



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 28

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

7 June 1985

The House met a 10:00 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege to bring to the attention of the House of Assembly a matter whereby in recent days I have been harassed and obstructed in carrying out my duties as a member of this House of Assembly, it has been done by another member of this House of Assembly, and my performance as a member on behalf of my constituents of Bonavista South has been adversely affected. I refer to the remarks by another member of this House, in this case the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), who is also the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the House of Assembly on Privileges and Elections, which makes this matter even more serious, Mr. Speaker.

The Chairman, in public statements to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation a number of days ago, left the clear impression that if I did not comply with the wishes of this Committee, or comply with parliamentary rulings, that I could be jailed. Now since that time the CBC, and rightly so, has frequently referred to that statement by the hon. member for St. John's North. Now this kind of report in the public media is indeed adversely affecting my work as a member of this House on behalf of my constituents to the point of obstructing my work as an effective member, because the

statements leave the impression that I have done something wrong. Now, Mr. Speaker, because no member of the House of Assembly, or in fact any parliament in our parliamentary system, can be jailed for not complying with a parliamentary procedure or a parliamentary ruling - for example, refusing to answer questions to a Standing Committee, which was the charge made by Mr. Carter, the member for St. John's North - the member concerned must, Mr. Speaker, withdraw that statement and apologize to me for casting dispersions on me as a member of the House of Assembly and damaging my reputation as a member of this House, because, Mr. Speaker, he left the clear impression that I had done something wrong or illegal, and you can only be jailed for doing something wrong or illegal. You cannot be jailed, Mr. Speaker, for breaking the rules of this House of Assembly. I can be expelled by this House, I can be suspended by this House, but I cannot be jailed by this House, and no other member of this House can be jailed by this House of Assembly, unless the court procedures, the law is going to jail that person for something wrong, something criminally wrong.

I also feel, Mr. Speaker, if the withdrawal or apology is not forthcoming, that the member for St. John's North should resign as Chairman of the Standing Committee of this House on Privileges and Elections. Because it makes it more serious when someone, presently investigating a possible breach of another member's rights and privileges, at the same time makes statements to further take away the rights of that individual member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whether or not a

member sits in this House of Assembly is solely a decision of the people who elect him or re-elect him, or a decision of this hon. House through you, Mr. Speaker, in the Chair. This House does indeed have the authority to suspend or expel a member of this House for not complying or following parliamentary rules and procedures but at no time, Mr. Speaker, can this House of Assembly, or any member of this House of Assembly, or any committee of this House of Assembly, threaten to jail another member because of an issue pertaining to parliamentary rules and procedures.

Mr. Speaker, every member of this House is aware that as an individual member I have done nothing illegal or nothing wrong except to be fighting for my rights and privileges as a member of this House of Assembly duly elected by the people of the Bonavista South district. And I have done nothing more than that, Mr. Speaker, I have done nothing more than except to stand up for my rights as a member of this House of Assembly, and then be accused and threatened by another member that, if I do not comply with certain things I will be in jail. That leaves the impression that I am now some kind of a criminal or something - and rightly so, because the media are merely quoting another member - and that indeed, Mr. Speaker, is casting dispersions upon me as a member and adversely affecting my work as a member for my constituents. I get queries to the effect. Is what Mr. Carter saying right, that you are going to be jailed next week, Mr. Morgan? Can you carry working for us? We certainly hope you are not going to be jailed. But, Mr. Speaker,

that is the dispersion left by the member for St. John's North (J. Carter). And I say, Mr. Speaker, it was done not inadvertently, and that is the more serious matter. Surely, the Chairman handling a Standing Committee of this House must be competent enough to know the difference of these kind of procedures, he must know that, so surely he did not do it inadvertently. It was a vicious attack on my character, Mr. Speaker, done intentionally. And the key question is why was it done intentionally? That is the key question, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am asking you, in ruling on this matter, to ensure the protection not only of just me as one member of this House, but to ensure the protection of the rights of each and every member of this House of Assembly, by you, Sir, demanding the member who make this kind of statement and threat, if that was done, Mr. Speaker -

The Premier can very well be quiet while I am speaking and listen to my point of privilege, and not be interrupting with his comments.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A-a-a-w!

MR. MORGAN:

Never mind, a-a-a-w, Mr. Speaker! The Premier might think it is funny, but it is not funny for this member!

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, if any member of the House of Assembly is going to be allowed to threaten other members in the way I have been threatened by a certain member of the House, and get away with it, it is taking away the rights of all of us as members.

I am asking, Mr. Speaker, that you rule that the member withdraw these statements and apologize for them and, in doing so, prevent a reoccurrence of this whole matter, thus protecting all members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, not only has the member attempted to malign my character but, for some reason unknown to me - I would like to know the reasons why and I am going to pose the reasons why, because I am going to table the documents today in the House and make them public - the Chairman of that Committee is refusing to reply to correspondence from me, a member of this House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I understand the hon. member is trying to develop a prima facie case about the hon. the Chairman stating that the hon. the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) could be jailed but, at the present time, he is deviating from that. I would like him to confine his remarks purely to this point of potential privilege that he has brought up.

MR. MORGAN:

The point is, Sir, I am tying the two together, because the attempt to malign my character ties in with the question as to why that same hon. member, as Chairman of the Committee, is not responding and replying to questions I have asked him in correspondence I have written to him as Chairman of that Committee. Over the last number of days, I have gotten no replies to my questions put to the Committee Chairman. He is ignoring me as a member of the House of Assembly, and my questions put to him in

correspondence - and I will table the correspondence - with certain very important questions, and I am tying that, Mr. Speaker, into the other matter of his attempting to malign my character by his public statements.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take up too much more time of the House with respect to the point of privilege, but I will say I intend today, in Orders of the Day, to table a motion in this House of Assembly to deal with this whole matter in a proper way through debate in the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of privilege, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

The power of this House is unquestioned. The question was posed to me what limits of power this House had and I said that it has the power to have a person held in custody by the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Sergeant-at-Arms, when he is holding someone in custody, I presume, does not bring him back to his own house. He may bring him to a hotel but it is more like that he would put him under lock and key. Also, we found out yesterday when Mr. Joseph Maingot addressed the Committee that the four Atlantic provinces, as opposed to the House of Commons, have the power to fine recalcitrant members and I will read the relevant section from May: "The power of commitment is truly described as the "keystone of parliamentary privilege." As

was said in the Commons in 1593, "This court for its dignity and highness hath privilege, as all other courts have. And, as it is above all other courts, so it hath privilege above all other courts; and it hath privilege in jurisdiction too, so hath it also Coercion and Compulsion; otherwise the jurisdiction is nothing in a court, if it hath no Coercion."

"Without it the privileges of Parliament could not have become self-subsistent, but, if they had not lapsed, would have survived on sufferance. It has been used not only against private individuals, but also against sheriffs, magistrates and even judges of the superior courts; apart from its active exercise, the existence of the power of commitment lay at the back of the summary procedure by which, before a statutory remedy was provided, the Commons released from custody Members arrested in breach of privilege"... It goes on and on but it is page 117 in May. So I rest my case, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I must say that when the Chairman made that type of remark I had some wondering as to whether he should have made them. There is no doubt that he has made the statement that this is the highest court in the land but I think at this point - and I think I made that point myself - that at this point and at the point where the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) would not answer the

question, that our role was to report that to this House and the House would take whatever action it deemed appropriate. I must say that in speaking to this point of privilege that I did find at the time - I think it was at a night sitting of the Committee - I did find at the time that I thought the Chairman was going a bit overboard. Now perhaps the Chairman in Committee might not keep referring to hypothetical situations or to matters of theory that might or might not happen. I do not think that will serve any point in the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of privilege, I would like to refer hon. members to Beauchesne 201, Section 636, which states, "A witness must answer all questions directed to him even over his objection that an answer would incriminate him." And in Section 637, just the end of the first paragraph, "If he still refuses to obey, he may be ordered to be sent for in the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, or he may be declared guilty of a breach of privilege and ordered to be taken into the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms." Now, while I think we would all agree that this is not going to happen, or extremely unlikely, it is within the competence of the Committee to order that. In the opinion of the Chair there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, from my understanding of the rules, the Committee has to

report to the House. And because there is presently a motion on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, placed there by the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections (Mr. J. Carter), whereby an interim report was made by that Chairman, that it is now up to the House of Assembly. If the Chair made such a threat, Mr. Speaker, I would not have risen on a point of privilege earlier, but it was made by someone who did not have the authority to make the threat. It can only be made from this Chair and this House of Assembly. Only this House of Assembly can deal with a member of the House by expelling, by suspending him or her, or otherwise dealing with him or her. Arrested by the Sergeant-at-Arms was the term used. Arrested by the Sergeant-at-Arms, which is to escort the member from the House.

Only the Chair and this Assembly can make that kind of a ruling, not the Committee Chairman who made the threat publicly. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is the man was out of order when he earlier made the statement publicly, leaving as his clear intention that he was doing it to cast aspersions on me.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

If I might, I think what the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) seems to be bringing to this House is the feeling that perhaps the government has decided to close ranks and take on the

member for Bonavista South through the -

MR. FLIGHT:

That is right. That is what has happened.

MR. MORGAN:

Hear, hear! That is how it seems to me. It is that certain circle around the Premier.

MR. TULK:

I think that is the feeling I am getting on this side.

MR. FLIGHT:

And the Chairman has been too flippant.

MR. TULK:

Now I want to point out to the member for Bonavista South that that is certainly not the case of the Opposition members. We have not decided to take on any member or any witness or any person.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is right.

DR. COLLINS::

(Inaudible) over.

MR. TULK:

No, I am trying to get this thing under control.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is stating the obvious.

MR. TULK:

And if that is the case, perhaps the whole matter can be cleared up very simply by the Chairman standing in his place and saying that indeed that is not the case, and whatever apologies are necessary to the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan, by all means make them, if they are necessary.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I got in late this morning and I did not hear the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) as he initiated his point of order. But hearing the points, both back and forth I am drawn into the debate now to tell the hon. gentleman there opposite that he is obviously attempting to play politics with the situation right now. Because I can say that certainly is not the intent of the government of this Province, and it never will be the intent of the government of this Province.

From what I heard, the gist of what has occurred, it would seem to me, is that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) in his capacity as Chairman cited what the general rules of general application are. I mean, you can find many of them in the books, in Beauchesne and May and all the rest of them. The hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has taken exception to it because the hon. member for Bonavista South feels that it was said, from his point of view, in a threatening way to him specifically. You know, it is a matter of interpretation. I feel quite sure that the Chairman of the Committee, and certainly the government, was in no way attempting in any way at all to threaten the member for Bonavista South or any other particular member. This matter is now before the Committee. There is a motion before the House which will be dealt with very shortly, and we

can debate it at the time.

MR. MORGAN:

How soon?

MR. MARSHALL:

The Committee should get on with its deliberations, Mr. Speaker, and hopefully we can get this matter resolved. But certainly there was no intention to threaten the member for Bonavista South or any member in this House.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

For the benefit of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), I did not use the word 'threatening' I used the words 'it seems that the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) seems to think' - and I said 'seems to think' -

DR. COLLINS:

Well, that is what you rumoured.

MR. TULK:

Well, that is what seems to come through from every point of privilege he presents in this House, that the government is closing ranks on him.

MR. FLIGHT:

Isolating him.

DR. COLLINS:

Rumours.

MR. TULK:

I accept the word of the Government House Leader that the government is not, but then he must come to the conclusion that the member for Bonavista South is indeed saying that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter)

is attempting to isolate him for some reason or other. The member for Bonavista South is making a certain allegation which can be cleared up.

MR. FLIGHT:
Bring on the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
To that point of order, we are spending an awful lot of time day after day on this matter of looking into the privileges of the hon. the member for Bonavista South. I think it is very important, and it is particularly important to the hon. member for Bonavista South, but it has come around to exactly the same point every day.

