



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 8

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER
The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, in the nature, I suppose, of a statement by ministers, I would like, at this time, and I know all members of the House would wish to be associated with it, to take note of the fact that this is the 40th anniversary of V-E Day, a very, very significant event in our history. We all know people who are veterans, and at this time I think we should pause to reflect as well on the sacrifice of many of the members of the armed forces in that great conflict who did not return to their homes, and the number of veterans who have passed on since. It is hard to think that forty years has passed since the end of that conflict, Mr. Speaker, but I do not think that the occasion should go by unnoticed. I think Your Honour is the only member of this House who is a war veteran.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
And Jim Reid.

MR. MARSHALL:
I am sorry, the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), is also a veteran, but he looks too young to be one Mr. Speaker, but now I am getting into it with Your Honour. So, there are only two members of the House, Mr. Speaker, who are war veterans, and I would like to note their presence here as well today. I know all members of the House will

wish to be associated with these sentiments, and I think it would be fitting for this House to unanimously forward our sentiments to the Provincial Command of the Royal Canadian Legion to tell them that the elected members of this Assembly have noted this 40th anniversary and express to them our appreciation of their efforts on behalf of the freedom of the Western world and to express to them as well our appreciation for their continued involvement in community activities over the ensuing years.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the official Opposition joins with the government in paying tribute and giving significance to the contribution of war veterans and taking special note of the fact that this is the 40th anniversary of victory in Europe. It is very difficult for somebody who has not gone through the experience of war to appreciate not just the threat to human life and in many cases the physical injuries incurred by surviving veterans, but also, Mr. Speaker, the terrible uncertainty and anxiety which existed for a period of some six years, and possibly earlier in the years leading up to the war, not just amongst members of the armed forces at the time but amongst their families as well. It is extremely difficult to evaluate the terrible toll that this had on many veterans, who were not physically injured but who had to bear the mental and psychological trauma of those years, and the toll upon their families and the fact that they were absent for so long in the course of their war

service. I think it is very appropriate that we acknowledge the tremendous contribution they made to ensuring democracy, which at times we now consider less threatened. I think possibly because of excessive use by certain politicians in certain parts of the world about the concept of fighting for freedom at the drop of a hat. But something very basic was preserved through the sacrifice of the veterans from Newfoundland, Canada and other parts of the free world. I guess it was summed up best by Winston Churchill in his own inimitable fashion when, before they were very far into the war, in the very early days, he set out that they had a very single-minded policy, a very simple policy and that policy was to win. There would be a policy of winning without condition, unconditional surrender, and he set out to ensure, as he said, that if the British Empire were to exist for a thousand years, he wanted to see the effort being made by the people of Britain as being their finest hour. Well, I think that that applies to veterans from Newfoundland as well as other parts of the free world. I think that we can look back upon the historic contribution made by our veterans from this Province, both in the Second World War and the First World War, and say that they made their mark and they made all Newfoundlanders proud.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Before calling the next item, I would like to welcome to the galleries Mr. Howard Hewett, Mayor of the town of Cormack.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I apologize to the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) for not notifying him, but I just got a communication from Wabush Mines, indicating that the sales figure for product has been increased from 5,250,000 tons to 5,585,000 tons of product required this year. As hon. members know, we get a notification of the requirements through the board of directors of Wabush Mines, Pickands Mather, of the requirement for product from Wabush Mines. This will show that there is an improvement in the iron ore industry and that the planned shut-down of five weeks, which was previously scheduled, is now decreased to four weeks. I am sure all hon. members are as happy as I am to receive news of this nature, because it indicates that the mining industry is indeed starting to bounce back.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I would have appreciated, as the minister knows, a copy of the statement. I accept his apology. I will just

say this, Mr. Speaker: I want to go on record as congratulating the workers of Wabush for their increase in productivity. Productivity is tied, of course, to the morale of workers and the desire of workers to increase production and to make sure the operation continues, to protect their jobs and the jobs of their fellow-workers. The workers of Wabush will have the chance to say so, but I am not sure that they would give any credit that their increase in production is in any way tied to their increase in appreciation for the way the workers of Wabush have been treated in labour matters over the past four or five years. The minister made a statement. I am not sure, for argument sake, that the minister should take any credit for that statement. The credit goes entirely to the workers in Wabush. And, Mr. Speaker, maybe the increase in production is as a result of new management or new technology. Mr. Speaker, I will take the minister's statement. We will peruse it, we will answer it in the way it deserves to be answered. We will direct our answers, Mr. Speaker, in this particular case to make sure that the workers in Wabush realize this House and this side appreciates their ability to maintain their jobs and maintain the operation in spite of all the adversity they have had to face in that part of the Province in the past five years.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
The people of Labrador West will

be, I think, quite pleased to hear that the sales figures are up and as a result we will be working one more week this year, and that will account for the increased productivity - just to make sure that everybody understands how this productivity has come about.

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

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

MR. BARRY:
So as not to rest on our prerogatives, by leave members on this side would acknowledge that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) should have an opportunity to reply, but I do not think it would be appropriate to establish the precedent that we have a number of replies to a Ministerial Statement.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We agree with the Leader of the Opposition that there are rules and we have to stick to them, but it concerns the hon. member's district and by leave I think he should be able to respond to the minister's statement. But it is by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
Has the hon. member leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
Leave is granted.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order before I address the main concern.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

If I read the rules of order correctly, it says when there is a Ministerial Statement there will be replie, but it does not say specifically that it would be just the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). I will take leave this time, but I would appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, if you would examine the rules of order and examine also the precedents of this House. Because when we moved the resolution supporting the Corner Brook Royals, I also rose at that time and there was no objection. So I would appreciate it if the Speaker would make a ruling on it at some future time. I will take leave at this time, but I think that the point should be made somewhere along the line.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman mind if I spoke to that point of order and then the hon. gentleman can continue on with his comments just so that there is a continuity? Obviously it is a matter that the Chair will wish to take under advisement. All I want is to call to the attention of hon. members one similar occasion of which I am aware. The rules and their precedents in this House have been that the Leader of the Opposition or his representative,

and the leader of a parliamentary group have the right to reply. I recall somewhere in the period of 1975 to 1979, when Steve Neary was - I do not need to use circumlocutions now - sitting as an Independent Liberal, got up to make a comment and the ruling of the Chair at that time was that he did not represent any group, it takes more than one to make a group, and he did not have the right to speak in reply to a Ministerial Statement. So I draw that to Your Honour's attention.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I will take that matter under advisement and rule on it later today.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Getting back to the Ministerial Statement, I welcome it, but at the same time I wish to point out that this was a decrease of a planned layoff from five weeks down to four weeks. The layoff, I recall, was supposed to start around July 1 and go for about five weeks. One of the problems that our people in Labrador West have is if they plan to go out of the area for holidays they have to make reservations inordinate lengths of time ahead of time because of the deficiencies in the transportation available to them. A lot of them have now made reservations to go out early in July and come back about the first week in August. I am afraid this may mess up a lot of their plans and I think it points out the need for long-term lead times in these kinds of layoffs. If they are temporary layoffs, and if that sounds similar to the argument we last Fall about Bill 37, it is intended to.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue the line of questioning I was on yesterday to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). The minister will recall that yesterday I asked whether he was aware of any attempt by his federal colleagues to wreck the UIC programme. I pointed out that because of the seasonality of much of the work force in this Province, any change related specifically to lengthening the qualifying period or shortening the period by which people may draw UIC would have a drastic effect on these workers. So, Sir, in view of these facts, I wonder if the minister could tell the House, and thereby tell the workers of this Province, whether he intends to make any representation or whether he has made any representation to protest these drastic changes?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, Question Period in my understanding, is for things which are urgent or immediate or actually happening. These drastic measures which might or might not happen, which might or might not have been contemplated by someone,

do not constitute a question which is anything other than hypothetical. However, I do not mind saying that we have a very good working relationship with the federal government. We are doing, as I said, everything that is humanly possible to guarantee the jobs that we have in this Province and to bring in more jobs. We have a very good working relationship with the federal government in order to do that. Any drastic changes which may be dreamt up or thought up by someone to change the UIC system, I am sure will not be done without full consultation with this government, and to this date there are no drastic changes contemplated, there have not been any directed towards this government. And all I can say, Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, is we are doing everything humanly possible to protect the jobs we have in this Province.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is talking about jobs. I can assure the hon. minister that this question is not about jobs, I wish it were. It is about what workers do in the event that they do not have jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister has heard, in the way that all of us have heard, that there are some proposed changes with respect to the UIC regulations. Let the minister once and for all, Mr. Speaker, speak clearly, not from both sides of his mouth, let the minister speak clearly and tell the workers of this Province what he will do

in the event that there are some changes made respecting the qualifying period. Does he agree, for example, that the period should be increased from ten weeks to fourteen weeks or to twenty weeks or whatever? Will he protect the workers of this Province against such drastic changes?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I mean that is just point-blank a hypothetical question. What will the minister do if something happens? Will the minister do something else? And I will say, yes, Mr. Speaker, if something happens we will do something.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about this matter on this side of the House because we know once the regulation is made it is going to be too late to do anything. It is going to be too late in the same way that it is too late to do anything about this mandatory buy-back of salmon licence from part-time fishermen that I have not heard any of the ministers on the other side talk about.

Now would the minister bring in, or would he support a resolution brought in by this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that would ask the federal government, if they are going to bring about any changes in the UIC regulations,

that the Newfoundland labour force be exempt from any such changes?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is what will the minister do if the other side of the House brings in a resolution? Well, let the other side bring in the resolution and we will see what our response will be.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Premier. With the delay in the opening of the inshore fishery this year because of ice conditions, and the fact that unemployment insurance benefits will cease after May 15, the fact is that there are approximately 12,000 fishermen at this point in time wondering what will happen after that date. Can the Premier tell the House what action his government has taken with respect to having that deadline extended?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if it is demonstrated that there is extreme hardship as a result of it we will make representations to the federal government as it relates to it. We cannot as a government ourselves do anything in specific terms because of the money involved, but we will make representations on behalf of the

fishermen of the Province to see whether those benefits can be extended. But we will have them monitored day by day to just see what parts of the Province are most severely affected by the ice, how many fishermen are involved, and this kind of thing. But obviously, if it becomes a very severe emergency situation, we will take whatever action is necessary.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised the government has not done something already. The deadline date is approaching. I think most people will agree that it is very unlikely that the fishing season will start on time this year. I should inform the House that our leader yesterday wired the minister asking that steps be taken to extend the date. Would the Premier now undertake to do the same thing, Mr. Speaker, to wire the minister and request that in the event the fishing season cannot open on time, on May 15, that they will extend the deadline? Because fishermen are concerned. There are 12,000 or 13,000 fishermen today wondering how they are going to live after the 15 May. Would the Premier take that initiative, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, initiatives were taken back in March by the government as it relates to this matter. The former Minister of

Fisheries, Mr. Goudie, wrote the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald) on March 12 on this very matter about the question of unemployment insurance benefits and that if there is a problem coming up then we would like to see that special measures were put in place to extend the period. So the representation was made long before the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wired the minister yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I know every day that goes by brings this event one day closer, but I wonder could he tell us when he is going to introduce the budget?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

A good question. A good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for this unexpected question. It is an astute question and I compliment him on his interest in public affairs. I think the hon. member is on his toes. I will, on behalf of government, be introducing the budget on Thursday next, May 16.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power). Since the Summer Employment Development Programme is designed to provide career related jobs, and since the employer will normally be private enterprise or a municipality, what is the minister's advice to the young person in Noddy Bay - when I say Noddy Bay, it is merely a symbol of other rural areas in this Province - which has neither private enterprise nor a town council? What is the minister's advice to the young person in Noddy Bay who wants to become a doctor?

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

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have the correct the member's judgment or assessment of who is applying for the projects. As I mentioned in the House the other day, when trying to correct the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), who had, deliberately or otherwise, passed on comments to this House that 50 per cent of the cost had to be paid by municipalities - which, in effect, is not true and we showed that it was not true - in that statement I also showed that over 20 per cent of the applications were from communities, about 30 per cent or so from business enterprises, and the remaining 50 per cent were from charitable, non-profit groups such as

recreation committees, such as rural development associations, Kinsmen's clubs, local service districts and a whole range of things which have committees in every single community in this Province.

I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the next three or four days or so we will be able to announce another 3,500 or 3,600 of those jobs that are already approved and we will have those students working within a week or two. So the projects are available to all communities. Any group that was not already organized easily have organized recreation committees, rural development associations and the like and applied for projects. I would be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if any community in this Province is exempt from some of those applications because almost every community has applications in.

