on another wave, if you want, eight or ten industries which have applied and have been approved. We are going to try to expedite the process to ensure that all of the money gets spent and all of the jobs are created as quickly as we can.

The businesses now, the projects that have been approved I think are eight, and I just give these out, Mr. Speaker, as some examples of how flexible the programme is: There is 1 job for 16 weeks to a business in St. John's, the Carpet Centre; there are 2 jobs for 52 weeks to D.F. Barnes Limited, St. John's; in Terra Nova, Pinedale Farms, a farm, Mr. Speaker, in rural Newfoundland; Micro-Tech Computer Centre Limited, 1 job for 26 weeks; Atlantic Industrial & Marine Supplies, 2 jobs for 80 work weeks; Tors Cove, 2 jobs for 32 weeks; Blaketown, in the district of Bellevue, Cooper's Fur Farm, another farm - the Opposition is saying we are not interested in agriculture in rural Newfoundland, we are only interested in hydroponics in Mount Pearl, and out of 8 projects here are two are to farms in rural Newfoundland - Fong's Restaurant in Carbonear and in Outer Cove Studio 2. There are only 13 jobs but they are 13 brand new jobs, incremental over what these businesses had on last year. And my point in raising it, even though it is a small number of jobs and a small amount of money to this point, there is \$5 million in the programme. The applications are coming in fairly fast and furiously now, from all over Newfoundland, and what we are going to try to do is, on a very timely basis two or three times a weeks, get the money out, get the jobs approved so that we can go on with what we started to do earlier this year.

Coming after me, Mr. Speaker, this morning will be the Minister responsible for parks and the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development with other jobs that

are being created. Up to now, on departmental jobs there are 1,122 plus the 13 in the private sector, which will be up into the hundreds in a week or two, plus the new lots of jobs that the other ministers will be announcing this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
It is always a delight to even get the Premier on his feet to talk about jobs, even eleven jobs, if it is in the five to ten statement, or thirteen jobs, as in the twenty to eleven statement, and the thing keeps changing. It goes to show the mad pace of this job creation effort by this government. It is an ongoing thing. They cannot even keep their statements up to date, a job here and a job there. We would have a few more, Mr. Speaker, if the few measly, stingy, underfunded programmes were administered fairly. But even in this sheet, Mr. Speaker, you can see the unfairness. I happen to know, by being a party to it, that even the dispensing of the applications was manipulated so that people in certain areas actually had proposals submitted before the applications went out to certain other districts, before they even reached the desks.

MR. FUREY:  
Some of them had them without even looking for them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am telling you that in order to hand deliver, you have to have them in hand.

MR. DOYLE:

(Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I were the Minister of Municipal Affairs, whose head is wanted by every self-respecting councillor in Newfoundland -

MR. SIMMS:

That is irrelevant.

MR. SIMMONS:

Irrelevant but factual.

Mr. Speaker, I make an appeal to them to just get off the politics. I mean, what an obsession it must be, what a tremendous weight it must be to think every single second of the day survival, survival. How will I survive the day? I will manipulate a few applications here, I will do this, I will go in and I will scream my head off in the House of Assembly and see if I can put some people off stride who were sent here to represent the people. What a terrible, terrible existence to day and night, every waking hour, be preoccupied by political survival!

Mr. Speaker, the poll of last week really got to them. I feel for my friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) who is gone in that poll; the gentleman beside him who is gone in that poll, gone completely; the lady from Corner Brook; the gentleman from the

other side, the Bay of Islands, gone in that particular poll. I understand all this. We all have our crosses to bear. But I appeal to these people -

MR. TOBIN:

What about Fortune - Hermitage?

MR. SIMMONS:

What would you know about Fortune - Hermitage? What would you know, period? You know how to move that mouth, boy, if you only had a brain above it to help you move it.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) some job.

MR. SIMMONS:

Come on now. Give us some more of that!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, do not stifle his wit.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

He is saying order, by the way.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

He is saying order to you, by the way.

Mr. Speaker, we are all interested in the hon. member's rhetoric here this morning, yet he has had nothing to say about the statement. He is talking about this fellow and that fellow being gone in the polls, which has

nothing to do with the statement. Perhaps the hon. member would be able to confine his remarks to the relevant information in the Premier's statement. Mr. Speaker, that is what the purpose of response is all about, it is not for debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, at times it is difficult for the Chair to know if the response is exactly to the Ministerial Statement. The hon. member's time has now elapsed.

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:  
He is not finished yet.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

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

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
In fairness, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is being demonstrated now why this House is having some difficulty functioning. I sat down, Mr. Speaker, because a point of order was being entertained by the Chair. The point of order was being dispensed with and, in the normal course of events, either the speaker who had been interrupted would be recognized or, at least as a courtesy, would be informed that his time had

expired. Neither of those things happened at the time, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, and then another speaker was recognized without my being informed why another speaker was being recognized. If my time had expired, as I subsequently learned, that is fair ball. But, Mr. Speaker, if we cannot even go by the few rules we have left in this Chamber, it is going to be increasingly difficult to do anything in this particular Chamber.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition had a designated time to respond to the statement and he was on his feet for sufficient time to do that. Now, he engaged in so many irrelevancies that it was necessary to raise a point of order. That was his own doing that brought that about and, as is well known, points of order do come out of the time that is allotted to members opposite who respond to statements. Now, if they engage in irrelevancies that cause a point of order to be raised, well, they bring it on their own head, and it has to be done within the length of time that the rules allow for dealing with that particular statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member's time had elapsed. Actually, the hon. member's time had elapsed before the point of order had arisen.

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to try and return the debate to the matter at hand, which is the statement read by the Premier, and say that we of this party welcome the efforts of this government to support job creation in the business sector, in particular, but we have a concern about the exclusion of non-profit institutions in being able to access this programme.

There is a problem in this Province with restraint in health, education and human services, where people are hurting from high unemployment, hurting from the social ills that come about as a result of economic difficulties, and government should be looking at making job creation programmes available in the community to help institutions, non-profit and public institutions, and putting people to work to take care of our people who are hurting.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, we would say that for the Premier to come in and count up thirteen jobs, eleven of which are in PC districts, is a rather feeble attempt that we are going to see week in and week out; the government coming in and in a tedious way counting the jobs that they are creating, short-term, make-work jobs, not long-term meaningful jobs, to try and add up to the 40,000 jobs this government promised to create. It is going to become a rather tedious exercise, but we will respond to it in a productive fashion as it is presented to us.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

I think it is necessary to bring this up; it may be just a misunderstanding on the hon. member's part. This particular programme is for the private sector. There are other programmes for the public sector. This is for the private sector, p-r-i-v-a-t-e. This is where one matches the salaries in the private sector.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this morning to announce six additional jobs creation initiatives involving my department.

Five of these entail improvements to provincial parks. In total, the Parks Division of my department will spend \$95,913 to create 21 jobs in these five projects.

An amount of \$13,097 will be spent at Otter Bay to create three jobs; \$26,200 will see six jobs created at Blow Me Down and Bottle Cove; \$21,237 will result in five jobs at Chessemann; \$22,336 will result in four jobs at Indian River and Baie Verte Group camp grounds and



an expenditure of \$13,043 will create three jobs at Holyrood Pond and Point La Haye.

In addition to these five provincial park improvements, Mr. Speaker, an expenditure of \$17,036 will result in four jobs at the Salmonier Nature Park, which is administered by the Wildlife Division of my department.

All these projects will involve significant improvements to these various parks, consequently benefitting residents and tourists alike.

In total, these six initiatives will involve an expenditure of \$112,949 in the creation of twenty-five jobs. These bring to 225, Mr. Speaker - I would like to repeat, 225 - the total number of jobs created this Spring and Summer in improvements to our extensive and diversified parks system.

I would like to go on record as saying these 225 jobs, which are Provincial Job Creation projects, are in addition to the regular park employees; we have approximately 500 in total. This year, of course, the total expenditure through our Job Creation Programme, Mr. Speaker, will now total \$1,015,000 for 225 new jobs.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is very indicative of this government's commitment to our parks system and to significant job creation in areas of long-term value to the community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I thank the minister for giving me a copy of his statement earlier. We welcome any initiative or any announcement that will see the creation of jobs in the Province and we look forward to seeing many more initiatives, but do we have some concerns. As I was reading through the statement, Mr. Speaker, I was agreeing with most of it, until I came to the last line, 'This is indicative of this government's commitment to our parks system and to significant job creation in areas of long-term value to the community.' One of the concerns I have is how these people are going to be hired for these jobs. I am sure they are going to be hired fairly, as everybody else in the public service is hired, and I am sure the minister is going to make sure that they are and that he will bring to the House the system of how they are going to do that, and that they are not going to have to have PC club cards to get into the little club of 225 jobs. Hopefully that will not be the case, and I am sure the minister will clarify it.

Mr. Speaker, in reading over the statement I can see that everything is coming up roses and that have not will be no more. Forty-four per cent youth unemployment in the Province and the minister is coming in with this announcement, and with bravado he talks about the good job they are doing. Well, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the minister and his administration, that they are not

doing a good job, that it is a catastrophe out there in the Province with youth unemployment and that he should be coming in with a lot more announcements to take care of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We also welcome this statement from the minister inasmuch as it does represent some economic activity. We do not understand why the minister did not have this prepared when he made an earlier statement, a couple of weeks ago, about job creation for the parks this Summer - I guess some jobs were saved to have a timely announcement before the long holiday weekend.

We would have appreciated it if the minister could have given us some information about what kinds of jobs these are: What are they doing in the parks? What is the programme for upgrading facilities in the parks? People will be asking questions about that this weekend, as the park season opens. More than that, we would appreciate it if the minister might take a cue from the Premier's table which he presented, in which he outlined the number of work weeks that would be involved with these jobs. Short-term, six to eight or ten week jobs, is not meaningful job creation programmes. It represents, again, a part of what

is clearly going to become a tedious effort of counting jobs, jobs that might be good for the parks but not necessarily good for our people because they are not long-term, meaningful work.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased today, to inform hon. members that Cabinet has approved eleven new projects which will create forty-seven new jobs in the Province at a total cost to government of \$252,000. The projects include construction and resource management support to the Province's agricultural industry and resource development projects sponsored through the Rural Development Associations.

These new projects, Mr. Speaker, are specifically aimed at providing assistance to the resource sectors in rural areas of the Province. That is where the job creation activity is most needed, Mr. Speaker, and that is where my department is aiming its priorities.

The projects include land clearing to support community pastures, blueberry land development, study of fuel peat, hayland development, a tree nursery - I would like to deviate a little from the statement - which is a very good project of two development associations which got together on creating a tree nursery to supply

some seedlings for the Silviculture programme in this Province - bakery construction, which is another project I am rather delighted to get approved, which will help the Bell Island Co-op create the bakery they have been working on for several years. These approved projects are consistent with government's job creation priority which was announced in the latest Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, these projects are in addition to the eighty new projects which I announced a couple of weeks ago, which created 349 jobs at a cost of \$1,397,722.

