



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 65

---

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

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Friday

22 November 1985

[Preliminary Transcript]

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, on September 25 past, I issued a brief statement indicating that the Province's financial performance for the first quarter of the 1985/86 year was well on target with our budget projections tabled in this hon. House last May. I also indicated I would make a more detailed statement in our financial position as of mid-year, that is the end of September, 1985, and I am now pleased to do that.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting the results of our review of the budgetary situation let me first deal with current account.

In my budget speech of last May, government projected a deficit on current account of \$72.8 million for this fiscal year. On the basis of performance for the first six months of the year, we are now projecting a slight increase in that figure to a year end deficit of \$78.7 million. This results from quite minor changes, on a relative basis, in both revenues and expenditures - an increase of 0.4 per cent in revenues and an increase of 0.7 per cent in net expenditures.

In dollar figures, the current account revenue forecast has been

revised upward by \$7.5 million. Purely provincial source revenues are, in fact, projected to be \$15.8 million more than budgeted, but, regrettably, these are expected to be offset by a shortfall of \$8.3 million in federal source revenues.

The higher than forecast returns, during the first half of the fiscal year, from provincial retail sales tax and gasoline tax have resulted in upward revisions for the whole year of \$3 million and \$1.1 million, respectively, in these sources. There have been upward revisions, also, of the Province's personal income tax and corporate income tax estimates of \$4.7 million and \$6.1 million, respectively. A number of other changes net out at an upward revision of just under \$1 million.

Accordingly, from provincial sources, we are now forecasting an increase over the budget forecast equivalent to 0.9 per cent of total revenues.

Regrettable, as I have already mentioned, the estimates of transfers to Newfoundland under the Equalization and Established Programme Financing arrangements have now been lowered by the Government of Canada by \$5.4 million and \$2.9 million, respectively. In other words, federal finance is now forecasting a decrease in transfer amounts which equate to a 0.5 per cent decrease in our total revenues, compared to the budget forecast.

Turning to programme and other costs to government, our net expenditures for 1985-86 are now forecast to be \$13.4 million more than originally budgeted. There are several major factors contributing to this change. The

Fisheries Employment Opportunities Programme, recently approved in response to the poor performance of the inshore fishery this past Summer, is anticipated to cost approximately \$9.5 million in 1985-86 with offsetting revenues of \$7.5 million from the Government of Canada. The Jobs Strategy Program, also introduced in conjunction with the federal government, will cost our government \$3.5 million as our share of expenditure in 1985-86. Negotiations with the federal government for this programme were not concluded at the time the budget was introduced.

Because of major forest fires in Labrador this past Summer, government had to provide an additional \$1 million for forest protection. A further grant of \$845,000 was allocated to complete the important salmon hatchery project at Bay d'Espoir which hon. members will recall the hon. the Premier opened earlier this week. In addition, government has had to project an increase in expenditure of \$5.4 million for social assistance requirements. The net effect of these and other changes resulted in a the total expenditure increases of the \$13.4 million already mentioned.

As I have also already mentioned, these new expenditures have increased the total forecast in our May budget by approximately 0.7 per cent of total expenditure forecast which will not amount to just over \$1.9 billion.

Mr. Speaker, an appendix containing further details is attached to this statement, and from it and what I have already said, members of this hon. House can determine that government has been able to contain our current

account balance very close to the level budgeted last May, the deficit on current account increasing from 3.9 per cent of the total expenditures only up to 4.1 per cent of total expenditures, in other words, an increase of 0.2 per cent.

On capital account, let me briefly comment. Government is now forecasting a decrease of approximately \$11.5 million in net capital expenditures for our current fiscal year. It is anticipated that gross capital expenditures will decrease by \$42.1 million while related revenue will decline by \$30.6 million. Thus, net capital expenditures in 1985 - 1986 will total \$231.7 million.

It will be recalled that a major provision of the Atlantic Accord signed last February by the Newfoundland Government and the Government of Canada was the establishment of an offshore development fund totaling \$300 million over five years, with the federal government providing 75 per cent of this amount. A budget of \$40 million gross expenditures was allocated in our budget of 1985-86. A number of these projects are currently under consideration; however, some require major capital works involving extensive pre-planning and engineering design work. Consequently, actual cash flow expenditures during this fiscal year are expected to be considerably less than the amount provided in the budget; it appears that actual payments will approximate \$8 million. However, expenditures are expected to increase significantly in 1986-87 and the entire \$300 million will be expended over the five year term of the offshore development



fund.

Included in the 1985-86 capital budget are funds for the construction of several major buildings throughout the Province. Due to a late start in the construction season and other reasons, it is now expected that the cash flow on these projects will be some \$9 million less than budgeted. For similar reasons, reduced expenditures will be realized on various water and sewer and transportation projects.

Finally, in the 1985-86 budget, we included an amount of \$17.7 million as an equity contribution to Fishery Products International. As a result of the recent approval of the corporation's five year plan by our government and the Government of Canada, we have provided an additional \$10.5 million, bringing the provincial government equity contribution to \$28.2 million for FPI in 1985-86.

Let me conclude this financial review statement, Mr. Speaker, by commenting on our revised borrowing requirement for the year.

Because of the relatively small increase in the current account deficit which I have outlined, together with the somewhat greater saving on capital account, our budgetary borrowing requirements for the year are decreased by some \$5.6 million. At the same time, our debt retirement projections have also been revised downward by over \$7 million.

Therefore, the total borrowing requirement for the Province is nearly \$13 million less than forecast last May.

Mr. Speaker, members of this hon. House are aware that budget projections can never coincide precisely with events as they actually unfold. The revised forecast I am presenting today still relates to a year-end, some six months down the road. However, I am confident that the budget projections will realistically stand up to that test of time as they essentially have done so to date.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, there is a table at the back of the statement which will now be circulated to all members giving the actual figures.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the question arises, how many errors in the computation of the deficit does the minister have to bring before this House? How many times has he have to be proven wrong before the Premier gives him the flick and brings in somebody who knows how to project the deficit? Do we have to present as many errors in the deficit as we do conflicts of interest?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. BARRY:

And the conflicts of interest will continue and we can be sure, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to see a continuous revision of the minister's estimates of the deficit every time he comes before this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

The minister makes a complete and total farce of the process of preparing a budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

He comes in, Mr. Speaker, with a budget in the Spring and in less than six months we are talking about an increase. The minister discounts - it is only \$6 million, he says, what is \$6 million? He tries to show it as a percentage of the overall budget to make the figure appear smaller.

Mr. Speaker, it is 10 per cent of the initial estimated deficit. He is out in six months or less than six months. Does the minister have no shame? Is the minister going to continue? We have already seen a downgrading of the Province's credit rating because of the minister's lack of control. How much longer do we have to go on with this farce before we see another one?

When is the minister going to get a grip on his department and when is he going to get a grip on expenditures in this Province?

Will the minister - we will have an opportunity presumably on Supplementary Supply to follow up on this - explain why it is that revenues are down from his Tory buddies in Ottawa? Was he not one of the people out saying elect a Tory government in this Province and a Tory government in Ottawa and all will be well? Is the minister now having to eat those words, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PATTERSON:

Sit down Maureen.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

You campaigned for Maureen.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is yet going to make a speech in this House, you know. That was one of the longer ones we just heard from him then. One of these days he is even going to stand up on his feet and give a speech in this House.

MR. PATTERSON:

Tell us about the \$50,000 you made.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, every copper of it was well earned. You got your monies worth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Every copper was well earned. And I was not in Cabinet when I was earning it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

Yes you were.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:  
You went to Ontario and picked up their act.

MR. YOUNG:  
\$50,000 for a trip to Ontario, that is what he got.

MR. BARRY:  
I was not in Cabinet, I was out earning money by my hard work. I was not in Cabinet and I was not using my Cabinet connections.

Mr. Speaker, we have the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) come in here once again, every year for the fifth year in a row, and admit to this House, within six months of bringing down a budget, that he did not know what he was doing, that it is totally out of control. It is no wonder the Province's credit rating is being downgraded. If the Premier does not have the courage to do it, will the minister take it upon himself, out of honour, to resign?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

#### Oral Questions

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

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, my question was for the Premier, but seeing he is not in the House today I will go to the Minister of Public Works and Services. How much of this deficit was caused by the extravagant renovations on the eighth floor?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:  
In reply to that Rexogram, Mr. Speaker, I think there was none.

MR. EFFORD:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:  
Will the minister confirm that the renovations cost in the vicinity of \$1 million, all the renovations on the eighth floor?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, that is on the Order Paper and I am getting the details, but I think it is much, much, much less than that.

MR. EFFORD:  
Still no answer. A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:  
I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works and Services how can they justify such expenditures on renovations of office space when we have people doing without hospital beds, we have people doing without jobs, and we have school children being doubled up in classroom desks schools? Very simply, how can he justify such renovations to the eighth floor?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, probably that should go on the Order Paper, but did the hon. members of the Opposition reject renovations to their own office space?

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

You can talk about two gallons of paint and a bit of Stucco as renovations, but that is a far cry from \$1 million. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works and Services when he intends to invite the press, particularly T.V., to film that Buckingham Palace. Also would he make sure that the doors are opened to the people on this floor, the people in this Province who are suffering on low incomes, the people who are doing without hospital beds, so they can visit that eighth floor?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Well, everyone is quite welcome to the eighth floor, Mr. Speaker. Probably when we get the Leader of the Opposition's office soundproofed, at his request, so he and Rex can talk together, we will get around to that.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad we cannot soundproof the minister's chair over there. Now maybe the minister, without soundproofing, would care to indicate, Mr. Speaker, to the people of this Province how much in terms of government travel is being allocated through Globe Travel? Is the firm of Globe Travel doing all of the Premier's travel arrangements? What other ministers are having their travel arranged through that firm?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with my department. Every minister in this administration can travel with whomever they like. I do very little travelling. The ministers can answer for themselves. I tell you we have no dictatorship on this side, Mr. Speaker, and when you travel you travel with whatever travel agency you want to go to.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Is the minister responsible for seeing that public tendering is carried out? Will the minister indicate whether the travel arrangements for the Premier and ministers are tendered so that all travel agencies may have an opportunity to bid on those?

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose you have to give a foolish answer to a foolish question. I think the man this morning is really, really sick.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, has the minister responsible for public tendering take a look at the Conflict of Interest Guidelines where Guideline No. 10 says, "A Minister shall not accord, in the performance of his official duties, preferential treatment to relatives or to organizations in which he or his relatives are members or have an interest, financial or otherwise"? Has the minister looked at this Guideline and has he considered it in connection with Globe Travel?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, why should I worry about looking at the Conflict of Interest Act, about my relatives and stuff like that? Most of my relatives are dead and gone, and I buried them, and there is no conflict of interest in that stuff, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking

about the minister's relatives, we are talking about the Premier's relatives. And we are asking the minister, as the minister responsible for seeing that public tendering is carried out properly, will the minister indicate whether he has checked with respect to those working in Globe Travel to determine whether or not there is a relative of the Premier being given preferential treatment through the allocation of travel service to that firm?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Globe Travel is a private firm, Mr. Speaker. I cannot go down there checking on who they are. I mean, that is a choice of their own. I suppose if there are good people -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Are you going to check on who they are related to?

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, check their relatives.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Are you going to check on their religion, too?

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, check their religion. Whether they are black or white, Liberal or Tory, Mr. Speaker, these people down there came in on public tender. They got the space. We have gone to public tender now for the new building. It will soon be awarded. I cannot help it if they hire my wife or your wife or someone else's wife, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Is the minister saying now that the government is going to public tender and has been going to public tender with travel?

MR. MATTHEWS:

They tender the space, boy, the space!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I said we are going to public tender for the space. Now, Mr. Speaker, every time a minister gets onboard a plane, does he have to call a public tender to get his ticket? I mean, that is crazy, Mr. Speaker! It is like the crazy questions the hon. member is asking me.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

If all the travel of the Premier's Office or any other minister is going to be given to a particular travel agent, has the minister considered that just possibly there might be firms who would be prepared to bid on doing all that business, Mr. Speaker, not ticket by ticket, but doing all that business? Did that ever remotely enter into the minister's considerations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

I do not know what the hon. gentleman is getting at. How can anyone go to public tender for travel ministers are going to do over the period of a year? I do not know, but probably next week I will be out in Goose Bay. Should I have tendered last Spring to get a ticket to go to Goose Bay next month?

We have tendered the space. I do not know from whom ministers get their travel or from whom they get their bookings.

MR. TOBIN:

Who does he travel with?

MR. YOUNG:

I do not travel very much, Mr. Speaker, but if I am out around the bay and want to, probably I will phone Air Canada or Globe Travel or Cook's Travel. I do not even know the names of the travel agencies.