MR. DECKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister: when the Province contributed \$2 million to SEED, in the spirit of co-operation it was agreed to allocate this money according to guidelines already established by the federal government. How can the minister justify spending \$2 million on a programme which is clearly designed for urban centres and is totally irrelevant to rural Newfoundland?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Come out of your cave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, just let me go back for the sake of members opposite; I did it for the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) but obviously the member was not listening. The programme that we have in place, designed by ourselves and the federal government, is a programme that is designed for every single community in Newfoundland. It has several components to it. Besides having a co-operative venture of \$7 million between the federal and provincial government, it also has a very important component in that the jobs are supposed to be made available to students in the area in which they are studying - an engineering student goes to work on an engineering project, an accounting student goes to work on an accounting type of project. We have students working to get experience so that, when they finish their university or trade school course, they can go out to their employer and say, 'Look. Besides my course of study, besides my diploma, I have experience. I have worked in this field of endeavour for a period of time,' whether it is one Summer or whether it is over four or five Summers that person might be in school. Experience is absolutely crucial.

Another problem that we had with trying to create employment in this Province for students is outside their own community, it becomes very expensive to pay room and board. A St. John's student who gets a job in Wabush will find that a very large percentage of

his or her wage is going to be spent on expenses, room and board. Now, obviously one of the main functions, besides giving experience, is to make sure that the student, when returning to school in September, has as much money in his or her pocket as is possible. In doing that we have designed this programme so that the projects can be done in many individual communities in all parts of Newfoundland - and somebody just handed me a list - places like the Moravian Church in Hopedale, not what you would consider an urban community, but they have a project. We have projects in Nain, not Manhattan. These are very small communities in the isolated parts of Newfoundland, and I can show the member a list showing that it is not just St. John's and Corner Brook that have applied, but many, many hundreds of small communities throughout all parts of Newfoundland, so that the function of the programme, besides employment and experience, is that most of the students are going to be able to work in their own community thereby not having to pay room and board, and having more money in their pockets so that when they go back to school in September they will not have to incur the same degree of expense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the minister is talking around the subject, why will the minister not admit to this House that he made a blunder, that he just threw away

\$2 million, that he was duped into throwing \$2 million into a programme, conceived by Flora MacDonald at a cocktail party, for Upper Canada, a programme which is not suitable for Noddy Bay, not suitable for Trout River, not suitable for West St. Modeste or all the other rural areas of this Province? Why does not the minister just admit man-fashion that he blew it?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether members on the opposite side have a mental problem or a hearing problem when the member asks a question like he just did and says that this programme is designed for Upper Canada. A minute ago it was urban. I showed that it is not urban, as in Nain and Makkovik and other places. Now it is not urban, now it is not even Newfoundland, it is an Upper Canada programme. Mr. Speaker, that programme is well thought out, it is well designed, and it is going to help 6,000 or more students in Newfoundland this Summer get a job, get experience, and have money in their pockets come September. If the member thinks that that is a bad programme, then I just wish that he or his group or the previous Liberal government in Ottawa, had come up with the same programme, or a better programme, when they were there.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister

responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, I guess, if it is still in existence. The Western Accord, which was signed several months ago, among other things eliminated the PIP grants, but it also called for deregulation of oil prices by June 1 of this year. Many observers in the oil industry see a possibility of refined petroleum products being shipped into Canada from refineries in the Middle East and in Europe, where refineries are working 30 to 40 per cent under capacity. One barrier to their importation is the lack of deep-water ports in Eastern Canada. Since this seems to me an excellent opportunity for reactivating part of the Come By Chance oil refinery as a trans-shipment point for these products, I would like to know if the minister has entertained any designs along this line whatsoever?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know who wrote the hon. gentleman's question, but I will just say that I will see the question in Hansard, I will take it under advisement and respond to him. I might state, though, that I am very glad to have received a question in the House, after some ten days, on probably the most historic document that has ever been signed, certainly in contemporary Newfoundland history, the Atlantic Accord.

We had all sorts of promises from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) that he was going to ask all these penetrating questions on opening day, but the Leader of the Opposition has opened his mouth

about it because he cannot. He is embarrassed over it, and hon. gentlemen there opposite are embarrassed over it.

The hon. gentleman wants to craft his question along the application of the Atlantic Accord to the Come By Chance oil refinery, as I thought it was. If that is the import of his question, I can state that I will take the entire question under advisement and respond to him.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary by the hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am pretty sure that you missed entirely the thrust of it so I am going to try and repeat the thrust of it in such a way that we can get an answer.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is hard to hear you.

MR. FENWICK:

I will speak more directly into the microphone then.

The situation is that on June 1 oil prices in Canada will be deregulated and oil can come into the country from anywhere. Some observers have said that oil refineries in Europe and in the Middle East are working at so far below capacity that they seem to be ready to dump gasoline stocks on North America - it is actually a beautiful image if it caught fire - at prices much lower than we are currently paying. The problem that exists at this point is that the bulk carriers cannot bring it into ports like Montreal because they do not have the deep

water necessary. It seems to me that at least part of the Come By Chance oil refinery, the tanking and the wharf and so on, could be reactivated as a trans-shipment point for these gasoline stocks to be imported in. My question was, has the government looked at this and are they going to be doing anything with regard to this as a means of providing employment in the member for Bellevue's (Mr. Callan) district?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, obviously I will have to take the question under advisement. It is obviously a question that is based upon a number of hypotheses, a number of ifs and ands, but I will certainly take it under advisement. At first glance it is obvious that there are implications here with respect to situations in other parts of Canada. I would indicate as well to the hon. gentleman that his question, in fact, seems to be based on hypotheses that may happen or may not happen. I will certainly take it under advisement.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). It concerns a story that is being carried into today's media and I think it concerns the bribing or at least the alleged bribing of some federal fisheries observers, those people who monitor the catching of quotas by foreign boats. One former observer has said that he has

received \$1,000, I believe, a trip to New York, two prostitutes, fifteen bottles of whiskey, two cartons of cigarettes, and 100 pounds of tuna and sword fish.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we discovered that the West Germans have been overfishing for some two months offshore without the provincial minister knowing anything about it, without any consultation from his federal counterpart.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You sound like (inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Do you want the decorum of this House to stay as it is? You are always the teacher over there. Do you want to keep it up?

Let me ask the minister was he aware of that situation that was going on? I do not believe the hon. gentleman was. Does he know if the federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Fraser) or anybody else in the federal government was aware of that situation? Having now become aware of it, as I am sure he has, what action does he propose to take regarding those allegations by at least two observers?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the first couple of questions that the hon. gentleman asked there are almost too foolish to respond to. I mean, what can I say? I do not know if the federal minister knew or not. That is a question I assume at the appropriate moment, or the first opportunity, some member in the House of Commons, perhaps one of the gentleman's colleagues, will

address to the appropriate minister. I cannot answer that. I can say to the hon. gentleman that we are very concerned about the allegations that are contained in the media today. I can also say to him that the person who is allegedly telling this story is hiding behind anonymity. I would not say that the person who accepted the bribe, if there is such a person walking the streets of Canada, went to the federal minister and told him that he was taking bribes. I would not say anything like that is on the go. They certainly did not come to us and tell it. But we are concerned about it and, as a result of our concern, and in line with other activities that we know have taken place over the last several months, we have today, as a provincial department, instructed my officials to draft an enquiry to the federal minister expressing our concern and asking for an investigation into those allegations because the matter is very serious and we are very concerned about it.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

It is not refreshing to hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) talk as he does in view of the election promises of the Premier and in view of the election statements made by that party that you must have a P.C. Government in Newfoundland because you have a P.C. Government in Ottawa, and this great consultation and co-operation that was to go on.

Let me ask him one other point

about the supposed statements made by the observers on those boats. They make the point that at certain times they have seen irregularities and have documented them, but they were often ignored, one statement said, because of politics and the lack of value that is apparent for the resource.

Yesterday the Premier refused leave of this House to chastize his Tory buddies in Ottawa. He was more interested in protecting Mr. Mulroney's cosmetic image in the EEC countries. Now, let me ask the minister, has he been aware of politics being used to put pressure on these officials? Again, I suspect he has not. If he is aware of it, does he know if is provincial, federal, or some sort of international pressure? And, if he does not know, will he tell us what, specifically, he is going to do about that specific allegation? Yesterday we saw the tip of the iceberg. We can wonder just how much fish is being taken over there. As a man who is supposed to protect the fish stocks of this Province, you should not be so cavalier about it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, we might be able to get somewhere in this House in exchanging information for the benefit of the public if people like the hon. gentleman, leaving the politician innuendo out of it, would ask a question to which you can try to give a straight answer.

Now, let us look at the issue of the alleged consultation in this alleged happening here. I do not know from listening to the news media today and reading what is in the paper today whether those

alleged bribes took place recently. Did they take place nine or ten months ago? Did they take place four or five years ago when there was another administration in Ottawa? Did they consult with us?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, the hon. gentleman is talking about consultation.

Also, Mr. Speaker, those observers are not employees of any government, they are employees of a business firm that has a contract with the federal Department of Fisheries. They have nothing to do with us except in a peripheral way and we are concerned that the thing has been done. Who are the observers? There is a whole mess of stuff here that I have become concerned about as Minister of the provincial Department of Fisheries. As soon as we heard it, Mr. Speaker, we did not sit back and wait for Question Period or for somebody to ask us to do it. I mean, there are serious allegations made here, and I would like to have some answers. So, I have today instructed the officials in my department to put that representation together and to get it off to the federal government as quickly as possible, because this is serious stuff and it should be answered. And the only way it can be answered is not by my staring into a crystal ball and wondering what took place, but by asking the appropriate government and the appropriate agency of the appropriate government to do something about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. TULK:

How they miss the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) in the Fisheries Department!

Yesterday we found out about the overfishing by the West Germans on the Grand Bank in which they have taken some \$40 million worth of fish which could be used to supply our plants and our fishermen. Now, the minister admitted there was no consultation. Let me ask him this question: In view of the fact that the Premier yesterday would not grant leave to this House to condemn his federal counterparts, has he asked the federal minister for an inquiry? Because this could just be the tip of the iceberg - who knows? Has he asked the federal Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa (Mr. Fraser) for an independent inquiry, an inquiry that would be free of any political action or any political party? Has he made that type of representation, or is it just the type of representation where he says, 'Okay, will you tell me what happened?' Has he asked for an independent inquiry? This is serious enough to warrant one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I told the hon. gentleman that we are in the process since we heard about this, and you cannot dream things up. We heard about this at very short notice and as I said to him a

little while ago, I do not suspect that the culprit, if this is true, was going around informing officials or ministers that he was doing this kind of thing. But the moment we heard about it, I decided that we should make representation to the federal minister asking for an enquiry and an investigation into this matter. That has now been done, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Let me put a very short question to the minister. In view of the fact that the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) refused, or at least did not consult with his provincial counterpart, would he now ask that that enquiry by the federal minister be independent of any political party in this country?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, we have to get some facts on the table here.

MR. TULK:

You got the facts! Forty million dollars worth of fish gone.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I had more courtesy than to shout at the hon. gentleman. I tried to listen to him. Now if he is interested in an answer perhaps he will listen and let me try to give it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:
I will.

MR. RIDEOUT:
The innuendo, Mr. Speaker, in this particular supplementary is did the federal minister know? I do not know if he knew or not. If he did not know, how could he consult with me? You would swear from listening to the hon. gentleman from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that the facts were that the hon. federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) knew and deliberately did not let us know. We only heard about it in the media today and perhaps that hon. gentleman only heard about it in the media. How can you answer questions like that, Mr. Speaker, with any degree of intelligence?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
My question is for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Now that he has indicated that next week he will bring down the budget and make an honest man of himself, I would like to know if the Minister of Finance has received any correspondence from the Comptroller of the Treasury objecting to the illegal spending of money that this government has been proceeding with since the beginning of April? If he has, would he please table that document?

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the ghost of Steve Neary! Steve Neary regularly asked this question although he knew the answer. It is an old sausage that has been up in this House any number of times and for the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to bring this in as some new revelation is really a little bit ridiculous. There are certain documents to be tabled and I will table them at the appropriate time.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:
My question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), Level One. Is it the policy of this government to urge a division of the NTA, especially that all teachers in Labrador should constitute a separate bargaining unit, separate and distinct from the NTA?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, we have two bargaining units within the NTA right now, the main one and the one in Labrador. There is also a possibility of a third because there has been some talk about the Pentecostal Assemblies looking for their own bargaining unit. That is a concern to everyone involved in education and certainly to the NTA. We are certainly not the ones doing the urging. It would be much easier to deal with one bargaining unit than to deal with three in relation to not only time but also the cost involved in travelling back and forth in negotiating

sessions, etc. Consequently, we are not the ones urging different bargaining units. No.

MR. HISCOCK:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) yesterday said, 'I am calling upon NAPE and the NTA to look at the Labrador teachers and the civil servants as separate bargaining units and they will be better off.'