The projects will be administered through the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development in consultation with the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), I would like to respond to the statement.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He will not be back.

MR. SIMMONS:  
He will be back as soon as he works on the nurses' situation, which the gentleman for Torngat (Mr. Warren) has not said a peep about yet.

MR. WARREN:  
(Inaudible) doing a good job.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
He will not be back on that side.

MR. SIMMONS:  
No, he will be back on that side, after the election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a key -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
The order, Mr. Speaker, impresses me, Sir.

MR. WARREN:  
I am worried that he is not here, because -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Who can but be impressed by the absolute order in this Chamber at all times?

Mr. Speaker, the key phrase in the minister's statement is 'this is consistent with the government's job priority.' On that, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Read the statement and see what he said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
I understood, Mr. Speaker, the minister said that these

announcements or those projects are consistent with the government's job-creation priority. Is he denying he said that now?

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
No.

MR. SIMMONS:  
No?

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
The statement will tell you what I said.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Read the statement.

MR. SIMMONS:  
The statement has not reached here yet, that is the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would ask hon. members on the left to please keep a reasonable silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
The most significant statement in this ministerial statement is, 'this is consistent with the government's job-creation priority', and it is. It is very consistent, because government's job priority on a list of ten is number eleven. And this statement reflects that priority, reflects it very well. It is another nothing statement. It bandies around the word rural, rural, rural. Why will they not get the message that the people of rural Newfoundland have abandoned this crowd because they abandoned rural

Newfoundland before?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
All they had to do was watch the television last night to see that the Rural Development Association in Bay d'Espoir is not exactly in love with a minister who wants to control everything in Bay d'Espoir, the development. He will find that the erstwhile love affair between him and the Rural Development Council has soured somewhat when they find out where he is really coming from. So, if I were him, I would use the word rural, rural, rural much less frequently. The less he can draw attention to it, the better for his own survival. I would suggest that he go get the name of his department changed so the word 'rural' does not appear there, because it certainly does not appear in the priority of his activities from day to day.

This statement, Mr. Speaker, is another insult to rural Newfoundland, another insult to the thousands of people out there walking around without jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
And so are you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WARREN:  
You are wasting your talents.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:  
Name him, Mr. Speaker! Name him!

MR. SIMMONS:

It is early Friday morning, Mr. Speaker. These guys have blood pressure problems. Why should I aggravate them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of this party I would not say that this statement represents an insult to people in rural Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

People who are trying to put a bakery together over on Bell Island will appreciate the efforts the minister is making; he is giving them some assistance. What I would say people in rural Newfoundland have seen recently as an insult is the money that the government is going to be putting into the Sprung greenhouse project, out in the minister's own district, the \$2.5 million that is being given to this company from away. The minister today has \$220,000 to give to a number of projects across the Province. We have questions about where that money is coming from. It is unclear whether the \$2.5 million is in the minister's estimates for his department or whether it is new money that is going to be taken away from projects such as these, that are on the minister's

desk, and that question remains to be answered.

I would further say, Mr. Speaker, that we would appreciate on this side if, when ministers continue to come in to make these ad hoc announcements week to week, day to day about what they are doing with passing around jobs, if we could have a consistent formula to look at - where the jobs are going; what the duration is; what the nature of the programme is - so we can have some sense of tracking and we do not have to wait for propaganda, full page ads in the newspapers, to try to make sense of what programmes it is that government is referring to. So I will put that as a suggestion to all ministers for when they come forward with these announcements.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries, forty-five Level I students from Vaters Collegiate in St. John's with their teachers, Mr. Rick Canning and Mr. Keith Collins.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome thirty Grade X students from Mobil Central High School in the Ferryland district accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Gibbons and Miss Dunaway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

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. R. Aylward). I am sure that the minister is aware that the salient point of the House Royal Commission on Unemployment was to create work in rural Newfoundland.

In this spirit, is it true that you and your government have decided to withdraw support for the aquaculture programme in Bay d'Espoir - after giving commitments of full support to the people of Bay d'Espoir - an industry that could have created 150 jobs in rural Newfoundland?

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
No, Mr. Speaker. It is not true that we are withdrawing support from the aquaculture industry in Newfoundland. We have invested \$2 million in the Bay d'Espoir hatchery to date. We know we have to invest probably at least as much as that, and we see a future for more hatcheries in the Bay d'Espoir area, Mr. Speaker, and greater development. That is what the commitment of this government is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILBERT:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:  
The minister was quoted as saying they 'have invested', but you encouraged the people of Bay d'Espoir to form companies, to get involved in salmon growing, with your department's commitment of financial support. Is it true that unless the Bay d'Espoir Development Association bows to the wishes of this government, gives control of the salmon hatchery, which was 90 per cent federally funded, to your government, your government is refusing to support the aquaculture industry in Bay d'Espoir?

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, just to correct one thing, the last \$1 million to the Bay d'Espoir hatchery was 100 per cent provincially funded, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
There are federal funds invested in the hatchery in job creation programmes, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, but most of the capital money to create, to build, to give the resource, to put it in place, came from the provincial government, Mr. Speaker, and without that, none of it would happen down there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, the actual fact of

the matter is that the provincial government would like the owners of the Bay d'Espoir hatchery to continue to live by an agreement which we had in 1985 to provide a certain number of people to a Board of Directors. That is the actual fact of what government is requesting, just continue to agree to the letter that we had in 1985, and allow the Board of Directors to operate as it has been for the past two years, Mr. Speaker. The reason for it, Mr. Speaker, is because government knows we have to put in much more money down there to continue the development of the salmon industry and the aquaculture industry in this Province.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

The actual building of the hatchery I believe was 90 per cent federally funded. My question is: Is it also true that not only have the people of Bay d'Espoir to give your government control of the salmon hatchery, but to also commit 60 per cent of the smolt produced by this hatchery to National Sea? If this is so, how could you expect the industry to grow in Bay d'Espoir and create 150 jobs in rural Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, for a successful businessman in this Province to make a statement like that is ridiculous. Mr. Speaker, if you

have a business in Bay d'Espoir, a hatchery, a separate business, and you can guarantee right today that 60 per cent of its production will be purchased, that is better than most industries in this Province can do, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

A guaranteed income of almost \$600,000 a year, right today to be signed if it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, is one business decision, and that is not a big problem. This is not only a Bay d'Espoir hatchery, by the way. This hatchery, and maybe another down there, will supply salmon smolt to Green Bay, the St. Mary's Bay area, and several other parts of our Province. To bring other people on, what we know we have to do, and what we have told the Development Association we will do, is increase the capacity of the hatchery. There is a joint proposal there now, Mr. Speaker, presented to the people in Bay d'Espoir, between the co-operative, made up of the businesspeople in Bay d'Espoir, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, through my department and the Department of Fisheries, and National Sea, a well-known fish company in this Province, to do a two cycle grow out so that we can work out any possible technical problems that we are going to have. There has not been a proven product produced from scientifically proven smolt at this time - we do not know what kind of smolt would be the best strain to develop - and we have not had a two cycle grow out so that we know what we are going to market and how much the market is going to bear of our product, Mr. Speaker. This is the plan for the

next two cycles. This proposal has been given to the Bay d'Espoir people, Mr. Speaker. That is not all of the proposal, because this joint venture, which the co-op and its members will be involved in, means there is potential to compare a bigger operation, such as National Sea, with some smaller operations to see which type would work better and, if the smaller ones work better, we will go that way, Mr. Speaker. We have guaranteed the co-op \$264,000 cash up front to get their own people in business along with National Sea and their joint venture with National Sea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

It is interesting that the minister could get up and ramble on like that in answer to the question. You give no help to a proven industry like aquaculture, that has been proven over thousands of years - there is no problem at all in the development of that industry, it is not experimental - but, all of a sudden, your government, despite the advice of all the experts across Canada, with all the experts across Canada saying not to get involved in hydroponics, the government immediately commits \$18 million to an industry like that. Why can they not put the money into Bay d'Espoir?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern

Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, we have pumped money, and we will continue to pump money into Bay d'Espoir to create a successful aquaculture industry in that area. Mr. Speaker, we have given to the Co-op, the Hatchery Corporation, and the Development Association, in writing, what we want to do down there. I mean, it is not that we are or are not going to do it. We have commitments to develop an aquaculture industry in Bay d'Espoir. We are not trying to back away from that. All we want to do is have all parties live up to an agreement that we had. I mean, if this agreement is so bad, why was it not so bad in 1985? That is what I do not understand, that all of the sudden it is a ridiculous agreement, but it was not in 1985. It has been working for two years, so I do not know why it could not continue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. The Premier and the House will be aware that we in the official Opposition have advocated that the retail sales tax ought to be reduced. It is at the highest level of any provincial jurisdiction in Canada. It has gone up several points since the Premier and his administration took office.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) of points.



MR. SIMMONS:

If he would hear the question, Mr. Speaker! I know he would like to sit there and tell you what to do, but he is not going to tell me what to do.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if the member would hear the sentence! It is that the Premier and several of his colleagues, since they, either as Premier or other capacities, have been in government, since 1972, the sales tax has gone up several points.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We will change that. We -

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have not finished my sentence. If he is proud of the number of points it has gone up since he is in office, he can address that particular issue if he would like.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am not fussy about it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Are you? Not particularly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Hurry up! Ask the question.

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, we have the questions. You have not got the answers. Shut up, Len, boy. You child, you poor, little, pathetic child, shut up! Shut up! Shut up! Just shut up for a change.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Give it up! Give it up! Give it up, boy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are starting to lose your cool.