We went out with proposals and Globe Travel got the space downstairs. We have gone out again now with proposals and the best bidder, Mr. Speaker, will get the space when we go over to the new building.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, did the minister ever consider that the Premier or other ministers could have a rotating list of travel agents, so that when trips come up they could offer the business to a series of travel agencies instead of just one?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. BARRY:

Get him some glasses so he can read your notes, 'Bill'.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, there again, I do not know if they rotate or not. This hon. minister (Mr. Matthews) here travels with Cook's Travel World. That is how he is travelling, Mr. Speaker. He did not go down to Globe Travel. Here is his ticket.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition keeps on asking foolish questions, the people of Newfoundland will see that he travels and put him in a hearse, and I will be the one to carry him out!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The hon. the minister had a landslide victory out in Harbour Grace the last time, Mr. Speaker, a landslide.

MR. YOUNG:

I have not lost yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if he is not prepared

to give the people of the Province better answers than he just gave, the slide will be in the other direction.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has he considered, with his law partner as Chairman of the Board of Regents of the university and he himself as a member of Cabinet, that there might be some conflict in the way in which government's negotiations with the university with respect to financing arise?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, Mr. Speaker. The law partner to whom he refers is the Chairman of the Board of Regents of Memorial. He was appointed Chairman of the Board of Regents of Memorial, I believe, when the hon. gentleman sat in the Cabinet of the Peckford Administration, so it is passing strange that he would bring it up now.

As Chairman, the hon. gentleman spends an awful lot of time at no salary. I just reiterate, Mr. Speaker, what I said in my statement the other day. The hon. gentleman seems to have the impression that anyone connected with me cannot do anything at all, cannot carry on any mode of public service, which is what the gentleman has said. It is sort of like a selective law, Mr. Speaker. I would describe it as, perhaps, Leo's law of leprosy crafted by Rex's righteous wrath.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:



Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the Government House Leader would explain, considering that the Board of Regents of the university needs the approval of Cabinet before incurring any liability or before purchasing land under Section 38 of the Memorial University Act, and that the Cabinet must give consent for borrowing with respect to current expenditures under Section 41, and Cabinet must give approval for borrowing for capital purposes, and considering that government has been putting the squeeze on the university -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no need for a long preamble to a supplementary question.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a new question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, it appears to be a supplementary to the Chair.

MR. BARRY:

Well maybe if Mr. Speaker heard the question, you would be able to determine whether it was new or supplementary.

Mr. Speaker, considering that these approvals of Cabinet are required, and considering that Cabinet has been putting the squeeze on the university, would the minister indicate has he excluded himself from discussions concerning the university, and has

he, Mr. Speaker, been involved in the restraint programme which has been putting the squeeze on the university students and the access to funds at the university?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what a ridiculous question. I have excused myself, absented myself - it is not excused myself - at every given time when there has been any possibility of a conflict between my private life and my public life. The hon. gentleman is getting sublimely ridiculous right now in his questioning. I can tell the hon. gentleman, as he knows since he sat with me in the Cabinet of the Moores administration and the Peckford administration, that he cannot point to one single instance of any conflict of interest. He is getting so ridiculous at the present time in his statements. Mr. Speaker, I have done and I will continue to do the best in my public life. I would ask the hon. gentleman, as I have asked him before, to try and keep out of my private life. I will continue to do that, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my ability. I do not really see why the hon. gentleman is trying to make accusations the way he has now. He is a tiresome, boresome nuisance, yet he continues to ask questions like this. I can tell the hon. gentleman this, and I will tell him very directly, I have not so used my position as President of the Council, Government House Leader, and Minister of Energy at any given time while I have been in the government. Mr. Speaker, I can also give this undertaking, neither will I use my position,



after I retire as Minister of Energy, for my own personal gain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister raises the matter of his being in the Moores Cabinet. Would the minister confirm that the Premier, Premier Moores, sent a letter to the minister asking the minister to either become involved full-time as a Cabinet minister or to leave the Cabinet and to go full-time in his law practice? Would the minister confirm that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I had marked and great differences with the former Premier. I stayed in the Cabinet and I resigned from his Cabinet. That is a matter of record in the history of this Province. The hon. gentleman wants to try to dig up dirt, but I am not going to do that with the former Premier of this Province, who has rendered service to the Province, although I had a very significant difference with him. The hon. gentleman knows full well that I resigned from the Cabinet at that time because there was a plan to give construction of the government building to a certain private interest without calling public tenders. It was on that basis I resigned and that is a matter for the historical record

in the Province. The hon. gentleman can say what he likes. I know why the hon. gentleman is getting into the area he is getting into, but I say he would do a better service to himself, his Province and his constituents if he would ask me some questions pertinent to the public affairs of this Province, particularly questions with respect to the offshore, the Atlantic Accord and its implementation of the federal policies that apply, and the impact of the last discoveries. He would better ask me, Mr. Speaker, questions in the Hydro areas. For instance, there is one question we could debate very publicly, and that is a difference between the way in which the reversion case was handled immediately after I succeeded him and the way he handed it before.

But, Mr. Speaker, he refuses adamantly to do that although I challenge him to do it. But I am afraid the mark, Mr. Speaker, of a coward is the man who will avoid his public duty to ask questions and try to bring up personal affairs, not only mine but of everybody else who is not connected. I have never been involved at any time in a conflict of interest situation -

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Could I have the minister withdraw the word "coward", please?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I said it was the mark of a coward, it was a cowardly characteristic what the hon. member is doing.

MR. BARRY:

Could we have that withdrawn, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I did not quite get the wording of that but I will look into it and rule on that on Monday.

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further. The hon. gentleman cannot ask questions on public issues. He is afraid to meet me head on, particularly with respect to the most sensitive thing that has occurred in this Province in the past few years, the issue of the offshore and energy matters. He happened to be minister when he was over here. I succeeded him, and he is over there, and he has an ideal opportunity to ask me questions on it. I would stress that the hon. gentleman ask me questions on public issues and not try to get into my personal life, particularly when it was unwarranted.

He cannot show one single case of an actual conflict of interest and I think, if that is the situation that he ought to try to bring this Legislature up to the plane that was originally intended for it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I put it to the Government House Leader that Premier Moores requested that minister to devote his full energies to the Cabinet of the day or to get out. And I ask the minister to go on record in this House as either confirming or denying that. If we are talking about courage, Mr. Speaker, and we are talking about honesty, let us have the minister go on record about that.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it is quite improper to mislead this House. Now I am not suggesting for a moment that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is misleading this House deliberately, but I was around at the time he refers to and the former Premier was going on about having sent such a letter, but such a letter was not never produced.

MR. BARRY:

There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a serious matter as the Government House Leader knows, which is why he avoided the question, to mislead this House. Now I ask the minister straight out and

directly, was he or was he not asked by the then Premier of the day to either devote his full energies to his Cabinet portfolio or to get out? Get on the record in this House. Answer that question!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a mug's game the hon. gentleman is playing and I have no intention of joining him. I do not think it is relevant to get into past history. I can say that I had - it was a matter of public record and the hon. gentleman is aware of it - very sharp differences with the Premier of the time which caused me to submit my resignation because of a particular issue. Mr. Speaker, I think that has been accepted.

MR. TOBIN:

That is past history.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, it is very much past history. I do not particularly wish to get into discussion of my relationship with Premier Moores. What was then relevant is now a matter of past history. I sat in the backbenches over there for three or four years in that administration. Then, when there was what I perceived to be a change in policy, I accepted an invitation to come back into the Cabinet. In both areas I, have as well as my colleagues and many in the Moores Administration, have conducted themselves with honour and integrity. The hon. gentleman now is just feeling very uncomfortable, particularly after yesterday, and he is trying to weasel into everything.

Now the time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman to get up in this House and ask questions with respect to public policy, with respect to public issues. The hon. gentleman is going to do nothing but serve to hasten his own destruction, and it will certainly be much deserved, by this tack that he has been taking in the past time. I do not choose to get down in the gutter with the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has been rolling there quite a bit.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, let the House know that the minister refused to answer that question, refused to say yes or no to whether he was asked to leave Cabinet because he was only spending most of his time down in his law practice and was not doing the job that was required of him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Why did you leave?

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at a few appointments here. Would the minister confirm whether or not his law partner is a member of the Health Sciences Board?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know, I

really do not know if my law partner is a member of the Health Sciences Board. What was it the hon. gentleman just said in his preamble? I forget what he was saying because I really am not listening to him all of the time. What was he saying in his preamble first off? Does anyone remember?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. MARSHALL:

Anyway, I do not suppose it really matters. Look, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if one of my partners is on the Health Sciences Board. I can tell the hon. gentleman that people who serve on the Health Sciences Board do not get paid, do not get any remuneration. As I say, people who are associated with me who want to render voluntarily service to the Province, in a public way, I think are to be commended rather than have their names dragged around as the hon. gentleman is doing. I just lost what the hon. gentleman because I had an appropriate reply.

MR. BARRY:

Did Frank Moores ask you to get out of Cabinet because you were not there full time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

How ridiculous! I recall what he said now, Mr. Speaker. He talked about me being in my law office and he wondered about my effectiveness. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is making him so green is I do not think anybody in this Province quibbles about my effectiveness after the Atlantic

Accord and gravity based systems that have been brought into this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone would quibble when they realize the type of objection and the type of effort that the hon. gentleman made with his catalogue and dialogue of misery in his plan for this Province. He did not want the agreement, first of all, and he did everything he could to prevent it by buttressing those people who were trying to take our resource from us. Then, when we got the agreement he kept crying, "Oh, you are not going to get development because of oil prices." When we got the oil prices, he kept crying about we were not going to get concrete platforms but floating platforms. His dialogue for this Province is a dialogue of grief. That is what I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister also confirm that there is another law partner of his on the governing Board of the Waterford Hospital? Mr. Speaker, would the minister give us an indication whether this spider's web of influence has been a systematic plan of the minister since he has been in government?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I just have to repeat myself. I thought of a flippant answer but I do not think I will give it because it relates to people who have a mental illness in relation to the hon. gentleman's question. The hon. gentleman talks about a web, Mr. Speaker. The web, I am afraid, is down in that little burrow of a little rat's nest on the fifth floor. That is where the web is, Mr. Speaker, and where it has been strung. It has gotten to the stage where he has asked the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) to soundproof his room. That is because he does not want his colleagues there opposite to hear the types of consultations that go on between him and Rex from time to time.

MR. PATTERSON:

They need the walls padded down there.

MR. MARSHALL:

So, Mr. Speaker, he wants to insulate himself against his own elected colleagues. And well he would, Mr. Speaker, because he is certainly not setting any example of leadership or any example whatsoever of the way in which to conduct oneself in the public Legislature of this Province. He has a trust, Mr. Speaker. He has been elected by the people of this Province and he himself should try to discharge his trust by acting responsibly and fairly and equitably in his dealings in this House.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) whether she has checked out the matter that was raised initially by the minister with respect to the minister acting in a matter with the Crown on the other side. Has the minister checked with the officials of her department on that matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain what the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. All that we have heard about this morning had to do with the Moores administration and appointments to hospital boards.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I know that the minister is usually sleeping while Question Period and other matters are going on in the House, but on Monday I asked the minister to check with her officials with respect to a case involving the minister acting on one side and government on the other. Has the minister checked with her officials on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, again I am not sure what the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. I know that he has written to is carrying on correspondence with my Deputy

Minister. I assume whatever the latest subject of his correspondence with the Deputy is will be dealt with by the Deputy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that the Deputy Minister's initial letter to me, refusing the information said, "On the instructions of my minister" - i.e., the Minister of Justice - "I have been instructed not to give you that information." Would the minister confirm whether or not that is the case?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the case. The Leader of the Opposition had inquired about a matter which had been dealt with in the Unified Family Court and, as the Leader of the Opposition is aware, the Unified Family Court Act says that all noncriminal matters within the jurisdiction of that court have to be held in camera. Those are delicate matters relating to children and families which should not be discussed openly in the public realm. The Deputy Minister suggested to the Leader of the Opposition that any inquiries that he have about Unified Family Court cases be directed to the court and whatever information the court decides should be disclosed to the Leader of the Opposition is up to the court.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister tell the House whether she is so far removed from the administration of justice that she does not know that decisions, as opposed to evidence, decisions of the court and the names of solicitors acting is public information in the registry. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot obtain that information unless you have the name of the particular case, but the minister has it within her hands through knowledge of her officials to supply the information that is being requested. It is not confidential information and I ask the minister to acknowledge it. It is public information available from the registry if you have the name of the case.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister of Justice, in the letter to which the Leader of the Opposition referred, at my direction referred the Leader to the Unified Family Court which operates a registry which has available information about Unified Family Court cases-

MR. BARRY:

You have to have the name of the case.