There are a number of ways to deal with this matter: There is Motion 4 here which can be called; it can be dealt with by leave of the House. The way it is at the moment it is in the hands of the Committee and in due course they will bring back their report, and when that is on the Order Paper for debate, every hon. member will have ample time to debate and raise any objection that he may have at that time. There is no point of order.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A further point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, a point of order dealing with the procedures of a Committee of this House in not replying to correspondence from a member of this House, and I refer to correspondence to the Chairman of that Committee (Mr. J. Carter), dated June 4, and now being

tabled, in which I posed a couple of serious questions. I have not received an answer to this letter and I am asking in this point of order why it is that Committee does not follow the procedures of this House of Assembly. In that letter I posed seven questions and of that total I will pose them again to this House: 'Has the Committee Chairman discussed with the Premier any matter pertaining to the operations and procedures of the Committee, particularly my letter of May 29, 1985 to the Committee, which included a copy of my signed statement to the RCMP?' That is one question,

The second important question is this one: 'Did the Chairman discuss the Committee's interim report, tabled in the House of Assembly on Monday, June 3, with the Premier prior to its being presented to the House of Assembly?' These are very important questions I want answers to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I would refer the hon. member to Beauchesne, page 190, section 569, paragraph (3): "The Speaker has ruled on many occasions that it is not competent for him to exercise procedural control over the committees. Committees are and must remain masters of their own procedure." So it is up to the Committee to deal with that matter. There is no point of order.

Statements by Ministers

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the House today on the substantial progress achieved by Ministers of Regional and Economic Development at recent meetings in Vancouver. One of the items discussed was the "devolution" of the Industrial and Regional Development Programme.

This programme is the mechanism through which the federal government provides incentives to private industry. To date, this has been a programme totally funded and implemented by the federal government. Historically, expenditures under the programme, in Newfoundland, have been in the range of \$2.5 million per year.

The federal government has proposed that Provinces deliver a portion of the programme, specifically that portion related to small business, and involving capital expenditures of less than \$2 million.

In taking this action the federal government recognizes that the provinces are in a much more advantageous position to deal with local industry and react to the needs of the local community.

The provinces have been requesting such action for some time and the federal government are now responding to that request.

The devolution of IRDP will proceed through a subsidiary agreement under the Economic and Regional Development Agreement (ERDA) and the agreement will be delivered by the Province.

This agreement will provide for

higher levels of incentives and higher cost sharing ratios in the poorer areas of the country, thereby, emphasizing the fact that the programme, in part, will be a regional development initiative.

In the case of Newfoundland, the federal government is proposing an annual expenditure, through the agreement, which will be significantly higher than historical patterns. This indicates an optimistic forecast of private sector investment in Newfoundland over the next few years.

This agreement will also compliment incentive programmes already available under a number of other cost shared agreements, namely the Oceans Industry Agreement, the Tourism Agreement, the Burin Peninsula Development Fund and the Rural Development Agreement.

The Province welcomes the action taken by the federal government in regards to devolving IRDP and this again points out the close co-operation between both orders of government in harmonizing and streamlining government programmes for the benefit of the private sector.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, this is clearly a slow Friday. Devolution is the new term. I have news for the minister, IRDP has been there for some time and working, devoluting itself in such great urban centres as Port aux Basques, and so many other parts of this country. I have to say to the minister this is a typical Friday morning

statement where there was some fooling around and people saying, "Who has a statement that might help us get in the weekend papers?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about, "The federal government is proposing an annual expenditure, through the agreement, which will be significantly higher than historical patterns." I quote from the statement.

As past experience will show, it takes a lot more than the good will and the money of the federal government to crank up the private sector in this Province because, in addition to good will, and in addition to federal government money, we need a bit of initiative here at the provincial level.

I just came over here a few minutes ago in a cab and the cab driver - and those cab drivers are great conversationalists I must say. They have their finger on the pulse. - and this morning the cab driver said to me, "Do you work in the building?" And I said, "Yes". He said, "Do you know if Mr. Peckford has created all those jobs now that he got the permission?"

Mr. Speaker, this so-called initiative that is in this statement is not worth the paper it is written on until we have a provincial government and a Department of Development that stops frustrating the private sector in this Province, stops frustrating the creation of jobs. No amount of IRDP, no amount of devolution, no amount of bandying around of new words for old Band-aids will address the basic problem; the attitude of a government that does not understand the private sector and

does not care if it understands the private sector because it is too busy, too preoccupied, tucking away, in patronage appointments, people who have been rejected by the electorate, Tory rejects.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could stand here and welcome this kind of an announcement, but I know the spirit in which it is given. It is given to try to paper over a Black Friday, another Black Friday, of which we have had so many in this administration.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the Premier.

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh! There she blows!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the rules of this House, in a Ministerial Statement, the person from the other side who is responding to the Ministerial Statement has half the time that the minister has used in giving the statement, and I suggest to you now that the hon. member's time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that in this particular session the Premier is getting more and more practice. He has always been known to look ahead for the next

job and he is practicing to be Leader of the Opposition. Other than that, the point of order had no point at all.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the Premier is quite correct. The hon. member had gone over his time and I was lax in allowing him to continue.

MR. SIMMONS:
Kowtowing again!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. the minister, I would like to welcome to the visitors' gallery, forty-four students from Topsail Elementary, with their two teachers, Mrs. Newbury and Mrs. Norris, and six parents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
I would also like to welcome to the House, Mr. Shawn Power, Mayor of Buchans, and Mr. Sandy Ivany, Director of the LEAD programme in Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

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

It gives me great pleasure to announce a further advance in the policies of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador as it pertains to the residents of the North Labrador Coast.

Since 1977, the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and its predecessor, the Department of Rural Development, have operated the government retail stores in the communities of Nain, Davis Inlet, Hopedale, Postville and Makkovik. The merchandise sold in these stores include food, clothing, guns, ammunition, outboard motors, appliances and many other items. The selection varies from community to community reflecting the availability of some goods in nearby privately-owned operations. That is, the government does not intend to compete with private sector businesspeople operating in Labrador.

As part of government's continuing commitment to provide supplies to Northern Labradorians at a reasonable cost, the programme I am announcing today will aid the approximately seventy senior citizens of that area whose well-being depends solely upon a strict, fixed income.

Therefore, effective June 11, 1985, all old-age pensioners in the five communities served by government retail stores will be eligible for a 10 per cent discount on cash purchases up to \$100 per week per person. This discount will enable senior citizens of the North Coast to purchase both more provisions and higher quality provisions than they could otherwise afford.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to inform

the House that my parliamentary secretary, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), will be making the same announcement in his district in Labrador today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we support this move and we acknowledge that the senior citizens of the Coast of Labrador, particularly these Northern communities, need assistance, and, Mr. Speaker, nobody would deny these senior citizens the 10 per cent which is going to be provided by this new government policy.

However, Mr. Speaker, it does not go far enough. It is not good enough to deal with only that very, very, small percentage of senior citizens who are out there now, suffering hardship in this Province, and, Mr. Speaker, suffering hardship because of the policies of the hon. gentleman's friends in Ottawa. And what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is we see the Conservative government in Ottawa, through its de-indexing of the amounts payable to old age pensioners, we see them taking approximately \$1500 out of the pockets of senior citizens over the next five years. This is not going to make up for that hardship, it is not going to make up for the hardship to all the other senior citizens of this Province who are being adversely affected by Conservative policies.

It is interesting that the

Conservative party is sending out appeals for help from Ottawa, and to quote this appeal they say, in reference to the Budget, 'we are fighting for the financial and economic survival of Canada and each of us who believes in this government and Brian Mulroney's realistic policies must pitch in and do our part,' and they send a pledge form. I would like for the hon. gentlemen, and maybe for the Premier, to stand up and indicate whether they agree and have signed and sent back this pledge which says, 'I (blank) pledge my support to the Prime Minister and our government for the 1985 budget presented by Finance Minister Michael Wilson.'

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

I am sure by leave they would like to hear the pledge, Mr. Speaker, that they are being asked to send back. No, not by leave?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is not worth it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, again this year my department will be operating our fish plants in Northern Labrador. These plants involve processing facilities at Nain and Makkovik, and feeder facilities at Postville, Hopedale, and Davis Inlet.

In connection with these operations I am pleased to

announce today the following price increases to be paid to fishermen for their number one product during the 1985 fishing season. The price for large salmon, six pounds and over, Mr. Speaker, will be increased by ten cents, from \$1.65 to \$1.75 per pound.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
The price for small salmon will be increased by five cents a pound, from \$1.15 to \$1.20 a pound.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
The price for char will be increased by seven cents a pound. And for 1985 char will be purchased without reference to colour. This mean for large char, six pounds and over, the price will increase from seventy to seventy-seven cents per pound while for small char it will increase from fifty-five to sixty-two cents per pound. The decision to buy without reference to colour means that the net gain to fishermen in certain instances will be greater than seven cents a pound. During 1984 we purchased char according to two colour specifications, red, pink and pale, with the pink and pale product commanding a slightly lower price. For 1985 we will purchase all our char according to red price specifications thus, for a large pale or pink char, the price will be seventy-seven cents a pound as opposed to sixty-five cents a pound, a price increase of twelve cents a pound, Mr Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Our scallop prices, Mr. Speaker, will remain the same as in 1984 - twenty cents a pound for unshucked and \$3.50 a pound for shucked - unless market prices improve. Should that occur, Mr. Speaker, then our prices to fishermen will be adjusted accordingly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Our prices for groundfish will mirror those paid by agents of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation and the negotiated price agreement with frozen fish producers.

It is my understanding that the Saltfish Corporation has announced increases for some saltfish products and I want to assure fishermen in Northern Labrador that our prices for these products will be raised to reflect this increase.

Mr. Speaker, my department is fully aware of the role it plays in the exploitation of the Northern Labrador fishery and we are constantly striving to improve our effectiveness in that regard. I believe that these price increases, during a difficult period of our fishing industry, provides concrete evidence of this commitment.

I am very pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is simultaneously, today, making this announcement in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
That was the first point I was going to make to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) that the member for Torngat Mountains today must be having a field day and I would suspect he is unshucked.

In any case, let me say to the minister, on a more serious note, Mr. Speaker, that we welcome the price increases for the fishermen in Labrador. It is good news for them. But we would only wish that the minister, on some black Friday morning, as the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) said, could cheer up Newfoundlanders and the rest of the Newfoundland fishermen by coming in and telling them, assuring the rest of those fishermen, that they, too, were going to get an increase in their real income.

Now let me say this to the minister, he has made an announcement but does he believe, in view of the gas price increases and the fuel price increases that have been put in place by his federal counterpart -

MR. FLIGHT:
With his blessing.

MR. TULK:
With his blessing - I do not know about his blessing, at least he is silent - does he believe that the fishermen of Labrador are going to be any better off this year than they were last year? I think the point has to be made very clear to him that, of course, in many parts of Newfoundland, they are going to be a lot worse.

He also comes in here and talks about this price increase as if

the government had, through some action of its own, increased the price. Now I wonder if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, or does this have something to do with a price increase in the marketplace? Is this a result of government action?

AN HON. MEMBER:
We are buying it.

MR. TULK:
You are buying it but, I would presume, you are also selling it or, at least, you are hoping to sell it. The minister comes in looking for some action like the other ministers here as well, came in this morning looking for something for the weekend press and it was almost as if he had, overnight, created a price increase for the fishermen in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome this statement, we welcome the good news for the fishermen of Labrador but why does not the minister make some real statements like about the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation rather than coming in and just making those little minor statements? Now, we know why he is waiting -

MR. SIMMONS:
He is trying to scoop 'Garfield'.

MR. TULK:
He is trying to scoop 'Garfield' and besides that we know why he is waiting, he has a few more of his buddies who need political appointments and I suspect that somebody is going to be Chairman of that Northern Fisheries Development Corporation.

MR. FLIGHT:
Who is going to be Chairman of Northern Fisheries?

