



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 22

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday - Fri

29 April 1986

2 MAY

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon. members of the House of Assembly and, indeed, the entire population of Newfoundland and Labrador, are quite proud today about the achievement of our team, representing the Province, last night in beating the Western championship team by a score of 7 to none in British Columbia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:
The team is truly representative of the whole Province, as there are players from St. John's, Stephenville, Corner Brook, and a few outport players as well. I think the team is certainly a credit to Newfoundland. And we obtained a lot of publicity from it. There are a lot of people who never heard tell of Newfoundland, let alone Corner Brook. I think in Ontario, whose team succumbed to defeat earlier, and out in Western Canada everybody is very proud. For the information of the hon. House, it is interesting to note also, Mr. Speaker, that the famous Herder trophy, named after the Herder family, the first team to have their name on that trophy, back in 1935, was none other than the Corner Brook Royals. Then there was the Boulton trophy in 1985, which is emblematic of the Eastern Canadian Championship,

and, of course, the Herder again in 1985. In 1986 we first won the Herder Trophy, then the Boulton Trophy, and now the Allan Cup. I am very, very proud of the accomplishments of our team as the member for Humber West, representing half of Corner Brook, and immediate past president of the Corner Brook Hockey Association and an individual who certainly played a role in making up part of that team some twenty-five years ago, when a young Ray Baird played with that team.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:
I am sure all hon. members of the House will join me, through the Speaker, in congratulating these true champions from coast to coast. I am sure all hon. members are very proud of their achievements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:
The next stop, the Stanley Cup.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I just want to respond to, Mr. Speaker, for a couple of minutes. I, too, send congratulations from the Opposition and from the House of Assembly. My team from Stephenville has suffered the wrath of the Corner Brook Royals in the last two years, but I must say everybody in Stephenville and in Newfoundland today would like to congratulate the Royals on a

fine effort. They have done an excellent job, they have done us proud. I know Mr. Baird Jr. plays on the team, and I am sure Mr. Baird Sr. is very rejuvenated today. I hope he enjoys his trip to Corner Brook to welcome Corner Brook Royals back to Newfoundland. I would like to say that they have done us all proud and I think a message should go out stating that fact, and hopefully next year we will do the same thing. Maybe Stephenville will do it next year. But to take it away, Corner Brook has done an excellent job and the best of luck!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I sent a telegram to the Corner Brook Royals in care of Mr. Cliff Gorman this morning: "Congratulations and best wishes on your spectacular Allan Cup victory. All Newfoundland and Labrador was cheering for you and all team members can be justifiably proud of this victory. You are a credit to your Province. Again my congratulations on a job well done."

I think they did wear the uniforms that were paid for by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador at their meeting with the team last night. I also want to indicate publicly what I have conveyed to the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), that we would be happy to support financially an undertaking in Corner Brook over the next few days or a week,

whatever it takes, organized by the member for Humber West and the city council, to ensure that proper recognition in Corner Brook is given to the Allan Cup champions. I am sure all hon. members would not mind if a few tax dollars went in that direction at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Just a short response to that. We concur with the telegram and so on, and we also concur with supporting and giving the team a banquet etc. I think that should be, and we should go all out to reward them. Also, maybe we should have a little option here to have all members of the House of Assembly considered for that banquet instead of just government members. I think that is a reasonable request for us to make, as I am a member of the Stephenville Jets Association and so on. I concur fully, I think we should congratulate them as much as possible and fully support a banquet and so on. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers I would like to conclude a matter that I brought up yesterday. It was in connection with what happened in the House on Friday. The hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) was not present yesterday, but I read this because

it was part of the overall comments that I had to make. I will read it again. The hon. Opposition House Leader made it quite clear that he was not implicating the Premier in any conspiracy or instructions to any member. I could not find any indication that this was done by anyone in the administration. The hon. member for Fogo did say, "They are behaving like parliamentary thugs in that they are trying to obstruct the process, and in this sense you would call them a goon squad."