MS VERGE:

which may be disclosed to the public. But the legislation governing the operation of the court provides that Unified Family Court matters, other than criminal matters, are held in camera because of the nature of those cases. Mr. Speaker, I think there is an ongoing correspondence



between the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Minister, so the nuances of this matter will be properly dealt with in due course.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister undertake to authorize the Deputy Minister to release all information that is not kept in camera by the courts?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have already said that the Deputy Minister is dealing with the matter. I will be consulting with him and it will be dealt with properly, in accordance with the law and in accordance with the provisions of the Unified Family Court Act which protects the privacy of children and families which have personal matters dealt with by the Unified Family Court.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the Gallery sixty-three democracy class students from Ascension Collegiate, Bay Roberts, with their teachers, Edward Neil and Verdon Mercer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome fifty-three Grade IV and V students from St. Joseph's Elementary School, Fermeuse, with their teachers, Brendan Jordon, Mrs. Myra Brophy, Mrs. Marie O'Keefe and Mrs. Maxine Fennelly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Petitions

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

I would like to present a petition on behalf of 1,575 citizens of the towns of Burgeo, Ramea, Grey River and Francois. I will read the prayer of this petition:

"To the hon. the House of Assembly. The petition of the undersigned humbly showeth that the economic significance of the Burgeo highway is, without exaggeration, the lifeline to the communities of Burgeo, Ramea, Francois and Grey River; That the fact that the highway is a single connecting route between the communities it serves and the Newfoundland community at large; That the highway, as now maintained, contributes significantly to the depreciation and wear of vehicles which use it; That, in its present state, it represents a forum of economic discrimination to the citizens of Burgeo, Ramea, Francois and Grey River; and that, in Winter or Summer, it is an unsafe highway.

"We, the undersigned, the citizens

of the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir make petition to the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador that the Burgeo highway be immediately ungraded and paved.

In support of this petition to the hon. House, we subscribe our names."

Mr. Speaker, there are 1,575 citizens of those communities concerned enough that they felt that their own recourse was to present a petition to this House.

One of the interesting things about this petition is that citizens from Grey River and Francois, two communities that are connected to Burgeo by boat, still feel that this is their lifeline to the community at large, the community of Newfoundland. This, to me, shows that there is a vital concern from all the residents of that area. The citizens of Burgeo and Ramea, of course, are vitally concerned because they are immediately connected to Burgeo and then, by car ferry, to Ramea. They have a very, very serious concern with the condition of that highway.

Just yesterday - and we have not really gotten into Winter conditions on that road - the highway was closed. The mail could not get through down there yesterday. I received phone calls from people down there that the highway was closed yesterday. The highway is a ninety miles of dirt road between the Trans-Canada Highway and Burgeo. All this Summer only so much maintenance has done on that road. It has been graded, and as we know if you grade you must put some fill back but there has not been anything like that. It is basically down

to the bed rock now and I know, I have driven over it a few times. The people have gotten used to driving over it, but it is imposing, as they say in that petition, an economic hardship. They have to drive over it and their \$10,000 and \$12,000 and \$15,000 cars are being depreciated at a lot faster rate than anywhere else in Newfoundland. This imposes an economic hardship on the people in this area.

The last time I was down there I was talking to the Manager of Fishery Products International in Ramea and one of the points that he made to me is that the Ramea fish plant has to be economically viable and to be economically viable today it has to compete with the other plants that they are competing with selling fish in the United States market. He pointed out that it takes an extra \$400 to \$600 to get a truck load of fish out of Ramea because of the extra charge put on by truckers who charge for the undue depreciation that these vehicles are subject to as they come down to take the fish. So this is an example of an economic hardship and the life blood of Ramea is concerned. They must have a highway that is able to make that plant competitive.

The other thing, of course, is the citizens in those communities have to pay extra for the goods and services that are brought in over the highway because of the condition. I feel that this petition is just and this government, the members opposite, must address this problem and go to Ottawa and endeavour to have a secondary roads agreement concluded so that this road is put into a condition that is acceptable for the people who are



living in the twentieth century in Newfoundland.

The safety of that road has often been in question. We are now going into Winter and last year we had a situation where people were stuck halfway for three or four days, they could not be reached from either side. I have asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to provide some sort of safety or rescue equipment there for conditions when they arise like this. I feel that when we see 1,575 people in that whole area are concerned enough that they would humbly ask the House of Assembly to look into their plight, we should do something with the road condition. They are subject to an increase in their cost of living because of this road. We have a situation that they feel is going uncared for.

Mr. Speaker, with this, I present the petition.

MR. DAWE:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE:  
Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to respond to the petition presented by the hon. member. First of all, of course, as with all petitions which ask government to try and improve the transportation situation in their particular area, I fully support that sort of a prayer. An adequate transportation system is certainly something that this administration has been trying to work towards as for a great number of years.

I think it is important perhaps in

light of what the hon. member said to give a little bit of background. The Burgeo road is a fairly new phenomenon in transportation links within this Province. There have been a great many millions of dollars spent in the past fifteen years or so in building up that particular transportation link.

Mr. Speaker, before 1983 the people of Ramea did not have a car ferry service to connect them with the road and it was in 1983 that that particular service was brought in. That service cost an ongoing annual expense of almost \$700,000. We are in the process of building a new vessel at a cost of in excess of \$6 million to replace that boat and improve the service to the people. We have spent millions of dollars over the past two or three years in paving programmes and upgrading programmes.

We have spent in excess of \$200,000 on communication systems and radio networks at the base camp on that road for the service of not only the travelling public but certainly for the safety of the people from the Department of Transportation that work on that road.

It cost the Province, and willingly so, more per kilometre of road to maintain that road in Winter months, to service it, than any other stretch of road in the Province. There is more of an effort placed for that ninety some odd kilometres of road than any other stretch of similar road or road within the network that we have.

We are continuing to work towards a continuation of a secondary highway agreement to make sure

that that particular road is paved and brought up to grade. But, I think it would be false if the impression was left by the petition presented that there has been no effort nor is there any effort in trying to make sure that that particular stretch of road and the people of the area are serviced by an adequate transportation link. I think the record will show that there has been a very, very significant contribution and, hopefully, there will continue to be a significant contribution in making sure that that particular network is improved adequately.

Initially, when the road was first being contemplated, meetings were held with the town councils in Burgeo and Ramea. It was pointed out at that time by engineers and by others, both from the federal and provincial governments, that the topography of the area and the weather conditions would automatically indicate that there were times during the Winter when, because of records that had been taken over the years, that there would be stretches of time during the Winter where that particular road would be impossible. No matter what the equipment or the numbers of people, it would be impossible to keep that particular piece of road open. It was understood by the people at that time and there are public records which indicate that the people understand that the road may at times in the Winter be closed, but we need the road, and rightly so, for the social and economic development of our area but we are willing to accept the fact that, due to weather conditions, we may be, at times during the Winter, subject to closure. This has indeed happened. But, I guess, when people get used to a road

network, they sometimes forget what people told them and they themselves knew would be coming off. It is virtually impossible, Mr. Speaker, from a snow clearing perspective and snow control and the kinds of storms and weather conditions on the Island of Newfoundland, with the exception of some stretches in the Northern Peninsula, by far the worst piece of road to try and maintain during Winters, particularly with drifting snow and cold conditions. But, Mr. Speaker, over the past number of years, we have made a very, very significant contribution to the transportation network there and will continue to do so.

Hopefully, over time, and not too long a time, we will be able to address the concerns expressed in the petition.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that there are still children in the gallery and to keep his speech fairly decent.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. member for  
Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If you, Sir, are going to allow that kind of abuse of the rules, how can I represent the concerns of my constituents? We know that that member is known for the spurious, nuisance point of order that is intended to disrupt and, yet, the Chair continues to tolerate it. At some point we have to flick that member out of the House. I am not going to take this. I have been sent here to represent some people, to do it honestly, and I am not getting the protection of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

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

The hon. member for  
Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I sat here in silence and I listened to the gentleman for St. George's (Mr. Dawe), the Minister of Transportation, because I wanted to hear his viewpoint.

I think at some point, Mr. Speaker, we ought to recognize that there is a time for the partisan shouting back and forth, I would hope that it were less time than we have been spending on it, but there is also a time for the views of the people who sent us here to be aired and we are not getting that opportunity, Mr. Speaker. If we do not get that opportunity at a regular basis,

then the whole function of the House is breaking down and it is doing so very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the petition. I want to call to mind that the closure, as I said to the minister yesterday, had nothing to do with the dead of winter. It is November 22 we are talking about and we are talking about a situation where a federal Liberal government over the years put in \$35 million to build the road and the Province is not budgeting adequately to maintain the road.

By the minister's own admission, the officials and the politicians who participated in this negotiation for federal/provincial funding were aware before the fact that this was going to be a difficult assignment. One has to assume, if the Province entered into an agreement for funding to build, that they undertook the maintenance responsibilities, although they were somewhat difficult and recognized to be extra-ordinary.

MR. DAWE:  
The road was never built to a standard that could be maintained properly. Capital construction is still an ongoing process and it makes the maintenance difficult.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I understand.

MR. DAWE:  
The maintenance is not on perfect road conditions. The capital money has not been completed yet.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I do not argue with that at all, Mr. Speaker, that is not the essential point we are making. The point we are making is that there is a lack of equipment on

that road, there is no snow fencing on that road and there are a couple of particular points on that road, Mr. Speaker, where the problem of access during the winter could be eased considerably with a few feet of snow fencing.

MR. DAWE:

No, that is not true.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

It could be eased considerably by a more strategic placement of equipment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE:

That is not true.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

The reality is that the Province is not budgeting the maintenance amount to look after it. Mr. Speaker, there is a safety issue.

You see the difference, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I have to say, with some apology to the chair, I get irrate by what goes on this House because there are two rules here. We sit here in silence and we listen. That crowd continually disrupts and they are allowed to get away with it. Mr. Speaker, what is the point in trying to speak to a petition? I understand that the minister has a different view than I have on it. I have heard his view and I think, with respect, I should be able to put forth my view.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like to assure the hon. member that the rules are equal

for everybody in this house. The hon. minister did interrupt on a couple of occassions here and I did call for order. I would say to all hon. members that the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage has asked for silence and he is entitled to that.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter also, and the minister will not like this either, is that when I was involved at the federal level with some other people we had to light a fire under him and his administration to get them to start the paving. We had money set aside for the paving of the Burgeo road. They wanted to spend it elsewhere. That is a political choice, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- but after we lit a good big fire under them we got twenty miles of road paved. Under some duress from us, they began to do it. Now, it would appear that that program is being scuttled. He is right that the road is not finished, that is the whole point of the petition.

Mr. Speaker, surely the ultimate insult of all is for a Minister of the Crown, a publically paid official, to get up in this House and to tell 1,575 people that there is something false about their petition. I mean what is more basic to your rights as a citizen out there than the right

to seek redress of grievance and for a Minister of the Crown to get up and say that they are being false, that they are not representing the situation. If they are being false, I say to them through Hansard, because I hope my colleague will send it up to them, that if they are being false, it is in underplaying the gravity of the situation. They have not stated if forcefully enough in my view because they are a very small conservative people who tend to understate their problem. That is one of the reasons why they continue to have a problem up there, Mr. Speaker.

They have not been vociferous enough in their petitioning of this House and the people who decide the expenditure of public funds. I commend them for the petition. I support them in their petition. Their petition, as it relates to the Burgeo road, calls to mind problems elsewhere in terms of roads in this Province, a situation where when the roads get built, Province a situation where the road gets built, the Province does not budget adequately for maintenance, and so the people have inflicted upon them matters of safety - life and death situations. Only last Winter we had one of them on the Burgeo Highway. This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, of basic humanity, basic safety, as well as the basic right of people to have their fair share of tax dollars for the purpose of providing suitable transportation. I heartily support the petition.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:  
Motion 1, Supplementary Supply,

Mr. Speaker.

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

#### Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak on the subject very, very briefly because I think hon. members have made many good points. If I could just get the attention of the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), he asked me the other day to give what amounts to an update on Statement 1 in the budget document, and I want to table that information now. Other than that, Mr. Chairman, I think the resolution and the bill before us has been giving a very good airing and I am sure will be treated with dispatch from now on.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Chairman

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

MR. GILBERT:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we heard the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) again this morning, as I pointed out one time last week when I spoke, admit defeat by putting this bill and subjecting us to a \$56 million or \$57 million deficit in Supplementary Supply. Now we have received the Mid-Year Financial Report which shows once again, as was pointed out earlier today, the hon. minister has admitted defeat by coming in over-budget again.

This, to me, signifies there is a very serious problem with members opposite in their attempt to govern. It is obviously an attempt. If you cannot bring in a balanced budget, how can you govern? We have this Mid-Year Financial Report submitted by the hon. minister this morning, and it shows again the utter incompetence of members opposite to provide a basic form of government to the people of Newfoundland. They have betrayed the trust that the people of Newfoundland put in them when they were elected, because here they are asking the people of Newfoundland to believe them, even though they gave them a mandate to govern.

Now here we are on November 22 and we are talking about Supplementary Supply for March 31, 1985. They are asking us to approve Supplementary Supply for last year. We are half way through the year, we have the Mid-Year Report, and it shows that the minister was again unable to bring in a balanced budget.

To me this is a very, very serious matter. I think the people of Newfoundland deserve a lot better than what they are being offered by members opposite.