MR. TOBIN:

Throw a bucket of water over him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, our approach is different this morning. We do not intend to continue the farce of this House. Unless we get protection, we are not even going to ask the questions. We need protection.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the retail sales tax is at the highest level in all of Canada, thanks to this administration. We have been saying for a long time that that is having a debilitating affect on the economy. Now, we have Mr. John O'Dea, the President of the Board of Trade, who said publicly that people are going outside the Province to make purchases so they do not have to pay that particular tax, because of its very high level. That in itself is having an effect on the economy. I ask the Premier, in the light of considerable weight of evidence that this 12 per cent sales tax is indeed counterproductive, would he agree to undertake an review of it with a view to decreasing it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have already taken

a number of reviews. When your current account deficit goes from \$42 million in one year to \$172 million in another year and the Leader of the Opposition gets up in the budget debate and condemns the government for its high deficits, then goes on to condemn the government for not spending enough on health care and on transportation, the Leader of the Opposition cannot have it both ways. We cannot have less money coming in and do more. That is impossible, Mr. Speaker. We increased our health budget this year by \$39 million, we have increased the ambulance road service by 200 per cent in the last eight years, we have to continue to expand in other programmes - education, transportation, job creation and so on - so we cannot at this point in time look at reducing it. We can only look at stabilizing our revenue generation, which we have done, by not increasing taxes any higher than they are. They are too high, but if people want the present services and more services - around the Province today everybody is wanting the government to spend more money - then obviously, Mr. Speaker, we cannot look at reducing the taxes because there are demands out there. The only place that the money can come from is through revenue. Mr. Speaker, we have reviewed the tax regime many, many times. What we are trying to do now is to get around it by doing a 50/50 deal with the private sector to create jobs. Some 1122 jobs that have been created through the fishery, forestry, rural development and parks, with close to another 100 or so jobs today, and there will be hundreds and hundreds next week and the next week. This is the way we hope to get around our deficit problem, by

stimulating the economy more, which will generate more revenue. But we are not going to be foolish and stupid enough to think that we can deliver the demands that the people of Newfoundland legitimately have by reducing taxes, thereby reducing our revenue and, therefore, having less to meet those demands.

MR. J. CARTER:

The Leader of the Opposition does not pay any taxes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, a wonderful speech.

The Premier gives as his defence the high deficit, from \$42 million to \$172 million, but I wonder who caused that? Are we being blamed for that now, Mr. Speaker? The Premier is like the child who went out and bopped off his parents and then pleaded for mercy on the grounds that he was an orphan. Mr. Speaker, the high deficit is that Premier's problem. He created the problem. Nobody forced him to do the expensive renovations on his office, which makes up part of the deficit. Nobody forced him to -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Did I say something somebody did not like?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. It is a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. the member please pose his question?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, of course the deficit is high.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I wonder would hon. members on my left would please allow the question to be asked?

MR. SIMMONS:

Of course the deficit is high, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier must take the full responsibility for that, but that is not the particularly the question I asked him. Let me put it a little differently, so we do not ask the same question the same way and get the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) all excited.

The gentleman who is the President of the Board of Trade has made a very direct allegation and, in the process, a suggestion that he feels would help the economy. Is the Premier telling the House that he rejects that particular suggestion as not being of worth? The Premier will be aware, if he wants to talk about deficits, that the highest paid Cabinet of any provincial jurisdiction in Canada - just the salaries of those guys, and their perks and the press secretaries - would contribute something to his deficits. So if he wants to look for ways to trim the deficit we can give him some suggestions on that point. But the question is: Is he rejecting outright a suggestion from Mr. O'Dea that would have the effect I submit, of stimulating the economy?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all the Leader of the Opposition cannot have it both ways. He wants to criticize as if renovations or whatever contributed in an enormous way to the deficit even while the Leader of the Opposition is looking for more space now from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and the Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He wants more office space, yet he turns around and gets up and starts attacking the government on office space. Now how can the Leader of the Opposition have any credibility in talking about renovations or office space? By the way, I did not increase my office space, it is the same as when the first premier took over here when this building was built. It is the same square footage that has always been there.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is not true.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, that is true.

MR. SIMMONS:

You took next door.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, that is the Cabinet Room. You are talking about the office space. The Leader of the Opposition has a request in looking for more space for his office, and yet he is criticizing us for a balloon deficit because of extra office space.

Now how can the Leader of the Opposition have any credibility in asking that kind of a question?

It is crazy. The Leader of the Opposition has to get his act together.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, first of all, if the Premier insists on introducing irrelevancies and the Chair permits them, would the Chair permit the following irrelevancy? The Chair in its wisdom, in its capacity as administrator of the House, gave the Opposition an extra staff person and a half in the last month or so. My letter to the Speaker, which I understood was a private communication, asked if he would acknowledge the fact that there was now an extra body and a half down there and could he help me accommodate that situation.

That is the extra space the Premier is talking about, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Way to go!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the Premier's reasons, I would like to hear the Premier's rationale as to how he can say he took the Cabinet Room on the eighth floor, forced the press out of the tenth floor, and yet does not have more space for himself on

the eighth floor? Stop talking fantasy, boy! Come down to earth for a change.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) record.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Now, Guy, just cool it. Mr. Speaker, the question is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:  
He is a nice guy, Mr. Speaker. He is a nice guy. I know him well. I do not know what he is so worked up about. He is a nice guy.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:  
You are a nice guy, too.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
- get away with it, buddy.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Oh.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would ask the hon. members to my left to please allow questions to be put.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

It is impossible to carry on Question Period if there is a continuous, concerted effort to interrupt and, unfortunately, I am coming to that conclusion.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I understand the nice guys are all upset, but the question to the Premier is this. Mr. O'Dea has suggested, and has also expressed concern, and we share that concern, that the 12 per cent sales tax is not only too high, but is spread over too broad a range of commodities. Can the Premier indicate to the House whether or not there is some hope for these people out there who have just about everything taxed now and, of course, in tandem with the federal government they want to tax chocolate bars, candy bars and everything. The whole sales tax issue is becoming much more onerous. And I would ask the Premier does he see any wisdom in that suggestion of Mr. O'Dea? And has he any thoughts that he might address that situation?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition is not reading the material that is being put out by the government, the budget and so on. The Minister of Finance announced in the budget that we are investigating a stock option's plan, for example. We announced in the budget that the development corporation was going to get substantially more funds for equity participation with businesses, that we starting a youth entrepreneur programme, that we had a venture capital programme going. These are the measures that we are using, plus our 50/50

cost sharing of new jobs with the private sector, plus our park job creation, plus our fishery job creation. We also give an exemption of retail sales tax for new equipment that is put into industries around the Province. On new equipment that is bought we give a retail sales. We have a loan guarantee programme which has guaranteed loans to twenty-five to thirty fish businesses around the Province, we have a Farm Loan Board with a subsidized interest rate, we have a Rural Development Authority with subsidized interest rates, we have a Fisheries Loan Board, Mr. Speaker, and we have a bounty system, all of which cover all the various sectors of the economy, not one sector - not just fisheries, but fisheries and farming, and for anybody buying new equipment there are retail sales tax exemptions. So we are doing a lot; the venture capital programme, the equity programme, the youth entrepreneur programme, and our job creation through the various department, plus the 50/50, and a three year tax holiday for small corporations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you list up all of those initiatives, they are fairly substantial in trying to do exactly what the Leader of the Opposition wants done and what Mr. O'Dea is taking about.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and it concerns one of the recommendations in the Provincial Bed Study Report which was tabled

in this House some weeks ago. The report in question, Mr. Speaker, recommends that there not be a chronic care facility provided for the people of Twillingate district, but instead that the existing hospital, the Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hospital, be reduced, and that the pediatric ward, for example, be discontinued and that the intensive care facility in that hospital be downgraded to a two bed unit. I wonder would the minister, Mr. Speaker, tell the House if in fact it is his intention to implement that recommendation?

DR. TWOMEY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I made a Ministerial Statement in this House a number of weeks ago I clearly outlined a policy of the Department of Health and of the government in dealing with that bed study.

I think I put it clearly and succinctly, that the Department of Health had used the bed study as a guide for the future, not as a blueprint that we were going to use it for the benefit of all people in Newfoundland, and for the benefit of the health care system. I think in a subsequent question I said that nothing was carved in stone. Furthermore, I can give the member the assurance that before any change is made in any health care facility across this Province there will be close liaison with the boards, with the administration, and with all the health care personnel who are responsible for the running of these institutions.

I can assure the member now that we have not contemplated reducing the beds at this time. We have not contemplated closing the intensive care center or the intensive coronary care center.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
I thank the minister for his reply and his assurance, if I understood him correctly, that no such action would be taken without prior and due consideration.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in the Orsborn Royal Commission report on health costs, there was a recommendation that there be a chronic care facility provided in Twillingate district - in fact, it was number three on the list. Will the minister now tell the House, Mr. Speaker, if, in fact, that recommendation will be followed, or will they bypass that recommendation by accepting the one in the latest report, that a facility of that nature not be provided in Twillingate district?

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
Mr. Speaker, you are talking about the Royal Commission Report on hospital and health care services. In that report, if you review it, you will find a very definite statement. Our recommendation is that we would employ the services of someone knowledgeable in the

distribution of health care beds in this Province. The government did that. That bed study has been published. You are aware of its contents. They are the ones that have met around the Province, as I have told this House. They have not met with everyone, but they have travelled extensively. Their conclusion was that there could be about 350 beds closed over a period of time. I think the period of time was between now and 1990.

Again I gave the affirmation that we were using it as a guideline. I am not sure when I make this statement, but I did not think that the Royal Commission on Hospital and Nursing Home Services did make a recommendation for Twillingate. I am not quite sure but I think it did not. The government has decided that during the next three years there will be a moratorium in granting money for the erection of buildings.

That is the policy of this government at this particular time. We are not putting a chronic health care center in Twillingate at the present time.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker:

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

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier a question. The provincial bed study which was just alluded to, which cost a couple of hundred thousand dollars, which was made public a year after it was given to Cabinet, recommended that the St. Lawrence Cottage Hospital should cease to provide in-patient care

when the new hospital in Salt Pond opens, and it said the same thing about the Grand Bank Cottage Hospital. The Orsborn Royal Commission Report recommended that these two hospitals close as well. So let me ask the Premier, when will these two cottage hospitals close on the Burin Peninsula?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, we commission studies from time to time and we look at these studies and, as the Minister of Health has said, they become the guidelines, they do not become the blueprint. Suddenly government does not relinquish its right to govern based on a report, and every single sentence and word in a report become government policy. It is a guide. It is to get more advice from people who are qualified in the field. We have made a basic decision as it relates to St. Lawrence and Grand Bank and the Salt Pond facility, and it was announced by the government some time ago. So there is no plan at the present moment to close down these facilities.