There is clearly here an imputation of unworthy motives. The term, 'parliamentary thug' is unparliamentary. I refer hon. members to Beauchesne, page 104, paragraph 320. The first reference to an unparliamentary comment is "A parliamentary pugilist and a parliamentary bully." I put parliamentary thug in that category. Now I would call on the hon. member to withdraw any imputation of unworthy motives in the words 'parliamentary thug'.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to your request there is absolutely no hesitation on the part of this member to withdraw anything that is unparliamentary, including the words just mentioned by the Speaker. I will say this, that I think as a result of Friday morning, even though we did use, perhaps, some unparliamentary words, I understand that the committees are proceeding much better and that in itself is very worthwhile. I withdraw unequivocally.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier, since the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not in his seat. Yesterday Newfoundland's representative in the Federal Cabinet, while he was in town, rather than clearing up any misapprehensions or any confusion that may have existed in the minds of Newfoundlanders regarding the future of the railway, Mr. Crosbie introduced a new element. He talked about a choice between - well, he was not very explicit in his details. He grunted through the whole interview on television that I saw. It seemed like he was half scared to say very much. I want to ask the Premier or the Minister of Transportation, whoever wants to answer, what exactly was Mr. Crosbie talking about when he mentioned a choice between the railway or a highway and then introduced that new element, ports? Could the Minister of Transportation probably shed some light on what the Newfoundland Government knows now about what the federal government has in mind for this Province and explain what is meant by ports in this case?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I met with Mr. Crosbie yesterday, and a week or so ago as well as did the Minister of Transportation. I did not see the interview to which the hon. member is referring and, therefore, I cannot answer the questions relative to that interview. I can only say what I said last week, that in our negotiations with Mr. Crosbie and other people in the federal government, that the federal government is still in the process of preparing a proposal to give us which is going to contain several options, as I understand it. We will have to wait until we get that proposal. But as to what Mr. Crosbie said extemporaneously to the press, I do not have the full transcript of that.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue, a supplementary.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier if I am clear on this: Is the Premier still saying today that even though he has talked to Mr. Crosbie and obviously others about this very important matter as it pertains to this Province and the future of the railway, or highways and ports in this case as well, is the Premier still saying that there is no proposal from Ottawa before this government to be examined?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think if you look at some of the comments Mr. Crosbie made, he has indicated that they are going to put a proposal before the Government of Newfoundland, but there is not now a proposal before us. They have been talking to us and getting data and information, but there is not now a proposal before the Government of Newfoundland. The federal government has undertaken to put a comprehensive proposal before us in the next couple of weeks.

MR. CALLAN:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier did not say very much about this new element that was introduced, as I have said. Would the Premier explain what Mr. Crosbie meant by ports? Obviously it had to come up during any oral discussions or whatever that the Premier may have had with Mr. Crosbie. What is Mr. Crosbie talking about, a choice between railway, highway and ports?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

As I said, I did not see the interview and I do not know what Mr. Crosbie meant by ports. I guess he was just talking about the general transportation issues of the Province. I do not know what it meant in relation to the railway at all. The hon. member would have to ask Mr. Crosbie. What we are trying to impress upon the federal government is that our preferred position is a continued railway with major upgrading. It

is no good to continue the railway unless there is major upgrading because if we go the way we have gone the last ten years in the next five or six or ten years, we will see the railway gone and that will be the end of it. So what we are trying to impress upon the federal government is they have to make a number of decisions. Number one is: Are they going to support the Province's position or are they not? If they are going to support the Province's position, then fine, it is all over. If they are not going to support the Province's position, then what are the various proposals that they are prepared to put on the table? That is where it is right now. As far as ports go, I do not know what context that was used in at all.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). In the Auditor General's Report it is pointed out that the School Tax Authorities that were in existence before 1978, through a technicality after January 1, 1979, have become illegal, have no basis in legislation to exist. I ask the Minister of Justice if this means that these sixteen School Tax Authorities are, in fact, operating illegally, or have been operating illegally over the last number of years?

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

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, a question such as that posed to me by the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) seeking a legal opinion is against the rules which governing the conduct of proceedings in the House. Beauchesne clearly sets out that no member may ask that kind of a question to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
The School Tax Authorities have been collecting school taxes, they have been taking people to court to collect back taxes and so on. What process is in place or has been put in place in the last number of months to correct this situation?

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) is responsible for school taxation in this Province and he and his department will be responding to the Auditor General's Report in due course.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power). We just yesterday had an announcement of sixty-two lay-offs at the University which

are far-reaching and wide-ranging. Stephenville and Marystown are going to lose their Extension offices, Educational T.V. is going to go, thirty-six of sixty-two faculty are being cut away, and twenty-seven staff.