Now, let us talk about some of the inequities in the Newfoundland system. First of all, at this time of the year we are here looking at the unemployment figures which are great - unemployment is up by this, or it is down by that.

I am getting phone calls every day from people in my district who are concerned about something else that has gone up again, the hydro rates, Mr. Chairman.

Hydro rates have just been increased - the fuel adjustment has reared its ugly head again. Fishermen in places like McCallum, Francois, Grey River, Burgeo, Ramea and Bay d'Espoir, who are making \$110 if they are lucky enough to be on unemployment, they are concerned right now because hydro rates are increased.

And not only that, in places like McCallum, Francois, Grey River, Ramea and Burgeo, they use diesel power and that means that they pay up to three and a half times the rate of the rest of Newfoundland. I had a call from a gentleman in Burgeo yesterday, and he was concerned because he had his bill and there was a fuel adjustment charge on it. He told me that he had to cut down his water heater to save two dollars, and now he finds that he got his hydro bill yesterday for diesel generated electricity and it is up nine dollars. He said, 'You just cannot win, Mr. Gilbert.' This is the type of plea that those of us here, who care, are getting from people out there.

What are hon. members opposite doing? They are telling us that Newfoundland Hydro, that great company that was listed in Fortune Magazine last year, is



one of the most profitable companies in Canada. People who have to live on \$110 a week cannot understand why they have to pay a fuel adjustment charge and why they have to pay three and a half times the rate of the rest of Newfoundland. They feel that the system is not equal. I can only agree with them. There are some problems. Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro is a Crown corporation, and I feel that if they are going to be listed as one of the most profitable companies in Canada, they should at least be able to do something to equal out the rates that are paid by all Newfoundlanders. Why should it be the people who live in places like McCallum, Grey River, Francois, Burgeo and Rames who are forced to pay three and a half times the current rate for hydro? This is one of the inequities in our system and I feel that we in this hon. House have it in our power to correct that and make it fair, so that all people in Newfoundland pay the same rates for their hydro.

We have another sort of an odd situation concerning Newfoundland Hydro, as I see it. Newfoundland Hydro's headquarters is in Bay d'Espoir, another part of my district. In Bay d'Espoir - a promise unfulfilled, I think is the way some of the people put it - they have 85 per cent to 90 per cent unemployment. Under Canada Works which we have seen some jobs applied for, some projects applied for, but we certainly have not seen any of them approved yet.

In Bay d'Espoir, in the areas of Milltown. St. Alban's, St. Veronica's, St. Josephs Cove, Morrisville, and Conne River, we have 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the people unemployed, and we have Newfoundland Hydro, this company

that was listed in Fortune Magazine, or one of those prestigious magazines from Upper Canada which tells us all about the profitable companies we have, and Newfoundland Hydro is listed as one of the most profitable companies in Canada, twenty-third or twenty-fourth or something, this company makes this money off the backs of the people in Bay d'Espoir. I believe something like 40 per cent of the total hydro for Newfoundland comes out of Bay d'Espoir. They employ about ninety full-time people out of the 3,800 people who live in that area.

Mr. Chairman, there are 170 full-time workers in that area. It is a shame to think that out of 3,800 people there are only 170 who work all year around, and they are the people who work with Hydro, Mr. Chairman, the people who are teachers and the people who work with government. They are the only people who have full-time jobs. Yet Newfoundland Hydro's cheapest source of energy for the whole Province comes out of Bay d'Espoir.

Now, in Bay d'Espoir, in that area, the kids do not have swimming pools, and other recreation facilities are very limited, while Newfoundland Hydro, which is listed as one of the most profitable companies in Canada, makes its money off the backs of those poor kids who do not have swimming pools and playgrounds.

I have talked to Guide leaders and Scout leaders and they have said, 'Some of the kids we have in Guides and Scouts have never been out of this area, have never seen a movie.' This is the sort of thing that those of us living in other parts of Newfoundland take

for granted. And yet, we have Newfoundland Hydro making all this money off the backs of those people. You know, Mr. Chairman, they do not pay any taxes to the communities of Milltown or St. Alban's or Morrisville. They make this money off the backs of those people and they do not put one cent back in taxes or grants in lieu of taxes. Unlike the paper companies and the mining companies, they do not pay anything to the communities in Bay d'Espoir.

The minister has got up from time to time and said, 'Well, really, we are not taking anything out. The water is a renewable resource and it flows through, so really we do not owe them anything.'

I heard the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) say this morning he is not going to go back into history, but I am willing to bet, Mr. Chairman, that immediately I sit down, some hon. member over there will get up and talk about Churchill Falls, something that happened seventeen, eighteen, twenty years ago. And I would like to point out that some of the hon. members over there were members on this side at that time - and they will be again after the next election - and they voted for the Churchill Falls agreement, blindly, as they say.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. GILBERT:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman, I am just going to make a very brief remark related to the initial statements made by the hon. member who just sat down.

The hon. member made some statements about the mid-year report. He said he thought it was terrible that there was an increase in the deficit. He calls it a disgrace, and by implication, it should not have occurred.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at that now, because I do not like to let people get away with talking through their hat. The revenues were increased over the budget. They were up by \$7,465,000. In other words, the revenue in the budget in May was \$1.817 billion and, in actual fact, we are now projecting that the revenues will be \$1.824 billion, an increase of nearly \$7.5 million in revenues. Now, you will say, 'Your revenues are up, why the increase in the deficit?' The reason is that our expenditure went up more than the budget. The net expenditure in the budget was \$1.89 billion and now we are projecting it as \$1.903 billion. The expenditure was up. The hon. member cannot criticize us for our revenue side because our revenue was up, so his criticism is 'You should not have put up your expenditures. For your incompetence you should be thrown out of office because you put up your expenditures.'

Well, now, let us look at the expenditures that went up, that the hon. member opposite feels are a disgrace, should not have been done, and they should, presumably, now be rescinded. Let us look at those increased expenditures that



put our deficit up. What were they?

The first one is the Fisheries Employment Opportunities Programme. The hon. member opposite is criticizing and is saying it should not have been brought in, the Fisheries Employment Opportunities Programme. Now, as all hon. members know, the inshore fishing industry suffered tremendous difficulties this year. Many fishermen are now faced with social assistance because they did not get sufficient catches to allow them to qualify for unemployment insurance. Because of that, this government, in conjunction with the Government of Canada, decided to bring in the Fisheries Employment Opportunities Programme. But the hon. member opposite says, 'No, you should not have done that. You are going to put up your expenditures if you do that, therefore, you can increase your deficit even though you have increased revenues. We do not want you to increase your expenditures and increase the deficit, so you should not bring in the Fisheries Employment Opportunities Programme.' Now that is what the hon. member says.

Secondly, what is another reason for our expenditures going up? The Jobs Strategy Programme. Now the hon. member presumably finds fault with our increasing our expenditures by bringing in a Jobs Strategy Programme. Now what was a Jobs Strategy Programme? The Jobs Strategy Programme was a programme brought in by both orders of government because this Province has one of the highest, if not the highest unemployment rate in the country. But the hon. member does not care about that. He says, 'I do not care what is

going on with the unemployment rate in the country, I do not want you to increase your expenditures and therefore increase your deficit, even though your revenues have gone up. I do not want you to bring in a Jobs Strategy Programme.'

Now, the next thing: What other additional expenditures? My heavens, there were an awful lot of forest fires in Labrador this year, it was probably one of the worst forest fire seasons we have had in the last decade. So what did government do? Government had to spend an extra \$1 million more than we budgeted to fight the forest fires. But the hon. member opposite does not agree with that. He would say, 'Look, if you do that you are going to increase your expenditures and therefore your deficit, so let the forest burn down. Do not protect the forest. It is ridiculous! You are incompetent if you protect the forest. You must let the place burn to the ground and then we will applaud you.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Burn your boats.

DR. COLLINS:  
Yes, it is equivalent to the old Liberal cry of burn things, 'burn your boats.' Now they want to burn forests.

Now, what is another expenditure? Another expenditure was \$845,000 for a salmon hatchery. Why do we want a salmon hatchery in this Province? Is that not a ridiculous luxury, to have a salmon hatchery? We should not have put money into a salmon hatchery because that increases the expenditures and if you increase your expenditures, even though your revenues are up, you

have increased the deficit. Let us not have a salmon hatchery.

Now, my good friend over there from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), I will bring him into this argument, I am sure he would not want that, because it is in his district and he knows it is needed down there. But even despite that, what is happening to the salmon industry, if one might call it that, in the world? It has been taken over by the Norwegians because they are now farming salmon. And the reason why they are doing that is that the wild salmon catches are way down, and we are going to be moved out of the salmon market if we do not compete and do much the same, so we decided to bring in a salmon hatchery.

But the hon. member says, 'I do not care whether our fishing industry goes down the drain or not, do not do anything that is useful and helpful to reverse that trend, let it go down the drain, do not increase your expenditures and therefore your deficit.'

Now, finally, there is an amount in here that increased our expenditures again. Now what was that amount? It was \$5.4 million. Is that not an awful lot of money? Surely you should not spend that. But then you would have to see why are we spending it? It is for social assistance requirements. Now, who is on social assistance? Surely there are widows, there are children, there are poor families, there are handicapped families, there are the blind people, there are the handicapped people, there are the people who are just economically inefficient, incompetent and cannot handle their own affairs and, therefore, they have

financial troubles. But the hon. member opposite says, 'Look, I do not care about these people, do not increase your expenditures no matter what the need, because if you increase your expenditures you will increase your deficit even though your revenues have gone up. I am against all that.' He says, 'I think you are incompetent to have done that. I think it is ridiculous of the government to have done it. You should have let the blind stagger around in the street and freeze to death. You should have let the homeless children starve in the gutters.' That is the hon. member's argument.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope it will be noted that I applauded the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) for his adequate performance when he commented on the mid-year statement. It is rhetoric to say that a budget can precisely match what is going to happen, especially in these times. It is ridiculous, even in the best of times. We have never, and I do not think anyone ever will bring in a budget that matches the actual events. In the early days, when the economy was going well, we brought in budgets that were off but they were off on the surplus side. We now have brought in budgets that are off but are off on the deficit side because the economic conditions are different.

Our difference between actual and budget are very small compared to other provinces. I only have to recall that the province of Nova Scotia the other day had to bring in revisions to their budgetary estimates which were off by \$26 million as opposed to our situation here, where we are off by approximately \$6 million. Anyway, the point I really have to

drive home is that our deficit is increased by a small amount because there had to be brought in very, very necessary additional and unanticipated, and could not be anticipated, expenditures. But the hon. member opposite says, it does not matter what need their is, whether it is the needy, whether it is forest fires, whether it is job creation, whether it is an improvement in the fishery, you should not do those things because we must not govern competently, we must pay attention to the bottom line and let the needs go by the board. I would urge the hon. member, if he must make criticisms, to make them, but at least make them with some sense and some logic to them.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Fortune-Hemitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Chairman, the first thing I say tongue-in-cheek to the minister is that it is my experience in projecting my own personal budget, or overstating it to please the bank manager, I get suspicious of anybody who understates his projected revenue. On that note we congratulate the minister for finding some money that he did not even foresee before the fact.

Having said that, I thought what happened in the past few minutes, the exchange between the gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), was fairly instructive.

MR. J. CARTER:  
The children have gone home now,

you can revert to your normal self.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Chairman, that is not strictly true. The gentleman for St. John's North (J. Carter) interjects the children have gone home. Most of them have gone home but one has remained, and for his benefit and for his virgin ears I shall choose my words and choose them very discreetly.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows full well that the gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) said none of the things, absolutely none of the things that the minister put in his mouth, or attempted to. I recall some years ago I had on my staff a music teacher. I had heard that sometimes artists tend to be temperamental but I have never been one who subscribed to generalizations on the basis of a few examples, so I had always dismissed the idea and perhaps I should still continue to dismiss it. But I know that at the very least this person was the exception that proved the rule, perhaps, proved some rule. He was a musician and, Mr. Chairman, you would identify this being an accomplished musician yourself, having wowed audiences in Halifax and Toronto and Ottawa and elsewhere that I can personally speak of. This musician was a very accomplished musician, but confront him with certain other matters related to the routine of daily life and he was completely as sea. He comes to mind this morning, because as I sat there and looked at the minister go through his routine, a routine that, one, he was very uncomfortable with and, two, knew very little about, and I recalled by analogy the musician who, in

his immediate field, was a very skilled practitioner. And so with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). In his field of medicine he is known as a very skilled practitioner who knows his practice and his discipline well, but take him outside of that and he is like my musician friend, he is a fish out of water, he is completely at sea.

You see, my friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) gave him what I thought was some fairly wholesome and well-intended criticism. But the minister had to get on the defensive and had to get flagrant in his abuse, had to misrepresent completely what the gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir had to say.