MR. SIMMONS:

What a crime, scooping Garfield like that!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier which perhaps it might indicate the reason why we have a Black Friday, and not just because of the caplin weather that is outside of the window. Mr. Speaker, the statistics are out on this past month's unemployment from Statistics Canada. And while, Mr. Speaker, there is an indication that the unemployment rate has reduced from last month's 23.6 per cent to 22.5 per cent, it is up, Mr. Speaker, over the same month last year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, in light of the figure - and this might answer, by the way, the question raised by that cab driver - now that the Premier has gotten permission to create a few jobs, has he started the process? Well, if we look at the number of jobs for the same month, in 1983 there were 175,000 working; 1984, 173,000; 1985, 172,000, some 3,000 fewer people working this month than there were in the same month two years ago, 1,000 fewer than this time last year. Is this what we can expect from the Premier in his living up to his mandate to create jobs?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) saw fit to ask that question today. And whilst we are not in as good a position as we were last year, we are not now, as we were in the last three or four months, going in the wrong direction. It is too bad the Leader of the Opposition did not see fit to point out that in April there were 161,000 Newfoundlanders working and in May there were 170,000 Newfoundlanders working. We actually created 9,000 in one month. That is not bad for one month.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Stop the nonsense! You did not create any.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So if the Leader of the Opposition is going to criticize us when the unemployment rate goes up, I think he should start complimenting us when the unemployment rate goes down. And remember, Mr. Speaker, that there were in the labour force 217,000 people in April, there were 223,000 in the labour force in May, for an increase of 6,000, if my arithmetic is right. So the labour force increased by 6,000 and we created 9,000 jobs. We even more than kept pace with the new numbers coming into the labour force. That is not bad for a government that just got re-elected on April 2 and this is June 7. I think 9,000 in a month is pretty good, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, on a supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

Has the Premier forgotten his response to my question about the same time last month, when he indicated that the reason, in his opinion, there were so few working at that point in time was because the ice was in? Does the Premier take credit for moving the ice out? Is that the extent of his job creation in this Province? And would the Premier be man enough to admit that as a result of his government's policies there are fewer jobs in this Province for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians this month than there were in the same month last year?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member after we have a few questions and answers going back and forth and he gets in trouble, has to shout and bawl and all the rest of it. The long and short of it is, Mr. Speaker, upon until this past month or so the unemployment rate was going up in this Province. Now it is turning around, and one of the reasons it is turning around is because very early on we went to pre-tender on something like \$25 million or \$30 million worth of projects even before the election was called.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, our policy of pre-tendering projects early in the year is starting to pay off. That is one of the reasons why we see the unemployment rate now going down. Nine thousand jobs, Mr. Speaker, in thirty days. Just imagine if we keep this up every thirty days for the next four or five months! What is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) going to do? Oh where, oh where will he go to have a criticism against this government? Nine thousand jobs in thirty days is good in any society. And watch out, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition may have to start eating his words over the next three of four months.

MR. BARRY:

A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier is misleading, I am sure that it cannot be intentionally, but the Premier is misleading the House and trying to mislead, but they will not be misled, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, when he says that employment is turning around. Mr. Speaker, the point is that the unemployment rate for this month, in this year, is higher than it was in the same month last year.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

MR. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is on his second supplementary question. He is making a speech, he is going off into his usual tantrums and fits of spite, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, in Question Period, on supplementary questions, there is to be no preambles, no speeches. The hon. gentleman did not get the answer he wanted so he should not go off in his little spiteful tirades.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, there should not be any need for a preamble in a supplementary, or final supplementary question.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, my question was and still is, would the Premier admit that the unemployment rate is higher this month than it was for the same month last year, and does that not indicate that instead of turning around and improving the economy, the economy is getting worse because there are fewer people working this year than there were last year? And would the Premier also acknowledge that any improvement in the unemployment rate, seasonally adjusted, seasonally adjusted unemployment rate, and I would like to stress that, Mr. Speaker, as they do month by month, would the Premier admit, as Statistics Canada officials volunteered themselves, that the only reason for any improvement in the rate this month over last month - not over last year - is because there have been so many people dropping out of the labour market in

despair and have stopped looking for work?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, may I quote to the hon. gentleman the words of Oliver Wendell Holmes when he said, "I find the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand as in what direction we are moving."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Right now, Mr. Speaker, we are moving with 9,000 more jobs. We still have in this Province more people coming into the labour force per capita than most anywhere else in Canada, because we were later in getting some of our young people, and the women participation rate in the labour force is increasing at a higher rate in Newfoundland than almost anywhere else in Canada now. Six thousand more people came into the labour force from April to May of this year, 6,000 more, but the economy of Newfoundland was still able to create 6,000 job for those 6,000 new people who came in, and 3,000 more, to help get our unemployment rate down. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is performance. As the great Mr. Holmes said, It is not where we stand, it is in what direction we are moving. We are moving in the right direction, and it is too bad the Liberal Opposition are not willing to participate in the movement in the right direction that the economy of Newfoundland is now starting to take.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, Oliver Wendell Holmes also said -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I understood that was a final supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, it was. If I could just point out to the Premier, Oliver Wendell Holmes also said that 172,000 is less than 173,000.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On Thursday, May 30, the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), in answer to a question, made a statement in this House concerning PCBs. He gave the impression, and this was supported very strongly by the Premier and the members opposite, that PCBs were not really harmful, that they could be used as a local treatment for rheumatoid arthritis, that they are used as cleansing agents and that there has been extensive exposure of the people of Japan to PCBs, who have been eating it for years without any observable effects. I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), recently back from his trip to a PCB conference, if he would support those statements made by the Minister of Health?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I was not in the House when those statements were made but I understand that my good friend, the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), has a pretty broad knowledge of the medical profession. From what I have read about PCBs, there is no conclusive evidence that it is cancer causing.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Does the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) know -

DR. TWOMEY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. TWOMEY:

I think if you carefully look over Hansard what I said the other day was, 'Yes, they have eaten rice in Taiwan and in Japan, yes, people have been exposed to it. The World Health Organization has not been able to affirm that there is any direct relationship between PCB and cancer except in mice, and I did not mention mice last day. I said the other, that it was used empirically, 'empirically', I say, and I did not recommend it as a treatment for rheumatism or any other disorder.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

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

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

MR. BAKER:
I cannot speak to the point of order now?

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

MR. BAKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Does the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), recently back from his conference, know that PCBs have been linked to brain, nerve, liver and skin disorders, that there have been teratogenic effects in lab animals from PCBs, that in Japan, which the Minister of Health referred to, the breakdown products of PCBs in human metabolism, one of them called dibenzofuran, causes eye problems, nausea, vomiting, darkening of the skin, acneiform eruptions? Does he know that another one of these breakdown products of PCBs, and these are called arrhenoxides, have in fact caused changes in the nuclear composition of cells and have been in that sense linked to cancer? Does he know, Mr. Speaker -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Supplementary questions are supposed to be brief.

MR. BAKER:
They are all questions.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The hon. member, then, should ask one at a time rather than take up the time of the House on a whole range of questions which is only supposed to be one question.

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

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, I was asking a question. If you will look back in Hansard, the record, you will find the whole thing was a question. Does he know these things? Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that - this is an important matter - in light of the fact that in the United States the environment protection agency has established a maximum acceptable limit -

PREMIER PECKFORD:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The hon. member is now into a preamble and not even into a question, and the question is supposed to be brief in the first instance. So the hon. member is out of order.

MR. BAKER:

I am speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member was getting away from the point of order that was raised. I would ask the hon. member now if he would direct a question to the hon. minister. I found it difficult to follow the hon. member, there was a series of questions, one after the other at the time. Maybe he would direct a question now to the hon. minister.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, in light of all of this information that I can verify, and in light of the fact that the US Environmental Protection Agency has established that for humans to be able to consume fish safely, the acceptable level of PCBs in water is fourteen parts per trillion, not million or billion, but trillion, in light of that, Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), still support the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) in the rather irresponsible impression he left with the House last Thursday?

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that the hon. rookie member for Gander (Mr. Baker) does not understand the mandate of the Department of the Environment for which he is the Opposition critic. The mandate of the Department of the Environment is to make sure that we know where PCBs are stored, if they are in use, and how they will be transported. These were the

issues that I dealt with with my counterpart in Montreal on Friday, May 31. If you have specific questions about health problems, then I would suggest to the hon. member that those questions be directed to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), who is quite competent to answer them.

MR. BAKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) is supposed to be the Minister of the Environment and he is supposed to look into -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I would ask the hon. member to direct a question to the hon. minister.

MR. BAKER:
When, Mr. Speaker, and this question is directed to the Minister of the Environment, when is the Department of the Environment going to stop being a fawning, sycophant, yes-man agency, and publicity agency for other departments of government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, that question really does not deserve an answer.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, I did not get an answer to the other questions either.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
.Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! A point of order,
the hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:
Mr. Speaker, I think it has been
scientifically established now
that PCBs have been known to be
linked with that dreaded disease,
liberalism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My
question is to the Minister of
Career Development and Advanced
Studies (Mr. Power) but, since he
is not here, I will direct it to
the Premier. We are moving in the
right direction. I have to
disagree. My question is, since
the unemployment rate for youth
has gone from 38.5 per cent up to
40 per cent this month, is there
any plan of action in the near
future to do something to attack,
or do something about it? I give
you that question.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, over the next
couple of months I think we will
see the same trend develop with

the younger people of the labour
force as is now developing with
some of the older people in the
labour force. There are two
thrusts: One is that we are now
up to about 2,000 jobs for
students under the SEED programme,
and there are 4,000 more to go.
So that will assist. Secondly,
that I know of right off the top
of my head, the Minister of
Forest, Resources and Lands (Mr.
Simms), for example, will be
announcing over the next number of
weeks a number of reforestation
and silviculture programmes, many
of them targeted all around the
Province, and there is going to be
a fairly high percentage of youth
get jobs in those programme. So
that is two specific initiatives
that the government will be taking.

We already started one in the SEED
programme, there are 2,000 jobs
there now, and that will go to
6,000 or perhaps a little bit
more. Then in the silviculture
reforestation area we are going to
be moving with quite an array of
projects, starting the latter part
of this month, into July and
August and into the Fall, that are
going to help that segment of the
labour force. So there are two
right off the top of my head that
we will be doing and I know there
are others.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Could I just interrupt the hon.
member for a moment to welcome to
the galleries Joe Crane, a town
councillor from Stephenville, and
Pat Griffin, a city councillor
from Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

On that I welcome those things. That is fine and dandy. Now, you have 40 per cent unemployment for people in that age group who are actively seeking work. I am wondering if there are going to be any actions taken? The Youth Advisory Council has made recommendations, they are an arm of the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, and I am wondering if any of those recommendations are being considered and if they will be implemented in the near future? Because they are very constructive, and would help in starting to solve this problem?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, they are being reviewed and will be reviewed by the minister and by Cabinet. And if there is more we can do besides what we will be doing this Summer, we will do it. I attended a very successful Youth Conference on the weekend. It was a Progressive Conservative Youth Conference here in St. John's. We had thirty-five or forty districts represented, a couple of hundred youth here, and we will be following that up with another conference in the Fall. We will be taking the recommendations from the Youth Advisory Council very seriously, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth to whom they report, and if any additional programmes come from that body, we will be only too happy to introduce them. But we are moving, Mr. Speaker, to create more jobs in that sector of the

labour force and we will continue to do all we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It seems that the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is anxious to get into the action here this morning, so I will give him a chance now by asking a question regarding health. In the Budget \$2 million have been earmarked for work on the Central Newfoundland Hospital. Would the minister tell us exactly what can be expected to be accomplished this year at the Central Newfoundland Regional Hospital in Grand Falls with that \$2 million? What exactly will that \$2 million pay for in this fiscal year?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you. I can get him the exact details on paper, if he wishes. But I can give him an overview, and if that does not suffice, I will be glad to give him the rest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. TWOMEY:

There is architectural planning, one, preparation of the ground

site for the extension of the new hospital, and, I believe, changing the modules for patient care within the hospital itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Construction will start.
Construction will begin.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) wants to defer the question to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the member for Grand Falls, he can do it. But I would like to ask the minister, a commitment of \$16 million was made to the Grand Falls Hospital, would the minister indicate to the House how many extra beds will be established at the Central Newfoundland Regional Hospital when that \$16 million is spent.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I presume you are talking about new beds?