First off, I would like to ask the minister his reaction to that? Does he think that this is going to be of any help or improve the educational aspects as Memorial University? How is this going to help it? Well, just what is his reaction?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, there has been, obviously, some confusion in the Province in the last day or so about exactly how Memorial is being treated by this government during the budgetary process. Obviously Memorial University, being an autonomous university in this Province, makes its own decisions as to what it does with the money that government gives it for its operating and capital grants. Memorial has decided to cut certain portions of the University, to layoff a very small number of people, closer to ten or twelve, and it leaves certain other vacant positions vacant for a longer period of time rather than fill those positions, not to layoff over sixty people but basically to layoff ten or twelve people and leave other positions vacant.

I just want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, through you to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, that this government has been extremely generous to the University this year, and I will be glad to table

a document showing exactly the amount of money that we have given Memorial University this year and the increase over last year. But before I show these figures, Mr. Speaker, I just want the process to be understood. This government funds Memorial University as a university which has autonomy over how it is administered, over which programmes are left in or taken out, which employees are hired, fired or made redundant. We, as a government, do not interfere in the workings of the University on a daily basis, nor does any government in Canada interfere with any university.

In the case of the University budget this year, there was no agency of government, if you want to put the University into that category, treated as fairly as was the University. I gladly table this document, which I asked my staff to make up this morning after the comments of yesterday, to actually show how much money the University received last year, in which they maintained a very high quality of education in Newfoundland, and how much money they will receive this year, so that the same quality of education can be maintained. In total, Mr. Speaker, the actual figure for last year, 1985 - 1986, was \$76,309,700. The actual budget for 1986 - 1987, from \$76.3 million last year goes to \$87,052,000 this year, an increase of \$10,742,000, an increase, if you average it out, to over 14 per cent if you take in capital and current together. It is somewhat of, I suppose, a puzzle to us in government as to how, then, somehow or other the budgetary cuts, if you put it in that large general connotation, causes the University to make some priority changes as to what they are going

to do. The budgetary cuts are not on behalf of this government, Mr. Speaker. They have received a very substantial, significant increase and I will say to the member for Stephenville that the announcements made yesterday about ten or twelve layoffs, the announcements about Channel 13, will not, in this government's mind, severely affect the quality of education at Memorial. We are convinced that this very large increase shows government's commitment to Memorial and shows our commitment to maintaining the quality of education at Memorial University.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We, on this side, have no problem with the fine increase you gave this year, but for the last three or four or five years you have not been giving them enough anyway, so it has finally come to the point where, even with a big increase -

MR. GILGERT:

They have not even caught up.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Exactly. Where even a big increase is not enough. You can gloss it over all you want, but it is not going to help the situation whatsoever. You are going to have positions not being filled. We just read that there is going to be a big increase in enrolment next year and they are cutting back on teaching positions. You called it a puzzle. Well, I am puzzled, because you are giving them \$87 million and you are saying you

cannot do anything about what they do with that money; you have no control over what they are going to do.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is making a speech. He is not a supplementary question.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Your Honour has ruled in this House that there should be short questions and short answers. I would ask Your Honour to take note of I think it was either a four or a five minute answer that came from the hon. gentleman opposite. If there are going to be short questions, there must be short answers as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no need for a long preamble in a supplementary. Also, so that we can have as many questions and answers as possible, I would ask hon. ministers to try to keep their answers as short as possible.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

There are layoffs occurring when

the enrolment is going up. Young people are going to university. The minister says he cannot do anything because of the economy. Is he going to make any representation to the university to try to get them to stop these cutbacks so that, with the increase in enrolment of students next year, they will not be cramped in the classrooms? I mean, there are all kinds of things going on down there. Is he going to make some representation or something along that line?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Opposition if my answer to that first question was four or five minutes long, but I tried to explain the process before I showed exactly what government did. And the process in Canada is that a government does not interfere with the daily operation of a university.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on!