Mr. Chairman, we are not against some expenditures on fish hatcheries and on the aged and the poor, we are not against job creation. That is not the plea in what the gentleman for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir had to say, or what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said earlier, the issue is whether you have in the Ministry of Finance somebody who knows what he is doing or not. The evidence over the past five years is on the side that he does not know what he is doing, because again and again and again he makes a prediction which is widely off base. That is the issue, I believe, that my friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir was talking about. Surely, despite the haughtiness and the arrogance of this particular administration, they are not about to fling out the essential principle of Parliamentary democracy, that the government is accountable to the House? They have tried it in many, many ways. They have doctored the rules to the extent that they are hardly

accountable any more. The very exercise we are in now, we are here rubber-stamping \$56 million long after it was spent.

Mr. Chairman, surely the Minister of Finance, if he keeps tripping and bungling in terms of his projections, we have to bring him to account. The gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir surely still has the right, even in this limited forum of democracy, and the responsibility to demonstrate to this House that the Minister of Finance is way, way off base. We are not saying do not spend, we are saying do your homework a whole lot better than you are doing it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I recall that the other day the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the man who by his own admission is a part-time minister, the part-time minister from St. John's East, said that we on this side ought to apologize to our districts for various sins. I want to tell him and his colleagues that we indeed do that on a regular basis. We apologize regularly to our districts. We apologize for the two critical years that were lost on the offshore through footstomping and tantrum kicking. Why, Mr. Chairman? We were going to have a better agreement. It is better, Mr. Chairman, a lot better for Ontario and Quebec than the other agreement would have been, a lot better. We apologize for those two critical years, Mr. Chairman. We apologize to them for the bungling this government did on FFTs. We apologize on a regular basis for that.

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member speaking knows full well or ought to know, he is either extremely ignorant or else he is deliberately misleading the House. I would choose not to believe the latter. I think he just does not know. We cannot have this fiction spread about.

MR. SIMMONS:

A difference of opinion.

MR. J. CARTER:

We cannot have this fiction spread about, that the former deal was anything like the present deal that we got.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is a difference of opinion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. CARTER:

Everytime he says it I will get up and object, and any hon. member on this side who is worth his salt will do the same thing. It is wrong and rotten and miserable for him to suggest that the deal that we refused to sign was anything like or as good as the deal that we eventually got.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

There is no point of order. We differ and I am glad. It is to my credit that I differ with him on essential points, and on this one, Clause 54 was the biggest sellout

in Canadian history.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. HISCOCK:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, he has ruled on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I have ruled on that point of order. Do you have another one?

MR. J. CARTER:

Too late. You were wool gathering.

MR. SIMMONS:

Come on. Come on.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

In his point of order the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) basically said that you could not compare the two. I will say this about the Accord, one of the things that did take place was Newfoundland and Labrador lost the opportunity of buying 40 per cent of each well over a period of time.

MR. SIMMONS:

He seems to be debating it.

MR. HISCOCK:

By signing the Atlantic Accord that was done away with. Because of pressure from the Americans, particularly Mobil, one of the things that the Tory Government in Ottawa did with the National Energy Programme was, of course, get rid of the 25 per cent back-in

clause. So I would say on those two points, Mr. Chairman, the Accord itself is one for private business. It does very little for the average consumer in this Province, or the idea of eventually taking over the oilfields ourselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, we on this side apologize regularly for the sellout through Clause 54 of the offshore agreement, and we apologize regularly for the bungling the government did on the FFT issue. It came late to the cause, after the cause had been lost. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that the cause was scripted to be lost.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we also apologize in our districts regularly for the bluff that was run on the Marystown Shipyard workers during last Spring's election, when they were told that they would be exempted from the freeze. They are being told different things now, Mr. Chairman, that the ballots have been counted, very different things altogether.

We apologize regularly to the people in our districts, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier going on national television in December, 1982, and saying that some fish plants on the South Coast would have to close. That is not the story he is telling these days, Mr. Chairman, because he, too, is part of that thing called 'News Speak' where you invent a fact and

if you say it often enough, enough people begin to forget what the real fact was.

MR. KELLAND:

Double talk.

MR. SIMMONS:

Double talk. 'News Speak'.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I admit to the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) that we on this side have much to apologize for. We spend so much of our time making the kinds of apologizes that I have just made reference to, Mr. Chairman, that there is little time left to tell them-

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

- Mr. Chairman, about the programmes that we would implement once we become the government.

MR. J. CARTER:

Sit down! Your time is up, sit down!

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, I thank the gentleman. With leave I shall continue to make some other remarks.

MR. J. CARTER:

No leave!

MR. SIMMONS:

No leave again. I will be back at it.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for



Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is unfolding his arguments in such brilliant fashion, and they are so attentive to this exercise in logic, that I will permit him to carry on.

MR. J. CARTER:

To a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) has been time and time and time again suggesting that the Atlantic Accord is less than what we could have gotten if we had signed the agreement that the Liberals wanted us to sign. I do not know what you have to do or say to prove otherwise.

We have printed the Atlantic Accord in newspapers. It has been published, it has been dissected, it has been commented upon and yet, they still persist in trying to mislead the public of Newfoundland. I do not know what resources this House can call upon to set this fact straight but I think something -

MR. SIMMONS:

Bring in the legislation.

MR. J. CARTER:

The legislation will be brought in shortly and it will be debated. You can say something one hundred times but it is not going to change their view.

MR. LUSH:

Is that a point of order?

MR. J. CARTER:

No, it is not a point of order, it is a point that should be made

time and time again. I would call upon those who are better versed in this particular Accord than I am to defend it. It is plain to me that this Accord is the best that we could have gotten and is so much better than any other agreements, that I find it hard to understand why the hon. gentlemen are continuing to knock it. Of course, it is to their political advantage to do so and I suppose they feel that if they can fool enough of the people enough of the time that it may be worth their while to go on in this vein, but I think it is a sad day for Newfoundland when some of the members that represent the public come into this House of Assembly and mislead the public. I think it is a terrible, terrible thing and I just wonder what we should do.

However, I will take my seat and let someone who is much more able to defend this Accord than I am, to have a few words.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to talk about the Atlantic Accord. I am going to wait until the legislation is brought in. We were promised that legislation at least a week ago, we were told it was supposed to be brought in on November 15 and here it is November 22 and we still do not have it. We will talk about the legislation when it is brought before the House and then we will all find out how good the Atlantic Accord is.

Mr. Chairman, as I ended

yesterday, I was talking about some of the industries that the Liberal administration started in this Province.

MR. J. CARTER:

Like the rubber boot factory.

MR. CALLAN:

No, the Terra Nova Shoe Factory that the Mulroney government are going to close down now.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, they are not.

MR. CALLAN:

We will see.

MR. YOUNG:

Go away boy. You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. CALLAN:

I am not the only one who do not know what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. It was in the media.

MR. SIMMS:

If you only knew.

MR. CALLAN:

Is the media only good when it gives a positive story on the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), when it favours the government? Is the news reporting bad when it is against this government? How can they help but report anything else but badness? What is this government doing that is good? Name some of it. Look around this Province, I challenge the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) to look around this Province and tell me, he can get up for ten minutes if he wants to, what is happening in this Province.

MR. PEACH:

There are about 5,400 more jobs for youth this past summer.

MR. FUREY:

You obviously did not see On Camera the other night.

MR. CALLAN:

Okay, let me just respond to what the member just said.

What we had last Summer, and the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) can twist and turn it all he wants to, what we had last Summer was we had a continuation of the Summer Youth Employment Programme. The idea was spawned in Ottawa under the Liberal Government, and, of course, the LIP Programmes were also spawned in Ottawa, that is where the idea took fruition. What did we hear the Premier saying in some of his speeches? They were silly and stupid because all they were doing in lots of communities was putting a second fence around a graveyard. I explained to the Premier at the time when he made that stupid statement that if that happened in Green Bay, then all he was doing was insulting the people in that area. They were called LIP Programmes so it meant that the local people took the initiative to apply for this programme.

I have on my desk, and I thank the Minister of Career Development, stacks - every application.

MR. YOUNG:

Are they wet?

MR. CALLAN:

No, they came in recently. Every application that was applied for from the district of Bellevue under either the Jobs Strategy Programme or the \$9.5 billion I will call it, the special programme. I thank the minister for the applications. We do not get a list of the roads programmes



or the water and sewer programmes, that are approved by the minister. But this minister - I assume he does it for all members - sent me copies of every application that was sent in from the district of Bellevue.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What a government!

MR. CALLAN:

What a minister!

I went through them, every one of them, and what do I see, Mr. Chairman, what do I see? It is called Jobs Strategy, it is just a continuation of the Liberal programmes that were in existence in Ottawa years ago. The minister, and the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) can twist it and turn it.

From Chance Cove there is an application there for the replacement of a slipway or a wharf, and all over the district it goes on and on and on. In Markland they are looking for repairs and renovations to their community hall, the community hall that was built under the LIP Programme, or Canada Works, or Jobs Strategy, call it what you wish, a rose by any other name.

MR. PEACH:

Do you want it?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) has the right to listen to me and then get up and make his own ten minute speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please! Could we have silence while the hon. member for Bellevue is debating.

MR. CALLAN:

Answer the questions that I am asking him. I said yesterday what this government has been doing for fourteen years or more has been knee-jerk reactions and the department that the present Minister of Career Development is into now, that is what that is. The minister talks about all the wonderful things that are going to be happening in the trade schools in two or three years, but this minister has been around and this government has been around for fourteen years. Why did they wait until now? It is a knee-jerk reaction, that is what it is.

They have seen studies that have been done, that have told them that the people in this Province, and I know them and the minister knows them, and the member for Carbonear knows them, people who went to trade school and they did a carpentry course. They came out and they could not get any employment. They went back the next year and they took a pipefitting course. They came out and they could not get any employment and they went back the next year and they took a navigation course. They came out and they could not get any employment so they went back and they took a cooking course. We have known for years and years that people in this Province have been trained for the wrong jobs. There were no jobs because this government has not been creating any jobs. There are no long term plans, as the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) referred to them. There are no plans and strategies coming from this government.

What do we have? The member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) who spoke earlier talked about

electricity in this Province under Vic Young, who is now in charge of FPI. What kind of a job did he do with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro? What has this Province been doing over the last fourteen or fifteen years with Hydro? Knee-jerk reactions. We are going to develop Bay d'Espoir because in two years time we will not have enough electricity, so we have to develop Bay d'Espoir. Now we are going to develop Cat Arm because in another year we are going to need some more. Now they are going to develop something else and that is what has been happening, knee-jerk reactions. Nothing in this Province, Mr. Chairman, nothing.

What this government has gone through for the last fourteen years, Mr. Chairman, are several stages. The first stage, as I mentioned yesterday, was the witch hunt stage. The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who stands up now so sanctimonious and pious and talks about, "You should not be asking me those questions." What kind of questions was he asking back in 1970 and 1971 and 1972 and even after he became a member of government? What was he doing? He was referred to around the Province - every child who is over fifteen years of age must have heard the expression - 'Witch Hunt Willie'. It was on the lips of every person in this Province. Here is a man who looks across the House in a sanctimonious attitude and says, "Do not go treating me like that!"

So, Mr. Chairman, what we went through in the early 1970's was the witch hunt stage.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I never heard of it.

MR. CALLAN:

No, because your head was buried in the sand too deep. Your love for the Tory Party was so blind that you could not see anything else. You did not want to hear it. It was too negative sure. Is it negative now?

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) interrupting me and he is not even in his own seat. You would think the man would have some class, some decorum. He is a Cabinet minister. Why does he not act like one?

So, Mr. Chairman, we went through a witch hunt stage. Then, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MATTHEWS:

(Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, would you ask 'The Red Rooster' to be quiet?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Could we have silence please for the hon. the member for Bellevue debating.

MR. CALLAN:

We went through the witch hunt stage, Mr. Chairman. What did we go through after that? We went, after that, through the promised land stage. The witch hunt stage, by the way, almost brought down the former administration in the election of 1975. It almost destroyed that administration because it is not the role of governments to be conducting witch hunts. It is the role of governments to be creating jobs. It is the role of the Opposition - can anybody understand that - to find out the problems and the

faults of government and to point them out to the people of this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:  
By leave, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WARREN:  
No way, B.J.

MR. CALLAN:  
Who is that, Bas Jamieson, B.J.? I am not Bas Jamieson. Bas Jamieson got defeated.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. CALLAN:  
I will get into the other stages some other time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Chairman, thank you.

After my earlier few words this morning I notice that the Minister of Finance got up and attacked me because I pointed out some of the truths about the inequities that his government had inflicted on the people of Newfoundland. I would like to assure the hon. minister that anything that he has done for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir I am quite happy to thank him for it. He mentioned the fish hatchery and I can assure you that that is going to be very important in the development of Bay d'Espoir. I would like to point out to him that it was initially started by federal funds from Ottawa when my colleague from

Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) was the MP for that area. He was the one who put the initial money into it. We feel on this side of the House that we justly have had some input into this fish hatchery. I am sure that the Bay d'Espoir Development Association is going to carry on and do a masterful job of developing an industry there that we hope is going to employ fifty people.