I am not talking about Labrador West, I am not talking about the Churchill Falls area. What I am talking about is the Parliamentary Secretary advocating that all Labrador teachers have their own bargaining unit. So when the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) says that this government is now talking about reconciliation and is offering an olive branch, are they not also putting the wedge in by saying the Pentecostal teachers can go their way and the Labrador teachers go their way? The question I want to ask is has this policy being communicated to the NTA? Since the Parliamentary Secretary has said he is advocating this I would assume it is government policy, so has the policy being communicated to the NTA?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the remarks were

certainly made by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). It is his opinion, I am sure, and certainly not that of the Department of Education or the government. Being the only true representative for Labrador in the House, he certainly expressed concerns brought to him by his people. I am sure these will be considered. But certainly the department, as I said, or the government has not issued any statement saying we are going to have or we want or we will support a separate bargaining unit in Labrador in total. As I have already said, we already have one as it relates to Labrador West.

MR. HISCOCK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the C.A. Pippy—Park Commission and the annual report of the Public Service Commission.

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I think this is day 10 of the debate. I rise to present a petition. I will read the prayer of the petition. It is on a subject that we are quite familiar with, which is electrical rates. It is signed by 118, including myself, citizens of the Province. It says: "We the concerned citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador so hereby protest against high, increasing electricity rates in our Province. As you are aware from the news media concern there has been an astronomical jump from December to January in our light bills. Something has to be done. We are asking for your help and support in signing this petition to help stop high electricity rates in this Province. We will then present this to the Members of the House of Assembly for Newfoundland and Labrador."

It is almost an ongoing debate now. I think that it is probably appropriate because it is one of the most important subjects to come up in the last five or six months. I think it is important that we continue the dialogue that seems to be established in this House. One of the things that was raised by the government side almost perpetually on this particular issue is that nothing short of bringing Labrador power onstream would be a solution to the problem. I think, like most categorical statements, it is half true. In the long run, I think that the Labrador power is the solution to the problem. I regret, along with everybody else, that it is taking so long to get to it. But I think there are other short-term measures that could be addressed as well. I

recall back to members opposite who have even made suggestions, such as the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), and also other suggestions that have been made by other people.

In this particular segment of the debate I would like to deal with just one other issue that has been raised and that is the question of subsidies in order to keep the rates down. I have gone on record as saying that I think a universal flat subsidy to bring down the rates is not an appropriate method of doing it, because what it tends to do is to subsidize high electricity users at the cost of low electricity users. Although, when I listened to the members of the Liberal Party putting forth this position, they actually do not put it forward in that way. What they say is that there are the poor in the Province, the people on social assistance, people on unemployment insurance and the working poor, who have to be looked after and I agree. I think that it would be appropriate to do something there. But as much as I have been able to twist the problem around in my mind, I cannot think of a simple procedure, other than something extremely complicated, which addresses that problem. Obviously if a person is on social assistance there could be some additional help there. If a person is on unemployment insurance through, if a person is among the working poor, I cannot figure out how, short of putting in a massive bureaucracy, they can be identified and they can be singled out as the people who should need help in the short run. If there is a way I stand ready to listen to the proposers of the particular solution say with practicality how you would be

able to do this. But it seems to me that we are talking about an incredibly complicated situation. I do not know if there is something that can be done with the income tax form at the end of the year. I suggest that might be a solution. If that is, then fine, that sounds like a good way to go at it. But it seems to me that what we should be looking at is some short-term solutions to it, and that includes the things that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) suggested in terms of looking at how we can decrease the amount of consumption in the short-term, looking at the kinds of things that we have suggested in the plans we put forward and all of them, I believe, should be reviewed by some sort of an inquiry into the whole situation. So I again repeat my own support for the suggestion of the New Lab Action Committee. We should have an inquiry of some sort to look into this situation because I think they would be able to assess these problems and have a look at which ones would be the most appropriate solutions.

I lay the petition on the table for forwarding to the appropriate department.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), but in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the members' attention to one solution that we might offer. It

surprised me to hear the member suggest that he had listened to the spokesmen for Liberal Party and they were only concerned with the low wage earners, people on fixed income and widows. Of course we are and we need an immediate solution because of the horrible circumstances those people find themselves in. But if the member for Menihek wants a quick solution that would help everybody, I would ask him to take a look at his last month's light bill, or next month's, or all of his constituents' light bills, and realize that I am holding a bill in my hand here for \$2,600 - that is the electrical rate that is being charged - but stacked onto that is \$486 SSA - retail sales tax. There is one solution that the Liberal Party will put forward and ask the government to immediately look at taking off the retail sales tax on electricity.

MR. BARRY:
Off the fuel adjustment charge.

MR. FLIGHT:
The fuel adjustment charge, certainly, maybe off all electricity, because we removed the RST from oil some years ago when we realized that buying oil to heat a home was a burden. We removed the sales tax. Now why do we not look at removing the sales tax, if not off the whole electrical bill, certainly off the fuel adjustment charge. On this particular bill we would be saving in excess of \$140 for this particular individual? So I would have to ask the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) would he not agree to ask government for this. They are the people who control this, they are the people who got us into this mess that we are into, they are the people whose ministers stand up and facetiously

present petitions. And while I am on the subject, I would like to ask the Premier, since he is in his seat, when are we going to get the petition that the New Lab group presented to him with 35,000 names on it to be presented in this House of Assembly? Yesterday the Premier stood up and he supported the petition facetiously. When that particular petition was presented to the Premier with 35,000 Newfoundlanders' names on it, it was given to him to be presented in this House of Assembly. Since the Premier is so interested in supporting petitions, I would suggest to the Premier that everybody is waiting, certainly the people who gave him the petition, to have their rights recognized and have that particular petition presented in the House of Assembly and not in a facetious way. I hope that when the petition is presented the Premier will give us some examples on what he intends to do in the short-term to lift this burden, this unbearable burden on the people of Newfoundland and on the consumers of electricity in every category - the stadiums, the churches, schools, homes, fixed incomes, high incomes, low incomes, every Newfoundlander has been devastated by this fuel adjustment charge.

And, Mr. Speaker, while I am at it, let me point out that the cost of electricity on this particular bill is \$2,600. The total bill is in excess of \$4,000 - \$1,400 of this money is fuel adjustment.

MR. J. CARTER:

Can the member explain? Is that bill from a private home?

MR. FLIGHT:

I will table the electrical bill

if the member wants to see it, but let me quote the figures for the member: \$2,600 in electrical rates, \$1,100 fuel adjustment, \$467 SSA. That is \$1,500 that this government could look at. Certainly they could wipe out the SSA - it was done before on electrical bills and it was done on heating bills. Now we are paying the SSA on oil burned at Holyrood. And one wonders why the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked for a public inquiry. We want answers to the questions that the Leader of the Opposition raised in requesting the public inquiry. Are we getting the right prices for the oil we burn down there? Are they burning off oil in order to make room for new shipments, as has been suggested?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no.

MR. FLIGHT

Well, give us the inquiry.

PREMIER PECKFORD

You can not have an inquiry every time it rains.

MR. FLIGHT

The people will not believe the Premier anymore.

PREMIER PECKFORD

We have an inquiry every time there is a rate change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. FLIGHT:

The people are not believing the government. They are not trusting them. They are not believing them. The consumers want an inquiry where they have their own representatives sitting on the inquiry. Let them see the facts.

Let the Premier say no to them and not to this House of Assembly.

So, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the petition I would hope that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) took note of our recommendation. That is one of the things we have been fighting for and will continue to fight for to have the SSA dropped while we are paying that exorbitant fuel adjustment charge. There is one way of getting all sectors of society and all the people of Newfoundland a break. And, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Premier again to present the petition that was given to him by the New Lab Action Group with 35,000 names on it and, in so doing, I would ask him to indicate to us that he is indeed prepared to take some action. One step would be setting up a public inquiry on which there would be representatives of the consumers, the people who are being devastated by the policies of this government with regards to electrical rates in this Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have to get up and speak on this petition again today. First of all, there is a great myth that the Opposition and other people are trying to perpetrate on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador as it relates to public enquiries and electrical rates. Every time Newfoundland Light and Power or Newfoundland Hydro wish to change the way they are doing their business, they have to go before the Public Utilities Board and a full public enquiry is held. As a

matter of fact, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have supported, financially, the Federation of Municipalities, representing the consumers of the Province, giving them the money to hire the experts so that they can put up their intervention into this enquiry that is held every single time that Newfoundland Light and Power or Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro go to change or adjust their mode of operation. So every time there is any increase contemplated by either one of those utilities, the public utility or the private utility, their is a public enquiry held. There are experts hired by the interveners, they are questioned under oath, and all the information is made public. Every single thing to do with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and Newfoundland Light and Power, from the lowest employee to the president in both utilities, has to be scrutinized and is scrutinized, under oath, by a quasi-judicial body. It is a public enquiry every single time..

It has become a political issue as opposed to what actually happens. There is an enquiry every time, and if members of the Opposition are responsible members, then they will see to it that they get that information through that public enquiry. It is, perhaps, the most legitimate, serious kind of public enquiry into matters dealing with any arm of government, or government itself, every undertaken in this Province. There is more enquiry and investigation into Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and Newfoundland Light and Power -

MR. FLIGHT:

But nothing is published.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is published.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is rubberstamping.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not rubberstamped, it is investigated. There are questions asked and answered under oath. All the data from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro has to be produced. It is scrutinized, it is criticized, it is enquired into by lawyers and accountants, brought in from the mainland the last time by the Federation of Municipalities, some of the best people and accountants in the utility business were brought in and they were questioned under oath and all the matters were brought out. If every other part of government was enquired into as much as Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, man oh man, Mr. Speaker, we would have about fifteen or twenty kinds of enquiries going on all the time.

Mr. Speaker, here is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) when he was Minister of Energy: 'The principle is that the user of the power, or the user of any product, should pay the true cost of providing the product or the service, whatever it may be, and that is the only way you avoid serious misallocation of resources.'

MR. BARRY:

It is not necessary any more.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Here is the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, the Leader of the Opposition - he cannot take it now - when he was Minister of Mines and Energy, saying, and I will table it, 'It is simply a question of whether this money comes out of

the Consolidated Revenue Fund, out of the taxpayers' dollars, or whether it is paid by the actual consumer of the energy, Mr. Speaker.'

This is what the leader of the Liberal Party said then. He was mouthing then that the consumer had to pay. Mr. Speaker, this is the Leader of the Opposition, this is the Liberal Party over there talking. 'We have to keep in mind', said the Leader of the Opposition, 'that just as energy is becoming more costly in other parts of the world we cannot expect it to be other than the same here, in Canada and in Newfoundland.' This is the Liberal Party that is up now mouthing about it, Mr. Speaker. Here is the story! Here is the story! I mean, it is unbelievable!

The point that should be remember, Mr. Speaker, and, as I said yesterday and I will keep saying, this very year passed we subsidized rates to the tune of \$23 million to the PDD customers, the people who are getting diesel generated electricity. If they had to pay what it would cost, their light bills would double tomorrow morning and they would be four times higher than people's in the urban centers in this Province. We are now subsidizing it to the tune of \$23 million a year. There are public enquiries into Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and Newfoundland Light and Power, and the Liberal Power of Newfoundland, under their leader, has been supporting and has been mouthing the very thing that we have been saying for years and years.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

This being Wednesday, Private Members' Day, we are debating an amendment to the motion by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). The debate was adjourned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the motion that is proposed by the member for Bonavista North is a motion which makes a lot of sense, a motion which has now seen an attempt by members opposite to eviscerate it, to render it into meaningless platitudes. We talk about the people of this Province paying the highest level of taxes in Canada, and we see, as the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) just pointed out, taxes, including taxes on fuel adjustment charges. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, has taken the opportunity, contrary to the rules of this House, incidentally, which say that there should not be debate on petitions, which prevents members on this side from replying, prevents myself from replying, of going back to - it must be at least 1981 - comments in Hansard. And do you know something? That is one of the problems the Premier has and one of the problems that members opposite have, they cannot realize that circumstances change, they cannot realize that they must adapt, Mr. Speaker, to changing times; they cannot realize that the cost to the consumer in this Province with respect to electricity rates as well as with respect to other rates in this Province, is going sky high. Mr. Speaker, if the Premier cannot

understand that, if members opposite cannot understand that, they are going to dig this Province and the consumers of this Province deeper and deeper into a burden, a burden with respect to supplying the necessities of life that will put the people of this Province prostrate, will put them in the position of being unable to grow and provide for their families, and, Mr. Speaker, see the economy of this Province move ahead the way the economies of other parts of Canada are moving ahead today.

We hear, Mr. Speaker, members opposite talking about -

MR. J. CARTER:

Where is the relevance?

MR. BARRY:

The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), Mr. Speaker, is irrelevant.