In the case of St. Lawrence, as I told the hon. member for Bellevue a number of weeks ago, it is a particular circumstance which is much different than many others. This facility, as I understand it, was given to the people of St. Lawrence by the Americans - you have got to look at the circumstance - as a memorial because of the problems that they have had down there over the years when the old mine was going and so on. If you just do a broad brush of the Province and say numbers of people and beds, you will do a

whole bunch of things to the Province, you would close half the Province down. But if you look at the circumstance of St. Lawrence, where it was a memorial given by the Americans, one, that makes it a lot different than other facilities around the Province. Two, you have a mine being reactivated down there and a mill operation for the first time, plus a fish plant. There is, in our view, in consultation with the local people, some legitimate arguments for the continuation of that facility at its present level because we have to watch and see what happens in the mines and so on and the accident rates, and the same thing with the fish plant. So after we get these broad recommendations from various commissions and so on, then we just do not, holus-bolus, swallow it. We look at the local conditions in the area and take into consideration some of the concerns that the local people have, given the history of the facility, and so on. It is on the basis of that that we make up our minds, and we have made up our minds as it relates to the facilities there.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, the Premier talks about the economy on the Burin Peninsula, talks about the St. Lawrence mine, the prospects for it and so on. Now that same bed study, that same report, said about Come By Chance, 'The Come By Chance Hospital should cease to provide in-patient care when the new hospital opens in Clarenville.' In other words, it

should close. That was done. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a good economy in Come By Chance area. With almost 600 people at the Come By Chance refinery, with over 500 people at the fish plant in Arnold's Cove, not to mention the hundreds of others in the area served by what used to be the cottage hospital, let me ask when does the Premier and his administration intend - and with the prospects of course of concrete platforms at Adam's Head - to upgrade the medical facility at Come By Chance to at least a sixteen hour clinic and possibly a twenty-four hour clinic? To be consistent, when are you going to do it?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, we have answered that over and over, many, many times, for the hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Not satisfactorily.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Well, that is just too bad if it is not to his satisfaction. I am not here to satisfy the member for Bellevue. I am here to lead a government, to try to do as much as I can for all parts of this Province. I am not here to be dictated to by the hon. member for Bellevue, and certainly not by the temporary Leader of the Opposition. That is for sure, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to.

I find it passing strange that the hon. member will use Come By Chance as a reason for upgrading health facilities in the area when he wants the refinery closed down, and condemns it every time he gets a chance.



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

My question is to the Minister of Social Services.

Yesterday, in the House of Assembly, the minister announced the creation of 338 jobs in his department for this Summer. I would like to ask the minister why, at the same time that he is creating 338 jobs, is he cutting back on thirty-five jobs within the regional offices?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, since 1979 - 1980, the staff of the Department of Social Services has been increased by 52 per cent. The reduction of thirty-five was the number that was on over and above the complement, and it should make no difference to the work load, Mr. Speaker, or the services that will be provided to the people.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

This will have to be a final supplementary.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the number of people

depending on social assistance is the same this year as last year. Would the minister explain why he hired on those thirty-five people to take care of the case loads by the social workers and sees fit to lay them off in 1987 when the same number of people are dependant on social services?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

These thirty-five were not necessarily hired last year. Mr. Speaker, over a period of time we exceeded the complement, the number that we were supposed to have. As the Premier has pointed out this morning, we do have a deficit of \$172 million this year, and, Mr. Speaker, our department as well as the rest has to stay in line. That is one department. As I have said many times in this House, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Social Services is probably the only department that in the last number of years has never received a cut in programmes. There has never been a freeze on staff or anything else. As a matter of fact, every year we have continued to increase the amount of money that is available for different programmes, and brought in new programmes. So this thirty-five cut back in staff is just a normal thing, Mr. Speaker. We are over-staffed basically. That is what it boils down to.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, a couple of minutes ago, here in the Legislature, the Premier indicated that I had indicated, myself, here in this Legislature, on several occasions, I think he said, that I did not want the Come By Chance refinery opened and that I have suggested that it should be closed down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all I have ever said in this Legislature regarding Come By Chance is that the Premier should stop trying to take credit for it. It fell into his lap. I am the happiest person in this Province and in the district of Bellevue to see it open with nearly 600 jobs. If the Premier, any of his cronies or any of his staff can find any indication anywhere where I have indicated or said in any way, shape or form that I do not want the Come By Chance oil refinery opened, then I will resign my seat and then he can have another by-election and go out to Come By Chance and promise that the hospital will never close as long as he is Premier, as he did in 1981.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier to the point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously that is not a point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. Just let me point out the hon. member is trying to abuse the

procedures of the House under a point of order to make another speech. Everybody in Newfoundland knows that the hon. member and his party, over the last number of months, have been frowning upon the development that has happened. We went out and encouraged an investor to come to this Province, got the investor to come to this Province with no money from the provincial government and we have 520 people working out in his area. I know the hon. member is upset with that. I also know that, as a result, the last poll that was done showed the hon. member would lose his seat if an election was called today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am prepared to rule. There is no point of order. The hon. member took the opportunity of explaining his point of view. There is a difference of opinion.

### Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 10.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Corporations Act," carried. (Bill No. 38)

On motion, Bill No. 38 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 11.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of

Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural, Agricultural And Northern Development Act," carried. (Bill No. 37)

On motion, Bill No. 37 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 12.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act And The Uniformed Services Pensions Act," carried. (Bill No. 40)

On motion, Bill No. 40 read a first time, ordered read a second on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Order 3

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 3, the Concurrence Motion.

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment for a few minutes on a word which the hon. the Minister of Finance gave some prominence to when he brought in his most recent budget. He brought in the word 'slippage', Mr. Speaker.

Being from outport Newfoundland, I sort of thought that slippage might be something like wharfage and it probably had something to do with a place that you would haul a boat up or that you would tie a boat up. Or it might have had something to do with dunnage, the various pieces of lumber you use when you -

MR. PATTERSON:

What about garbage?

MR. DECKER:

- load a ship with pulpwood or lumber or as the hon. member so rightly says, it might have had to do something with garbage, which might be a little closer to what the hon. gentleman was trying to talk about.

But he used the word slippage, Mr. Speaker, to refer to what happened in his budget, to show what happened to our economy where it slipped from \$40 million - not to \$40 million and \$500,000, not even to \$41 million, but he had the audacity, he had the gall to get up in this House and say, 'We experienced a little bit of slippage over last year. We anticipated that we would have a deficit in the operating account, the account we use to pay our light bill and buy our groceries and the day to day operating,' he expected that we would have a little bit of a deficit of around \$40 million, but from the time that that prediction was made and all the accounts were in and all the bills had arrived and it was all summed up, we discovered there was a little bit of slippage, Mr. Speaker. It slipped, Mr. Speaker, not to \$41 million but to \$175 million, slippage, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

No, that is not right.

MR. DECKER:

It is not right, is that what the hon. the Minister of Finance says? Was it less than \$175 million?

DR. COLLINS:

That was planned (inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

I see. It was planned. So it was not really slippage. It was premeditated. Is this what the hon. Minister of Finance is saying that it was premeditated slippage? Now, Mr. Speaker, we have another slant on this innocent word which was slipped into the estimates this year, slippage now we understand was premeditated slippage.

Mr. Speaker, whether it is premeditated or whether it is accidental is totally irrelevant. The fact of the matter is it is a disgrace, it is an absolute, total disgrace when we go from an estimated \$40 million deficit to \$175 million. It is not slippage, Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace. It is an absolute disgrace.

But an even bigger disgrace is the hon. minister's attempt to deal with the slippage. Does he say that we are now going to put Newfoundlanders back to work, all 40,000, 50,000, 60,000, 70,000, 80,000? If I were to say 80,000 unemployed, nobody would contradict me, because nobody knows how many people are unemployed in this Province. Did he say, 'One way we are going to deal with this \$170 million deficit is to put Newfoundlanders back to work in the primary industries, in the fishery, in the mines, in the lumber woods, so that we can create new dollars?' Did he say we are going to do that? No, Mr. Speaker.

Did he say that we are going to go to the bond market and try to raise that \$170 million? Probably it would have been a useless exercise, Mr. Speaker. What he said he would do was he was going to throw his hands in the air and say to Ottawa, 'This is your

problem. We are the fellows who put this Province in the mess it is in. We are the people who caused this \$170 million, which I understand now was a premeditated slippage. But, Mr. Ottawa we are not going to take any action to get us out of this mess. We are going to throw this back into your hands.'

The Premier you know was not far off when he said we are back in the 1930s again, because there is definitely a similarity in what the minister 'voluntarily', and I put voluntarily in quotation marks, Mr. Speaker, because I am not sure if it was voluntary. I see a similarity between what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is voluntarily doing and what Britain did with us in the 1930s involuntarily. It was not voluntary on our part.

There is indeed a very close similarity because in the 1930s the responsibility for governing this colony was taken away from us. We had gotten ourselves into difficulty and we could not pay our foreign debt. Great Britain took over, Mr. Speaker. In the process, we were under a dictatorship. Now maybe it was a benevolent dictatorship, but nevertheless it was a dictatorship. That dictatorship lasted until 1949.

I have talked to people of my father's and grandfather's generation who describe to me the days of the Commission of Government. It was utterly useless to write to the Commission and complain because you had a problem with a wharf or because you had a problem with a road or because there was a problem with social services. It was totally useless because that Commission

did not have to answer to the electorate. There was no electorate. They were appointed. They ran it the same way that you would run a big company.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness, it worked. It worked if you consider the debt was paid off. I understand ourselves and Poland were the only two nations on earth who paid off their war debt from the First World War. It worked. England herself did not pay off her's but it worked. But at what price? At what cost? It divorced us from all knowledge of governing ourselves. We were years and years without elected representatives.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there were people in the Province who did not even know what we were getting into when the question was put in 1949 as to whether or not we wanted to come back and to become Responsible or wanted to go into some sort of an economic relation with the States or if we wanted to enter into Confederation with Canada. We have been so long without having run our own affairs, I would suggest we did not know fully what we were getting into.

So when the Premier talks about similarity to the 1930s, there is indeed a similarity, but the actors have changed this time. This time instead of the Mother Country, Great Britain, with all of the paternalism that that phase suggests, we have now the paternalism of Ottawa. The hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has abrogated his responsibility. He has given up his responsibility. He has shrugged it off his shoulders and said, 'Here Ottawa, we have once again gotten ourselves in a mess.

Will you take the responsibility and will you bail us out?' Now this is what happened. This is the way he is going to deal with this slippage, as he calls it. This premediated slippage, he now tells us. We are going to say to Ottawa it is no longer our responsibility. We are not going to try to do anything about it but we are going to ask you to do something about it. This is the situation we are in. I see a similarity there between 1933 and what the hon. the Minister of Finance is saying.

But, Mr. Speaker, when Great Britain took responsibility for our affairs in 1933, it was at a tremendous cost. It was at a tremendous price to the people of this nation, as we were, this colony, as we were, at the time. I would suggest, Sir, if we refuse to take responsibility for our actions that government, I will not even say 'we', Mr. Speaker, because we on this side of the House are not responsible for it. We have to bear the consequences like every other Newfoundlander. We are the ones who are going to have to relinquish our birthright, but it is nothing only the responsibility of an administration which is more interested in getting elected and re-elected and grasping for power than they are in governing, Mr. Speaker.

So, when I say that the responsibility of governing has been relinquished, I have to put the blame squarely where it belongs, and that is in the lap of that administration, which, fortunately, we see the last dying days of, which fortunately is going to soon be thrown out of power.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier, when he postures about calling an election in September, is right because I am not sure this Province can last another year with the kind of shirking of responsibility that we see from this Minister of Finance.