It still does not take away from the point that I made to the hon. Minister of Finance. Newfoundland Hydro is there taking out all this cheap hydro power and not putting anything back. That does not change. But there is a fish hatchery there that was started by the federal Liberal Government in Ottawa some years ago. It is now finished. For that I can assure you that I am thankful, as are all the people in the district. We are looking forward to some great things from it. It is a new operation in Newfoundland, a fish hatchery, and we think that it is going to be very important to the overall development of Bay d'Espoir.

I would like to just remind members opposite that there were a few more promises made to the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. One of them was for a senior citizens home for Bay d'Espoir. A circular which I tabled in this House back in May showed that a construction site was going to start within a few days after the election. Then we found out that this was, as the fellow said, 'like a puff of smoke on the Grand Banks'. There was nothing to it. A puff of fog on the Grand Banks! A promise and that is all it was. They had done a survey.

Mr. Chairman, would you ask the hon. minister for soccer balls to keep quiet.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir has requested silence please.

MR. GILBERT:

He might learn something. Anyhow, the senior citizens home that was promised during the last election to the people of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and it was promised, I feel, in good faith because there was a demonstrated need for this. The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) would possibly be aware that there is not a senior citizens home on the South Coast of Newfoundland from Grand Bank to Port Aux Basque. He should not be laughing when we talk about senior citizens homes. The whole deal about it is there was a demonstrated need for this senior citizens home in this area.

MR. EFFORD:

Was he laughing at that?

MR. GILBERT:

Yes he was.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I asked a question on it. I asked if the issue was still alive.

MR. GILBERT:

I hope it is alive, this is why I am mentioning it here. I just want to remind people that there was a promise made and we do not want it to be a broken promise. I hope that when the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) gets up the next time and says something about the speeches I am making that he will be able to say that there is a senior citizens home now in Bay d'Espoir. I will be quite happy and I will thank him

on behalf of the people and on behalf of the suffering people that are there and the old people that are now living with their relatives with no nursing care and have to be moved to St. Anthony to go to a senior citizens home, I will thank him on behalf of those people. There is a need.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman, would you ask the member to be quiet please and he can speak after I am finished?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Silence, please!

MR. GILBERT:

There was a commitment made during the last election. In this area of Bay d'Espoir you have eighty-five or ninety per cent of the people unemployed. First of all there was a demonstrated need for a senior citizens and then the hope was held out to them, this was the promise that was put out during the election that there was going to be ninety jobs created.

As I said earlier this morning, in an area that has 3,800 people and there is 170 full-time jobs, 90 more jobs was a Klondike. It was something that they were expecting but all of a sudden, members opposite say very casually, "When was it promised?" I have tabled the document in the House on when it was promised by a Cabinet Minister in this government. There is no doubt about it, it was promised. I think that with the situation that we have in Bay d'Espoir, where you have those people unemployed, it is a crime against the people down there that you would hold out promises like that and not fulfill them.

Earlier this morning, I presented a petition in this House on behalf of the people in the Burgeo and Ramea area and the minister sort of doubted that the petition was serious. The 1,575 people that signed that were really serious, they were concerned and they felt that had a just cause when they asked for it. We have seen secondary roads assigned this year and we heard the federal member say that he was going to look after the ones in his own district. There has not been any effort put in to do anything. The people of Burgeo have been trying to arrange a meeting between the Federal M.P. and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and myself. It is now postponed until sometime in January. It was supposed to be this Monday but everyone was too busy, they were going off to meetings somewhere. Here is the situation that we find ourselves in. The Burgeo road is there, it is unsafe, it has been demonstrated that it is unsafe and the minister himself that it is not up to grade and it is impossible to keep it safe because of the conditions.

MR. DAWE:

It is possible to keep it safe with the proper maintenance on it.

MR. GILBERT:

Well, we are asking you to do the job so you can do the proper maintenance on it. This is the whole prayer of that petition, I would point out, and this is the situation that these people find themselves in down there. They have not got a road that they feel safe to go on this time of the year.

I was talking to the doctor in Ramea the last time I was down there and he is concerned about

travelling over that road in the Wintertime. He feels that there should be more communication, telephones and stuff like that, installed on the road. I know that there was a telephone put in the highways camp there, and there may be one in the Price camp, but I am saying that there should be more. He feels that if an accident occurred there people could die because of the lack of communications. I think it is something that should be addressed and something that members opposite should look at. Because of the very fact that it is so remote there should possibly be an effort to put in telephones somewhere along the road.

When I stand up I am talking about the needs of the district. I see the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is back in the House now and I am glad that he is back.

DR. COLLINS:

I was listening.

MR. GILBERT:

Well, I am glad.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, before my time ran out a few minutes back I was talking about the four stages that this government has gone through in the last fourteen years. I am going to try and get them all outlined this time. Knee-jerk reactions, that is all we have

seen from this government, nothing new. They were going to close down the ERKO plant at Long Harbour and John Crosbie said the people should be put on welfare and the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) said the same thing. Well, anyway we have it there. Terra Nova Shoes, again created by the former Joey Smallwood government, looks like it is in trouble because of Toryism. Of course, the aluminum smelter that this government promised for years finally ended up in Quebec and we did not get the Lower Churchill developed, neither did we get the aluminum smelter. The fishery is in just as big a mess now as it was when the other Cabot came here, John Cabot. On and on it goes, Mr. Chairman.

What we saw this government doing over the last fourteen years, in addition to knee-jerk reactions to every little thing are things like with the pulp and paper industry, for example, which is in the same state now that it was fourteen years ago. They brought Kruger into Corner Brook, an knee-jerk reaction to a company that was pulling out. Nothing new, no new initiatives.

A scattered bit of pavement, you hear of pretending announcements spending the taxpayer's dollars, an announcement as if it were their own. Of course, we saw a few new hospitals go here and there, most of them political, the one in Clarendville, a political hospital. We see hospitals closing down at Markland.

MR. TOBIN:

How about the hospital on the Burin Peninsula?

MR. CALLAN:

I know all about the hospital.

How many years was that promised?

MR. TOBIN:

I will tell you what, I promised it in April of 1982 and we delivered it.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Chairman, the ignoramus for Burin-Placentia (Mr. Tobin) is interjecting again.

MR. TOBIN:

The billy goat from Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

We went through the witch hunt stage in the early seventies, Mr. Chairman, and then we went through the promised land stage. They won an election or two on the promised land stage, promising how good things were going to be if you put us back. The promised land stage actually lasted up until the last election. The Premier was still promising that promised land. A lot of people, of course, began to see through the Premier's empty promises during the last election so a lot of the people said, we have heard this now since 1979 so how stupid does the Premier think we are. Newfoundlanders are their own worst enemies. They have proven that in several elections. But how stupid does the Premier think we are to keep promising and talking about 45,000 jobs and not delivering and then asking for the permission of the people? 'I want you to vote for me again now because I am asking your permission to create some new jobs.'

MR. PATTERSON:

5,000 jobs.

MR. CALLAN:

All we see, as I said just now, Mr. Chairman, is a continuation of the LIP programmes, Local



Initiative Programmes, where the initiative came from the local area to apply for a community hall or a ball field or a slipway or the many, many other things that have been built. Now the same applications that I have on my desk, that the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) sent me, are the very same programmes.

What are they applying for in Swift Current under this Jobs Strategy Programme? They are applying for the same thing that they applied for year in and year out to repair their community hall, to bring it up to a better standard. The same thing.

Where are the skills going to come from, Mr. Chairman? And, of course, in other communities they are talking about the same ideas. In my own hometown of Norman's Cove where they have been applying for water and sewer for fourteen years - and have not gotten it because this government did not want to put it in Norman's Cove, they wanted to put it in a Tory district - what have they managed to do? What have the town council in Norman's Cove managed to do over the last ten or fourteen years? What they have done, Mr. Chairman, is they have survived, they have water through artesian wells and make-work programmes that have managed to keep the people, at least, with a fairly decent supply of water. There is no provision for the sewer that is building up.

The application is in from Norman's Cove this time around, I saw it yesterday on my desk on the fifth floor. The application is - and I have to laugh, even though, they come from my own district and I am sure that other members have

seen it as well - you see there is a provision in there, somewhere in the regulations: Will you hire Native people? I have seen applications from the district of Bellevue, where there are no Native people in the true sense - they are natives from Norman's Cove and Swift Current and all that, but, they are not Inuit or Eskimo or anything - I have seen applications where the answer to the question, yes, we will hire so many men and so many women and we will also hire Natives, where possible. How silly! How silly! It is the same old LIP programme and this government in Ottawa, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mulroney and his crowd, what were they going to do? John Crosbie was going to do away with the foolish LIP programmes, the same way he was going to do away with the foolish ERCO plant. What do we have? We have the identical applications. What other applications can you expect to come in from Swift Current or Norman's Cove or Southport or Gooseberry Cove or Dildo or South Dildo or Whitbourne or Markland? What other applications do you expect to come in?

So anyway, Mr. Chairman, we went through the promised land stage. Then we went through the procrastination stage. These two went hand in hand actually.

MR. LUSH:  
And overlapped.

MR. CALLAN:  
Yes, and overlapped. Procrastinating, putting things off, knee-jerk reactions, but the promised land would come by and by.

MR. LUSH:  
In the sweet by and by.



MR. CALLAN:

I had to laugh, Mr. Chairman, when my colleague for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) was telling the parable the other day about his cobbler friend who bought the lottery ticket, I assume he was a cobbler because he said he never struck a tap after he bought the lottery ticket and did the same thing that this government did, bought a lottery ticket and everything is going to be fine.

But what stage are we into now, Mr. Chairman, before my ten minutes run out? What stage are we into now?

MR. TOBIN:  
Prosperity.

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, look around the Province and see all the prosperity. Mr. Chairman, the stage we are into now is the brazen it out stage. We know we have not done anything. We have not done a thing, and anybody who looks around the Province can see.

There is a new extension to the Confederation Building going ahead. We in Opposition have been calling for that for at least ten years. Why are you spending all of the money renting space downtown in Atlantic Place and all over the city from Craig Dobbin and Frank Ryan and all the other Tory cronies? So we said let us build our own building and, so finally, the government did it. But is that anything new or wonderful? Is that a grandiose idea, something that came up during during the middle of the night in somebody's nightmare?

MR. TOBIN:  
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, just a very short point of order. I do not think that could be let stand because the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is on record of opposing the extension of Confederation Building. That is my understanding.

AN HON. MEMBER:

So am I.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

What we have now will continue, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:

Cabinet minister are brazening it out and the whole government is brazening it out.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bellevue, I would direct his attention to pages R3467 to R3469 because he raised exactly the same questions yesterday and I answered all his questions yesterday. If

he will just read those pages, he will be duly enlightened and he will not have to bring up these questions again.

Mr. Chairman, just let me comment though very briefly on what the hon. member was sort of getting at in a distorted and in a vague and almost an inarticulate sort of way and what the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), in his own sort of round around way, was getting at the other day. That is the unemployment problem we have in the Province. There is no doubt about it, we have a very serious unemployment problem here. Why have we got it? Why is unemployment such a serious thing in Newfoundland?

I think there are a number of reasons. Firstly, we have got a very narrowly-based economy. We are onto fisheries, we are onto mining and we are onto forestry - a very, very narrowly-based economy. We have always been like that. So it means that our employment is very difficult because of that.

What are we doing about that? We are bringing in, because of the offshore, a benefits package which will widen the base of our economy very appreciable. We will have a much larger small business economy. We will have a much larger industrial base to our economy as a result of the offshore. It will not come automatically. It has to be worked on. It has to be carefully planned and that is what we are doing. So that is one way we are getting at the unemployment thing.

The next thing is our type of work force. We have a very innovative work force in Newfoundland. You know, the old saying goes, if you

put a Newfoundlander out on the barrons, give him a piece of wire and, you know, a pick axe or something, he will survive there where half the rest of the world will starve to death. We have a very innovative work force, but we do not have a skilled work force. It is sort of native ingenuity they have. It is not learned skills. So what are we doing about that? We are bringing in vocational school reforms. We are building new institutions, such as the new Fisheries Institute. We are expanding the Trades College. We are expanding the university. So that is what we are doing again to attack our work force problem here. Another way of getting at our age old unemployment problem.

Thirdly, our unemployment is high because we have few financial resources in the Province. We are not a rich Province. There is not much investment in the Province. So what are we doing about that? We are co-operating with the federal government. We have got a good co-operative approach with the federal government. Now, it is not perfect. It is far from perfect I suppose. Certainly it was disasterously far from perfect on the factory freezer trawler issue. But apart from that we have got a much better co-operative approach with the federal government than we have had for years and that co-operative approach is designed to increase investment in the country, whether it is in forestry, whether it is in fisheries, whether it is in agriculture, whether it is in transportation, whatever it is. That is another way we are working at trying to get at the roots of our unemployment problem.