We are talking about the economy of this Province. We are talking about ways of getting this economy moving, and one of the ways, Mr. Speaker, is to deal with the crushing burden of electricity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have made certain specific recommendations which have to do with reducing the rate of taxation. And another area of relevancy, which I will be happy to hear the member for St. John's North address, is that retail sales tax should not be on the fuel adjustment charge. It should be removed, Mr. Speaker, because we see government imposing this fuel adjustment charge on the one hand and the tax revenues of government increase at the same

time. Now, it is one thing for them to say, 'We have to meet the cost of electricity.' Mr. Speaker, we all know costs have to be met. And that is what the Premier was quoting me as saying. He did not, Mr. Speaker, however, deal with our submission, that the real question the people of this Province are wondering about is if the costs are not higher than they should be at Holyrood, is Newfoundland Hydro getting the best price that it can for oil? Is it locking itself into long-term contracts, Mr. Speaker?

MR. FLIGHT:

Are they burning off oil to make way for new shipments?

MR. CARTER:

Rubbish.

MR. BARRY:

Is it locking itself into long-term contracts at excessively high rates? Mr. Speaker, if members opposite think that they are going to avoid answering that question, wait until the estimates of the Department of Mines and Energy come up.

MR. CARTER:

Pure slime.

MR. BARRY:

The minister will not be able to squirm away from answering those questions.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is when the minister will get the questions he wondered about today.

MR. J. CARTER:

Order! Order!

MR. BARRY:

Before I say something rude to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, would

you ask the member for St. John's North to stay quiet while I present my remarks, and then, if he has the courage, he can stand up in this House and let us have his views on whether retail sales tax should continue to apply to the fuel adjustment charge. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to shut him up, please.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition would like to be heard in silence.

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have made certain specific recommendations to this House with respect to the way in which this problem of a stagnant economy in this Province should be dealt with. One of the ways is to deal with costs which our consumers are incurring, wherever these costs can be dealt with. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the ordinary individual in the street, the ordinary consumer of electricity, puts no faith in a statement by the Premier or a statement by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) that Newfoundland Hydro is doing everything it can to keep costs down. The only way that the consumer will have confidence that this is happening is by a public inquiry with consumer representatives, and they should have that. They should have that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

The Premier talks about hiding behind an inquiry! What is he doing with the inquiry on unemployment, in that case? Is

this an admission by him that he is trying to hide behind that inquiry to avoid dealing with the problem of unemployment? Well, we are putting forth ideas for members opposite to look at to deal with the problem of unemployment. We submit that the way to deal with unemployment in this Province is to get the economy moving by stimulating the economy, and the way to stimulate the economy is to reduce taxes.

Mr. Speaker, if members opposite would like to have a few hard facts and figures, I would like to refer to a report prepared by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, a provincial survey, Mr. Speaker, carried out in October, 1984.

DR. COLLINS:

We meet with them regularly, by the way.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I know, the Minister of Finance has the same figures and I am surprised that we have not seen them come forth in this hon. House from the minister by now.

Question one: Which of the following represents serious problems of a provincial nature, affecting the operation of your business?' Mr. Speaker, we are talking now about Newfoundland businesses. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the item which is set out by far as the greatest problem -

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The acoustics in this chamber are good. Everyone has a microphone. We can all be heard. It is not necessary for the hon. member to shout. Now, I cannot help it if he has some sort of pathological, psychological problem that causes him to shout and roar, but, for the rest of us, if he can keep his voice down to within the range of normal level, we would appreciate it, and I think we can ask him to do that.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is obviously no point of order. It is just again an interference, an attempt by members opposite whenever hard-hitting points are being made which they cannot deal with in the course of debate to try to cut off members of the Opposition. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it becomes more and more difficult, however loud we shout, to figure whether or not there is anything penetrating through to the consciousness of the member opposite. The only contribution that that member has made, Mr. Speaker, is this sort of silly point of order since he has been sitting in this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask if we could have the member opposite kept quiet while I make my few remarks.

Mr. Speaker, 69.9 per cent of the people surveyed indicate that the total tax burden imposed by the provincial government is the most serious problem that they have to deal with in carrying on their business. The next closest to that was 42.9 per cent, which indicated the cost of municipal government was serious. Workers' Compensation, by comparison, 30 per cent considered it a serious problem.

So, we have almost 70 per cent - 27 per cent more than the next closest - dealing with the total tax burden as being a serious problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at another question that was asked: 'For which of the following taxes would a reduction be most beneficial to your business?' And they set out, Mr. Speaker, different taxes, corporate income tax, personal income tax, retail sales tax, fuel tax, business tax and so forth; 51.1 per cent indicate retail sales tax as being most beneficial to their business if it were reduced. By comparison, 26.3 per cent indicate corporate income tax, and to be fair to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), business in Newfoundland recognizes that the reduction in corporate income tax that took place last year in respect of small business was helpful. But right now, Mr. Speaker, the most serious problem, as indicated by this survey, is the level of retail sales tax. With personal income tax, only 13.1 per cent consider it a problem; 19 per cent consider that a reduction of property tax would be most beneficial; but 51.1 per cent, a majority of the business people in this Province, say that a reduction in the retail sales

tax would be most beneficial to their business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other questions here that I would like to deal with. Incidentally, in terms of creating employment - and this links in with another positive suggestion we have made to members opposite - in terms of the setting up of a youth employment programme, an apprenticeship and training programme, this is an interesting question put by this same group: Would a government incentive cause you to provide on-the-job training for young people less than twenty-five years of age? Would a government incentive cause business people to employ more young people? You know something, Mr. Speaker, 57.9 per cent of the business people in this Province answering this survey said that they would employ more young people.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of how they would best see government providing this incentive to private business to hire young people, the response, Mr. Speaker, is, by far again, the majority of those answering the survey would say the assistance to business to employ young people in terms of subsidization of the wages of the young people. This is again linked directly to this apprenticeship and training programme which we had been putting forth as a way of tackling this tremendous problem which exists amongst our young people today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to go back to the resolution again for a moment, the body of the resolution is: BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that both governments - Provincial and Federal - be called upon to

immediately produce an employment strategy which will substantially reduce the number of unemployed people in this Province. Okay that is motherhood, we do not stop there however. We go on to say, AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in an attempt to stimulate the economy, and thereby create jobs, that the Provincial Government immediately take steps to reduce the level of taxation in this Province. And then, Mr. Speaker, we go on to say, AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, just in case that is not definite enough, that the reduction of the tax levels start by a reduction of the Retail Sales Tax from 12 per cent to 10 per cent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that those figures which I just quoted from a survey of the business people of this Province would indicate that the level of retail sales tax is a serious problem which should be dealt with. I think it is also fair to say, Mr. Speaker, we can see from this response, if we had the sales tax reduced, we would see more employment in this Province. We would see business hiring more people. Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that government does not have it easy in terms of meeting the costs which it has to meet with the revenues available to it today. But, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a time in our history which not only coincidentally comes after close to fourteen years of Conservative or Tory administrations in this Province, and we have seen, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate increase from around 9 per cent or 10 per cent when the Conservative Governments first came in in 1972, up to around 15 per cent or 16 per cent when the present Premier took over from Mr. Moores in 1979, and up

to, Mr. Speaker, 26.2 per cent in January of this year. Now, Mr. Speaker, what that means is that we are seeing a larger and larger segment of our society having to bear an unfair burden of the job that we all have of seeing that the economy of our Province is developed. That our resources are developed so that we have a growing economy for the long term. But for the Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, to say that what we are proposing is to borrow our way into prosperity, whereas he is aiming to develop us into prosperity, is a distortion, Mr. Speaker, of what we are setting out which is that he cannot manage the present. Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are not managing the present. Just ask those 26.2 per cent unemployed in the work force. Just ask those 60,000 men and women who are going without work. Members opposite cannot manage the present. How are they going to be expected to manage the future, Mr. Speaker?

MR. TULK:

That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

What we are talking about is how do we avoid losing the productivity energies of an entire generation of young people? How do we avoid losing the productive energies of those middle-aged individuals or those just getting close, but still five or six years from reaching the old age pension, who now find themselves unemployed for the first time in their lives, Mr. Speaker, and have no hope for a job? Do we write those individuals off? Is this the great development philosophy of members opposite? Are we to

write-off this generation of young people? Are we to write-off those thousands of middle-aged and older men and women who now find themselves unemployed? Are we to say to them we condemn you to bearing the full burden?

MR. J. CARTER:

Keep your voice down!

MR. BARRY:

Is that what we are being asked to say, Mr. Speaker. I ask you again if you would ask the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) to show some courtesy and avoid this ignorant display that we see him continuously putting forth here.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. CARTER

Has he finished?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's North continues, as he has now for some time in this House, to ignore your rulings and show contempt for the Chair, Mr. Speaker. We ask you to please control him.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation, and it is the same sort of response that was shown when Franklin Roosevelt in the United States, back in the late 1930s said, 'It is time for a new deal.' The same sorts of arguments were made. "Oh, you are going to borrow us into a situation where we will never be able to repay." Mr. Speaker, it is time for a new deal for this Province. It is time for us, it

is time for this government to take some chances, Mr. Speaker. It is time to have some new approaches because the present approaches are not working. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, expect those 60,000 men and women to make the sacrifice of their lives, of their useful working lives while we wait for members opposite to show what they can do or more likely not do, Mr. Speaker, in terms of developing the resources that we continuously hear them talk about, but which, unfortunately, have not made a dent yet in our unemployment figures. We have only seen unemployment continue to increase. We need some new approaches, some dramatically, radically different approaches.

MR. J. CARTER:

Like what?

MR. BARRY:

And, Mr. Speaker, if the choice is between some short-term increase in the deficit, and that is a real choice, it is a serious one, but it is one that, I submit, we should make today in this Province, because, otherwise, we are going to bring on social problems the likes of which have not yet been seen.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak a few moments on this resolution put forward by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). However, I am going to speak to the amendment of the resolution. I believe the amendment is quite straightforward. It calls upon the federal and provincial governments to take some action in making sure that the unemployed in the Province will be much better off than in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I believe today in the Question Period there were some questions asked to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker). For some unknown reason, it must be very difficult for the hon. member to understand that there is going to be some 6,000 jobs created in this Province this Summer as the hon. member said it was only for the larger urban centers of the Province. I think the minister gave an indication that there were two towns in my district that will receive some employment through the course of the minister's new initiative. Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) does not want to see even short-term jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we, as politicians, have to pull our load in trying to make sure that people can get off the unemployment role and in the market. But, there is a particular group of people in this Province that I believe we should look upon to play a leading role and that, Mr. Speaker, is our teachers. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have some teachers, not very many, in this Province today that are teaching democracy classes in this Province but they

are teaching hatred towards politicians. I think that is evident in the last provincial election. There are only a few of those teachers.

MR. K. ALYWARD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. ALYWARD:

I wish he would go to the resolution, Sir, instead of lambasting people who are working in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to say there are some, very few, but a rotten orange can spoil a full case. Some members in the Legislature have children going to schools, and a particular teacher, or teachers, are picking on children in the high grades. Do not tell me it is not so because it is. I think it is shameful for teachers to stoop so low. I have a lot of respect for teachers in this Province and that is why the teachers in Labrador, the ones that I know anyway, are really respectable. I do not want to see them tarred with the same brush as some others are tarred with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Good point. Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

So, let us all pull our weight. Our workers of tomorrow are the students in the schools today, our

students in Grade XII. They are the ones who will be looking for jobs tomorrow so I think it is up to the teachers to give them all the encouragement that they can muster to look for a job. One of the first things that I learned when I left Grade XI - and I learned that from a teacher, and the hon. member is not here now, he was defeated by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) in the last election - but he said to me, 'Go and see your politician.' That was the first lesson that was taught to me after I left school. If you are looking for a job your politician can help you. How can your politician help you when some teachers are telling them, 'Do not go to the politicians. They are bad men.' In fact one teacher went as far as to take a picture of a particular politician and said 'if you do not like him, let us slap him.' That was done in some of the schools. I think it is utterly ridiculous that a teacher would stoop so low in a democracy class and get students to smack the face on a picture of a particular politician. I think it is ridiculous. It should never be allowed.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about unemployment among our youth. This is where it starts. I think that teachers have to play a very important role and I compliment most of the teachers in this Province for doing a good job, but there are a few, a minority group, who can do much better than they are doing.

MR. MORGAN:

Held back by the NTA executive, in many cases.

MR. WARREN:

Well maybe that is another reason why there should be separate

bargaining units. There are all kinds of reasons that we can pinpoint.