MR. POWER:

Sure, I can decide and I can interfere with what happens in the vocational schools in this Province that come directly under government control, but the university is an autonomous body. I assume that if that party were to take power in this Province the university would lose that autonomy; the university would then become an arm of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, which we, Mr. Speaker, have no intention of doing. We had every intention of giving the university a very large, substantial increase this year, to

give them an adequate amount of money so that they can deliver education in this Province, Mr. Speaker. In the budgetary process, besides giving the university a very large increase to allow for the increased number of students that they have, we also, Mr. Speaker, did not change the best student aid regulations in Canada so that we could have every student in Newfoundland, who is academically capable of doing so, attending Memorial University and getting that good education which this government provides for.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I guess it is the largest increase ever given.

MR. POWER:

It is the largest one I have ever seen.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Premier. I had previously asked the honorary Premier - honorary next term - what his government intended to do about the 120 forestry workers whose jobs were in jeopardy because the Province did not have a forestry agreement in place. In reply to one of my letters, the Premier said that he could not give me any guarantee because negotiations concerning the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement depended on federal co-operation. Can the Premier assure this House, now that the Forestry Agreement is signed, that the 120 forestry workers from Bay d'Espoir will be

rehired?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give a guarantee, nor can I give a guarantee to anyone in this Province who is unemployed that he will have a job tomorrow or next week or the day after. But I want to clarify a matter that the hon. member has brought up. There were two agreements. I will deal with what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said in Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given, because I am not allowed to do it now in Question Period. But I just want the hon. member's to understand that there were two separate agreements; there is the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement and then there was a separate F.E.S.P. Agreement. The F.E.S.P. Agreement was not in the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement. They were two separate ones altogether. Now we have the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement signed, the largest per year amount ever since we have started signing Forestry Agreements. Now we are working, with the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), on a F.E.S.P. Agreement as well.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that

in the Premier's letter to me he referred to the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement as the thing that hung those workers up for not having a job. Now, I am sure that those 120 workers in Bay d'Espoir are not particularly interested in whether they get a job under the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement or under the F.E.S.P. Agreement. The only thing is it is the time of the year when they normally go to work. They have worked with this government anywhere from seven to thirteen years, and the only thing that they are concerned about now, if the Premier is not going to hire them with the Department of Forestry, will he give a commitment that one of the other departments of government will give those 120 workers a job?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I object to the hon. member getting up and saying get 120 jobs for me in my district, forgetting about the whole bunch of people in other districts who need work as well. The organizations down in Bay d'Espoir can apply under CEIC. There are some applications out now that have been approved by the minister and by the governments for work in forestry. We have silviculture here in this Forestry Agreement that we just signed yesterday where there could be some jobs for some of these people in silviculture activities, so there are ways and means by which a lot of the people in Bay d'Espoir can be employed. How many jobs are we now going to be doing under CEIC, for example, in forestry? How many applications are in under

CEIC for forestry?

MR. SIMMS:

Already there are \$2 million worth of approvals, and that is about as much as we had under the F.E.S.P.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There are about \$2 million worth of approvals already in the forestry sector in the Province as a whole under CEIC, and that was the exact amount that we had under F.E.S.P. when we had the F.E.S.P. programme going. So there are avenues through which the hon. member should work to help get jobs for those people in Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is obviously not understanding my question because I am not asking him to create 120 jobs in my district. All I am asking him is to maintain the 120 jobs that have been there, people who have worked with the Department of Forestry for the last seven years and some of them even for thirteen years. Those are jobs that were there, Mr. Premier, not jobs to be created. Those people will not qualify under a CEIC programme, they will go to the bottom of the list. I ask the Premier, again, what he is going to do about the 120 workers, former employees of the Department of Forestry? Is he going to hire them back?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let us get one thing straight.

These F.E.S.P. programmes were not permanent programmes, they were an agreement for a certain period of time. So for the hon. member to say that permanent jobs were lost is wrong because they came under an agreement which had a time frame on it. Now, as I understand from the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, these 120 people have now expired their twenty-six weeks or whatever whereby they would qualify now for applications under CEIC, because the time has elapsed under which they would not qualify so that now they can qualify under the CEIC programmes. The hon. member is just trying to confuse the House. There is also under this new Forestry Subsidiary Agreement silviculture projects which will be ongoing around the Province. The hon. member should do his job.