Fourthly, we have very poor - poor

perhaps is not the correct word - but anyway, a very deficient managerial approach to business in this Province. Again, it goes into our history. So what are we doing about that? We are trying to widen the managerial area in this Province. For instance, the salmon hatchery that the hon. Premier opened the other day. That has brought a new type of business and, therefore, will require new business management into the Province.

Similarly, the mid water fleet, that is a new type of fishery technology. We are bringing that into the Province. There have to be new skills, new ways of managing and handling that type of vessel.

We are in secondary processing in the fishery. That is a new type of approach for us. We have done a small amount. Janes and Company have been doing some secondary processing for quite a number of years. But we are now going to do it in a much bigger way. Down on the Burin Peninsula, FPI is getting into secondary processing. So here is a new managerial type of approach to the fishery.

In the paper industry, we are modernizing. We have a modern plant out in Stephenville. We have now set about modernizing Corner Brook and Grand Falls. Again, it is a new approach to the management of our paper industry and that, of course, will tend to attack our chronic unemployment problem.

It is the same with silviculture. This government has brought silviculture into our forest industry. It was never there before. We always thought we

could go out and chop down wild trees forever and we would never run out of them. Well, we found that is not so, and this government has brought in very extensive and important silviculture programmes. In other words, we are managing our forestry much better.

I do not have to point out what we are doing through the Department of Health and the new thrust we are putting into Tourism.

Members opposite are just making points when they say nothing is done. There are many things being done in many, many areas and it is going to take time and a heck of a lot of work, but it will come about, and ultimately, the basic causes of a chronic unemployment problem will have been addressed for the first time in our history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I guess it is probably one of our last chances to get some issues of concern to each of us as individual members of the House of Assembly on the floor and to be able to discuss them in a fairly open manner.

I do not view constructive criticism as being negative in a general sense, but not to appear negative, I mentioned earlier a time or two that there are some areas, I believe, in which both sides of the House could probably show a fairly high level of co-operation. I see nothing wrong

with a high level of co-operation between both sides of the House, providing it proves to be of some measurable benefit to some regions or some electoral districts and perhaps the entire Province. I would like to touch on one or two of those at this time.

We touched on, a couple of times, the funding with respect to the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation, and I was very pleased to be able to agree that it was a step in the right direction and something that perhaps is needed.

I was a little disturbed at the sort of light-hearted manner in which at least one media outlet today referred to - I guess it was being a little facetious - but they sort of treated the fact that they may soon be able to get Labrador caribou, which I believe is perhaps a viable enterprise. They seemed to treat it a little lightly, but maybe they were just joking, early morning humour or whatever. I think it is something of a serious thing. The pilot study showed that it could perhaps be viable with the right sort of support. I believe the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), for one, and perhaps many others on that side, are quite interested in seeing that become a viable enterprise.

If we have a narrow economic base in a Province-wide sense, we certainly have a very narrow base in Labrador, particularly parts of Labrador, and if this is an opportunity for the Inuit to show their resourcefulness and their enterprise, I think it is certainly a very worthwhile expenditure of money. I am pleased from that point of view.

To go on with something I just lightly or briefly touched on earlier, I would like to suggest again, perhaps in a little greater detail, that the minister and his colleagues, the other ministers who would be directly involved with this, for example, Culture, Recreation and Youth under the Wildlife Division, might consider entering into some kind of a project which, let us say in general terms, we could call it experimental caribou farming with a view to perhaps domesticating the animal. There are a number of different, I think, side benefits from that particular approach that would be beneficial to, not just the Inuit and the aboriginal people in Labrador, but perhaps a little wider ranging than that. What might be considered under that particular heading is the fact that if you have the caribou in captivity - I do not particularly like that word as to what it seems to connote - but if you have, under experimental caribou farming, the animals in captivity or under controlled conditions, I think it would allow some opportunities for biological study which I believe goes on anyway under the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth's Department. I think that that would provide an opportunity for closer study. Although at times, of course, you have to go into the field and see them in their natural habitat. A farm can be put very close to a natural habitat, except under control boundaries and so on. That might provide some opportunities for biological studies that would be easier than some of the other methods that have to be used from time to time.

As every hon. member knows, we have the largest free-roaming herd

in the world. I think the numbers are in excess of 500,000 animals. That in itself is quite an attraction but many, many people who go to certain parts of Labrador never get to see a caribou. We are talking about over 500,000 to start off with and visitors to our section of the Province have never seen a caribou other than in a freezer, steaks or roast or something like that.

It seems to me that that is almost a major attraction. Think of what has been done in tourism and so on on other continents, for example, Africa, where they have natural resource of wild animals and herds and so on and what an interesting attraction that could become. Where everyone cannot, once they get into, let us say for argument sake Happy Valley, Goose Bay, all the time, a lot of people get that far instead of further on out to Lake Eon area and other areas where you might see parts of the Georges River herd. I think from a tourist point of view, the fact that is an experimental farm project underway and a domestication effort for study purposes will also provide I think probably a half decent tourist attraction in the Lake Melville area. I have discussed that in other forums a number of different times.

Perhaps the ministers of the government might take into consideration that that might be another one of the other benefits that could be derived from the experimental farming I suggested.

Another thing and I have discussed this with the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) on an earlier occasion, that the Labrador Correctional Center, I think is probably lacking in land-based

rehabilitative programs that would be of some benefit to the inmates who are Labradorians in the Correctional Center. We might consider another benefit in that the experimental project. As I said, I have been talking about this in another forum for quite a number of years, prior to the center opening, and following its actual operation. If there was some way we could perhaps tie an experimental caribou farming project in with the Labrador Correctional Center, we would have the benefits of being able to do the biological studies and have the benefits that might be derived as a tourist attraction as far as the caribou are concerned. It also would provide a land-based rehabilitative program that I believe is lacking in the overall program right now. I visited the center a number of different times and I have discussed, in generality, some of the concerns and so on of those who must administer the center at the line level. I think that could be something that would be very worthwhile.

Certainly the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) would be aware, being a former resident of Happy Valley, Goose Bay, there are some geographic locations fairly close to the center which could be put to good use in that regard. So those are some of the immediate benefits that I would see which could be derived from that sort of an enterprise.

In all seriousness and with whatever support I could give to the government, I will ask them to have a look at those possibilities. I would be willing to discuss them with the ministers at any given time and offer some ideas of my own and ideas I have

garnered from talking with other people from Labrador and Naskaupi district, more particularly. There is a lot value in that sort of an approach, if we keep an open-minded and broad-minded approach to what we can do to develop that very valuable, natural resource that is inherited in the caribou herd.

There are a lot more things than the commercial caribou hunt or sport caribou hunt so we have to look at other aspects as well and be broad-minded and look at other aspects as well and be broad-minded enough and have a broader view so that we can derive the best benefits for the most people in Labrador.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I must say that since this session of the House started that is the first member of the Opposition who has spoken in a positive manner as to what this government is doing towards Labrador. I say to the hon. member keep talking like that and we will probably find a seat over here for you.

The hon. member mentioned about the media. I listened to the media this morning also and I think it was Mr. Dyke who was making some comments about the marketing of caribou meat on the Island. I should advise the hon. member that

since I heard that this morning I have been in contact with LIDC and subsequently Monday morning there will be an individual from LIDC responding to the CBC programme, answering all the questions that he threw out this morning, in a most positive manner.

Mr. Chairman, I should say also to the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) that his concern about domestic harvesting has been discussed for the past number of years and, in fact, I think if we go back through Hansard I brought it up to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth about two and a half years ago. I was talking to the wildlife biologist in Labrador, one of the best wildlife biologists in the Province, I might add, and he is very concerned about domestic harvesting. In fact, I would like to advise hon. members of the House that only just yesterday I came back from Labrador West, where a professor from McGill University, who was addressing the Labrador West Economic Conference, also touched on the domestic harvesting of the caribou. We realize there are so many caribou out there and if we do not take them, one of two things will happen. They will be killed off by the wolves or they will be taken by the people from Quebec. So I think we should have our share of these magnificent caribou.

MR. HISCOCK:  
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. HISCOCK:  
I agree with the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), on the idea to have an experimental farm and



health correctional center. We are talking about sending caribou meat down to other parts of the Island. What about Southern Labrador - Cartwright, Black Tickle, Paradise River and all those other areas? Those people see caribou in their back yard but are not allowed to kill them. I will be there speaking on this at a later date, but when Cartwright came out to Labrador in the 1700's he brought so many men and they stayed there for about fifteen or sixteen years and married local Eskimo and Indian women. When the people down in Southern Labrador talk about land claims, Mr. Chairman -

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, the point of order that I am making is that here is the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), as Parliamentary Assistant, talking about helping people on the Island part of the Province, but when it comes to helping other parts of Labrador he is doing nothing. When it comes to land claims, I am putting the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) on notice that the people in Southern Labrador have a claim and they should not be paying fees just the same as the people in the North. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, I could understand why the hon. member for Eagle

River (Mr. Hiscock) is saying that the hon. member is not doing anything for Southern Labrador, but the hon. member would realize that on CBC this morning, and on the radio station in Corner Brook which goes into his district, I announced \$14,000 for the Fishermen's Committee in Mary's Harbour, in Williams Harbour. It was done for the hon. member's district. It was announced this morning on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) by this hon. member.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. WARREN:

With regard to \$14,000 for Mary's Harbour or any other area of the Coast, I say to the member for Torngat Mountains and to the government side that we are not going to be bought off and shut up with \$14,000 grants. If we do not get the road to Red Bay done and help for tourism in other areas, then I say he can take his \$14,000 and probably put it towards his new house. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

I should, Mr. Speaker, make a comment back but I will wait for the hon. member to speak and then I will get up on a couple of points of order, probably.

Going back to the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), he was



really speaking very positively about some of the things that this government has done. I would also like to pass along to the hon. members opposite, and I think the hon. member for Naskaupi realizes this, that the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation has been given the possession of the Voiseys Bay fish camp and, through the Department of Justice, they are taking inmates from the correctional centre and bringing them up to those surroundings to assist with maintenance, upkeep and repairs and everything else going on with the Voiseys Bay fish camp. This building will be used primarily for the people in that particular area. I think I am on the same train of thought as the hon. member was, and, as he said, we should be doing more in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area. I believe that the hon. member is correct and I support the views and ideas he brought forward because they are very, very positive ideas.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that I appeared before a committee that was set up on recreational needs for the Province. I noticed that the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) was supposed to appear before them, and, while I may be corrected on that, I gather he did not appear before them on behalf of the party over there. At that time I brought out some of the needs of all Labrador, not only the Labrador Coast, but Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Nain, right down as far as the hon. member's district in Red Bay, L'Anse-au-Clair, Mary's Harbour, Port Hope Simpson, everywhere. Someone has to speak up for Eagle River, because unfortunately the hon. member cannot be found when the people want him. I cannot

help it if Mr. Strugnell calls me from Spotted Island. I cannot help it if Mr. Martin calls me from Cartwright. I cannot help it if Mr. Rumboldt calls from Mary's Harbour. They are concerned, they have to talk to somebody in the government, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, they are calling me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to say to the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), in my conversation with the wildlife biologist the day before yesterday at the meeting in Labrador City, he said they were going to be doing a biological study, a survey on the Mealy Mountains herd to see if there is the potential to harvest the Mealy Mountains herd within the next year or so. I understand requests have been made to do this study during this Winter to see exactly what the population of the Mealy Mountains herd is and hopefully, maybe within the next twelve months, there could be a commercial caribou harvest in the Mealy Mountains on a small scale.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Naskaupi and I have two things in common. One is no hair; the other is we both sat on the Town Council in Happy Valley - Goose Bay at the same time. Both of us got along well. I do not think any two council members could get along any better. But the thing which is most important is that the two of us have concern for Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, I have to compliment the member on his way of approaching his first year as an MHA in this House, and his way of showing concern. Once in a while

which all politicians make a slap at each other, but that is only part of the course and we all take this for what it is worth. However, keep up the good work, I say to the hon. the member for Naskaupi, (Mr. Kelland) and shortly you will replace the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, this is a strange and peculiar and unusual government, unusual in their incompetence, Sir. One could accept that, but they are also unusual in the way they want to lay blame. For example, witness the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who a few moments ago got up and blamed the high levels of unemployment in this Province on four factors, four factors, by the way, that we have known since early colonization. To his credit, at least he knew them, but he blamed the present levels of unemployment on these factors. For our narrow based economy, his solution, of course, was going to be that elusive dream that the government have been holding out to the people of Newfoundland now for some six or seven years the offshore. So he was going to take care of that one, but the problem about it is we do not know when it is going to be, we do not know when that activity is going to start.

Even now when things are suppose

to be in motion and we have the money committed, the \$300 million committed for putting in the proper infrastructure, we find out from the minister's statement that very little of that money was spent this year. Of the Province's portion, barely \$8 million was spent. We wonder why the delay? It is a five year programme. Now can the minister tell us what time are we going to start this? Is this all going to be left for the last year? Is the bulk of that money going to be spent in the last year, possibly when we are into an election year? Are they going to use that again for another election? Why the delay in spending this \$300 million?