I say to the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) to ask some of the teachers in his district whether they would like to see a separate bargaining unit. Ask some of the teachers in Nain and Goose Bay and they will tell that they are not getting fair treatment from the NTA. I said in the House yesterday that I believe it is time - personally I still believe it is time - but it is up to this government or the NTA what to do, but everybody has to take the appropriate and a positive step forward that will help everybody concerned, not just a minority group.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that another thing that came up today also into employment, and that was unemployment insurance. Fishermen who cannot get their lobster traps in the water are looking for an extension to the unemployment insurance benefits. Mr. Speaker, I should also remind this hon. House that there are people from Rigolet to Nain who cannot get their gear in water any year before July 1st. So if we are going to do as Mr. Rompkey did last year for the Northern part of Newfoundland up as far as Cartwright, but then cut off there, and the people North still had to suffer until July 1st -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Stop talking about the past, boy. Deal with the future.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the past because it is the past government in Ottawa that did not help. It was the past government who brought in the bureaucrats

that brought in the regulations. All of a sudden I must have touched a nerve because the hon. gentleman realizes that he is part of a party who for the past fourteen years have been nothing but problems for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear! Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make any drastic changes. I tell the hon. gentleman, in all sincerity, I believe, in due course, the hon. member will realize and finally awake to the awaking that there are better days ahead for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador under this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to say one other thing. I do have a major solution to unemployment in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all we have to do is hire on 1000 people. There is a job for 1000 people probably for the next two or three months, filling in the two holes, one on each side of the Straits, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), when he was minister of Mines and Energy on this side, decided to dig, which cost the taxpayers of this Province in excess of \$1 million. Now there could be an lot of employment there. There are two big holes on both sides of the Straits initiated by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order.

MR. HISCOCK:

It is amazing what colour your glasses are once you sit in a certain sunlight.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are you quoting from Beauchesne now?

MR. HISCOCK:

In actual fact, if you want the page I will end up quoting the page.

Mr. Speaker, on the resolution with regard to unemployment and that. When the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) gets up and says that the Minister of Energy (Mr. Dinn), any Minister of Energy is responsible for setting off the blasts, he is wrong. I believe that the one who set off the blasts was the former Premier Mr. Moores. The point of reference is that all Cabinet follow the direction, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier. So, Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains, who went on the government side, would be much better of, Mr. Speaker, if he tried to get the youth in Torngat Mountains jobs instead of wandering in the past.

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, there is obviously no point of order. The member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) was becoming very upset by the fact that my good colleague for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) suggested a solution to the unemployment in this Province that is presently

being debated as a result of the resolution and the amendment put forward in the resolution. I suggest to you, Your Honour, there is no point of order whatsoever. The member for Torngat Mountains is speaking very much to the motion that is before the floor, which is dealing with youth unemployment in this Province. The member for Eagle River is beginning to be very upset by the fact that the truth is being told by my colleague as it relates to the disgraceful performance of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) when he was Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we seriously look at it there is enough employment to employ every single youth, not only in Torngat Mountains, but also in Naskaupi, in Eagle River and in the Strait of Belle Isle, if there was some way that we could get those two big holes filled in, which cost the taxpayers \$1 million.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Over \$100 million.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, \$100 million, Mr. Speaker, would make it sound better or worse.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the social services programmes that have been getting people off social assistance. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the past year and a half there has been something like 8,000 or 9,000 jobs created. This government took people of

these social assistance payrolls. Mr. Speaker, some were put on the UIC, yes, but the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) should realize that they were not put on UIC for at least ten weeks. So the hon. gentleman should realize that a lot of people in his district would not appreciate these kind of comments from the hon. gentleman who is supposed to be representing them for the next three or four years. So is he against a person on welfare in Roddickton getting a job for ten weeks? Is that what the hon. gentleman is against?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

No, you do not want any jobs, you want everybody on welfare all the time. That is what you want. Again, Mr. Speaker, I hit awful tender nerves. I do not understand why, Mr. Speaker, that every time I get up, for some reason, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) get very, very upset when I talk about jobs. Now the hon. gentlemen should realize that in this Province the Premier came back with thirty-six seats. And with all the ammunition that has been thrown at this party during the last election, with all the people that had all kinds of money and everything else who ran against individual candidates, they still could not win more than -

AN HON. MEMBER:

We did not have the public treasury though, did we?

MR. WARREN:

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who ran against me had as much money as probably the

public treasury and he could not do it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

He tried it, Mr. Speaker. And let me just say to the hon. member that people realize this government is doing what they can. And one other thing, of the 26.2 per cent unemployment in this Province today, does the hon. member know where at least 10 per cent is coming from? It is the young Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who went away to the Mainland four, five and six years ago, who, now, cannot find jobs on the Mainland and have come back home. Every day young people are coming back home because there are no more jobs available.

I remember a famous politician who came into St. John's Airport in 1979, who came home for good. Now he is finally coming home for good and bless him, he is a nice man.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back in my concluding remarks by saying that this government, through the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), through the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), through the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), and through everyone of the ministers, is making sure that every available job that can be found in this Province is found for our people.

I should advise the hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) that, you know, we have to realize that there is not a job for everybody. If there was there would not be any unemployment.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Only a Tory can get one.

MR. WARREN:

No, Mr. Speaker, you do not have to be a Tory to get one. I am sure the hon. gentleman realizes that there are some jobs in his district that are not Tory jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about on the offshore. You have got to be a Tory.

MR. WARREN:

On the offshore, yes, Mr. Speaker, in fact, I know there are three jobs from my district in particular -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

- that are neither PC nor Liberal for that matter. In fact, I do not care what they are as long as they can get employment. My main aim is making sure that as many people as possible I can help, find employment. That is my main aim.

Now, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said that we should reduce the sales tax. Sure, everybody agrees that we should reduce the sales tax. I believe there should be no sales tax on clothing whatsoever, but how are we going to get our revenue in this Province? There may be a good logical reason it what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition brought forward, but it is one that this government at the present time cannot contend with at this time.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to support the amendment on this resolution. It shows that this government is determined to work

with our partners in Ottawa in making sure that as many jobs as possible will be given to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave, by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, it is only my modesty that allows me to rise to follow such as blistering attack, such rare eloquence, but being as modest as I am, Mr. Speaker, I shall try my humble best. I say to him that it was not his finest hour. His attack on teachers certainly does him no particular credit, but I should not be so unkind as to pursue that because that will come back to haunt him without anything that I would do. It will come back to haunt him.

I am with him to the extent that in any profession, in any category of people, be they housewives or teachers or Cabinet Ministers or taxi driver or whoever, there are some people who are more competent than others and more ethical than others, but that is not what he said. He tarred them all with the same brush. What he ought to have the courage to do is go outside this House -

AN HON. MEMBER:
He only said some.

MR. SIMMONS:
It is not enough. It is weasel words to say, 'No, I only mean some.' Which some?

Mr. Speaker, surely the courageous

thing to do is not hide behind the immunity of the House to make that kind of a statement but to go outside the House and say, I have evidence that the following persons are not fit to be teachers, name names, chapter and verse. Surely that is the honourable thing to do under the circumstances. But, Mr. Speaker, when he crossed the floor, I have to say to him as a friend, he raised the intelligence of this side of the House and he raised the intelligence of that side of the House as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Now he talks, Mr. Speaker, about taking people off social -

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

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

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I believe in the few comments that I made I did not make any comments about any particular member in this House. But I think I would say that I brought as much intelligence to this side as the hon. member brought to that side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
To that point of order, there is no point of order, just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, when a line has been delivered and it has had some effect, however small, any member, especially an experienced member of the House like the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), should learn to brood for a while, and then seek the right occasion, rather than seeking a false occasion, because he gets egg on both sides of his face by getting up on a point of order, but he knows that. He is a smart man.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at another point in his splendid, eloquent, mind-boggling oration. It is that he would dare to admit publicly what we have been saying on this side of the House. This comes back to the problem of making the transition, the transition that says, today I am a Liberal, oh, I forgot, yesterday I was a Liberal and today I am a Tory. I guess, in the transition, he thought out loud. He said what we have been saying for years. The real purpose for the social assistance jobs is to get people on UIC. He admitted that that was the extent of the job creation programme over there.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) for putting down this resolution, every single word of it. You see, Mr. Speaker, when all the nit picking is done, and smart remarks are made across the House, and people break their own arms patting themselves on the back for the last brilliant aside they just made, the young people out there still have no jobs. That is the tragedy of it. They have not jobs.

MR. J. CARTER:

We know why, too.

MR. SIMMONS:

As I said when all the smart alecky remarks are made. So if the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has one more smart alecky he wants to make, before he goes to his savory farm, let him do it and then I will get on with an issue that I believe is a fairly serious issue. He may not think so because he has a couple of jobs. Most people do not have one job. Does he realize that? Not most people, 26 per cent of the people do not have one job. Will he get that through his tick skull that 26 per cent of the people out there are fed up with his smart alecky remarks, his asinine comments on every issue. Now if he will shut up I will get on with my speech, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy is that a lot of people do not have jobs.

MR. J. CARTER:

Do you know why? Do you know why?

MR. SIMMONS:

And that point, Mr. Speaker, we are going to get across. Mr. Speaker, I like the exchange in the House, I like the opportunity to get feedback from particular members, but I have a ground rule: The people responding have at least minimal intelligence, and for that reason I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, not to enforce silence, but to enforce silence only insofar as the member having less than minimal intelligence is concerned, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). I will take jibes from anybody else in

the House because, as any member of the House knows, it helps in formulating what it is you want to say to the House. But when you have a person who is determined to obstruct because he cannot go out and look after his savoury, he is here determined to obstruct because he has nothing better to do, Mr. Speaker, my people did not send me here to be obstructed by that idiot, that clown from St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. the member to withdraw the term 'idiot', it is not parliamentary.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw anything that is unparliamentary. The problem with the member for St. John's North is that everything is unparliamentary when you look at him.

Mr. Speaker, the sad fact of the matter is that joblessness in this Province is nothing short of a tragedy. I intend during the course of the debate, in the next few minutes, to tell you why. One of the 'whys', Mr. Speaker, is that the joblessness rate, at 26 per cent at the moment, is a stinging indictment of a government that has been in power now for thirteen years, is completely bankrupt of ideas, and has come close to bankrupting this Province. The government that used to scream years ago about the size of the deficit has driven it right through the roof, right through the clouds. That is the one of the 'whys'. This government that has engaged in confrontation over the past few years with the federal government, as an end in itself, has left

money on the table in Ottawa, millions of dollars, that could have been used to stimulate the economy and to create jobs, and that was not done because the fight was more important than the lives and the livelihoods of those people out there.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) last Wednesday, and I wish he were here, moved an amendment that would strike out all the words in my hon. colleague's resolution and then put some new wording in, basically saying 'That the House urge both the federal and provincial governments to initiate strategies and programmes to reduce the number of unemployed.' Initiate strategies and programmes: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us give the devil his due. And I do not think of him as the devil, I think of him as a friend and a person whom I wish very well in his Fisheries portfolio, but let us give him his due. What he did last week, Mr. Speaker, and I hope my friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is listening, and not only listening but will not disown me for this, what the Minister of Fisheries did last week must be regarded by almost any politician as a skillful piece of political snooker. He sat down in his office, or somebody did it for him, as the case may be, and that is irrelevant to the point I want to make, and he said, 'Let us move an amendment which will put the heat to the Liberals. Let us put them in a position where they will have to vote for the resolution because it calls on the two governments to initiate strategies to reduce unemployment. I mean, to vote gainst that', he said to himself, 'would be the equivalent of voting against motherhood.' I say to him, a skillful piece of

political snooker, and politicians who get their jollies from one-upmanship must recognize it as such. As a piece of political snooker, as a brilliant piece of one-upmanship, they must be impressed by what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) did last week. As a politician, I am impressed.

But here is the problem, Mr. Speaker; the jobless are not impressed. The jobless of this Province are not impressed when they hear a minister in his motion, which I am sure was skillfully worded, he stood by it, others on that side have stood up and supported it, now let us hear what it is he is advocating, let us hear what it is he is pushing, saying that this House ought to urge the federal government and the provincial government to get together - now there is a noble sentiment we have heard somewhere before - so they can initiate some strategies and programmes to reduce the jobless. Did you hear the wording? To initiate - not to continue, Mr. Speaker, not to carry on, not to expedite what is already in the system, not to add to it, oh, no, to start, to initiate. He wants them now, after this love relationship we have heard about, this sleeping together thing we have been told about, federal Tories and provincial Tories getting married off, after eight or nine months of that he wants a resolution from this House now that they should go out and start working on unemployment. How long, Mr. Speaker, will this charade go on? We had a Tory government elected in 1972, 1975, 1979, and in 1982, and I always thought as a voter that implicit in getting yourself elected as a government was a mandate to create jobs where jobs

were necessary to be created. But, no, the Premier goes out and says, 'By the way, after being here all those years, in the minister's chair, and the Premier's chair latterly, I think I would like to have your permission, people of Newfoundland, to create some jobs.' So that was the mandate he looked for and 46 per cent of the people, less than half of the people, gave him the mandate he was looking for, which he had had for thirteen years already. But it has not stopped there, Mr. Speaker, it has not stopped with the April election. Oh, no! Now we have the Minister of Fisheries coming in and saying, 'Would the House give us permission to initiate some strategies to start the job of reducing unemployment?' Not carry on, initiate. They want to start now? I say to them, if they have not started now it is much too late, much too late for those unemployed.