In 1933 circumstances forced us to relinquish our right to govern ourselves and to carry on our own affairs. The action of the recent budget has relinquished our right to carry on our own affairs.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. DECKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I do have to rise briefly just to make sure that the hon. member's last few remarks are not left on the record unchallenged, and therefore might get into the public perception as being the main thrust of the budget.

I do not know if the hon. member has not read the budget speech in detail, and the documents with it, or whether he has not got a good understanding of it or whether he has let time befog his mind. It was only a little while ago but, nevertheless, he might have let time befog his mind and he has just forgotten all about it, or some other less worthy intent.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, if we take

what the hon. member just said, if that is a reflection of the thinking of the Liberal Party, their thinking is that we, Newfoundlanders, must be content the way the Terms of Union, our relationship in Confederation, is going. They are saying that the budget was wrong in trying to establish a new relationship with the federal government in terms of support for the provincial government here and in terms of developing our economy here. He says it was wrong to do that. It was an abrogation. It should not have been the path we followed. Now, that must necessarily mean that he is content, and the Liberal Party is content with the way Confederation is going.

Well, I can tell the hon. member we are not content. We do not think it is going well enough in our regard and we have laid out the facts why we think that. It is not that we are being hard to get along with. It is not that we like fighting with anyone. It is not that we feel it is all right for us to have a lesser deal in Confederation than everybody else, because in some way or other we are lesser beings in Newfoundland.

We are saying we are Canadians. We have been Canadians for thirty-eight years. When we joined Canada we expected certain things out of Confederation. The people in Central Canada expected this Province to get certain things out of Confederation. We are now pointing out that thirty-eight years later, that has not come about.

Now, if the Liberal Party is content with that, I would suggest that is their problem. They have something to answer to the

electorate about. If they say, it is okay for Newfoundlanders to be only about a 60 per cent level of the average Canadian in terms of employment, in terms of income, in terms of public services, in terms of any number of things, it is okay for Newfoundlanders to be at this level, it is presumably because the Liberal Party does not think Newfoundlanders deserve anything more.

Now, we do not agree with that. We take serious objection to that line of thought. We say that as Canadians, despite all the difficulties in the Canadian economy and any other thing you want to think about, we have right to our fair chance at the opportunities and the growth in this country, and we are not getting it.

Now, what do we propose to do about that? We went to the federal government on certain general things. We say what we have in this Province is equivalent to a tight money policy. There is just not enough money in our economy to allow us to grow, to allow our businesses to expand. They are limping along.

MR. BARRY:

Reduce your taxes.

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. member says, 'Reduce your taxes.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we use taxes for? We use taxes by and large to put in essential services and essential infrastructure without which a modern economy cannot function.

I can reduce taxes by 50 per cent if I decide no more roads, if I decide no more support to the various sectors of our economy, if I decide no more welfare payments,

if I decide no more schooling and all these sorts of things. The hon. member opposite says, 'Well, you can find great amounts of money in cutting down on the bit of travel and so on and so forth.' That is so ridiculous that it is beneath the intelligence of the member opposite so he is merely making a political statement. I mean, that is not an intelligent remark. That is in actual fact a stupid remark. That is clearly a moronic remark. So I will not engage in conversation on that any longer.

Now, the point is that we have got a problem in this Province, the Liberal Party will not face up to it, we are facing up to it and we have faced up to it and we are not grabbing Ottawa by the throat and saying, 'Please face up to it.'

Now, what response are we getting? Fortunately, we have an administration in Ottawa now that is not doubly deaf which was a situation that we were faced with for so many years, certainly since 1972, doubly deaf. You went up to Ottawa and first of all you could hardly get anyone to pay any attention to you and secondly when they did they came up with all these sorts of glib remarks, like 'We support Newfoundland,' and then they tried to take away our resources. On the one hand they say, 'The resources must be developed for the benefit of Newfoundlanders,' and then they came away and tried to take them away from us, to cut us out, to not let us have anything to do with it, to spread throughout the rest of Canada, our local resources. It is like going to Manitoba and saying, 'We want half your wheat, we are going to take it away from you. It is your natural resource, we know that,

but we are going to take it away from you.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one thing we have said and we have got the sensitive hearing, fortunately, from our present administration in Ottawa. We have said, 'Now look, we just do not want your sympathetic hearing. That is good enough as a first step, but we want you to go beyond that and we have certain specific things that you got to pay attention to. You have got to put more money into regional development. You just cannot say, well, regional development is the same as industrial development.' It is not. If you put all of your money industrial development, it flows through the populous, well developed parts of the country and the less populous, less developed parts of country do not get a very big share of it because most of the industrial activity is up there.'

So we say you cannot do that, you got to change your mind, you got to back to the other way and largely put your money into regional development and the most needy areas get the biggest crack at that pot. Now that is what we said to them in general terms, in semi-specific terms.

We even went more specific than that and I will not go into all the details but I will, once again, emphasize the most glaring aspect of that. We said to them, 'Do you spend money on defense in Canada?' The answer is obviously yes. 'Do you spend it equally across the provinces?' The answer is obviously no. We say, 'Do you spend it very unequally across the provinces?' The answer they have to give us is, 'Yes, we spend it extremely unequally across the

Province to the extent that on a per capita basis in Nova Scotia, for instance' - and I am not saying this against Nova Scotia, I wish Nova Scotia had more, I am not concerned about impoverishing them, that is not my concern at all, let them have \$5,000 per capita for all I care - but I am saying, 'Is it not a bit inequitable that you spend \$1,000 approximately per capita in defense expenditure in Nova Scotia and you spend \$50 per capita on defense expenditure in Newfoundland and Labrador? Is that not a little bit too inequitable and, if it is, are we asking for something very unreasonable? Have we declared that we are outside the Canadian community? Have we said we do not want defense expenditures?'

Now I am talking about the majority of sensible Newfoundlanders. There is a certain small sort of kooky click who say, 'No, no, no defense expenditures in Newfoundland, I do not care whether they are for national defense or local defense or defense of the Arctic or playing our part in our international obligations. I do not want that.' That kooky bunch that says, 'No, no, no, no defense. I do not care if it is economic spinoff, no defense spending in Newfoundland.' Of course, I am referring to our friends in the NDP. These are the kooky fringe bunch in our political spectrum these days. We really do not have to pay too much attention to them. We have to counter their arguments, but we certainly cannot allow ourselves to be deflected from our main responsibility.

So, we are saying because of our location, because of our obvious



value to Canada in defence terms on the Eastern ramparts of the nation, sort of with a purview and a view over the Atlantic routes, between the Old World and the New World, because of our proximity to the whole Eastern Arctic, and, there are restricted channels coming from the Arctic which pass by our shore which are very important to defend and to have clearly established Canadian sovereignty over, I am talking about off the Labrador and so on.

We are saying because of all these things, but more than that, because of the underutilized, defense infrastructure in this Province, the defense installations that we inherited from the Second World War, and obviously also because it would be beneficial to us economically -

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please! The hon. minister's time is up.

DR. COLLINS:

- we are saying direct more money in our case.

If I can have just a minute, if I may, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

DR. COLLINS:

That, we think, is a defensible message to Ottawa. We are not going to get it handed to us on a plate. We have to keep after them because they have many other concerns and we are a distance from Ottawa. We are not going to get it tomorrow. We cannot go up with one document and expect our next budget will show all these great things that we asked for. It is going to be a persistent battle. It is going to take

sometime to turn around that thirty-eight years where we have not had a good deal. But we will do it, if we do achieve a certain consensus.

I am not saying a total agreement and the absence of partisan argument about this. We have to be realistic, we are going to get that. I think we have to achieve a provincial consensus that we all say, 'Yes, things have to change. Yes, they have to change marketedly, and yes, we are agreed upon the main areas that the change should take place in.'

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that I do have to counter and take out of the record at least along with the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle's account of things, I have to put in my own account of things speaking on behalf of the government.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to reply to the hon. minister, but before I do that, I am sure the minister does not realize what he is saying when he refers to the voters of St. John's East as being the kookie fringe. I would ask the minister to guard what he says. The hon. member might be a part of the kookie fringe, but I did not put the hon. member there, nor did the Minister of Finance put them there, but the voters of St. John's did and you have to take your words under advisement.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister now puts a third face on the reason

for this slippage. The first time I heard him use the word 'slippage' it was almost as if it was an accident, it went from \$40 million to \$180 million, and it is still going, Mr. Speaker, and God only knows where it is going to be before this session of the House is out, before 1:00 o'clock today. God only knows how far that slippage is going to have gone because we are on a slippery slope, Mr. Speaker, and we are slipping farther and farther into debt. Every minute we are slipping farther! But the first reason for it was it was an accident. It just happened. It was something that was not planned.

The hon. minister gets up in this House a few minutes ago and says, 'It was premeditated, it was planned, it was a planned slippage, it was,' I do not know, I just forget the words he used now, but certainly 'it was premeditated.' Now, Mr. Speaker, when he gets up and answers the little bit of constructive criticism which I gave, he throws another light on it. Why now did we have this slippage, this premeditated slippage, this \$180 million which is probably \$200 million but the time I finish speaking? Why? Because he wants to get Ottawa's attention.

Now, here is finance, here is economics, the hon. gentleman should be the head of an economics department in one of the universities. You put a province into debt \$180 million because you want to catch the attention of Ottawa? Now, Mr. Speaker, come on. Come on.

MR. BARRY:

Is that the same group that promised to co-operate and consult?

MR. DECKER:

Come on, Mr. Speaker, I mean how stupid does the minister think Newfoundlanders are? How stupid does he think Canadians are? More importantly, how stupid or how deaf does he think the bond markets are? You put a province into slippage, premeditated slippage by \$180 million, and the figure is still rising, because you want to catch Ottawa's attention. You want them to take notice of us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:

What would you like to see cut out of it? Come on, tell us what you would cut out.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, \$180 million because he wants Ottawa to take notice.

I can suggest fifty schemes which would cost an awful lot less money, Mr. Speaker, which would cost an awful lot less money. I would suggest he take the House of Assembly and let us go up to Ottawa, silly, but not as expensive as \$180 million. One hundred and eighty million dollars to get Ottawa to take notice.

Mr. Speaker, the reason it is only \$180 million is because we have a government in Ottawa who listens. That is why it is only going to cost us \$180 million. God Lord, are we not fortunate that we do not have a Liberal Government in Ottawa? Are we not fortunate that we do not have an NDP Government in Ottawa because he would have had to spend maybe \$1 billion, he would have had to take \$1 billion slippage to get Ottawa to notice us. Because, presumably, other political parties would not have

had this same caring, this same concern, this same listening to Newfoundland as the present administration in Ottawa, which the hon. minister helped put there by the way. We all remember his crusade for prosperity, do we not? We all remember the bus going across Newfoundland. We all remember the Prime Minister who was not afraid to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland. We all remember that hon. Minister of Finance was one of the main, prime movers in putting that government in Ottawa and now, to get their attention, he has to put this Province into slippage, to use his own words, into a slippage of \$180 million.