MR. FLIGHT:

New beds.

DR. TWOMEY:

On the ward service? New beds will not be provided on ward service or ward level for patients, but beds will be

provided in the outpatient department. There will be changes in other departments. The pediatric center is being reduced in size because they find that there is not a need to have so many pediatric beds because of the changes that have occurred during the last few years in pediatric medicine. A lot of that work is being done in outpatients, as you are aware of, at the moment. This is not happening in Grand Falls alone, but I believe in all pediatric hospitals and all hospitals that treat pediatric patients all over the world. This is factual. If the chassis of the Central Newfoundland hospital is being built, and if there is an necessity after the commission has resurveyed the request for the Central Newfoundland hospital, beds will be put in there and that has been promised.

I could go on but I do not want to take up the time of the House. The bed requirements: We can go into population, we can go into bed requirements, and I will be prepared to give all these facts here and now if necessary.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) that the people of Grand Falls and Central Newfoundland are not interested in what is going on in Zimbabwe, or going on all over the world with regard to health and with regard to what is happening with health services, they are interested in whether or not, having spent \$24 million this past

five years on the Grand Falls hospital, and after having made a political football of it for ten years, they are going to get the beds they so desperately need. So, now, the Minister of Health should stop philosophizing and reminding this House that he is a direct descendant of British aristocracy, or a reincarnation of Winston Churchill, because the people in Central Newfoundland are not interested in that, they are interested in how many beds we are going to have in the Central Newfoundland hospital.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is going into a speech again on a supplementary question. There are people on the other side who want to get into the Question Period, and the hon. gentleman is making a speech as well as spewing his usual little innuendoes and little, tiny insults about the ancestry of the hon. gentleman, of which the hon. gentleman, I know, is quite proud, as we are equally proud of the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase the question.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I would ask the hon. member if he would pose his question right away?

MR. FLIGHT:

The Central Newfoundland Hospital serves all of Central Newfoundland. The Premier has

taken care of the Buchans hospital situation, he has talked for a month and a half on chronic care. I am not talking about chronic care, I am talking about the Central Newfoundland hospital.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member if he would please pose his question?

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) for the record, and for the needs of the people of Central Newfoundland and their desire to know what to expect from their health service, indicate to them how many new beds will be created by the expansion of the Grand Falls Hospital, how many new beds in Grand Falls over the life of that programme? How many new beds will the \$16 million provide, and when?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

I am a little bit surprised at my friend who is being overcome by the exuberance of his verbosity, because I thought I answered that question in my first reply.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, you did not.

MR. RIDEOUT:

He did so.

DR. TWOMEY:

Yes, Sir, I did. I told you emphatically beds are not going to be increased in the Central Newfoundland Hospital at this present time and, to the very best

of my knowledge, we have the concurrence of the Board of Directors that they have accepted this fact. We also have the concurrence of the Board of Directors that they are quite prepared to listen to the commission's report on where extra beds, if any, should go. And I know that you have read extensively, as you have asked me these questions, and you are aware that the Royal Commission on Hospitals and Nursing Homes have recommended a downward trend in beds - 350 to 355 - with an increase in the chronic-care beds. I have answered your question, I will answer any questions straightforwardly, I do not need a lot of preamble. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to keep the question very simple because I do not think there will be a chance for a supplementary. My question is for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. I am going to give you all of it because I am not going to get a chance for a supplementary, I can see. First of all, have you hired Everett Osmond yet? Secondly, how much are you paying him? If you have not hired him and intend to, how much are you going to pay him? And thirdly, if you could avoid hiring this obvious political appointment, how much more of a

discount could you give to the senior citizens of the North Coast of Labrador? And if you kept the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) home as well, how much more of a discount could you give them?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, there was a barrage of questions there. I would say it would be more appropriate to place them on the Order Paper. I have been attending meetings in Ottawa the past two days, dealing with aboriginal peoples of our Province. I will have to find out the facts for the hon. member. I know I have been trying my best to convince Mr. Osmond to come to work for us, we need someone for special projects. And knowing the man's ability, I would certainly be proud to have him work for my department. I will get the exact details for the hon. member as to when and if and how much and whatever else.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On June 3 I put a question to the hon. the Premier because the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell) was not in the House. I see he is in the House today and very simply, without preamble or anything, I

would like to ask the hon. minister, concerning the proposed hike in CN fares, if he would tell the House what is being done to stop that increase.

MR. RUSSELL :
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RUSSELL :
Did you say you asked this question on Monday or Tuesday, when I was not here?

MR. EFFORD:
That is right.

MR. RUSSELL :
Would the hon. member mind repeating his question?

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. member what his proposal was to curb the hike in the CN bus fares.

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

MR. RUSSELL :
The minister will do all he can within the jurisdiction of his department to protect the consumers. Until such time as I am able to provide the hon. member with an answer, I will take that question under advisement.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
I contacted some people at TerraTransport and, according to them, a rate of increase of 9 per cent will become effective July 1. The proposal is already put forth to the CTC, and this is a very important fact, due to the de-indexing of senior citizens' pensions. Low-income people are the majority of the people who use this thing. So we will let this go by.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question. There is no need for preamble to a supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:
A very simple question, Mr. Speaker: What does he intend to do to stop this increase in the bus fares?

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

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, I think that question is better posed to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or the Premier, have an obligation to require ministers to remain in their seats while Question Period is ongoing. I have a question this morning, a very important question, for the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt). About ten minutes ago, he left his seat, and consequently, I cannot ask the question.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, my!

MR. W. CARTER:

It is a very serious matter!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Notices of Motion

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the following resolution to the House of Assembly:

"WHEREAS the House of Assembly appointed a Committee on Privileges and Elections and instructed that Committee to investigate possible interference with the rights and privileges of

a member of this House of Assembly, namely, the member for Bonavista South; and

WHEREAS the Chairman of that Committee, the hon. the member for St. John's North, has attempted to malign and cast aspersions on that member, further interfering and somewhat obstructing the member for Bonavista South in his performance as a member of this House of Assembly; and

WHEREAS the Chairman of that Committee on Privileges and Elections refuses to properly respond to correspondence and refuses to answer questions of members of this House regarding the procedures of the Committee;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT this House of Assembly order the hon. the member for St. John's North to carry out his duties as Chairman of that Committee, on investigating the possible interference with rights and privileges, in a responsible and proper manner; that he be instructed to reply to correspondence and questions put to him by members of this House of Assembly; and that he be ordered to refrain from making any further statements attempting to malign the character of any member of this hon. House of Assembly." Barring this, Mr. Speaker, this House should order the removal of that member from the Privileges and Elections Committee.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move the House

resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the raising of loans by the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, entitled "An Act To Amend Certain Acts Having Regard To The Canadian Charter Of Rights And Freedoms."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honoured today to present to the House a petition signed by approximately 2,300 people, most of them I believe from around the Baie Verte Peninsula, but certainly relative to a subject that is very important to the people of Round Harbour and Snooks Arm in my constituency.

The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is that, "We, the undersigned, the public, do strongly oppose the decision made by the Green Bay School Board to close the elementary schools at

Snooks Arm and Round Harbour. Due to the fact that roads are not open to those places during the Winter months, we find it very unreasonable for small children to have to walk up over the hills which surround those communities and wait in freezing temperatures for a bus." And they go on to say that under no conditions will they allow their children to make the fifty-six mile round trip bus ride per day to the school in LaScie.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the prayer of this petition, and in supporting unequivocally and whole-heartedly the prayer of this petition let me say that I find it inconceivable and I find it unacceptable how any five, six or seven-year-old child can be made, Mr. Speaker to walk, and I say walk, because Round Harbour and Snook's Arm, Mr. Speaker, from October or November, whenever the first snow flies, until the snow is gone in May or June, as members in this House might know, are isolated communities. You cannot get on a bus in January, February, March or April and go down around Round Harbour or down around Snook's Arm, pick up the children like you can in Ming's Bight or Pacquet or in St. John's or somewhere else and take them on a bus and take them to LaScie to school. You cannot do it and there is nothing that you can do, Mr. Speaker, to make it happen.

You can throw \$5 million each at the hill coming out of Round Harbour, at the hill coming out of Snooks Arm and it will still not be possible to send a bus or any other rubber tire vehicle down in those communities in the Winter months. So the communities, Mr. Speaker, are effectively isolated. They are just as isolated as Harbour Deep, they are

just as isolated as any community on the North Coast or the Southern Coast of Labrador.

So on this decision I have said publicly, and I have attempted to meet with the board I might add, Mr. Speaker, but to date they have refused to do so -

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. FENWICK:

We have had some arguments about the direction that petitions are addressed to and that may be a properly worded petition but it sounds to me very much like it is being addressed to the Green Bay School Board, or it should be addressed to the Green Bay School Board, but I just wanted the member to assure us that it is directed to this House for consideration.

MR. RIDEOUT:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not think it specifically says that it is addressed to the House or to the Green Bay Board, but it was brought to me by representatives of the parents group to present to the House. So I hope I am in order and it is certainly an original and signed by 2,300 people. The prayer of the petition is all there and all that.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I will be quite frank with the Speaker, I think that the point was raised the other day by the government side about a petition presented by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) and I believe another one presented by the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford).

I think this is getting to be quite ridiculous. The intention of the petitions are well-known and I think the Speaker should take a close look at what is going on in this House when we have people jumping up and down saying, "Is the petition really addressed to this House?" The intentions of the petitions are well-known and I would like for the Speaker to take another look at all of those cases.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly clear. The point that was raised the other day, in the case of the petitions by the member -

MR. TULK:

It is the same as this one.

MR. SIMMS:

No, it is not. In the case of the member for Eagle River, the prayer

of his petition clearly said, "We hereby petition the federal government." Now that is distinctly different from the provincial issue that the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has raised. And Mr. Speaker, I believe, has already indicated that he was going to consider that whole area. I am not sure if he did make a ruling while I was away from the House but I agree with the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that it is a serious matter, there needs to be some clear direction on it and that was the reason it was raised the other day.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, I would like to consider this matter carefully because this problem seems to be cropping up continuously.

When the petition is presented I have not had the opportunity of seeing the petition. I do not know exactly the wording of it, whether we should change that so that petitions are looked at beforehand, I do not know, because the responsibility really is to the member presenting the petition to see that it is in order and correct.

I would like to give that a little bit of thought and I would certainly welcome any comments that any hon. members have to say on that matter.

So the hon. member is in order.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I guess the five minutes allotted for petitions has pretty well run out, but, just in closing let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I have attempted to resolve this matter with the particular

board concerned. I have attempted to arrange meetings with the board and representatives of the parents and, to date, there has been no satisfactory resolution reached and I cannot in all conscience, and I support the board on many, many things, but I cannot, Mr. Speaker, in all conscience as the member representing those people, stand idly by and not express in the strongest possible terms my concern that you cannot bus five or six or seven-year-old students out of Round Harbour and Snooks Arm.

I do not care if you get down to five or six students, or if you get down to two or three students. There are provisions under special allocations within teaching units to make sure that there is a school operated in those communities.

If there is a problem with capital expenditure to upgrade the school a bit, well this year all the denominational education committees have more money than ever they had before. There has to be a will here to make sure that those students are not put through the misery of having to walk up over 2,000 or 3,000-foot cliffs twice a day to get to school. I do not think that that is what the education system in this Province is all about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will table the petition and ask that it be directed to the department to which it relates.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, one of my earlier incarnations was as a superintendent for those two schools. So I know rather directly what the minister and the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has been speaking about. I support the prayer of the petition. I would like to see the school in Snook's Arm, the school in Round Harbour and other schools such as these continue.