What else does the amendment say? He talked about co-operation, and on the face of it, Mr. Speaker, again to be against co-operation is to be against motherhood. Mr. Speaker, what kind of co-operation have we seen on overfishing? We heard the story here in Question Period yesterday, but what kind of co-operation have we seen on that? We have seen collusion, that is what we have seen. And when co-operation becomes defined as collusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not want any part of it.

We have seen the coastal boat service, and co-operation there has come to mean silence, collusion - you say nothing and I will not say anything. Mr. Wilson, the Minister of Finance in Ottawa, got up in November - now,

the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) might not have heard the statement, but I heard the statement and I can send him a copy of it - and gave notice that he had some proposals before him to increase the unemployment insurance qualifying period from ten to fourteen weeks and to do a number of other things, seven things altogether, which, in toto, would cut the guts out of the unemployment insurance programme. And I say to members on the other side of the House that while it is great theatre to sit there and cheer the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, watch the hole you are digging for yourself. Because I would not want to be the one, and I am not going to be the one, Liberal or Tory, to be seen to be aiding and abetting what Wilson is about to do it Ottawa when he brings his budget down. He is going to cut the guts out of the unemployment insurance programme, he said that to you in November. And I take issue with the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies who talks about it being hypothetical. There is nothing hypothetical about it. They gave notice publicly last November, in the economic statement, that these are the things they are thinking about. If we do not send them a House a very strong signal that we cannot have that happen, it will be a disaster for Newfoundland for the number of weeks to be increased from ten to fourteen. Would you realize the havoc that would play do in Petits, I say to my friend, down in parts of the Bay of Islands, in parts of my district, in Buchans, all over this Province. What havoc that would play. You go through your communities and you look at the people who are scraping to get ten

weeks, and tell them 'Joe, boy, the next time you are going to need fourteen weeks. And I will tell you why you need fourteen weeks, because that fellow Wilson up in Ottawa, and because our Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) sat in the House and talked about hypothetical situations, because he had not read the minister's statement last November or refused to tell the House that he had read it.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of issue we are talking about. Now if that is co-operation, Mr. Speaker, I do not want that kind of co-operation, because that is working against Newfoundlanders. That is the kind of working together that we have now with the two Tory Governments. They are working together all right, but they are working together against ordinary Newfoudlanders. On the coastal boat service, collusion, on the unemployment insurance changes, collusion, on foreign overfishing, collusion. If that is co-operation, Mr. Speaker, I can do without it. If that is working together, yes, I agree, but it is working together against the best interest of Newfoundlanders on the South Coast and all over this Province. Now I am going to disown that kind of co-operation.

What else, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I was there and I settled that issue in Petit Forte when that member was in trying to make some politics of it. Mr. Speaker, if co-operation means what we have seen in the past

eight months, capitulation, then Ottawa, you want to do it, you go ahead and do it, they are bowing before Ottawa for the last eight months. That is the kind of co-operation. Absolute capitulation of the mandate. They have abdicated their responsibility. They have given it all over to Ottawa. Do they not realize, Mr. Speaker, that the mandate of our Provincial Government, whatever the party stripe, and the mandate of a federal government, whatever the party stripe, are not necessarily coincident. You have to come at it from a different angle. Bill Davis, when he was Premier of Ontario, a lot of Tories in Ontario are wishing you were still the Premier, I tell you, and a lot of Tories across this country are wishing he were still the Premier, he did not have this constant fight, because this fellow called Trudeau happened to have another political label. You had the difference, Mr. Speaker, of two men, Davis and Trudeau, dealing as men, instead of the problem of a man dealing with a boy. That is the issue, not partisan politics, Mr. Speaker, but understanding what your mandate is and what people you represent. Mr. Speaker, we in this House whatever our party stripe represent not Tories or not Liberals, we represent the people of Newfoundland. And so, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), when he talks about co-operation means what he what he has been doing for the last few months, capitulation, collusion, silence, I disown that kind of co-operation, Mr. Speaker, being led around slavishly by the nose because the Prime Minister wants to look cosmetically all right over in Bonn, despite the fact that all of the papers said,

he was an unmitigated disaster. Being muzzled on the coast boat service, being muzzled on unemployment.

Remember all of those statements, Mr. Speaker, we used to have when the unemployment rate went up every month and the Provincial spokesman would be on the radio saying what a disaster it was. Now we have gone to 26 per cent. Have you heard them on the radio lately? No, Mr. Speaker. I return to my point. Collusion and silence has taken over from the people's agenda. The people's agenda has been supplanted by the Tory agenda. It is not important any more, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Newfoundland be fought for on Winter drilling or on any other issue. What is important now is that the Tories enjoy their period in bed together, being yes men, handmaidens of Ottawa, that is what they have become, Mr. Speaker. So that is why, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is skillful and cynical. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we will not, if the Tories in Ottawa and the Tories here have not got their act together all ready, we will not in May 1985 urge them to initiate, to begin. If they have not already begun, they have missed the boat by a long shot. What we will do is stand foursquare, Mr. Speaker, behind what has to be one of the best-worded, most thoughtful resolutions ever to come before this House of Assembly. Because not only does my colleague for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) cite the problem, he provides some solutions to it. He talks about an employment strategy. He talks about stimulating the economy. He talks about reducing taxes. In the amendment all that has been removed, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TULK:

There is too much action.

MR. SIMMONS:

All that has been removed because it smells of action. And what they have supplanted, what they have put in instead, is a meaningless platitude about working together. Well we have had working together right up to here, Mr. Speaker, and working together has come to mean capitulation, collusion and silence. It has not come to mean any jobs for Newfoundland. That is why we are here. That is why our resolution is here, Mr. Speaker. And that is why we on this side and, why I, in particular, will support the unamended resolution wholeheartedly, and I would urge everybody in this House, who is here representing people first, to support us as we vote for this resolution.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Before recognizing the hon. member I would like to rule now on the point of order that was raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. This was in reference to whether a second hon. member would have the right to speak to a Ministerial Statement. I have checked our own Standing Orders. There is nothing in it to guide one. In Beauchesne, on page 303, Statement by Ministers it states: "On Statements by Ministers, as listed in section (2) of this Standing Order, a Minister of the Crown may make a short factual announcement or statement of government policy. A spokesman for each of the parties in

opposition to the government may comment briefly thereon and Members may be permitted to address questions thereon to the Minister." That, to some extent, covers it.

But we have one precedent that I have managed to find in our own House and that was in Hansard of November 27, 1975. This was a question asked by Mr. Neary, at the time. The Speaker thought that he may be getting up on a point of order. And Mr. Neary said, "No, the Minister's Statement that I am asking now." The ruling of the Speaker then was: "I would have to point out to the hon. members that the right to make brief remarks, ask questions, or ask for clarification is limited to the Leader of the Opposition. The leader of other groups or the spokesman, a spokesman for either such gentleman, and the hon. member will not fit into that category." The Speaker went on further to say, "There is no group." The ruling has been made. And I do not see any group in the area. I must rule likewise the hon. member does not represent a group in this hon. House. He can reply to Ministerial Statements by leave.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in this debate this afternoon, we have been talking about taxes and taxing, and the only thing I find that has been extremely taxing has been listening to the hon. member who just took his seat. That has been extremely taxing. There has been a certain amount of personal invective flung back and forth across the floor. And I would

like to say I do not mind it at all. It does not bother me the least bit. I will draw the line, of course, at insulting hon. gentlemen's mothers. I realize that that injects a certain amount of vigour into the debate, but it is perhaps crossing a line that should not be crossed.

There seems to be a general rule of parliaments that the sleaze factor always remains the same. Now, we had two or three sleazy characters who failed or decided not to run for the election and they were not re-elected, but in their place where people who were just as sleazy. I would like to report to this House that this rule seems to be an iron rule of parliamentary democracy. The sleaze factor in this House has remained the same. And, of course, we have that great rejuvenated Liberal Party. So many have been elected that it is hard to tell the difference between the 'riff' and the 'raff'. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen would like to have distinguished themselves. And, of course, we have the ten-day wonder on the other side. I must say, he did a lot for the federal government that he was in at the time, and probably his most signal achievement was in leaving it after ten days. And the moment he left the federal government, I think its complexion improved.

However, I would like to point out to hon. members that the reason for the high unemployment in Newfoundland is not hard to find. It is 26 per cent. I do not know if that 26 per cent is an accurate figure. It is perhaps the wrong way to approach unemployment figures, it is better to figure out what percentage of all the population is working. And, using

that yardstick, Newfoundland is even worse off than other jurisdictions. But one of the reasons that unemployment is so terribly high in Newfoundland is that the federal Liberal Government of Pierre Trudeau pursued inflationary policies of overspending and building up an excessive deficit, and in order to service this deficit, they have no discretionary money left for imaginative, sensible plans, so the federal government is left with very few resources to step into the areas of Canada where unemployment is greatest. I think it is just a shocking fact that they have left a terrible legacy behind, one that will take years of good Conservative management to correct. I hope, in time, it will be corrected. If hon. members want an example of what I am talking about, of Liberal mismanagement at the federal level, I will just confine myself to one example, and that is their persistent refusal to upgrade the ferry system from Newfoundland to the mainland. I do not know how many members of this House have had occasion to use that ferry, but it is a very, very poor service. The boats do not leave at regular times, the accommodation is poor, it takes a couple of hours to get your car on and a couple of hours to get your car off. There is only one ferry all year 'round and that is located at the extreme Western end of the Island. It means a 600 mile drive to get across there. It also means that large transport trucks are overusing the Trans-Canada Highway, which is suffering accordingly. There has been a persistent refusal to establish a reliable East Coast ferry year 'round, and the one that is established in the Summer is quite inadequate. Every way we

look, Mr. Speaker, the transportation service between this Province and the mainland is woefully inadequate, and what this must do to the cost of transporting goods and to the difficulty of transporting goods, and the difficulty of ordinary economic endeavour - make no wonder the unemployment is so bad because it must be so hard to start up anything. To start up any kind of business which involves trade with the mainland must be very, very difficult, and I would be very, very nervous about trying to set up such a business.

Now, what positive things can be done? This is what this resolution is all about. I have some suggestions and, in the few minutes allotted me, I would like to go over them.

One thing, Mr. Speaker, is that I wish that Crown land was more available in this Province. I think if more private individuals were able to get and hold and have small blocks of land, the economy would benefit. There is nothing like having a bit of land to look after, to invest money in and to spend your time at developing. It may mean that some of this land would be farmed, some more of it might just be enjoyed, but I think there would be a greater level of economic activity if land were easier to get and were more widely owned. I know that the government is giving out small lots, cabin lots, but I am talking now about relatively large blocks of land, 50 to 100 acres, that can be secured by individuals for their own use.

By the way, I realize that there is fear that this land would be sat upon and not used. So I say,

let people buy the land at a fair price, let them submit to reasonable taxation, if necessary, and let them submit to reasonable zoning laws.

I wish that the government would look at this very carefully. And, in line with that, I think we could talk about reforestation. In the neighbouring Province of Nova Scotia, a lot of the land is privately owned and is operated as private woodlots, and individuals take it upon themselves to reforest the land. And I think a small, privately-owned woodlot could provide quite a good living for an individual. In fact, in Nova Scotia, it does, although I realize the tree growth there is better and the growth of hardwood is better and faster. But still, there is quite a flourishing industry in Nova Scotia using hardwood and softwood woodlots.

Another thing that should be done in Newfoundland: With a lot of the small harbours, for some reason or other the beach forms what is called a barachois, and at the base of a lot of these harbours there is a fresh water or brackish pond that is blocked, usually, from the rest of the harbour by an accretion of beach rocks or sand, which could be bulldozed out of the way with a relatively small bulldozer, or one of these loaders, allowing access for small boats. In Norman's Cove, an expensive small harbour was done by blasting through a rock wall that was in the way, and this has been of tremendous benefit to the people in Norman's Cove. There are a great many harbours all around the Island, and for a very small expenditure, access could be made to these brackish ponds for small boats, to create some very pleasant, safe

small-boat harbours with easy access. I am thinking not only of the advantage to fishermen but the advantage for tourism and for just general Summer enjoyment. The tourism dollar and the recreational dollar is not one to be despised, it can sometimes be just as big as any other dollar, and I would like to see the government have a closer look at this.

I would hope that fish farms would be more easily developed. There are a lot of ponds here that could be stocked with trout, and yet, members will find if they try to pursue this, it is very hard to buy or get access to fish fry to put in small ponds. It is just one of these things. There are a number of difficulties that I do not have time to go into now, but it should be and could be easier, and if that were done, I think we could have a tremendous sports fishing industry in all the ponds in Newfoundland that have easy access. And we know that Newfoundland probably has more ponds than it has Conservatives.