I would humbly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that maybe, it is just quite possible, that this co-operation, this listening Mr. Mulroney, this co-operating Mr. Mulroney, this Tory blue Mr. Mulroney, I would suggest, with all humility, maybe Mr. Speaker, there is just something wrong with the Prime Minister's ears. Maybe he is just not listening, if we have to put our Province \$200 million into debt in our current account just to catch his attention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us not be so silly. Let the Minister of Finance not talk such nonsense. That is not economics. That is Tom foolery, that is not politics, that is posturing, Mr. Speaker, that is nonsense. Let us let the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), when I sit down, get up and explain himself. Just on the odd chance that the media might pick up what the hon. member said, I will sit down anytime he wants me to so he can get up and clarify. Surely he does not want Hansard to show it. I will even go along -

if the people in Hansard are prepared - I will even go along with him withdrawing his remarks. What a silly excuse for a \$180 million slippage because he wanted to get the attention of Ottawa.

He also said, Mr. Speaker, that he wanted to change Confederation. What he wants to see in Confederation is ten Balkan states. What he wants to see in Confederation will never be any good to Newfoundland whatsoever because, if we are going to have ten Balkan states, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have two strong Balkan states and we are going to have six very, very poor Blakan states and we, Mr. Speaker, are going to be number six in the six; So let the minister be advised, when he talks about changing Confederation, when he talks about changing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

Could you keep those cuckoos quiet, Mr. Speaker? Could you keep these cuckoo clocks quiet, Mr. Speaker? They come out, Mr. Speaker, and they are just like the bird in the cuckoo clock. They are so used to nodding every time the Premier gets up and says something that when a fellow is trying to make a good speech in this House they begin cuckoo, cuckoo to try and keep him down. Mr. Speaker, is there some way there could be a bit of protection?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have some silence while the hon. member is making a speech?

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance wants to change Confederation. It is foolishness the hon. member is talking about, changing Confederation so that we would have ten separate states. He wants to break up Confederation. If he were to take away the central government in Ottawa - this is what the member's party has been trying to do, decentralize the nation.

There is no gain whatsoever. Why do we not realize it? There is no gain for Newfoundland unless we have a strong central government. What other reason is there to have transfer payments? What other reason is there to have schemes such as DREE? There is no other reason unless you have a strong central government, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that the government in St. John's is just as concerned about St. Anthony as it is about St. John's. That is because we have a provincial government and the role of government is to be concerned for the weaker regions of the Province. That is how it is supposed to be in theory and that is how it will be soon when we move across the way. That is the provincial government.

Ottawa, as a central government, has to be just as concerned with Newfoundland as it is with Ontario. That is the way it used to be when we had sanity in Ottawa. We have had two and a half years of insanity, we have had two and a half of years of the cuckoo's nest, as my colleague points out here, but that is just a temporary abrasion, that is just a temporary blimp which will soon pass away as the polls have showed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say a few words on the concurrence debate also, Mr. Speaker. I believe I should begin by mentioning the big project in the Mount Pearl - Kilbride area, the project that will save thousands and thousands of dollars for the consumers of this Province.

However, in speaking about this I want to say one thing about an embarrassing situation that happened a couple of days ago to a private business person in the Province. This private business person came to my office and asked me to do what I could to assist the man in his endeavours. He left my office quite satisfied with the responses that he got from me and with the intervention I was going to do on his behalf.

Mr. Speaker, around twenty minutes to three he was accompanied by another business person in this Province who asked -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Two o'clock.

MR. WARREN:

- Okay, two o'clock - who asked

him to come to a friend of his in the Confederation Building and see if they could get some more information. This young businessman, an entrepreneur, agreed to go along and they were supposed to meet with the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey).

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Where was he?

MR. WARREN:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, which there is nothing wrong with that whatsoever because I think anybody should have the opportunity to meet with anybody they desire, but when he walked into the Opposition Office, not only was the member for St. Barbe there, but also he had five other colleagues there. They got him there in an embarrassing situation and then they came to the House and embarrassed the gentleman again. It almost caused the gentleman to lose a business. That is what the Opposition done to this gentleman a few days ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was an irresponsible move by the member for St. Barbe and his cronies that he had sitting around the table with him. Now, Mr. Speaker, for that hon. gentleman from St. Barbe to do such a terrible disservice to a very promising young entrepreneur in this Province was disgusting, it was most disgusting.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
He should resign.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I think, yes, I believe the hon. gentleman should at least hang his head in shame.

I understand what the hon. member is after and I am also most interested in the absence of one the most decent, honourable

gentlemen on the other side, the absence of the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). The member for Naskaupi has not been here now going on nineteen days including the weekend. Now, I understand, I do not know what is happening, but I know this much: In conversation with most reliable people the hon. gentleman is most reluctant to come back in this House as long as the present Leader of the Opposition is acting the way he is acting. The hon. gentleman for Naskaupi has too much pride, too much decency about him to see the dirt that came out this morning from the Leader of the Opposition. He does not want to be any part of it.

MR. TOBIN:  
Fortune - Hermitage is the worst district for a sitting member and Bellevue is second.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I cannot say too much about the Bellevue district. My home roots are there. I have many relatives and friends there. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that the word has been out that people are looking for a dedicated member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:  
I have many relatives and many enemies in Bellevue.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, what did the Mayor of Chapel Arm say? I am sure the hon. gentleman realizes what the mayor of Chapel Arm says. What did the Chairman of the Fishermen's Committee in the various communities say?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
What did they say? Tell us.

MR. WARREN:

No, no. I cannot. It is not appropriate at the present time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It might embarrass the member.

MR. WARREN:

I am sure as my hon. colleague the Minister of Fisheries, who I accompanied on a trip to Bellevue -

MR. TOBIN:

So, you were out there?

MR. WARREN:

In fact, several times now.

MR. CALLAN:

Who arranged the trip?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman want to know who arranged the trip. I should tell the hon. gentleman the trip was arranged by the the fishermen's committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

And the fishermen's committee called me to ask the minister if he would come out.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He is finished. He is gone.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) opposition see you.

MR. WARREN:

I do not know, he was not there.

MR. CALLAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CALLAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

No, Mr. Speaker, I was not in attendance at that meeting. The committee, I am not sure if he is committee chairman or committee secretary, actually, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) talks about his friends and relatives, it was one of his very close relatives who invited him and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) out. I was not invited but I might say, Mr. Speaker, I was about my district's business, I should say that.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, myself and the hon. Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) both had a similar invitation to be in the district of Bellevue on that very same night. I accepted the invitation, the Minister of Health did not accept the invitation. I, Mr. Speaker, on that particular night, on a Wednesday night, I was in the town of Sunnyside watching, Mr. Speaker, a very interesting play. It was written by a Tory teacher in Sunnyside, a fine gentleman, one of my friends, but not one of my supporters, obviously, but he and a doctor at the Come By Chance Clinic wrote a very good play entitled *Not By Choice, Not By Chance* about the closure of the Come By Chance Hospital. It was a very interesting play. The CBC were invited. I do not think the CBC were invited to Long Cove -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member for Bellevue please state his point of order?

MR. CALLAN:

My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I cannot be in two places at the same time. I cannot be in one particular place, like my hometown of Long Cove, since I was not

invited.

Now the member for Torngat Mountains may stand up and say, 'Oh, you did not have to be invited, you should have been there anyway.' Which is nonsense. I do not break in on meetings to which I am not invited.

MR. SIMMS:

It is all very interesting but boring.

MR. CALLAN:

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to set the record straight. That is my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your ruling. I know it is no point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman comes up with excuses, first he blamed it on the Mayor for Chapel Arm because he said she was a Tory. Now he comes up and talks about my relative, but I am sure the hon. gentleman knows, he is not Tory.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

I am sure he knows he is not.

MR. TOBIN:

Well, what is the problem.

MR. WARREN:

So therefore the hon. gentleman should realize the message must be out there. The hon. gentleman is

not doing a good job for his constituents. The polls have shown that. Since the leadership Convention has been called and since the former Leader for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) resigned, and he resigned on good principle, because he did not want to be a paid leader by a number of businessmen in the Province, since then people in Bellevue, the people in Fortune - Hermitage, the people in Twillingate, the people all over the Province are saying, 'What are the Liberals doing paying Clyde Wells?' I mean they never paid Steve Neary, they never paid Len Stirling, they never paid

MR. MATTHEWS:

They never paid Leo Barry.

MR. WARREN:

No, they never paid the hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. FUREY:

(Inaudible) pay Brian Peckford.

MR. WARREN:

No, Mr. Speaker, I should say to the hon. gentleman that the word is out there that the Liberal Party does not want - and, Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's paper from the former Leader of the Party, what did he say? What did the illustrious gentleman, Mr. Ted Noseworthy say? The only person you can get as a leader of a Liberal Party is a person you pay for. Mr. Speaker, I should tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that the voters of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are not going to have a leader in this Province that is going to be controlled by a few people with dollars.

MR. TOBIN:

On the street he is known as the

million dollar man.

MR. WARREN:

The million dollar man.

Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting if one looks over there and sees a picture with the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) on it and the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), side by side. I bet if you opened that book there now you would see a knife inside.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. WARREN:

No knife! Oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

It has been used.

MR. WARREN:

The knife has been used, yes, Mr. Speaker. I should say to the hon. gentleman opposite and my good friend from Bellevue, that he is going to have to change one of the faces -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I got up on a point of order just now to clarify some statements that were being made by the member for Torngat Mountains. I want to take a few more minutes now to clarify a few other things.

How people can stand in their places and totally misconstrue and

totally confuse issues, and tell only one side of the story, is beyond me.

The Minister of Finance was up earlier talking about how bad, old Ottawa - of course, it used to be bad, old, Liberal Ottawa, now it is bad, old, Tory Ottawa - and he talked about how they are not looking after the extremities of the country. You know, they are concerned about Ontario and Quebec, and they are not concerned about the regions.

Mr. Speaker, this government is a prime example of what he, himself, was talking about. This government, Mr. Speaker, is not looking after the extremities of this Province in the same way that Ottawa, under a Tory government, is not looking after the extremities of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I was watching *Here And Now* one night last week, I think it was, and I saw an interesting programme. I saw the mayor and councillors up in St. Anthony coming out of their town council building with their black arm bands on and they were mourning for the loss of democracy in this Province, an undemocratic government did not give them the water and sewer they applied for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were two messages in that, of course. That particular clip on *Here And Now* that night spoke volumes. It did more, Mr. Speaker, to get the message out across this Province about the unfairness, the inequality, the undemocratic, the dictatorial ways of this government, it did more than any paid ads could have done by the Liberal Party or by the NDP Party. It did more than five Question Periods could have done



in this Legislature, because these people, Mr. Speaker, were the common, ordinary people who represented and who tried to run a town, free labour, voluntarily, tried to run a town and tried to run it well, but got no co-operation whatsoever from this uncaring, undemocratic, dictatorial government that we have here in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains also talked about the fact that I was not representing my district and that is why they were getting in touch with him. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. The member for Torngat Mountains knows - of course, I know that he was speaking tongue in cheek. He had a smile on his face as he talked about his cousin on the Fishermen's Committee in Long Cove, who has always been a Liberal. If he has any common sense, and I am sure he has a lot, he will continue to stay Liberal, especially as we come now closer each and every day to the ousting of this government, this government which has outlived its usefulness, which has become old and tried.