I appreciate the position the school board is in, and I took encouragement from the latter remarks of the gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay when he implied that he would leave no stone unturned. I think his phrase was, 'He would not stand idly by.'

I would, if I were the school board or the superintendent, construe that to mean that he will not stand idly by. That he will recognize that the issue is one in which the government could play a role. At the moment, because of current teacher allocation stipulations, the lever is there on any school board in favour of playing the small schools against the large ones. The lever is there to encourage boards to close out those one and two-room schools because of the teacher allocation provisions. And, of course, the only people who can change that situation is the Executive Council of this Province, the Cabinet of this Province.

So I would appeal to the gentleman to stand by his words not to stand idly by, and to take to Cabinet, and first discuss with his colleague the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) a way that could address the particular dilemma that is being faced by those small schools.

There are not a lot of numbers there therefore not a lot of votes there, but I am sure he rises for other reasons. The issue is quite different. It is a humanitarian issue. And I quite agree with him that given these roads, and this is not to cast aspersions on the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) because no matter how much money he dumps in there, he is not going to be able to remove the hills. And you are always going to have a fairly hazardous bussing situation at the best of times.

For all of those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the prayer of the petition. And in so doing, to state that I understand the position the board is in. They are pulling within existing regulations. It seems to me as one who knows something about the situation in Snook's Harbour and Round Harbour that the optimal solution would be for the minister who tabled the petition to talk to his colleagues with a view to having the regulation broaden.

I am not sure it would cost that much money, Mr. Speaker, but it would address an important principle to have the regulation doctored, if you like, tailored is probably the better word, to suit the particular requirements of Snook's Harbour and Round Harbour so that they are not continually being played off against the larger communities in this Province.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for bringing the petition to the House. The number of names signed to the petition shows the serious situation that is involved here and the concern of the people in the area.

We have in Newfoundland, because of our geography, the need to bus students to central locations on occasions, sometimes, perhaps, against the will of the people involved. But, here we have an entirely different situation where, even though, we might want to bus the children to a larger centre because of the size of the school etc., the geography of the area prevents the people from doing it successfully. The hills involved in both communities are so steep that it is dangerous at the best of times, I understand during the Winter season it is impossible at all to navigate in the area. Consequently, young children have to walk for a considerable distance to the top of the hill in order to catch the bus.

When we talk about centralization of schools and improving education the bottom line is usually the dollar. But I think also there are times when we cannot consider the dollar value when we are looking at the safety of the lives of young children. So, we are very concerned about the situation. I have my officials looking into it right now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ensure the hon. member, and hopefully we can find a successful resolution to the problem.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Before calling Orders of the Day I want to acknowledge in the gallery seventy Grade IV, V, and VI students from St. Bernard's

Elementary School, Witless Bay, in the district of Ferryland, accompanied by their teachers Sister Theresa Devine, Vince Ryan, Barbara Cleary, Brenda Fardy, and Gertrude Corrigan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Committee of Supply.

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

Committee of Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

I wonder if I could ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) when he intends, or if he intends, to appoint a Deputy Chairman of Committees? We almost lost a Chairman this morning.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The Deputy Speaker and the

Chairman of Committees is doing such a stupendous job, he is doing the job not just of one but two or three people, that it has not even occurred to us that he needs any relief but we will be doing it shortly.

MR. TULK:

Have you got problems inside your caucus you cannot find anybody to fill the role?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, it seems that under the Standing Orders there is an obligation on the part of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to make that appointment. There is an obligation to help Your Honour in the Chair by having a Deputy Chairperson.

We understand that there are internal caucus problems with respect to appointments and we understand that the Government House Leader and the Premier may be put in a very difficult position if they have to make any further appointments since, as I understand, at last count it was only the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) and the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) that had not received recognition through appointment.

Now could the Government House leader be more specific. We need a Deputy Chairperson and how can this House function if we do not have a Deputy Chairperson?

It is a fundamental breach of the

Standing Orders of this House. It is a deliberate attempt by the Government House Leader to subvert the workings of this Assembly by not appointing a Deputy to relieve Your Honour of your onerous duties periodically.

Mr. Speaker, it is cruel and unusual punishment to force the Chairperson to stay in the Chair for the entire Session. That is just not fair to Your Honour and we would like to hear from the Government House Leader why it is we do not have that appointment of a Deputy Chairman. Is it because of the serious internal dissension that we hear about in the caucus? Is that why this appointment is not being made?

Now, Mr. Chairman, to get on to the main thrust of my remarks I would like to ask the Premier, we are waiting for the Premier to come into the House, I think the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) yesterday asked that the clock stop until the Premier came in? Did the clock stop?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. BARRY:

The clock did not stop.

Mr. Chairman, is there any way that we might get the Premier in to deal with his own estimates, that is the least that we could expect, that the Premier deal with these estimates of his office and the Executive Council Office.

In the absence of the Premier perhaps somebody else over there would indicate to me whether all of the lap dogs have signed this pledge of support. Now, I would like to read it out in full so that the House will have it, Mr.

Chairman.

This has been sent down by Mr. Peter Elzinga, MP, combined with a letter. He is right there, he is one of Mr. Mulroney's key people and he is saying that we are fighting for the financial and economic survival of Canada and each of us who believes in this government and Brian Mulroney's realistic policies must pitch in and do our part. The letter goes on after that to say that the dread Liberals and NDP have joined forces in a united attack - and listen to this - 'on our tough but fair plan to provide growth and new jobs and reduce the deficit.' 'Tough but fair' is what Mr. Elzinga is saying. I would like members opposite to indicate whether they believe that.

Is it fair to our senior citizens, that is really the main question, and are members opposite going to or have they already signed this pledge of support? I will read it out, 'I, (blank), pledge my support to the Prime Minister and our government for the 1985 budget presented by Finance Minister Michael Wilson.' Now listen to this paragraph. 'I support the fiscal and economic policies of our government and recognize the need for a national conscientious respecting these vitally important policies.' Do members opposite support the measures contained in the Wilson budget which would take money out of the pockets of old age pensioners or senior citizens in this Province? Do members opposite stand up for taking \$1,500 away from our senior citizens over the next five years?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this pledge of support goes on and says, 'I know that the future economic health and social stability of our nation

requires the government to utilize strong restraints on federal spending if a firm foundation is to be prepared for the future economic growth and health of Canada.' And then it ends off, 'I hereby pledge my support to the Prime Minister and our government.' And I am sure that members on the opposite side of this House in this Province will be adding a P.S. And 'P.S. we will never, never, never criticize any of your policies, we will continue to be lap dogs to the Conservative Government in Ottawa, we love you very much and we will always continue to do so no matter how much you tread upon Newfoundland and rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. No matter how much money you take from our senior citizens, no matter how many cutbacks there are in our fishermen's budget, no matter how many wharfage fees are imposed or dredging fees or other user fees for fishermen, no matter how much money is taken out of the agriculture budget, no matter how many forest centers are kept on indefinite hold, we will never, never, never criticize you.' That is the P.S. that is going to be added to this pledge of support by members opposite when they send this off to the Prime Minister. 'I hereby pledge my support to the Prime Minister and our government. P.S. I will never, never, criticize you in any way no matter how much you take away from this Province.' I want to know if that P.S. has been added to that pledge of support that has been gone out from the Prime Minister to members opposite.

MR. PATTERSON:

He campaigned with Maureen McTeer for Joe.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the teachers' terrorist over there is also somewhat sexist. Personally I found that Miss McTeer was a superb asset to her husband, a tremendous individual in her own right, somebody that anybody would be proud of in any party.

It is very unfortunate that the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) would criticize in this House the wife and helpmate of the Minister of External Affairs (Mr. Clark) for Canada. It is sad, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Placentia would engage in those sexist remarks. We know that the member for Placentia -

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

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

MR. PATTERSON:

I was enlightening the House a little bit as to the manoeuvring that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did in Ottawa during the election. He campaigned for the Leadership, he campaigned for Mr. McTeer, and he also flipped a coin with the leader of the Fishermen's Union in Newfoundland, I believe, as to who would be the Liberal leader in Newfoundland. I asked him before to elaborate on that and he has not done so. I would like to hear from him now, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to comment on that. It is unfortunate that we see happening already in Ottawa what started

down here in Newfoundland some time ago, which is they start eating each other. We saw Mr. Mulroney attempt to embarrass Mr. Clark -

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. PATTERSON:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is talking about the Tories eating one another. I think this a case of where Oscar Wilde said, 'It is the unspeakable chasing the unbeatable.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. When I spoke about them eating each other, I recognize that they do not have a very high regard for cuisine, and they do not care very much what is on the menu, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PATTERSON:

We would eat Liberals but they are too hard to clean, they are too dirty.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not really think there is a point of order, but the member for Placentia is now launching into a savage attack upon the Minister of External Affairs for Canada -

MR. PATTERSON:

No, I like him.

MR. BARRY:

- a very able individual, a very respected individual by all parties in Canada. It is very sad to see a member of the same party attack, first, the man's wife, and then the man himself.

MR. PATTERSON:

No. She is a beautiful woman.

MR. BARRY:

I can only assume that it is the same sort of concerted attempt to embarrass Mr. Clark that we saw come from Mr. Mulroney, the Prime Minister - where was it? Was it in Bonn or in Washington, where -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

By leave, I am sure. - where Mr. Mulroney permitted.

DR. COLLINS:

There is no leave in this House. No leave. The other day the precedent was set that there would be no leave.

MR. BARRY:

No leave?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, if all the hon. gentleman can do is criticize the federal budget, I assume, because we are debating the provincial budget, that he can find nothing in the provincial budget to criticize.

MR. BARRY:

We cannot trust the figures.

MR. MARSHALL:

First of all, we take a great deal of comfort in that. He spent his whole ten minutes talking about the federal budget. He flashes this communication that obviously he has gotten, because before he scurried across the House in a fit of pique he was a Progressive Conservative. So that is the excuse for the hon. gentleman getting it.

MR. BARRY:

The same inefficient operation in Ottawa, obviously.

MR. MARSHALL:

I could tell the hon. gentleman that from his own party all of a sudden, inexplicably, and I do not know how it occurred, but last year, signed by the then Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Trudeau, I got a letter, 'Dear Friend and supporter of the Liberal Party:' addressed to me personally.

MR. TULK:

That was when you and Jean Chretien were in love.

MR. MARSHALL:

Similarly, I have gotten one from John Turner.

MR. BARRY:

That was when you were kissy-kissy with Mr. Chretien.

MR. MARSHALL:

I can see why the hon. gentleman would get it, because he goes back and forth between political parties, as he has during his lifetime.

There is nothing to respond to really. The hon. gentleman got up

for ten minutes and he talked about that letter. Here we are considering a budget that is before the House, time is spinning out, and the hon. gentlemen will get up and they will then complain that they did not have enough time to examine the budget.

MR. BARRY:

Have you signed that pledge of support? It is a simple question.

MR. MARSHALL:

If the hon. gentleman wants to talk about something, let us have somebody on the Opposition get up and talk about the \$3,933.9 billion, the total amount of debt that this Province is going to incur as a result of this budget, the total amount over the years. Now that is something significant. This is something, by the way, that you would think an opposition would talk about, it is something that should be of real concern. If I were in Opposition I would be getting up and saying, Look, that should be of real concern to the Government of this Province.

MR. BARRY:

Unemployment is the main concern.

MR. MARSHALL:

All right, then get up and talk about the unemployment. The unemployment should be something of real concern, and certainly it is of real concern. And I am so pleased to see the results of Statistics Canada that came yesterday, that we have 9,000 more jobs. Talk about the amount of expenditure that has to be for public services, in excess of \$2 billion. Mr. Chairman, these are questions which are very germane and relevant to the estimates and to the budget that we are concerned about, these are the

types of statements that should be coming from the Opposition and not a member. A government minister has to get up and say to the Opposition, particular the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) that his is what you should be enquiring about. It just goes to show that the Opposition is not doing its job, it does not understand the process. They could not care less with respect to the matter.