The minister blamed the high rate of unemployment on the lack of skills of our workers, Mr. Chairman, and then went on with solutions. Now, again, that is something that we have known. If there is any lack of skills with the workers of this Province, the only people to blame are the government. These are the people that must accept this responsibility. Then he went on with the solutions. Our trade schools have been in existence for years and years and other post-secondary institutions, yet he still says we are unskilled and untrained.

We on this side of the House have alerted the government to the necessity of training people for the offshore. yet we hear, Mr. Chairman, that this was not done. In the last sitting of the House, last Spring, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), four or five years after this government started talking about the great benefits that we were going to get

from the offshore, decided that they were going to bring in a programme to train workers for the offshore. Now, Mr. Chairman, would you not admit that last Spring was a little late to initiate this programme of training for the offshore when we had been working out there for three or four years?

So, Mr. Chairman, they want to blame other extraneous institutions, other extraneous factors without accepting the blame themselves, without accepting the blame where it surely rests, Mr. Chairman, on the shoulders of this government. But, Mr. Chairman, they are a strange and a peculiar government. They want their cake and eat it, Mr. Chairman, they are a strange and peculiar government. They want to have their cake and eat it too. Well, I can tell you, they are eating something and there is lots of it, but it is not cake. Let me explain, Mr. Chairman, what they are eating.

MR. CALLAN:

How long have the trade schools been in this Province?

MR. LUSH:

When Mr. Diefenbaker was Prime Minister this Province received federal funding for our thirteen trade schools. Mr. Smallwood was the Premier. The minister talks about the great effort that this government have undertaken to take care of training the workers of this Province. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to say they want to have their cake and eat it too, and I was to demonstrate that, because they accept no responsibility for the terrible mess that the economy of this Province is in. They accept no

responsibility for that, Mr. Chairman. They went around last Spring asking for a mandate to create jobs, saying, 'Put us in, put in a Tory government because we have a Tory government in Ottawa, and we are represented there by a Prime Minister who said that he was not afraid to inflict prosperity on this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.' Mr. Chairman, they knew this was a federal government dedicated and committed to cutting expenditures. They knew this was a government dedicated and committed to cutting transfer payments. They knew that. This morning the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) gets up on his statement and talks about trying to justify again why he was wrong in his forecast and trying to lay blame again with respect to the deficit, that we are going to increase the deficit. Who does he blame? Who is the major culprit here? The federal government. These were the people who were going to inflict prosperity, and now he blames the federal government for the cuts in transfers, Mr. Chairman. They are eating alright, Mr. Chairman, but it is not cake. They are the people who must bear the responsibility because they are the people who went around trying to bluff the people of this Province, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

DR. COLLINS:

I just wanted to make sure that I understand the hon. member. The hon. member was previously saying we never criticized the federal

government. Is he saying now we criticized the federal government?

MR. LUSH:

I never mentioned the word 'criticized.'

DR. COLLINS:

Would he clarify whether we do or we do not?

MR. LUSH:

To that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Not only is the hon. minister incompetent with respect to handling the finances of this Province, he can not even comprehend the English language. He cannot even comprehend an articulate person.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, this government wants to lay blame. They lay blame for the high rates of unemployment in this Province on the people, untrained, unskilled, with no managerial skills. We have know all of these things, Mr. Chairman, but this government's job is to solve these things, to create employment for the people of this Province and not to state the long established traditional reasons why unemployment has been a problem in this Province. It is the job of this government to solve it and they are not doing it. It is their job to bring in prescriptions, to prescribe a cure, and they are not doing it.

They love to lay blame and now they are laying blame on the federal government for the increase in our deficit. Mr. Chairman, that was not what was supposed to happen. We were supposed to have no deficit when we got two governments of the same political stripe, when we were going to enter the new Jerusalem, that great promised land, and now we are seeing the results of it. This government cannot have it both ways, they cannot have their cake and eat it too. They now must be forced to eat crow. That is what they are eating, Mr. Chairman. The people of this Province, Mr. Chairman, as a result of that great election hopes, as a result of that colossal bluff, have completely lost confidence in this government. I will reiterate again, what they have done is a great injustice to themselves. They have done a great injustice to that political philosophy that was never widely accepted in Canada. They have done a great injustice to that Tory philosophy because never again will we not see a provincial and a federal Tory government together, we are not likely ever to see a Tory government in Canada anywhere as a result of the hypocrisy that this government have created throughout the Province.

I do not know whether other hon. members run into it but day in and day out, when I am going around Newfoundland, people tell me, they say, "Tom, I really voted Tory this time because I believed in having two government together, of the same political stripe, would be really beneficial. I really believed that. And we had not been in that kind of situation." I clearly told him that we had. I can remember the slogan, "We will

finish the drive in '65 thanks to Mr. Pearson." That was the benefit of two governments but they were two different governments.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Shall the resolution carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
The member is making such an excellent speech that I think we should give him another few minutes to finish his remarks. I would be glad, Mr. Chairman, to conclude my speech at this point and let the member continue.

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

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Chairman, again I want to say it is time that this government started doing something for this Province. It is time, Mr. Chairman, that this government started accepting some of the responsibility for the financial mess that this Province is in. It is time that the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) stood up in his place and told the people of Newfoundland why it is that we have a deficit.

I found it very, very strange this morning, when the member for St.

John's East -

DR. COLLINS:  
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman, as my good friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) so often says, the hon. member is not permitted to distort the truth even if he does it not deliberately. He is saying that I have not been talking about the deficit. I have been talking about a deficit since 1981. I have talked about the deficit in this House. I have talked about the deficit on the air. I have talked about the deficit in reviews. So, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is not being accurate when he says I have not talked about the deficit.

MR. KELLAND:  
To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:  
I appreciate the comments by the Minister of Finance when he says he has been talking about the deficit since 1981. In all truth, Mr. Chairman, he has had very little else to talk about. That is the method by which he operates.

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

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Chairman, it is time that the

Minister of Finance stood in his place and told the people of Newfoundland the real reason why we have a deficit, because of the incompetency of this government. That is the real reason. That is why we have a deficit in this Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, they like to lay the blame and they have got an awful gall. I see the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) coming in here and I want to say something to him, Mr. Chairman. Because I mentioned yesterday, when he brought in this submission, re: UIC to the Federal Commission of Enquiry on Unemployment Insurance, I asked the minister why he did not make a public presentation, why he did not present this in the public hearing, why he did not do it, to appear with everybody else. I said he was too embarrassed to do so.

Now, I want to elaborate on that because remember the minister presented this in secret, in camera, behind closed doors because he was too ashamed, too embarrassed to do it publicly. Imagine! The minister going before the Federal Commission and talking about the high rates of unemployment when he was a part of a government that has perpetrated the levels of unemployment on the people of this Province. Imagine that! So he could not do it. He could not appear in public. It would be too hypocritical to appear before this commission and suggest that the cure for high levels of unemployment in this Province was employment. Naturally, he has been a part of the government that has perpetrated that curse, that disease on the people of

Newfoundland.

The minister said that the commission complimented him on the detailed and comprehensive presentation. He said it was the most detailed and the most comprehensive presentation that they have received. I am going to tell the minister something. I want him to stand in his place and to tell us the truth about this. I have heard word that the minister was reprimanded by the commission, he was reprimanded because of the high levels of unemployment, that there were commissioners who told him that his government was responsible for the high levels of unemployment in this Province. Now let the minister get up and refute that. Was he indeed reprimanded by commission members? Was he? Was the minister reprimanded because he was a part of the high levels of unemployment in this Province?

Mr. Chairman, there is some reason why the minister did not present this in public. I have reason to believe that that is indeed true, the word that I have heard, that the minister was indeed reprimanded because he is indeed a part of the government that is responsible for the high levels of unemployment in this Province and he did not have the nerve to appear before the commission in public. He did not want to be reprimanded in public so he snuck it in. He went in secret to present this commission. What hypocrisy! What hypocrisy, Mr. Chairman, for the government of this Province to present this when they are the reason for the high levels of unemployment that we have in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, this is a government that has got to change its



tactics. They have to stop this notion, they have to stop this practice, they have got to stop this insidious method of laying blame on others. They have to stop this of laying blame on other governments, on other people, and on other extraneous forces. They have to get down to business and start doing something for this Province. They have to know what their job is. Their job is to govern this Province. They have some responsibility and they have to stop this blaming. It is time for them to initiate some financial and economic policies that are going to get this Province moving and that is going to create employment for our people. It is time, Mr. Chairman, it is time.

I hope that my urgent pleas are not falling on deaf ears. I hope, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of Newfoundland and Labrador, and for the sake of its people, that these suggestions that I am making will be responded to and cabinet ministers will get down to business and take their work seriously.

I know they are a bunch of tired people, Mr. Chairman, they have been around an awful long time, they have been around an awful long time, 95 per cent I suppose of the Cabinet ministers there have been there since the Tories came in power practically and their ideas are exhausted, Mr. Chairman, they do not have any ideas to attack the problems of today. They are trying to attack the problems with outdated solutions. They are not current, Mr. Chairman, with the ideas and approaches and concept that must be used in this technological age. They are almost antique. They are a tired bunch, Mr.

Chairman. I would like to see some of the backbenchers get into the Cabinet, some of the new people who are in, to see if we cannot get some ideas. Instead of that we still have the old, tired, members there who have no ideas, Mr. Chairman. The least we need right now is some new blood in that Cabinet, some new blood, and I hope that we get some new blood because we cannot carry on. We are on a road to disaster and as I said before, I hope my words have not fallen on deaf ears but that indeed the words I have said will be responded to. I am representing the views, I am bringing to this House the views and concerns of thousands of unemployed people throughout Newfoundland.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. members time is up.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman I will be speaking on this matter in question period as I have before and I will continue and any chance when I have the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman if I could have order please because it is an important matter.

The Minister of Finance stated that we have a narrow-based economy, mining, forestry, fishing and of course, potentials offshore, but one of the things that he did not mention is tourism. I am glad I heard the



Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth say tourism because I got a letter back from him the other day in reply to one I wrote in regard to Red Bay. The gentlemen on the other side do not know about Red Bay and the Basque whaling site, but they have had a major article in National Geographic, Equinox, on CBC, as well as in The Globe and Mail, The Evening Telegram and other major papers.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, the past summer myself and the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development were up in Red Bay and attended a Bakeapple Festival. We are quite familiar with where Red Bay is but, the people were asking where there member was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

I was on a holiday and the people of my district knew. The point that I am trying to make Mr. Chairman is that we have an economy here in this Province that needs developing and whether it is mining, fishing, or agriculture. Tourism is important. The Labrador Straits Tourist Association are rather concerned that with the publication of The

National Geographic we are going to have hundreds and possibly thousands of people come to Newfoundland and Labrador Straits looking at the Basque whaling site. When they to get to Red Bay, what do they find? They have to go over gravel road. They find out that there are no public toilets in Red Bay. There are no public restaurants. There is no motel in Red Bay. The Labrador Straits Development Association wants to set itself up as a corporation and get money from the Federal and Provincial governments to develop some basic facilities so that once the tourists come and go away they well say that this is a new site and they understand that it is not developed to its maximum potential, but they do have the basics. Whereas, if they come, Mr. Chairman, and find out what is going on, they will go back and give the Province a bad name. That may do more damage to Red Bay in the long run and to our tourists industry in the long run on that international spectrum. So I am asking the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) and the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) to pay close heed to what the Tourist Association in Labrador Straits is saying. I hope the member for Torngat Mountains, who is looking at me rather astutely, will use his influence to see that they get some services. There are only a couple of seconds left, Mr. Chairman, and I object to the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains interrupting instead of seeing that services are delivered to the people of Labrador-

MR. WARREN:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. HISCOCK:

- instead of getting money for the people of Labrador. That is what he should be doing instead of getting up on mere pits of points of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the hon. gentleman that only last week the President of the Tourism Association in the Straits area, Mrs. Shirley Little, and myself met with the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) concerning tourism in the Red Bay area. I can assure the hon. member that this government is paying careful attention to tourism in the Straits area and we are going to do everything we can. At the same time, when Mrs. Little was in here, she could not find the member to address the problems to.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, I am quite aware the President was in. In actual fact, the president and her husband and I had some drinks together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What! What!

MR. HISCOCK:

We did have a meeting.

The basic point that I want to make -

MR. PATTERSON:

It is one o'clock.

MR. HISCOCK:

Since it is now one o'clock, I will be bring it up at a later date. But I hope government will not put its head in the sand on this one. We have a major find, we have an opportunity to put ourselves on the international map with Red Bay, and I hope that the ball is picked up by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and by the Department of Development. I do not care who takes the credit and the Development Association does not care, but the fact is we have to get something on the go for next year.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I will adjourn the debate and will come back to this matter in both Question Period and debate at another time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee order to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m.

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