MR. GILBERT:

A final supplementary.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The previous one was a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. Premier I have no problem doing my job. The only thing that I have been asking here is that the Premier do his job. Where is the F.E.S.P. agreement? If they now have to be hired under F.E.S.P., why has he not got a F.E.S.P. agreement signed? I am not concerned about my job, I am concerned about his job. I want 120 people hired.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, our job! The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) have signed the best Forestry Subsidiary Agreement in the history of Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Tell that to the 120 workers in Bay d'Espoir.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- \$ 12 million a year more than any other annual amount every received under a Forestry Subsidiary Agreement. The hon. member may be concerned about the job I am doing, but I am also concerned about the job he is doing. Now a lot of the people in Bay d'Espoir -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Resign! Resign!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Can I have silence? I did not interrupt the hon. member when he asked his question.

All I am saying now to the hon. member is, number one, a couple of days ago we did not have a Forestry Subsidiary Agreement and now we have the best one in our history, and that is performance. Number two, if the hon. member would do his job, now that a lot of these 120 are beyond twenty-six weeks, they would qualify for an application under CEIC for some of that \$2 million already spent all around the Province for forestry

projects.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell). There is a bill presently before the House of Commons concerning the brand names and generic drug issue. I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications what kind of affect that is going to have on the consumers of this Province in the purchasing of drugs? Exactly what does the bill mean?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You have ruled a couple of moments ago about short questions demanding short answers. Now the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) just got up and asked a question, and that question is to explain a bill that is presently before another jurisdiction, to start with. To explain that generic drug bill will take the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications about a half an hour. Now, if we are going to be short in our answers, then the questions, even if they are only a phrase long, cannot have in them inherently something which is going to take a half an hour to answer.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase the question because obviously the Premier has not got confidence in the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications to answer it.

MR. RUSSELL:
You do not understand what you ask anyway. They are Rex's questions.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Wait until your point of order is ruled on.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The Chair cannot know how long the answer will take. I must rule there is not a point of order. I would ask all hon. members to pose questions that should have a short answer, and I would ask hon. ministers to keep their answers short.

MR. BAKER:
He could table the answer.

MR. YOUNG:
His constituents say he is a useless member.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs, the generic drug and the brand name drug issues presently before the House of Commons, what affect will it have on the consumers of this Province?

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

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, some months ago the federal government commissioned an enquiry, by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Eastman, to look at the whole issue of pharmaceuticals. The Eastman report, as it is commonly referred to, has been submitted. There has been considerable discussion about it and the period of time in which the report recommends to give exclusivity to the major drug companies in the research and development of drugs. There have been some meetings held and correspondence exchanged, I understand from my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), and his counterpart, Mr. Epp. There have been some discussions held between myself and my federal counterpart, Mr. Cote, pertaining to this report.

The danger, perhaps, and the concern that everybody has is what affect this will have on consumers should exclusivity be given for a period of ten or eleven years to the major drug companies in Canada, what affect this will have, as I said, on consumers if the generics cannot be obtained by the generic people for that period of time.

So if you only want short answers, that is about as short as I can give it.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.;

MR. EFFORD:
What I asked the Minister of

Consumer Affairs, and probably he did not understand the question I asked him, was what affect it was going to have on the individual consumers of this Province as far as the purchasing of drugs is concerned. I think that was a very simple and straightforward question. So probably when he rises again he will care to make some comment on that.

The second question I would like to ask him: Some months ago this same thing came up in Question Period when I presented a similar question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and at that time he said that he was going to make representation.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Now this is a final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:
Would the minister tell me the representation that he has made against this particular bill being passed? If he cannot answer the question, would he table the documents or the correspondence he has made to represent the consumers of this Province?

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

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that he had posed a simple, straightforward question.

MR. TULK:
So he did.

MR. RUSSELL:
It did not come from a simple straightforward member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know how dense the hon. member for Port de Grave is. It kind of makes me wonder.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, there have been rulings made in this House continuously about abusive language and personal attacks on members. I have stood here for the past five minutes and listened to the Minister of of Public Works (Mr. Young), as I have to call him, and several other members who are making these personal attacks. Now the Minister of Consumer Affairs in answering a question has to make this kind of attack on me. I guess the problem is that the question I asked is starting to get to the minister and it is starting to bother him, but I will continue to ask him questions, but I am not going to sit here in this hon. House and put up with the kind of abuse and personal attack that they are putting on myself.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
In Beauchesne, pages 104 and 105, it goes through the various things which are unparliamentary, 'sick animal', for example, is mentioned, 'dictatorial attitude', which sometimes the hon. members

opposite accuse me of without foundation, some very, very crude words which I would not repeat. They go through 'fraud', 'fraudulent character', 'deliberately deceive', 'demagogue', 'dishonest', 'evil genius'. I do not think the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs used 'evil genius' on the hon. member for Port de Grave. 'Fabricated a statement', 'crook', 'ignoramous', and I cannot find anything here to indicate that the Minister of Consumer Affairs has in any way impugned the motives of the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. SIMMS:

A horsewhip would have been appropriate.