Speaking of ponds brings me to Parson's Pond. I would like to see some more effort made in Parson's Pond, where there was at one time, a small, on-land oil well. A former Speaker of this House told me that he was operating a company there that produced fifty barrels of fishermen's gas per day.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Who was that?

MR. J. CARTER:
Sparkes.

This is certainly worth investigating. I do not know whether it would pay or not, but

it did pay at the time, and I would like to see that looked into.

You cannot go out to the West Coast without noticing the ski slopes at Steady Brook, and there seems to me to be a suitable terrain on the East Coast, around Clarenville, where the Winter weather is at least a little bit more predictable than it is here, and perhaps the development of a ski slope there might pay off. So I would recommend that to the member representing Clarenville.

So, with these few ideas, I think something can be done, and I would recommend to members opposite that they cease their foolish, partisan, bitter, unnecessary attacks on this government and concentrate on doing something constructive for a change. I know that is difficult for them, I know it is not in their nature, but I would like them to perhaps start the fiscal year off with a resolution of that kind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. the member for Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, I find that I am unable to support this amendment. You see, Sir, my friend and colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) in all sincerity put forward a motion to deal with unemployment in this Province. My colleague had just gone through an election, as all of us have, and I am sure that he met up with people who were suffering because of the unemployment in this Province. I

am sure that he met young men between the age of eighteen and twenty who had no income whatsoever. This particular group cannot receive able-bodied welfare. That is a concept that is gone. There is no longer any provincial help for this particular person. Many of those people have not yet worked. They do not want to work just to get unemployment insurance, but even if they did, they have not worked. They have no income except the few cents, the few dollars that their parents might be able to give them. This is what prompted this motion, I am sure, by the hon. the member from Bonavista North. We have seen in this House a tactic to manipulate this hon. House, to almost completely negate what the hon. the member for Bonavista North was trying to put through this House. Therefore, I cannot speak in support of this amendment and when the time comes I am going to vote against this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

I maintain, Sir, that the real subject is jobs, whether we talk about the amendment or whether we talk about the original motion, the real problem out there in the real world where people have to have money to pay for their groceries, where people live from day to day, the real problem out there, Mr. Speaker, is jobs and 26 per cent of our people do not have jobs. Now we know about 26 per cent because they are statistics. They have turned up in some computer, but what about the other hundreds and thousands who are no longer looking, who have quit looking for jobs? What about them? They do not care, Mr. Speaker, whether they are given Liberal jobs or Tory jobs or NDP jobs. All they want, Sir, is a

decent crack at the economy so that they can become responsible people in our economy, so that they can walk out into the world with world with a straight back and a straight face. That is what they want, Mr. Speaker. They are not interested in the nonsense about the manipulation of the rules of procedure. They want work, work, work, Mr. Speaker.

One attempt to supply this work is SEED, an example of cooperation. Yet, in a Ministerial Statement a few days ago we heard that, in the spirit of cooperation, we adopted the guidelines that already were in place. Is that what you call cooperation, Mr. Speaker, to take something that is handed down to you, that is shoved down your throat? You see, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to tell anyone in this hon. House that Canada is a nation of regions and something which may work in Newfoundland may not necessarily work in British Columbia. Something that is relevant to Quebec may not be relevant to Alberta. We must recognize this great nation for what it is, a nation of regions. When some member within her cocktail group comes up with an idea, it may not necessarily work in Newfoundland. We cannot throw \$2 million into something until we know it is relevant, Mr. Speaker. SEED is not the way to go. Mr. Speaker, her friends, her buddies, sitting around sipping their cocktails, who normally would employ part-time help during the Summer - all businesses do it, it is to give their normal employees their vacations - these big companies, Mr. Speaker, would still have hired. But now, thanks to Flora, when they hire the people that they would have hired anyway, they are getting the federal government to pay for

taking on those people. There are no new jobs across Canada. There might be a few new jobs in certain parts of Newfoundland, I will concede that, because now we are trying to manipulate SEED. I can give an example of a municipality in this Province which did not have the means to apply for employment under SEED. That municipality tried to work through rural development and the two groups together are trying to come up with enough money to have a few jobs, but the end result is, Mr. Speaker, they are going to have less jobs in that particular area, than they had last year, and a considerable number of less jobs, Mr. Speaker. That is the important thing. We are worse off in 1985 than we were in 1984. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker. That is the result of this cooperation. That is the result of shoving something down someone's throat and saying, 'You take this and be quiet and shut up and we will treat you nice and we will not say anything about it.' If that is cooperation, you can have it Mr. Speaker. I do not want it.

The hon. member from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) touched upon some topics about freeing up Crown land. He talked about fish farming. He talked about brilliant ideas and I agree with him. There is a need in this Province to deregulate the allocation of Crown lands. I agree with him. What the hon. member is touching upon, Mr. Speaker, is the over amount of regulation that is in this Province. We are choked into the ground by regulation. He could have covered it all if he had just said, 'Let us deregulate Newfoundland.' There is our problem, Mr. Speaker. Can you

imagine, Sir, the problem a small businessman has today if he wants to start any business in this Province? He has got to deal with the first level of government to municipality. Then he has got to deal with whatever department of government he is going under, be it forestry, agriculture or whatever. He has got to go through all this and then, in many cases, he has got to have a bunch of civil servants to tell him whether or not what he is about to do is going to be a success. That is asking someone who does not have an entrepreneurial spirit in the first place. Very few entrepreneurs are going to be civil servants. They have a different makeup, they have a different philosophy, they have a different way of looking at life but by nature a person who gets into a steady job is normally of a 'c' conservative and he will not take the chances that an entrepreneur will take. That is why there are so many entrepreneurs fall flat on their face, but some of them do succeed - thank goodness - and they are the ones who put us to work. So the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is right. We must deregulate this Province and then, I believe, we can put her back on the track.

There are other ways, Mr. Speaker, that we can put Newfoundlanders back to work. One of the tried and tested ways of putting the economy back is to stimulate the economy. That is an accepted fact in economics for years gone by. Now the provincial government does not have power over interest rates. I know that. We all know that, Mr. Speaker. The provincial government does not have any authority to do anything about the value of the dollar. I know

that. We all know that, Mr. Speaker. These are facts of life. However, there are some things that the provincial government does have power over and one of them is the retail sales tax. The retail sales tax is a drogue on this economy. Now when I talk about a drogue, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about a piece of chain that you put over the nose of your komatik when you use a dog team. That is a drogue, and when you drop that over the nose of your komatik, Mr. Speaker, you slow her down and the retail sales tax has slowed down this economy. I can remember the first time, in recent years, that it was applied to clothing. It was near Christmas. I am not talking about the 12 per cent. I am talking about the first time it was put on clothing after former Premier Moores - for whom I have respect. I do not care what his political stripe is, I have respect for the man - took the retail sales tax off clothes. Just before Christmas, this administration slapped sales tax on dry goods, on clothing. Can you imagine the effect that that had on the retailers in this province? They were geared up for the big Christmas rush, the big Christmas sale. Their inventory peaked, but like a bucket of cold water from the Confederation Building, the retail sales tax was thrown on clothing, and, come Spring, much of the inventory had to be sold off at less than cost. And then, again, Mr. Speaker, in the Spring of 1982, retailers were, once again, gearing up for the Summer sales and along comes an additional 2 per cent tax. Again sales dropped off in the retail trade. Again there was a decline in business. Again there was a decline in profits, and with a decline in profits there came

layoffs. It would be reasonable to assume that if we were to put our retail sales tax up to 100 per cent, then retail sales would ground completely to a halt. If we were to drop the retail sales tax to nothing, which I know is impossible, then it is reasonable to assume that sales would pick up. The law of diminishing returns comes into play after a certain point. I do not know what the point is, but I know it is far below twelve or far below ten. I know that it is better to sell 100 bags of flour with a profit of \$2.00 each than it is to sell two bags of flour with a profit of fifty cents each.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Try that again. How much flour are we talking about?

MR. DECKER:

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, I am able to recall that. It is a gem of knowledge.

Not only in the retail trade, Mr. Speaker, but also in the tourist industry, just think what this 12 per cent is doing to our tourist industry today. In this Province we are told that tourism has a tremendous potential and I believe that, Mr. Speaker. Every report that I have read in the past number of years has told us how important tourism is going to be to the future and I believe that. I believe that tourism is going to be a big thing.

But, Mr. Speaker, suppose a man is in any part of this world, in Europe, in North America, in Canada, and he is planning a trip to Newfoundland. He has heard about the Viking site up on the Northern Peninsula and he wants to see it. But before he comes to Newfoundland he discovers that

there is 12 per cent sales tax going to be added to his meals. A 12 per cent sales tax will be added to all the souvenirs that he buys to carry back home with him. Everything that happens to him in this Province will be added onto by 12 per cent. I can well imagine the reaction of that person, Mr. Speaker, when he learns that the government does not want him in Newfoundland. By putting 12 per cent sales tax on our tourists it was the same as if we had taken a sheet of plywood, four foot by twelve foot, painted the background white and in big black letters wrote out, 'Tourists! Do not come to Newfoundland, and if we had taken that sheet of plywood, and we had marched all over this world, that is what we have done when we have added 12 per cent to our tourist dollars in this Province, Mr. Speaker. We have told our tourists that we do not want them. Stay away! Do not come to Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, this 12 per cent sales tax is a curse upon us.

Some people have learned how to cope with it. I cannot help but notice, even since the short time I have been in this House, that from time to time new suits of clothes turn up. Is it coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that the new suits turn up after some hon. members have made a visit to some other part of this great nation?

MR. CARTER:
Oh, oh.

MR. DECKER:
If you want to buy a suit of clothes wait until you go up to Alberta where they do not have any sales tax or wait until you go across to Nova Scotia. This is happening, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I buy all my clothes in Newfoundland.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member for St. John's North (J. Carter) on a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

The privileges of this House are seriously circumscribed when a member makes insinuations like that. If a member has any factual information to give to this House, he would certainly be justified in presenting it, but to make insinuations like this cannot be allowed. I suggest the hon. member take it back. It is not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was saying, before I was so rudely interrupted, that there could well be, now there may not be, there could well be people in this hon. House who, on their visits to other provinces, bought clothing to avoid sales tax. This might have been the case, Mr. Speaker, but I certainly hope it is not. But, again, Mr. Speaker, there is another way to avoid sales tax. If you are ordering something from a business operating in another province, which business does not have a Newfoundland sales tax number or vendor's number, then

you can also buy without paying Newfoundland sales tax. Now, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this could be happening in this Province. You see people are circumventing paying the sales tax and the ones who are doing it are the wealthy who can afford to travel, the members of this hon. House who happen to get visits to other provinces, the people who are smart enough to use the system and order from companies which do not have a vendor's number for Newfoundland. This is what is happening. But sadly it is not apply to the poor fellow in parts of my district who earns \$4000 or \$5000 a year, who is not shrewd enough to take advantage of ordering from someone with no vendor's number, who is not wealthy enough to visit other parts of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I see the dropping of the retail sales tax as a sign, as a signal, as an indication to the rest of the economy, that we are about to do something. When Mr. Mulroney was elected he said he was going to send a signal to foreign nations that foreign capital is welcome in Canada. If we, Mr. Speaker, were to drop the retail sales tax we would be sending a signal to the tourists around the world, we would be sending a signal saying, 'Look, we want your dollars. You are welcome here.' We would be sending a signal to the small businessman saying, 'Look, we are trying to get this economy back on the tracks again.'

Mr. Speaker, I support the original motion, but I cannot support the amendment because, what it has done is water down the original motion to such an extent that it becomes meaningless, Mr. Speaker. It becomes meaningless

and it destroys the original intent, which is to get Newfoundlanders back to work again and use whatever means possible to do so.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the three or four minutes that I have available to me, I would like to make a few short remarks.

It is always interesting that Oppositions come and go, but they still remain the same. They deal with hypotheses. And it reminds me of a little poem: "If 'ifs' and 'ands' were pots and pans/And all the sea were ink/If all the trees were bread and cheese/What would we have to drink?" Complete hypothesis, Mr. Speaker.

A member who would stand on the other side and even suggest that the way that members of this hon. House purchase clothes was to go outside this Province to avoid provincial sales tax - I do not know if it borders on libel, Mr. Speaker but - certainly it borders on a certain level of mentality that I do not think should be acceptable in this House.

The member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), each time he has gotten on his feet since this session of the hon. House began, made reference to the removal of certain marine services in his district and others on the South Coast, and he asked, 'What is the

difference between what is going on now, with the behind-the-scenes co-operation and discussion and dialogue that is going on, and the previous administration?' In the Late Show last week I tried to answer that, and I think I did.