That does not apply to all the members of the government, there are some good members in the back benches. If the Premier were wise, Mr. Speaker, what he would do is put some of the tired faces in the front benches back in the back benches and move some of the faces in the back benches. The member for Deer Lake is an example. A fine, hon. gentleman, what a contribution he could make if he were up in the front benches, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister for Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. And

there are others in the back benches too, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) perhaps should be up in the front benches for a couple of reasons. I believe, Mr. Speaker, now I stand to be corrected, perhaps the member for Torngat will know better than anybody else, but I believe this is the only time in our history, since Confederation that Labrador has not been represented in the Cabinet. I say that knowing that I may be corrected, but I think I am correct in saying that not since 1949, not since Confederation, has that part of our Province, the Labrador section which has four districts, four sitting members, has no Cabinet Minister.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

I think the hon. gentleman is a little bit incorrect. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, I forget exactly what year but the former member for St. John's Centre, Ank Murphy, was Minister of Labrador Affairs.

MR. FUREY:

Well, let us have a member for Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Okay, the member for Torngat Mountains took a moment for clarification. Because my colleagues, who are not even in their own seats, some of them, Mr. Speaker, because they are making so much noise here I did not quite understand or get all of what the member for Torngat Mountains said but I believe he said that a St. John's member represented Labrador in the Cabinet. That was not my point. My point was I do not think we have seen Labrador unrepresented, not represented by any person at all, whether it be a sitting member for Labrador or St. John's. That is irrelevant in my argument. What I said, Mr. Speaker, and I stand to be corrected again, what I said is I do not think that the Labrador section of our Province has been unrepresented in Cabinet since Confederation, only now, since 1985.

MR. SIMMS:

Bob Aylward represents Labrador just as Ank Murphy did.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls, who thank God will not be with us after the next election, he nearly got the boot the last time, so not only will he be moved from the front benches, he will be moved right out of the benches altogether, he will not even be in the back benches after the next election, is always interrupting, Mr. Speaker, he is always interrupting.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, there are good men in the back benches that I think should be in the front benches because some of the people in the front benches are old and tired and they do not have any new ideas. They are just riding along. I have

said on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, this Province could be run by the civil servants better than it is being run by this present administration. Mr. Speaker, all this government is doing is riding along and most of the work of course - not most of it - all of it I suppose, is being done by the civil servants. All that government does is take credit for things that somebody else did while they were either down South or out joy-riding at the taxpayers' expense.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the travel expense account in the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the expense claim is way up this year. What the reason is for that, I am not sure, but I can say if the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is so visible - not so visible - is one quarter, is 25 per cent as visible in other districts of this Province as he is in mine, then no wonder that the travel expense has gone up.

Mr. Speaker, I read in The Clarendville Packet yesterday, which was last Wednesday's Packet, a week ago, where the member for Torngat Mountains was out in North West Brook, in my district, addressing the Rural Development Association out there. They are, again, mostly Tories so I did not get an invitation. Now perhaps the member for Torngat Mountains will suggest again, 'Well, I should have gone away. What silly nonsense. That is what is happening. Part of it, Mr. Speaker, I take credit for.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:

Part of it I take credit for and I will explain that in a moment.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. member is making very telling remarks about the resource departments of this Province. He has just run down his social calendar which is very relevant to the matter of resource but that is not my main point of order. My point of order is I am trying to listen to the hon. member but I am being distracted by some sort of man wanted group over there or these are dangerous people, report them to the authorities, some sort of document, I cannot quite make it out from this distance, some document on his desk there. I think that should be taken down. I am enough distracted by a certain other picture that I have to stare at day after day after day. I am glad to see the hon. member has responded.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how much time I have left but I want to read.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has one minute.

MR. CALLAN:

I want to read a little poem to the member for Torngat Mountains who has shown a very, very large interest in my district. And he is doing a good job, I will give him credit for that. Much of it

is at my suggestion by the way. I have made suggestions, as I have told the member here in the Legislature, that he just cannot favour one part of my district, he has to treat all areas of my district alike. He cannot arrange a meeting with one group and ignore another. So I have passed out the message to my constituents, especially the leaders of councils and rural developments and so on, 'Get the member for Torngat Mountains. If you want to get some funds from government, you will not get it through me. Unfortunately, it is undemocratic, this government is, it is dictatorial but you get in touch with the member for Torngat Mountains and he will arrange a meeting with the appropriate minister. What you could not get or you thought you were not going to get you will get it.' So it is my way, Mr. Speaker, of getting things for my district through the back door, underhandedly, I suppose is another way of putting it, but it is the only way you can deal with an undemocratic government who runs a campaign really of trying to discredit an Opposition member will not give him any road work unless it is -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:

By leave. I was going to read a poem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank first of all, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the member for Burin - Placentia (Mr. Tobin), who felt that he was being dragged into this debate by comments made by members opposite concerning the fishery. I know he wants to speak and there is still a few minutes left and hopefully I will not use all my time. I believe this debate is about to conclude in twelve or thirteen minutes or so on resource estimates so I did want to get a few licks in before time expired.

I do want to refer to the hon. member for Bellevue's (Mr. Callan) comments. Now, there, Mr. Speaker, is I would say an equal trade off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

If the hon. member is prepared to remove his sign, then we can be certain that we will remove ours.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member makes some very, very strange arguments. I must say in listening as an outsider to the debate between he and the member for Torngat Mountains as to what is happening in his district of Bellevue. The member for Bellevue is sort of implying the member for Torngat Mountains is out in Bellevue district all the time constantly meeting with groups and so on and so forth, which he is, but he is sort of losing the point

or not making the point of course that there are others who have been out in Bellevue district for meetings as well on many occasions.

The Minister of Transportation has been out and met with groups, I know, in Bellevue district. The Minister of Social Services has been out and dealt with groups in the Bellevue district and gone through the district. The Minister of Fisheries has been out there. So, what is wrong with that? The Parliamentary Secretary to the Premier has met with the Mayor of Come By Chance. I have met with the Mayor of Come By Chance. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Social Policy Committee has met with people there.

So, Mr. Speaker, he seems to be somehow psyched out with the member for Torngat Mountains. He overlooks the fact that there are many others over here who have been out and met with groups, and he seems to be psyched out by the member for Torngat Mountains. Now, I do not know why that is. But maybe we will see. Maybe there is a feeling of being threatened there somewhere implied. I do not know, but the hon. member will have to answer that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member just spoke for ten minutes, let me have a few words now.

Then he made this other strange and unusual argument about Labrador for the first time since 1949 not being represented in Cabinet. Now, that is a very

strange argument, because the member for Torngat Mountains got up on a point of order and said, 'Well, at one time, for example, the Labrador affairs were represented in Cabinet by Mr. Ank Murphy, who was the member for St. John's,' and he acknowledged that. Well, if that is the case, why would he not acknowledge that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the member for Kilbride, who is the Minister of Northern Affairs, among other things, is now representing Labrador in Cabinet? Why would he not?

MR. CALLAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the point that I was making is this: Obviously, if Labrador did not have a P.C. member, in this instance, then Cabinet could not be represented by a P.C. member from Labrador. But in this instance we do have a P.C. member from Labrador and he, since he is so knowledgeable about Labrador, should obviously be the member.

Further to my argument, Mr. Speaker, what should have been done - the member for Torngat will agree and the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development will agree I am sure - with that department is it should have been split and the member for Kilbride be the Minister of Rural and Agricultural Development and the member for Torngat be the Minister of the new Department of Northern Affairs. That is my whole point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has spoken two or three times. We only have a few minutes. I wish he would give us an opportunity to speak without interrupting on points of order. He has gone from one extreme now down to another extreme. Now he is down to the nub of it, I suppose, the point he is trying to make.

I want to tell the member for Bellevue that the member for Torngat Mountains, I suspect, will be in Cabinet long before the member for Bellevue ever gets in Cabinet. Now, I feel comfortable in saying that. I feel very comfortable.

Now, let me also say that the member for Torngat Mountains represents Labrador interests very, very effectively. I can tell him that. No reflection on previous ministers perhaps who were responsible for Labrador affairs, but I would say that Labrador now is being represented in Cabinet through the member for Torngat Mountains, as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Northern Development, as good, if not better, than ever it has been represented.

So the member for Bellevue need not be too worried about the member for Torngat Mountains. I know why the member for Bellevue wants him to go into Cabinet for Labrador. I know why. So he will not run in Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Now that is the crux of the matter.

MR. CALLAN:

Not only that, but then if he were the Minister for Northern Affairs he would not have any reason for going to Bellevue. He would be down in Labrador.

MR. SIMMS:

You would be delighted with that. Well, perhaps he will be able to work closely with the new member for Bellevue, whomever it might be.

That brings me to my next point. He made some brief reference - I admit it was a very brief reference - to the allegation that the member for Grand Falls will not be here after the next election. Now, he sort of alluded to that very quickly, very briefly, but he alluded to it. He sort of took some delight in saying it. I do not know why. He took some delight in saying it because the results of the last election in Grand Falls were close, they were relatively close. Now, in the meantime, my majority was roughly three times greater than the member for St. Barbes, roughly three times greater, whatever it was. I am sure the member for St. Barbe feels confident about coming back here the next time.

So to say because there was a forty-one vote majority in one election, the hon. member seems to forget the majorities in the previous two elections and I would suggest to him that things are going fairly favourable in my district of Grand Falls. They are progressing, moving along nicely in the last couple of years. This

government has been very good to the town and the people of Grand Falls and if they continue that kind of support -

MR. TOBIN:

Do you want the results?

MR. SIMMS:

No, I do not need them. I know what they were.

MR. TOBIN:

Do you want the results of the highest vote, who got the highest vote in the Province?

MR. SIMMS:

The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) got the highest vote.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the hon member, I would say, should not be to worried about whether I am going to be here because I would say he needs to worry a lot more about whether or not he is going to be here. Perhaps he needs to keep even a closer eye on the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have about two or three minutes and I really wanted to make some comment relative to the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Your time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

No, it is not up. I still have two or three minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister's time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

No, it is not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time is up. That is correct.