MR. MATTHEWS:

All of the above.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I heard the hon. minister saying that he did not know how dense the hon. member was. I think it would be better if we could refrain from personal comments, but I must rule that there is no point of order.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, certainly if I said anything of a personal attack or impugned the motives of the hon. member, I apologize for that, but I do not think that I did. I indicated in my answer to the hon. member that I was familiar with the Eastman report, that I had made representation in discussions with my counterpart, Mr. Cote, and then expressed my concern that if

exclusivity was given to the major drug companies, the manufacturers, for research and development, what would happen to consumers and the price of drugs if the generics could not get the drugs? I think it is a four year period now, but if that is extended to a ten or a eleven year period, or whatever, it might be there could be a problem. It is kind of an hypothetical questions because the bill has not been introduced into the House of Commons yet. I have not seen a copy of that bill and I do not really know what the details are of the bill that may indeed be introduced into the House of Commons. So, soon I will see what the bill is proposed to do. I have already made some representation to my counterpart, as the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) has. The concern we have basically is with the consumer and what the cost of drugs could be, but we will have to wait and see what points are made particularly in that bill.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, since I have been given this rather prestigious assignment of being spokesman for Finance for the Opposition, I have reformed its role, I have revolutionized its role, making a series of positive and progressive proposals and suggestions to the minister, which if followed would have the effect of stimulating and generating economic growth.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I understand this is Question Period, or did I miss it? The hon. member is making a speech. Now if he has a question of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), let him go ahead.

MR. LUSH:

It was just a brief preamble, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

We have seen the Premier use an age-old tactic this afternoon again. He has even got up and started reading this red book to us. We have seen him try to waste Question Period as much as he possibly can, and all this is just his latest attempt. The Speaker rules this House, not the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. the member was making a speech. I am allowed to raise a point of order.

MR. TULK:

Do not be so ignorant.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must say that that point is well taken. The hon. member spoke for a few minutes and he had not posed any questions. I would ask him to pose his question.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I was just merely giving a brief preamble to my question. I said that I had made several proposals and suggestions to the minister as opposed to being critical, and today I have another suggestion and my suggestion is in this question. In order to help stimulate the economy, to generate economic growth, would the minister please indicate to this House and to the people of Newfoundland whether he would consider following steps taken by other provinces in Canada by giving small business corporations a tax holiday? By that we mean giving them a little break from corporation taxes for a period of one year or two years, so that small business could indeed be the engine to generate economic growth. So, would the minister consider introducing a small business corporation tax holiday in the same way as the Province of Nova Scotia has and the Province of Ontario?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have written down in careful longhand a full list of the hon. member's suggestions and I have that list here in my hand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

At the first opportunity I will add to my list the suggestions that the hon. member just gave me. But I do have to point out that for some time we have had a lesser rate of corporate income tax for small businesses in this Province as opposed to large corporations, large businesses. I should also point out a so-called

tax holiday for small businesses in the early years of their operation is generally meaningless, because small businesses usually do not generate any profit and therefore there is no tax excused in their regard.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

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

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if Your Honour could check the rules and have a look at common practice in other jurisdictions with regard to points of order during Question Period? I understand it is customary in other jurisdictions that points of order that arise during Question Period are, in fact, not raised until after Question Period to allow the process to operate. I am wondering if sometime in the future Your Honour could give us the benefit of your examination of that particular situation.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I know you will take it seriously, but I have never heard such a ridiculous point of order given by such an experienced parliamentarian as the hon.

gentleman. How absolutely ridiculous! I mean, not have points of order in this House the way the hon. gentlemen there opposite conduct themselves in the House? You would not have a House of Assembly, you would not have a Question Period, you would have an exaggerated episode of the circus that they normally carry on during these sessions.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order. I would like to say that since I came to the House points of order have always been raised during Question Period.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the Annual Report of NORDCO Ltd. for the year ending March 31, 1985.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
I would like to table the 1985 report of the Newfoundland Forest Protection Association and, in doing so, I want to commend them on their revival. They have been pretty dormant the last couple of years, but in carrying out their

task of creating more public awareness of the forest resource of this Province, they have now published their 1985 report and will continue to do so in the future. I commend it to the reading of all hon. members. There will be copies distributed.