But it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and myself went to Petit Forte, Southeast Bight and Paradise and had meetings with individuals there, where the flags were flying at half-mast. They were flying at half-mast for the lack of initiative that was taken by the MP at that particular time, the present MHA for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). That was interesting, Mr. Speaker, because it was during that particular individual's term of office as MP that on the South Coast alone fourteen communities were dropped from C.N. Marine's coastal service. I would like for the member to express some concern now and say what he did or did not do - we all know what he did not do - when St. Alban's, Milltown, Harbour Breton, Little Bay East, Grand Bank, Fortune, St. Pierre, Burin, Marystown, Petit Forte, Monkstown, Southeast Bight, Paradise and Argentia came off the coastal boat service. Where was he when that happened? Well, the people of Petit Forte knew where he was. The problem was that they just could not get him to come where they were. That is why the flags were flying at half-mast and that is why the people in those particular communities supported the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

MR. TOBIN:

Eugene just said they paved a road for them.

MR. DAWE:

Yes. Well, again, Mr. Speaker, that only points out what I have been saying all along about the lack of information and lack of knowledge on the part of members opposite when they deal with any issue in this hon. House.

Mr. Speaker, last year we announced a number of projects in the area of job creation, trying to make sure, not only do we try to preserve and maintain but increase the road networks and transportation systems in this Province, at the same time, keeping in mind the important role that capital works programmes, particularly in the area of transportation, play in the area of seasonal employment in this Province.

Last year alone, Mr. Speaker, in the various government departments, particularly in the Departments of Transportation, Municipal Affairs and Public Works, the Province's capital budget amounted to 30 per cent of the onshore capital construction occurring in this Province. In the Department of Transportation alone last year, Mr. Speaker, that attributed to 2,300 seasonal jobs in the area of transportation. What makes that particular programme, as well as the Municipal Affairs capital programme, so important is that it occurs in all areas of the Province. It is spread out, not only in the urban areas, but in the rural areas of the Province as well, to provide an opportunity for people in all parts of the Province to take advantage of those employment opportunities. We are very proud of that, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue to do those kind of capital works programmes in the various

government departments to ensure that in these ongoing seasonal areas, the construction areas, the fairly high paying construction jobs, that Newfoundlanders in all parts of Newfoundland and Labrador have an opportunity to avail of those particular opportunities.

This year, Mr. Speaker, as budgets and as programmes unfold over the next number of weeks, this hon. House and the people of the Province will see this Province's and this government's commitment to continue with that kind of a programme to stabilize seasonal employment around this Province.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, to compliment the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) on the initiatives that he and the federal minister have taken with regard to the creation of 6,000 student jobs in this Province in a fashion which we were not able to do before, in identifying specific occupations and associating students - who are going on and continuing their education in those specific areas - with very valuable experience in the work place. I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not compliment the minister on his accomplishments in that particular field.

We have an opportunity which I think we are not taking full advantage of. I wish I had more time to talk about it. I speak of the area in our educational system, our school system, in programmes similar to the junior achievement programmes in the United States and other parts of our country, where an opportunity is given to educate young students into taking an entrepreneurial attitude towards possible career

advancement.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. DAWE:
Too bad, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North will close the debate.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker; it is very disappointing to feel that a resolution of this significance will not receive the unanimous support of a group of people who have been elected to serve the people and to create jobs for them. I say 'to feel' because I am not assured yet, but by what we are seeing, it certainly looks that way. First of all, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) tried to rule out the resolution, Sir, so that is certainly an indication -

MR. J. CARTER:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the

member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, Hansard will show that although I objected to the form of the member's resolution, I quickly followed up by saying that I would be the first to ask for unanimous approval for him to make his resolution once he had reworded it and humbly submitted it to this House. As long as he was willing to clean up his act, we would be more than happy to let him speak and even give him extra time to speak. But, for him to suggest that we were trying to euchre him out of his position to speak is wrong, erroneous and false and not worthy of the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Let the word go out, Mr. Speaker, that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) was against a resolution which asked for the creation of jobs in this Province.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I merely pointed out that the wording of the member's resolution was argumentative and insulting, and I urged him to clean up his act. That was the only thing I did say.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I rule

that it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. Member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, so that I can carry on and make some points, I will not refer to that anymore. The point has been made and the record will show. Mr. Speaker, then we had an amendment to the motion which clearly demonstrated that the government did not want to support a motion, Mr. Speaker, a resolution that was direct, that was specific in what it asked to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) started off his few remarks by giving his view of why we have the highest unemployment rate in the country. Let me give the member for St. John's North my view, why I think that we have a high unemployment rate, and why it has escalated to such ridiculously high figures in the last six years, from 15.1 per cent to close now to 25 per cent. Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is because we had a government which put all its eggs in one basket, we had a government that had a one-dimensional policy, we had a government that believed in the offshore as the only policy they were advocating, as the only policy they were articulating. They were so preoccupied with this one policy, this one-dimensional approach that everything else went down the drain. They were so preoccupied with that they gave no time to developing an integrated policy that meshed together the development of our renewable and non-renewable resources. They

neglected to develop a policy whereby the money from our non-renewable resources would strengthen the renewable resource area. They were doing this, Mr. Speaker, for one purpose, they were doing this to defeat the previous federal Liberal government. This is all they were doing over the past three or four years, deliberately criticizing and lambasting the previous federal Liberal government for their own political purpose. All they were doing, Mr. Speaker, in collaboration with other Tory governments throughout Canada, was trying to defeat the federal Liberal government, and down the drain with plans and programmes to develop this Province. They were willing, Mr. Speaker, to ensure the defeat of the federal Liberal government, and to ensure their own election, by neglecting the full development of the Province. Mr. Speaker, they were preoccupied in the past four or five years with sabre rattling and that is why we have such a horrendous level of unemployment in this Province, that and nothing else. A government that had a one-dimensional policy and was bent on defeating the previous federal Liberal government in Ottawa, these two combined explain to us very well, emphasize, why it is we have such a high level of unemployment in Newfoundland today.

Mr. Speaker, what is it about this resolution that hon. members on the government side do not like? I started off by saying that the pith and substance of this resolution was to create jobs, and we gave some suggestions. Is this a government, Mr. Speaker, that do not want suggestions? They have been asking that we give some and we gave some, we gave some directions, we gave some specific

suggestions but they do not like them. And the reason why they do not like them, Mr. Speaker, is because they will result in immediate action. It seems like the reason why members opposite are opposing this resolution is because it is not futuristic enough, it is not far enough into the future, it is not long-term enough. Mr. Speaker, it speaks for action today, it speaks for action now, so let us look at what they have wiped out. "WHEREAS the provincial economy is now stagnant": I have read resolutions from members opposite using that same phrase, but because it is in a resolution from the Opposition, they do not like it. "WHEREAS the people of this Province are paying the highest level of taxes in Canada": Again, I have seen the same kind of statement in resolutions made by hon. members opposite. Mr. Speaker, it looks like it is only lip service. It appears that when it comes to action they do not want to do anything about it. This resolution addresses itself not only to retail sales tax. There are other unpopular, burdensome taxes that this government have initiated over the past few years and I refer to the advertising tax of 4 per cent, that the advertising people and the people in the news media objected to so much. Though the furor has dropped, I can assure you that the media people, the people in advertising, still find that 4 per cent an objectionable tax. Mr. Speaker, another tax we could look at is the tax on insurance premiums that we pay on our homes. We are one of the few provinces in Canada that have a tax on insurance premiums. In any event, there is not a province in Canada that charges 12 per cent on these insurance premiums. Mr.

Speaker, there are many burdensome taxes in this Province that government could look at. We just mention the retail sales tax as the one we feel government could look at immediately to stimulate the economy, to get money back into the economy, to get people spending their money, and to create jobs. That is one of the immediate ones we mentioned.

"WHEREAS the Provincial Election was called to give the present administration a mandate to create jobs": It would appear that this government does not want to be reminded of that now, Mr. Speaker. They would like to forget that. Now that they are elected, they would like to forget. They would like to forget the fact that they were given a mandate to create jobs. Mr. Speaker, we on this side are not about to let the government forget that this is why they were elected, that this was the specific mandate, to create jobs. As I have said, it would appear that they would like to forget that now. Well, the people of Newfoundland are not going to forget it, they are not going to forget that this government asked for and received a mandate to create jobs. This is what we are reminding them of, Mr. Speaker. This is what this resolution is doing, reminding them of that mandate, but they would prefer to forget it, obviously. If they do not support this resolution it shows that they would prefer to forget that that is the mandate they received.

"WHEREAS we now have finally arrived that blissful state of having a Provincial Government and a Federal Government practicing the same political philosophy": Mr. Speaker, we cannot let hon.

members forget that either. This is a position they wanted to be in. This is a position they strived for. I am not so sure they are so happy about it, Mr. Speaker. I think they would have preferred it the other way, where they could carry on with their sabre rattling. Now, Mr. Speaker, they cannot carry on with the sabre rattling, the people of Newfoundland want to see the evidence, they want to see the proof positive, they want to see what it is like to have two governments, a Federal Government and a provincial government, of the same political stripe. This is what they want to see. They want to hear this government fighting for the same things they fought for in the past. They want to hear this provincial government calling on the federal government to create jobs. For example, they want to hear the government calling on the federal government to revitalize the Newfoundland Railway. That will create jobs! This is something that they have been asking for, the federal government to revitalize the Newfoundland Railway. That is what they want to hear, Mr. Speaker. They want to hear this government calling on the federal government for more money for the development of our forestry, for reforestation in Bonavista North, which was one of the most prosperous forest areas in this Province, and now, Mr. Speaker, not a stick of wood is being cut commercially, not one.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They had a big fire down there.

MR. LUSH:

That is right. The people down there would like to hear this government calling upon the federal government to get money to

reforest this area that was so prosperous, where unemployment was unheard of. Up to the fire, unemployment was unheard of in that area. But there has not been one square foot reforested in that area. Mr. Speaker, this is what they would like to hear: They would like to hear members opposite fighting in the same way they did in the past four or five years. They would like to hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) fighting against this mandatory buy-back of salmon licences, that just happened a couple of days ago, Mr. Speaker. Horrendous! Without giving fishermen any recourse of appeal, just buying back their salmon licences, and they did not tell them until about a week ago. Part-time fishermen with their licences, with their gear bought, all ready to take part in the salmon fishing this season, about three or four days ago got a letter saying they had to surrender their salmon licences, after spending their money to prosecute that area of the fisheries, and I have not heard a member opposite say a word about it, not a word.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. LUSH:

The least we could do for these part-time fishermen, who are going to suffer tremendous hardship this Summer from not being able to take part in the salmon fishery, is set up some form of an appeal so that these fishermen can go and present their case. Now, I realize there are some people from whom we should take these salmon licences, but there are people we should not take them from, bona fide fishermen. If this were two years ago we would have heard about this

mandatory buy-back of salmon licences from part-time fishermen. Imagine a government so callous as to bring that policy in now, so inconsiderate as to inflict that kind of punishment on the part-time fishermen of this Province. When they have purchased their equipment and are ready to prosecute the salmon fishery, they get this horrendous act inflicted upon them - three or four days ago - and we have not heard a squeak from the other side, Mr. Speaker. So we can see that what this government was doing in the last three or four years was just something to gain political points, actions all geared to defeat the previous federal government and to ensure their own election. That is all that was going on, Mr. Speaker, and that is why we have such a high level of unemployment.

When we bring in a resolution that is specific, when we bring in a resolution that is direct, when we bring in a resolution that is void of rhetoric, when we bring in a resolution that is void of meaningless platitudes, we see it defeated, Mr. Speaker. That is what I see is going to happen to this resolution. Mr. Speaker, let the word go out that this provincial government does not want to support a resolution related to creating jobs, they do not want a resolution that is specific, they do not want a resolution that is direct, they want something that is vague, they want something that is futuristic. They do not want to support a resolution where we see immediate action. Mr. Speaker, let the word go out that this government does not want to be reminded of its mandate to create jobs, let the word go out that this government would rather

forget that that was the mandate they asked for. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province will not forget and we will ensure that they will not forget. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for the people of Newfoundland if a resolution that is specific and direct is defeated. Let the word go out that members opposite do not believe that the high level of taxation is placing a hardship and a burden on the people of this Province. That is the word that must go out, Mr. Speaker, that they are not willing to look at the tax system, that they are not willing to try and readjust it, they are not willing to study and analyze it to see if they can make it a little easier on the people of this Province and in so doing stimulate our economy and create jobs for our people. That is the sum and substance of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I hope every member will support it.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Is it the pleasure of this House to adopt the amendment?

On motion, amendment carried.

MR. SPEAKER:
Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion as amended?

On motion, resolution as amended, carried.

It being Private Member's Day, I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, May 9, 1985 at three of the clock.