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate on a point of order.

MR. W. CARTER:

I rise on a point of order because, I think, what we have seen here this morning is pretty indicative of one of the weaknesses in this House where we have a minister, who is the minister of one of the most important resource departments in this Province, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), I suppose next to the Fishery, Forestry is probably one of the second most important resource departments, he stands in his place and speaks for twelve minutes and he does not mention the word Forestry. He choses to stand up and waste the time of the House -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do not be silly 'boy'.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is not silly. I know what I am talking about. He stands up, Mr. Speaker, where we have 30,000 or 40,000 people unemployed, a large number by the way in the forestry sector, a lot of problems in that sector of the economy and the minister stands in his place and spends his whole time, ten minutes, bantering back and forth with my colleague for Bellevue and talking about the member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that people in this Province are not taking this government, or even this House, seriously. Surely the minister could have put his time to better use representing, as he does, a department that plays a

very important part in the economy of this Province.

I give him his credit. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) yesterday, Mr. Speaker, dwelt on the subject matter at hand, Fisheries. It is to his credit, but that minister, who sits over there in a smart-aleky way and cannot seem to contain himself, gets up and spends the whole period that he is allowed, the last few minutes by the way in this debate, and he has not mentioned the word Forestry. He should be ashamed of himself. I am not kidding, by the way, I mean that sincerely.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I do not need a lecture by the member for Twillingate.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

The member for Twillingate, Mr. Speaker, who credibility in this Legislature is lower than other people that are well-known in this Legislature, I do not need a lecture from the member for Twillingate who sat there, sat there and sat there, sat in the city council. Who does he think he is? I need no lecture from that clown about credibility, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

And I am telling that clown that he should (inaudible)

MR. SIMMS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

You are a clown. You should resign.

MR. SIMMS:

You are a fool.

MR. W. CARTER:

You should resign.

MR. SIMMS:

You are a bluff.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. There is no point of order but a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

We can see why, Mr. Speaker, this Province is in the desperate situation it is, when a minister of the Crown will go on with such a display of ignorance as the minister did in the past five or ten minutes. My colleague for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was right in the reference he made and the accusation he made toward the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, because for twelve minutes he stood on his feet and made no reference to the economy of the Province and no reference to his department. He jokingly made fun of his own colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains. That is all he was doing, he was just ribbing his own colleague and the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan).

Mr. Speaker, I want an opportunity this morning to speak for a few minutes on what I tried to speak on yesterday afternoon in the Late Show and was stopped by the

heckling of members of the government. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I have I want to point out to the Premier and the ministers of the Crown something about the hydroponic development that is going to be brought to the Province of Newfoundland, and try to point out clearly that members of the official Opposition are not against any kind of development in this Province. It is not our position to try to stop jobs or to try to stop any administration from creating or bringing into the Province anything that will benefit the Province in any way whatsoever. What we are questioning is the secretive way in which it has been done over the past six months. And when we ask for information on surveys that are being done to substantiate the credibility of this vast amount of money that the Premier and his government are going to invest, which belongs to the taxpayers of Newfoundland, all we get from the Premier is, very clearly, after the deal is signed, after all the legal documents are signed, then we will release the information on the market surveys on the potential of development and produce that is going to be grown over the next number of years, what the cost of the development is going to be, and what the cost of the market is going to be to the consumer of Newfoundland. This, after all the legal documents are signed.

Mr. Speaker, I say very clearly that is no way for the Premier to stand in this House and tell the people of the Province that he is running the Province in a fair and intelligent manner. Because everybody knows full-well that when you start up a business the first thing you have to do is get your financial affairs



straightened out. You have to go to a bank, and the first thing the bank is going to ask you is what type of business you are going to start, they will want a projection of one year, exactly how much money you expect to turn over, the gross amount you expect to turn over in that one year, and then how much you expect your net profit to be at the end of the year. And in order to do that, you must have a market survey done. You must be able to show that, yes, the market is there to take care of whatever product you are producing in that particular business. If you have it done properly, it is done accurately, why not show it? What effect would it have on the legal documents being signed by the government and the Sprung Group from Alberta, on the deal that is going to be put forth in this Province, the \$13.5 million deal, if the market survey is shown?

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is stated very clearly -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for this debate has elapsed.

MR. EFFORD:

Did I have ten minutes there?

MR. WARREN:

No, but there is no more time left.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, Concurrence Motion, Resource Committee, carried.

DR. COLLINS:

Order 3. Concurrence Motion, Social Services Committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 3. Concurrence Motion, Social Services Committee.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A few minutes ago we saw an example of great efficiency in this House when two members were allowed, in fact almost encouraged to speak at once and this went on for some minutes. I am going to be very interested in reading the Hansard of today's proceedings to see how the reporters handled that. I suppose we got four minutes for the price of two.

Before I get into the details of the things that we discussed in the Social Services Estimates Committee, I would like to make a few general remarks and then, perhaps, adjourn the debate. The general remarks I have are these: I am not very impressed by the artificial distinction between current and capital. It is a hobbyhorse of mine, and I think other members, to a greater or lesser extent, share my view that the distinction that is drawn between current and capital in our budget is a somewhat artificial one and, if this particular distinction is dismissed or is dissolved, then a lot of our troubles, I think, for these particular estimates fade away, and I will go on to explain what I mean.

If government were to borrow enough money to bring Churchill Falls power to the Island, if it be a matter of \$1 billion or \$2 billion, that, in my view, would be a capital expense. If government, in its wisdom, in

conjunction with other provinces were to say dam the Strait of Belle Isle, that, in my view, would be a capital expense. If government were to try and provide the Liberal Opposition with the quarters that it would like to have, that would certainly be a capital expense because their desires are so great. But in all seriousness these huge expenditures of a one-time nature would be, in my view, a legitimate capital expense. But I fail to see routine renovations of offices, or the purchase of staff cars as being a legitimate heading under capital expenses; it is the type of expense, because of the size of government, that recurs year after year. Maybe not the same car has to be replaced and maybe not the same desk, but certainly desks, carpets, furnishings and cars have to be replaced at regular intervals; it is an ongoing expense and, in my view, it should be current.

Now, if you do then look upon the budget in that sense, then you see that practically nothing has changed. It is said that we have a \$178 million deficit this year. Well, our total expenditure exceeds our total revenue by some \$350 million this year, I think, if you except the amount that has to be borrowed for refunding some of our debt that becomes due this year.

We do have a bit of a bulge for our borrowing programme this year, but that will not happen next year. The so-called deficit, using the yardstick that I have mentioned, is no greater this year than it was other years. So, nothing has changed. We are in no worse shape this year than we were in other years, except that we do have quite a bit of capital to

roll over, bonds that are coming due.

So, I am not too concerned that we are in any worse shape this year than we were in any other year. I am not suggesting that I am happy about any deficit. In my view, a deficit, even on capital account, is to be deplored and to be avoided unless it is one of these massive outlays that I mentioned earlier. I think we could perhaps argue about it, but I think we would achieve substantial agreement along those lines, that very little has changed. We are no worse off and, unfortunately, we are not much better off this year than we were in other year.

Rather than get into the detailed remarks of the Social Services Committee, I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North has adjourned the debate.

DR. COLLINS:

If it is the wish of the House, we could call it one o'clock. (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed that we call it one o'clock?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Just a brief word before we request the adjournment. As hon. members know, Monday is a holiday in our Province and the House will not be sitting on Monday. In addition to that - and we discussed this with members

opposite - certain members of the administration have some important matters to transact outside the city, on the West Coast of the Province. We discussed with members opposite whether they would have any particular problems if we requested the adjournment to Wednesday, in other words, not sit on Tuesday as well as not sit on Monday, and my understanding is that this is acceptable. I think we would have the right to put the adjournment motion anyway, but we would want to make sure that there was an understanding of why we were doing it. I think that hon. members do understand that there is agreement on that point.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. John's East may want to have a word on it. Perhaps they could have a word just on the adjournment motion I am going to make.

I move that the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three of the clock.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, yes, we in the official Opposition, have no difficulty with that. I will leave it to the gentleman from St. John's East to speak for him and his colleague.

In the usual spirit of absolute reasonableness, particularly when the proposal was put to me by my cousin from Grand Falls - they should use him more often in negotiations on matters of the functioning of this Chamber. Mr.

Speaker, we place no conditions. We are pleased to co-operate. We understand that the reason has to do with some commitments that the gentlemen on the government side have in another part of the Province, and we express the fond hope that when the time comes that we have a similar commitment, maybe not too far down the road, that that will be considered, though we do not make that a condition. We are aware that government has the majority to make the decision anyway, but we appreciate the courtesy extended to us in consulting us on the matter, and we concur.

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker, we have no problem agreeing to the proposal to adjourn until Wednesday. In fact, it would give my leader and myself more time to attend to all the many questions and concerns coming from our districts. My leader was in Menihek yesterday and today, and I am sure he will be glad to have another free day, without having to come to the House and take a lot of time listening to the stuff that goes across the Chamber, which is totally unproductive.

I would like to take the opportunity to wish members of the government, who will be in Corner Brook, well in their visit out there, because I have just received news that there is a lot of excitement and anticipation about a possible election coming. There is so much talk about the NDP in Corner Brook, I do not know

whether you are going to get a warm reception out there. I would also like to wish all hon. members a pleasant holiday, in this case now an extended holiday, for the Victoria Day weekend.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, just for clarification purposes: First, we are not going to have an election on Tuesday. I would like to reassure the hon. member about that.

In regard to the Leader of the Opposition, unfortunately we cannot extend an invitation to visit with us on this particular matter in Corner Brook, on Tuesday. But if the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes us to get a certain accommodation in the future and he wishes to invite us to that event, we would be only too glad to go.

MR. SIMMS:

Observers.

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

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

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

Hon. P.J.McNicholas, Speaker

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

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

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

...2...

Member

Matthews, Hon. William (PC)  
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)  
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)  
Morgan, James (PC)  
Otteneheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)  
Parsons, Kevin (PC)  
Patterson, William G. (PC)  
Peach, Milton (PC)  
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)  
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)  
Reid, James G. (PC)  
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC)  
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)  
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)  
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)  
Tobin, Glenn (PC)  
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)  
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)  
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)  
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)  
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)  
Woodford, Rick (PC)  
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)

District

Grand Bank  
St. John's Centre  
LaPoile  
Bonavista South  
Waterford - Kenmount  
St. John's East Extern  
Placentia  
Carbonear  
Green Bay  
Ferryland  
Trinity - Bay de Verde  
Baie Verte - White Bay  
Lewisporte  
Grand Falls  
Fortune-Hermitage  
Burin - Placentia West  
Fogo  
Exploits  
Humber East  
Torngat Mountains  
Mount Pearl  
Humber Valley  
Harbour Grace

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

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

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

-2-

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