Why not enquire as to what measure can be taken to alleviate the unemployment in this Province, to reduce the deficit, to ultimately reduce the debt. Why not inquire as to how we are going to do that through our natural resources and how we are going to possibly use our natural resources and make constructive suggestions as to how we can, in this Province, take constructive measures to alleviate the unemployment, to reduce the deficit, to reduce the debt?

Why not talk about how that debt really affects us in a very real way when about 20 per cent of our revenues have to be paid out on interest on debt itself which amounts to many millions of dollars? You know, you could flick through this, here you go, look, you can see it. If the hon. gentleman wants to debate in the House productively, here you go, the government sector, it shows \$430 million next year going into Consolidated Fund Services and a lot of that represents interest. It represents 17.5 per cent and to us that is very concerning. We want to be able to take measures to alleviate that and we would like to be able to come into a House of Assembly where these matters would be debated intelligently, where there would be constructive suggestions made

by the Opposition. And what do we get? We get the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), or is supposed to be the leader, getting up and talking about a piece of paper that he has received because he was a former Tory from the federal government talking about the federal budget, etc., and not a single word with respect to the provincial budget.

Mr. Chairman, with one or two exceptions that is the way the whole budgetary process has gone this year. Now, look, the fact of the matter is, we are in a serious financial situation in this Province and the type of debate that comes in this House of Assembly with respect to it and not addressing it is not helping it at all. It is one of the reasons why it becomes very difficult for public interest groups, such as public servants, to realize why it is that we had to freeze wages. It becomes very difficult for teachers to realize why we cannot afford to pay the salaries.

But we cannot afford to pay the salaries, Mr. Chairman, because the money is not there. The only way we can do it is to raise taxes. We are seeing a greater bite from our general revenues coming out because of the extra amount of borrowings we are doing. And that, surely, is the type of debate that an informed Opposition should be bringing up in this House.

And I bet you it is, Mr. Chairman, the first time in British parliamentary practice that a minister on the government side of the House has had to get up and make suggestions to the Opposition as to how they should constructively conduct the debate

on financial matters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Just imagine, Mr. Chairman, look, over \$400 million next year going out in interest. Now where do we get that? Where does the government get the money? It gets it from two sources, it either gets it from the people or it has to borrow.

If it has to borrow, next year it is going to have to pay more interest, so it will rise above that \$400 million. And the only way out of the position we find ourselves in, Mr. Chairman, is to develop our natural resources and get a better revenue and inquire as to ourselves as to how we can alleviate the unemployment, to address seriously and encourage such measures as the government has taken with respect to the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment.

That shows the sincerity of the way in which the government wishes to tackle the problems that are about us. I mean, I can give several examples of what has occurred. We have gone through this process and what is it? - seventy-five hours on estimates in the budget debate. The member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), I am going to be interested in hearing his debate, his contribution on Monday. Yes, he was getting into something, he understands a little bit more than the Leader of the Opposition does, the process that we are going through, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition and most of the hon. gentlemen there opposite have wasted the time of

this House, the seventy-five hours, and have not inquired into the problems that we are meeting or offered any constructive suggestions with respect to it. Now if anybody were a stranger into this House and heard his speech they would say that the person speaking was a member of the Opposition.

DR. COLLINS:

I was beginning to wonder.

MR. MARSHALL:

So the fact of the matter is, we say, 'Yes, the situation is serious. Yes, this House of Assembly exists for a purpose. Yes, it is supposed to be for the purpose of constructive suggestions.'

So why does not the Opposition get up and speak and do a little bit of homework? They talked yesterday about research assistants and all the rest of it, you do not need any research assistants to know what the problem is with our finances. I mean, have you any qualified people over there aside from one or two of you who are able to get up and intelligently debate the issues before this Province or are you going to get on to silliness like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is, flashing a little piece of paper that he got from a computer because he had formerly been a PC?

What is he going to do next, get up and talk about the budget in Nova Scotia, the budget in Manitoba? If he purports to lead an Opposition and it wants to be the alternate Premier, surely to God he can give a more serious treatment to the issues that confront the people of this Province than the hon. gentleman

is doing. Look, we sit here and we bring this before the House for a purpose and we want to have good, constructive and informative debate and let us not see if we can get on with the job and do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Before recognizing the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) I would like to welcome to the visitors' gallery thirty-five Grade VI students and teacher William Greeley from Upper Island Cove.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I shall confine myself religiously to the discussion of the matter before us but I thought, just as a brief indulgence, I would make reference to the fact that unlike the Leader of this Party (Mr. Barry), who, at one time, went briefly astray and wound up in the Tory Party but then found his way back home, I have never been in the Tory Party. Yet, for some reason, I am a step ahead of him. He just got the invitation, Mr. Chairman, I have the membership card. I carry it proudly. The PC Canada Fund with my name on it, and 'A Sustaining Member' underneath. It is a proud piece of paper.

Of course, the point to be made on that is that whether former Tories or future Tories or never to be

Tories, the Tories in Ottawa like the Tories here are getting desperate because the message is gone out to Tories everywhere, why you can fool some of the people some of the times, and you are build great hopes about how if you get in power federally or provincially, there will be no patronage. You will be all lily white. There will be thousands of jobs the day you are created, the day the government is created, the day the government takes office. That is what the federal Tories said, that is what the Provincial Tories said here, it took them eleven years to say it here and then they wanted permission to do it.

The word is gone out, Mr. Chairman, and that is why the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) are getting those desperate mailouts from a Tory Government that is already bankrupt of ideas, and will soon be bankrupted financially as it continues to disappoint every one of its supporters who stood by it last Fall.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to the subject at hand, the budget, the estimates of the Executive Council. I listened with great deal of interest to the President of the Council (Mr. Windsor) about directions that we should be pursuing in analyzing this budget. I thought he did a marvellous job. Indeed, I thought for a moment he must have read my speech last week because I had raised some very serious concerns about the financial position of this Province. But I am not the person he has got to convince. He knows this Province is in serious financial straits, and I know it, and my colleagues on this side of the House know it, and the people

of Newfoundland know it. The person that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has got to convince is his almost seatmate, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Because while the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) says we have a serious financial situation, the Minister of Finance is on the television two nights ago saying, it is not serious at all. Saying it is no problem taking 20 per cent of your revenues just to service the debt. He did not see that as a problem at all. He dismissed it, out of hand.

Of course, it is a serious problem, an even more serious problem is convincing the Premier. And here we are with his estimates, he wants to fling out thousands and hundreds of thousands again on receptions and salaries and professional services and supplies and travel and so on and so forth. He is not even hear to defend the estimates. What an insult to the Committee, Mr. Chairman. What a blatant insult. It is a tradition. They keep telling us about parliamentary tradition. Well, one of the parliamentary traditions is that the minister responsible comes before the Committee of Supply to explain his request for funding. And here we have had a couple of hours of this talking about the Premier's Salary and the other heads pertaining there to, and he has not shown his face in the Chamber.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Not under his estimates. That is true.

Well, Mr. Chairman, he might have

been here earlier, I said in the last couple of hours, I am talking about the hour that has just about elapsed today and the hour yesterday he was not in the Chamber. He ought to be here. We have a number of questions we would like to put to him, but he is not anywhere in sight.

I would like to know, for example, what he would do if he had more jurisdiction on the fisheries. I spent five years up in Ottawa and My Lord, Almighty, the number of telegrams and the Telexes I got from that man. The day was not complete unless you got two telegrams from the Premier of Newfoundland about some urgent and pressing matter, either the Shoe Cove facility, or Search and Rescue, or Winter drilling, the fishery, Northern Fisheries Development Corporation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You ignored them all, did you?

MR. SIMMONS:

I learned to ignore all of them just as the minister in Ottawa, Mr. Fraser has learned to ignore the missals from the now the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). There was no problem in ignoring them because you knew the position would change next morning anyway, so you could afford to wait twenty-four hours you would get a new position. Now he wants more jurisdiction over the fisheries. Well, Mr. Chairman, I already said what I think about this. I believe in concept that the fisheries are a shared responsibility and their ought to be a full partnership between the two orders of government. That is what I believe in concept. In terms of this administration they have so -

MR. SIMMS:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

No, in terms of this administration, no, as a Tory Administration, this Tory Administration, now if there were one lead by the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) they may have a different view, but the present Tory Administration led by the bungling member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), no, I would not give it any more jurisdiction on anything, because he has so badly bungled the jurisdiction it has already.

Here was the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) you talk about piracy, you talk about cowboy tactics, here was the Minister of Fisheries for all of Canada in an absolute temper tantrum a couple of nights ago talking about shutting down the whole Atlantic Fishery. Now remember what would have happened, imagine what would have happened if that were, one, Pierre De Bane or Romeo LeBlanc or Herb Breau who made a statement like that, imagine the length of the Telex that would have gone from the Premier's Office up to Ottawa. And what did our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) say? What did our Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) say? What did our Premier say? Not a peep, not a word, and here was brother Fraser up there going to shut her down completely, the whole Atlantic fishery, our lifeblood, our number one industry, not a peep from this administration, not a solitary syllable. And he wants more jurisdiction?

Make no wonder he does not come into the House when his estimates are being debated. Did you hear

him this morning during Question Period? And the dangerous thing is, I think he believes what he is saying, that is the frightful thing. I am fearing for his mental health. He gets up there, and with a straight face this morning, talks about what he has done in terms of employment. And then in his answer to one of the supplementaries he, the Premier, admits what the real answer is. He says, look the only reason why there has been a few jobs created, 9000 jobs, and that must come as great comfort to the 60,000 out there without jobs, he says in response to the gentleman for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the Leader of the Opposition, he says, we have pre-tendered. In other words the real answer to the question, if he had decoded it, was that there is no change from last year, only that we have moved up the few jobs a month earlier. We have gone and pre-tendered, we have the thing cranked up a little sooner so that the little bump in employment terms that would normally come in July is now coming in June. That is basically what I heard him saying this morning.

But he made a commitment to the House, Mr. Chairman, and we should remember it, in responding to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) he said, 9,000 this month and in another three or four months 9,000 a month. The implication was clearly there, Mr. Chairman, that he is projecting an employment increase of 35,000 or 36,000 over the next three or four months. Let us hold him to that, let us see if that is the case.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have to pause to note again the almost futility of this particular exercise because the exercise is all about

holding a minister to account for his projected expenditures. And here we have, at this point in time, five ministers in the House out of twenty-two. This is the charade, they are suppose to be looking for the House's permission to spend all those billions of dollars to drive her in debt some more. The minister from St. John's East said a minute ago that we have a serious financial situation. Is there any wonder? Only five ministers - I am sorry, I did not spot the gentleman from Harbour Grace, six ministers.

MR. YOUNG:

I have been a minister longer than you were.

MR. SIMMONS:

I say to the gentleman I did not spot him. You see, Mr. Chairman, even when you are kind to that person he does not know how to behave.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:

By leave.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, perhaps I could invite the gentleman for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) to give us the benefit of his wisdom on the budget, give his maiden in the House maybe.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the member who just

sat down commented on the fact that there are certain ministers out of the House doing, I am sure, things that have to be done. He says that this is just a charade, what we are going through here, and the fact that they are out of the House means it is a charade.

Mr. Chairman, if there is a charade it was what the hon. member spent a lot of time on. He spent a lot of time commenting on newspaper items.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

What an insult. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) sits there and he jippers off with another minister. He did not hear a solitary word he said.

One of the questions I asked him this morning was how could he defend what he said on television two nights ago when he said, this Province is not in a serious financial position. Now, he might misrepresent what I say but he cannot do that. Let him be a man, at least in this respect, and respond to some of the issues.

Why does he say publicly that we do not have a serious financial position? That is what I talked about. Now, stop misrepresenting me or you will not get a chance to give your speech, I will see to that.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if Your Honour wants to take any action about that. It is quite out of order for any member to threaten another member in any way in this House. And certainly it is quite out of order to threaten a member that he will not be allowed to perform his duties in this House, i.e., express his views. Now that is quite out of order and I am of two minds whether to bring it up as a point of privilege.

I elect not to do so because the hon. member opposite is very erratic in his behaviour. Half the time he does not know what he is saying and the other half the time he does not mean what he is saying, so I will not bring it up as a point of privilege. But I would point out that the point of order he rose on is not a point of order and I would suggest that, on your own, you might want to take some action on the blatant abuse of the privileges of this House that the hon. member undertook by the threat to me that he would interfere with my rights to speak in this House.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

No threat, Mr. Chairman, a promise that I will keep him on track, that he will not ramble on in those inane irrelevancies. As a member of the House I will hold him to the rules and he will either do his job in this House as a minister, or we shall continue rising on points of order. That is a promise to him, not a threat.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

To that point of order there is no point of order. But this chair will not tolerate hon. members threatening other hon. members.

MR. LUSH:

That is good protection, Mr. Chairman, that is only fair.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the member who sat down spent a considerable amount of time commenting on newspaper reports that stated certain pronouncements that a federal minister made. A federal minister was supposed to have made some comment about keeping the fishery open or otherwise. He made foolish comments on a newspaper item of no relevance whatever to what is going on in the Committee at the present time. It is, of course, a reflection of what the members opposite are doing throughout this session. They do not have any thoughts of their own apparently, if there were not any newspapers around they would have almost no subjects to bring up. If the hon. member is talking about a charade it is the performance of the members opposite which is the charade and of course it was typified by the hon. member's remarks just a few moments ago.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there were a few other remarks came out. I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) discussed at some length the federal budget. Now we are supposed not to be dealing with the federal budget, we are supposed to be dealing with the

provincial budget, but in any case, apparently, they do not have much to say about the provincial budget, I presume they are satisfied with it, so they spend all their time talking on the federal budget.

Now one has to respond to that. Strictly speaking it is not something that we should be doing at this stage but I mean if they do bring in matters they cannot be left hanging there, they cannot be left on the record as one-sided comments, they have to be responded to.

One of the things that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) says, "Why are the federal people doing something different than what was done before?" They are bringing in changes up there in Ottawa. Why are they doing that? That is terrible, they should leave things as they were before.

Now of course in saying that he is forgetting that Canada is in a rather desperate state these days. I think that we have lost a considerable percentage of our export trade to other markets; we have one of the higher rates of unemployment throughout the world and our labour productivity has suffered considerably in relation to other countries in recent times. So the answer to the Leader of the Opposition is that we cannot leave things as they are, the federal government cannot leave things as they are. Canada was brought to a pretty low level by the policies of the Liberal Government in Ottawa that was there as a blot on the horizon for so many years. They brought Canada to a rather low state. So the federal government must change things. It cannot be satisfied

with the status quo.

I would just like to read out a little comment I have here by a rather prescient individual called Bennett W. Goodspeed and his comment is, "Shakespeare figured it out centuries ago, a comedy is when the characters discover reality in time to do something about it, a tragedy is when the characters do not." Now that is why the Federal Liberal Administration was such a tragedy. They did not see reality in time to do something about it. They were blind to the world forces that were going about them, they made no changes and accordingly, of course, the Canadian economy suffered.

Now the present administration fortunately they are new, they have a different view of the world, they see reality for what it is and they have to bring in changes. One of the changes they brought in was to stimulate private enterprise, private initiative.

It is easy for Liberal-minded people, and I use Liberal with a big "L" there, the Liberal Party-minded people, it is not easy for them to understand. They have been for so many years atuned to only looking on business as a source of party funds and not as the engine of the economy that they cannot understand this new approach. The Liberal attitude was that all things must come from government. This is where the economy will get a stimulus. Government must do everything. It must be centralized in government and, indeed, not just only centralized in government, but centralized in the central government, in the government in the central provinces. This is

totally against the whole idea of Canada which is a diverse community, which is supposed to have many centres of economic activity, it is supposed to rely on personal initiative, it is not supposed to be a sort of totalitarian type of regime which is the way Liberal thought tends. So it is difficult for the new government in Ottawa to change that attitude of mine amongst people with the Liberal Party mentality. And it is going to take quite a number of years.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

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

MR. SIMMONS:

One of the outcomes of having discussed matters with some colleague all the while through these speeches that he did not hear his own colleague from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who appealed to the Committee to ask questions and to have government members respond to those questions.

Now he is way off in left field. I am enjoying what he is saying because it shows just how warped the thinking is, it gives us an insight into him. But why does he not come to grips with the issues we raised? I am asked him about the serious financial condition of the Province, where does he stand on that? Where does he stand on the fact that his administration, of which he is a part, put the knife to the gentleman from St. John's Est Extern (Mr. Hickey)? Why does he not address these kinds of issues which are here in this House instead of skating around about a past regime in

Ottawa? If he wants to have a debate on it, I will debate him any time.

Mr. Chairman, the point of order is that he ought to be more relevant, he ought now in fairness to respond to some of the issues that we have raised in this particular debate and I have raised one about the debilitating nature of the public debt, what is he doing about it as Minister of Finance? Would he respond to that question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, it is obviously not a point of order. The hon. member says that I should be dealing with the crucial economic matters concerning this Province such as why did I knife the member for St. John's East Extern in the back? I mean you know that is supposed to be a very important economic point about this Province. I mean it is so purile, so childish, so naval watching one hardly knows what to say about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. minister's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), in giving us some directions to what we wanted to talk about, or what he wanted to

hear, he wanted us to talk about unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, what a scam and a sham because the government does not want to hear people on this side talking about unemployment. They really do not want to hear that, because if they did, why did they try to hide away and cover up the department that is supposed to create jobs, the Department of Manpower. Now they could have changed its name to person Power, they did not have to call it Manpower. They have eliminated that, Mr. Speaker, and now, in an attempt to prevent the Opposition from asking questions, because now we do not know who to direct the questions to. We do not know who is responsible for the creation of jobs in this Province, which department. They removed it.

Now I think they are trying to suggest that it comes under Career Development. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a sophisticated term, Career Development for Newfoundland because the only Career Development programme going on in this Province now is the career development of unemployment. That is the biggest single career in Newfoundland - unemployment - where we have about 45,000 or 50,000 people embarking upon that rather dubious career of unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what they have done. They have removed that department, taken away the name so that we could not really get at somebody. They were embarrassed. As long as that department was there then every day we would go at that department to ask them what they were doing to create jobs, so they removed it from the very obvious portfolio of Labour and Manpower. So, Mr.

Chairman, that would indicate that this government does not want to hear any questions about unemployment. They like to sweep that under the rug, but since the hon. member asked some questions about it we are going to ask some. We are going to ask about the philosophy, we are going to ask about their specific plans to create jobs in this Province.

The question I would like for the member to answer is this: What is the government's goal, what is the government's objective in terms of reducing unemployment this year? What are their specific goals, what are their specific aims, what are their specific objectives? By what specific percentage points does his government plan to reduce unemployment in this year? Mr. Speaker, this is what I want to know and this is what the people of Newfoundland want to know, by what specific percentage points does the member, or his government, plan to reduce unemployment in this year or the next year? Do they plan to reduce it by 5 per cent in this year or the next year? Do they plan to reduce it by 6 per cent, Mr. Chairman, or are they treating like a terminal disease? Are they treating unemployment like a doctor would a terminal disease and every time there is a change for the better they get a little hopeful? That is what it seems like, Mr. Chairman.

They are just drifting along and the Premier is going to take great credit today because the employment is up by 1.1 percentage points from last month and I expect if we had to determine this increase, if we had to ask how much this is determined by the provincial government effort, I would say it is very little

because we have started the federal job creation programmes now. We have started SEED, granted which is a contribution from the provincial government, but if we could only determine by what increase this 1.1 per cent is due to the efforts of this government I would say it is very little.

MR. SIMMONS:

All you got to do is take off three Tory candidates and work it out in percentages.

MR. LUSH:

That is right. And then we get what the percentage increase is.

But the question that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) should answer this morning is by what specific percentage points does his government plan to reduce unemployment in this year and in the next year? Is it by 5 per cent, is it by 6 per cent and, secondly, what does his government believe is a tolerable and an acceptable rate of unemployment for this Province? Let us ask that. What goal does his government have in mind? What is the acceptable rate of unemployment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

Is it 25 per cent? What is the goal that this government has in mind? What is the unemployment rate that they have set for the next five years? Is it 10 per cent, is it 12 per cent or are they going to keep it at the despicable and disgraceful high rate of 25 per cent? Is that what they plan to do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

Tell us! Tell us, Mr. Chairman, what he plans to do? Let us hear these specific figures not in generalities, to say we are waiting for the offshore, or we are waiting for the private sector to stimulate the economy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Or they are waiting for rain.

MR. LUSH:

Tell us which way they plan to go. Give us the specific figures. Tell us what is the tolerable, tell us what is the acceptable rate of unemployment, tell us what they have targeted as the rate of unemployment for this Province over the next three or four years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, yes. Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

That is the issue.

MR. LUSH:

Tell us now, Mr. Chairman, which philosophy they are going to accept in creating jobs in this Province.

For years, Mr. Chairman, we have been waiting for two political parties of the same political stripe, now we have it and both political parties espousing the notion, espousing the philosophy that it is the private sector that is going to be the engine that is going to generate economic growth and employment in this Province. That is what they said.

Mr. Chairman, the sad part about that philosophy is that one half is that one part of that equation

does not exist in Newfoundland and, that is, the private sector. Where is it, Mr. Chairman? Where is the private sector in rural Newfoundland? Where is this engine? Where is this motor?

AN HON. MEMBER:

A good speech, Tom. A good speech.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, the philosophy by the way is referred to by an economist, this kind of philosophy where we try to give incentives to the private sector. This kind of philosophy is referred to as a horse and sparrow philosophy. You feed the horse and hope there is enough left over for the sparrow. That is what that philosophy is called, Mr. Chairman, you feed the horse and hope there is enough left over for the sparrows.

That is this Tory philosophy, Mr. Chairman, their definition of the private sector is a little too narrow. Their definition of the private sector only includes, Mr. Chairman, the business community. That is all it included.

The Liberal philosophy includes a much larger definition of the private sector. We consider the senior citizens, Mr. Chairman, as a part of the private sector.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

We consider the young people as a part of the private sector.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

So their definition is a very narrow one.

So my second question is, is how is this very narrow, parochial philosophy going to generate, going to stimulate the economy of Newfoundland when a large part of the equation is missing? When a large part of the Tory equation is missing when we have literally no private sector in this Province?

MR. FLIGHT:

Grubby little manufacturing agents, that is the private sector, is it not?

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the Premier is on record a couple of times as saying that he does not believe in this philosophy. He believes, that it has got to be a mixed economy. He believes that rural Newfoundland is weak with respect to the private sector. He has made the point, I believe, in a Conference of Premiers in Vancouver. He mentioned that point.

But the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) believes solely in the private sector as generating the economy of this Province.

So, Mr. Chairman, where are we going? We have the Finance Minister on one philosophy, we have the Premier on another philosophy. Again, no clear direction as to where we are going. Which philosophy are we going to follow? Are they going to follow the philosophy as articulated in the Wilson Budget? Are they going to go by the philosophy articulated by the Province's Minister of Finance? Are they going to go the one that the Premier believes in, a mixed economy? Where the Premier believes that there must be an infusion of government funds.

That the government must take the leading role in creating jobs in this Province. And that is the way it has got to be, Mr. Chairman, because we have no private sector.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LUSH:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentlemen there opposite are not in the habit of taking my advice, and obviously they either refuse to take my advice and discuss seriously the issues before this Province, the financial issues before this Province, or they are incapable of doing so. You know, the result is the same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Now the hon. gentleman sits over there and he makes his speeches. He puts a big grin on his face. We are like we are in a school, look, he makes his great speeches and they are putting on their foolish little histrionics. So I am going to answer some of his questions now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Even though they were silly, what is an acceptable unemployment rate in this Province?

DR. COLLINS:

It is zero.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now the hon. gentleman says, zero, my colleague. No, Sir, his horizons I am afraid are not big enough. Our aim is minus twenty or minus thirty per cent. Because what we want to do, we do not only want to get full employment here, we want to be able to bring back the Newfoundlanders who are all over Canada -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

-who were chased out of this Province and could not find a job here because of Liberal policies over a period of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

That is what our goal is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

What are we doing? Mr. Chairman, what were these policies?

Look, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) he reads his paper rather uncomfortably over there now, because he realizes the debts to which he descended when he went over with the hon. gentleman.

But that is what I want to say to

you, it is not zero. In the immediate term what our goal has been that we want the same rate of employment as is average in the rest of Canada. That was the basis of all of our negotiations on the offshore. That was the basis and that is the basis of all of our thrust with respect to resource development. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that that is only a temporary goal. And the main goal is not zero per cent as I say to get full employment in this Province. To bring back those people who wish to come back to Newfoundland, and there are many of them, who were driven out of their communities, and out of the villages, and out of their towns because they could not find any work and they had to go to Toronto and Fort McMurray and all the rest of it, and in large measure they had to do that because of the type of the policies that were carried on by the hon. gentleman there opposite.

The hon. gentlemen who gave away the Upper Churchill, and if the Upper Churchill had not been given away, Mr. Chairman, we would have Labrador opened up there now. There would be full employment in Labrador. There would be full employment in the Province of Newfoundland through industries that were attracted, and those people who had to be forced to go to the Mainland to chase the jobs many of the industries generated on the power that the hon. gentlemen gave away that are churning the turbines and the business community in Quebec and Ontario. They would have been located here. So that is ultimately, Mr. Chairman, our aim.

On the immediate side, Mr. Chairman, what have we done? And

how do we achieve this? They are not just empty words, they are achieved, Mr. Chairman, and we said it over and over again, by acquiring the right to manage our own resources in this Province. Now we have acquired that right with respect to the offshore after a very acrimonious and bitter battle, when we saw the hon. gentlemen there opposite supporting -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

All I have to say is that they supported a Nova Scotia type agreement on the offshore, that they were behind us and trying to put public opinion against us and they said, "Sign, sign, sign, everything is going to Halifax," so that what we have Mr. Chairman, today and what we have for the future of this Province, which is going to safeguard jobs is we have the management of the offshore, we have the same rights to assess revenues as if they were located on land, we have the full rights within the Canadian Confederation. And lo and behold what do we see, if the proof is not in the pudding, Mr. Chairman, the Government of Nova Scotia is seeking the same agreement that the Province of Newfoundland has.

MR. FLIGHT:

There is a clause in the Nova Scotia agreement that gave them that right.

MR. MARSHALL:

But if the hon. gentleman wanted to be happened it would be a real circle, because what the hon. gentleman wanted us to do was to accept every single clause with the Nova Scotian agreement, including that last clause, and

since we were the last ones to put together an agreement, we would accept the Nova Scotian agreement.

The hon. gentleman either does not understand, I would hate to say that they understand because, otherwise, I would have to accuse him of being disloyal to the people of Newfoundland, betraying their interest, which they tried and they attempted to do.

What else have we done with respect to the fishery? We have restructured the offshore fishery. The hon. gentlemen there opposite were with the government of the day who wished to bring in a measure, adopt the Kirby Report that would have seen the closure of the Grand Bank plant, the Burin plant, and it would have seen the closure of the Gaultois plant. The hon. gentlemen there opposite supported those particular measures and we were told in no uncertain terms by these people there opposite that for instance the plant down in Burin would never work and we insisted it had to work on the basis -

MR. TULK:

Not true. Not true.

MR. MARSHALL:

- yes, it is, and it had to be established from the point of view of further processing and what has happened down in the Burin plant today as a result of what we did is not one shift, Mr. Chairman, they are going into two separate shifts. And the hon. gentleman has the composite gall to ask what we have done in unemployment.

Consider, Mr. Chairman, what we did over in Corner Brook. Today all of the West Coast would be a wasteland because Bowater was

going to pull out and we sat there and we negotiated and it was through our efforts that Kruger was brought to this Province, and on and on and on. So I could go on as I say and on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentlemen there opposite are not debating the financial issues properly. They are not addressing themselves to the issues.

I think they are still under a state of shock because, despite the fact that last March and April where we had wage freezes, we had to run an election with wage freezes and high hydro rates, the high unemployment, all the hon. gentlemen there opposite could do was muster together a paltry 2 per cent increase in their popular vote. And the hon. gentlemen realize that and at the same time they see the government over here attain the tremendous victory it did, a twenty seat majority in a fifty-two seat House, when you have wage freezes and you have high hydro rates and you have people understandably, as we are, concerned about unemployment. So the hon. gentlemen on the other side they are completely demoralized. They do not know how to lead the debate, they do not know how to debate the matters intelligently and directly. The fact of the matter is, as I say again, here we have the budget -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

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

MR. TULK:

The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) just reminded me of something.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mealy-mouthed Uncle Toms.

MR. TULK:

I would like to have his attention over there if I could. He just reminded me of something, last session of the House you will recall there was a Bill 37 and there was a Bill 35. Bill 37 had to do with the anti-labour legislation that this government brought in, Bill 35 had to do with a student aid bill. It has not appeared back on the Order Paper, I wonder when can we expect that one back or can we expect it back?

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

What we are discussing here is the critical situation -

MR. TULK:

No, you brought up Bill 37.

MR. MARSHALL:

- that this Province is in today with respect to the budget where we have to borrow the amounts of money that we have to borrow, where we have to borrow in order to pay our grocery bills, \$70 million, and the hon. gentleman get on the other side of the House and make jokes about the situation. The hon. gentleman has not asked one single incisive question about the financial affairs of this Province.

Why have they not asked questions with respect to the impact of the debt upon the current account next year? Why have they not asked questions about what effect it is going to have on our borrowing that for the second year we have had to borrow money to pay our grocery bills. All very serious questions, questions that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side should be putting to the government here and having the government respond rather than have a government on this side of the House have to point out what they should be responding to.

They talk about the committees not working, Mr. Chairman. How can the committees possibly be working effectively when we have the type of questioning that the hon. gentleman and the type of interruptions that the hon. gentleman on his point of order is bringing up?

The hon. gentlemen are treating the whole thing as a joke and it is a very sad thing for the people of this Province. Why do you not talk about the \$2 billion that is going to be expended this year, the high sales tax? Why not talk about the high unemployment rates and what is going to be done about it? Why not talk about the high debt and the amount of transfer payments and the effects of the fall-off of transfer payments on the future of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time has elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL:

Why, Mr. Chairman, do we not have an Opposition in this Assembly?

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member opposite can admonish and castigate us on the questions we ask, we can certainly admonish and castigate him on the answers that we get, on the responses that we get, because we do not get a response.

Now, I can understand why the hon. gentleman wants to get down to the estimates, because he is not capable of understanding a question that has a preamble. He is not capable, Mr. Chairman, of handling a question that has a preamble. The hon. member has now left his place, but I am going to come back again to two important questions in this particular heading that are very important, Mr. Speaker.

We are talking about the Premier's Office. We are talking about the gentleman who establishes the philosophy of this government. And I want to ask again two questions that the hon. member either refused to answer, or he did not understand the question, one of these two possibilities.

The question I want to put to the member again, the question that he avoided, the question that he did not answer is this, Mr. Chairman - and the people of this Province have a right to know the answer to this question, they have a right to know the specifics. Because this government asked for a

mandate to create jobs, and the people of this Province have a right to know what the government's aims and objectives are in this matter, not all of these generalizations and wandering all over the place and saying, 'We have this going on in the future,' and 'We have something else going on in the future,' and just going off, Mr. Chairman, and giving off some of the bile that the member is famous for. This was not the question.

The question was - and I want the hon. member to answer the question - By what percentage points does this government plan to reduce unemployment over the next twelve months? That was the specific question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Does the government have this goal? Does it have the specific aim? By what percentage points -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

If I may interrupt the hon. member for one second. There are four minutes left in the debate.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I will make it quick, Mr. Chairman. By what percentage points does the government plan to reduce unemployment over the next twelve months, over the next twenty-four months? 6 per cent? 7 per cent? 8 per cent? We do not need to get into a litany of

projects that will probably never take place.

The second question was, How does the member rationalize the conflict of philosophy that is now inherent on his side, with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) saying that it must be the private sector that generates the economy, it must be the private sector that stimulates the economy, when we have no private sector, secondly, the Premier believes that it has to be the government. So, here we have two senior men, the Premier of the Province saying that it must be the government and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) saying that it must be the private sector. Which way are we going, Mr. Chairman? These are the two questions. Answer them.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, there is a few mouths. All I can say is it is coming from the mouths of the party who drove all the Newfoundlanders into Fort McMurray and Toronto and Montreal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, indeed you did have to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

They had a philosophy, Mr. Chairman, of giving away our resources. They did it on the Upper Churchill and they were

perpetrating it last year when they were trying to force us into another give-away in the Nova Scotia type of agreement. That is exactly what they were doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:
All the hon. gentleman has to do is look at the marvellous programme, the SEED programme, that the minister brought in, the number of jobs that were created this Summer for young people, not enough, mind you, but as many as we could do. Look at the statistics of the 9,000-odd jobs created that occurred between the last Statistics Canada and this Statistics Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:
You see, it is one thing, Mr. Speaker, to get up and talk using empty rhetoric -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council has, I believe, another two or three minutes left, perhaps one minute. He has one more minute to answer a specific question on the budget estimates. Would he stand up and at least give the answer and never mind railing off about the offshore.

MR. CHAIRMAN):
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Here we have spent almost seventy-five hours, and the hon. gentleman gets up. I have given the answer to the hon. gentleman. I have told him what our policies are doing and what they are going to create in the long-term and the short-term. And I say to the hon. gentleman, our aim is not even zero per cent unemployment, it is minus 20 or minus 30, so hopefully we can provide enough jobs in the future to bring those young people who are now working in Fort McMurray and in Toronto who, you people, with your policies, forced out of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

Debating time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

On motion, 1.1.01 through 2.1.03, Legislative and Executive Council, carried.

MR. BARRY:
Which one was that?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Legislative.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, that the Committee

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed, without amendment, the heads of expenditure for Executive Council and Legislative.

On motion, report received and adopted.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the type of co-operation that we like to show to the House, I do not think it is beneficial to get into debate now. I am going to call the budget debate, by the way, on Monday. I talked with the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) and he has about forty minutes left, I think. I do not want to divide his time, I want to co-operate. Perhaps we will call it one o'clock, but before I do I can advise the House of the Estimates Committees.

At 1:30 p.m. today in the House, that is here, Social Services will meet to continue their exploration of the Education Estimates; 9:30 a.m. in the House on Monday morning Government Services will meet to continue their examination of Municipal Affairs; 9:30 a.m. on Monday morning Social Services will meet in the Colonial Building, tentatively, to consider

Justice, provided Education is finished within the time limit.

Now, the hon. gentlemen understand that it is Education today, if you do not finish it today it will go to Monday morning and then you will flow into Justice. Then at 7:30 p.m. on Monday night, Government Services will consider the estimates of Consumer Affairs and Communications, always, of course, assuming that Municipal Affairs is going to be completed first. And at 7:30 p.m. in the Colonial Building, Social Services will consider Environment - once again, very, very carefully saying 'tentative' that Education and Justice are going to be over then.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the schedule of Committee meetings after the House adjourns, and also for Monday morning and Monday evening.

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, June 10, 1985 at 3:00 P.M.