Notices of Motion

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the advancing or guaranteeing of certain loans made under the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957, and I will move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider certain resolutions relating to the guaranteeing of certain loans under the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957.

Forest Subsidiary Agreement was for over \$60 million and, therefore, for six years would come out to indicate a sum of \$12 million a year, in that previous Forest Subsidiary Agreement. I have had this checked with the Departments of Intergovernmental Affairs, Forest Resources and Lands and Finance, and I can categorically say now that the Leader of the Opposition's statements were completely incorrect.

I have before me the previous agreement. It was for \$54 million for six years. Nine sixes, I think, are fifty-four. In other words, there was \$9 million a year spent on that Forest Subsidiary Agreement. We have just signed a new Forest Subsidiary Agreement for \$48 million, to run for four years, and twelve fours are forty-eight. So the Leader of the Opposition saying that we did not have a better deal in this new agreement versus the old one, is completely unfounded. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition is not here to hear that answer, because we are demonstrating that we are doing better in our Forest Subsidiary Agreements and nothing to the contrary by the Leader of the Opposition can change it.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday questioned me as it related to the Forest Subsidiary Agreement and erroneously reported to the House that the previous

Petitions

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to present a petition signed by seventy-seven persons respecting Flight 103, C.P. Air on April 27, flying St.

John's, Gander, Deer Lake, Wabush and Goose Bay.

Those seventy-seven persons, including myself, Mr. Speaker, were quite concerned about that particular flight. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the flight from St. John's landed in Gander and after approximately one-half hour in Gander, departed for Deer Lake; meanwhile, there were forty-four or forty-five people they would not take onboard the plane at Gander. But the passengers, numbering, I think, either thirty-five or thirty-six, were left on the plane from Gander to Deer Lake, not knowing, until about six hours later when the other forty-odd people were transported by bus from Gander to Deer Lake, that they were not allowed to board the plane in Gander because the plane had developed mechanical problems.

MR. SIMMS:
Now! Now!
Now! Now!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I was one of those passengers, as were some of these petitioners.

The least CP could have done at that time was notify the passengers onboard that plane that they were encountering mechanical problems.

After leaving the plane at Deer Lake that afternoon and boarding another plane brought in from Halifax to complete the journey, we learned that the people left behind at Gander had not been taken onboard the plane there because it had been experiencing mechanical problems.

The people were very, very upset.

Many of them were young school children returning home after attending various events on the Island.

I know it is no big deal for the member for Torngat if his life is lost because in twenty-one days there would be another Tory replacing him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:
But we must be concerned, Mr. Speaker, about our youth, our promise for tomorrow. Knowing the sort of member I am, one who will fight for the ordinary Newfoundlander -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:
- several of them came to me on the plane and asked, 'Well, what can you do about it?' I told them, 'I will bring it to the attention of the House of Assembly at the first opportunity.' They asked, 'What can we do?' I told them one of the best ways to deal with it would be through a petition. Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, we have a petition.

I will read the prayer of the petition, headed up with my own name: "We passengers, assigned for Labrador on Flight 103, CP Air, April 27, are annoyed by the inconvenience that occurred during a flight.

We petition the hon. the Minister of Transportation to fully investigate the circumstances surrounding Flight 103 from St. John's to Labrador on the above date."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition will allow me an extra minute, let me tell you something else that happened.

After we boarded the replacement aircraft and it taxied down the runway, the pilot announced, 'I have to apologize. We have to go back, since with too much fuel onboard we will not be able to take off.' So we went back and they removed some fuel. On takeoff the second time, the pilot came on again and said, 'I know you are not going to believe this, but we have to return to take on more fuel; we took too much off and we do not have enough fuel to get to Wabush.'

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to ask for an investigation into that particular flight. The only way to get to Labrador this time of the year is to fly. I would venture to say those seventy-seven people are very, very much concerned about safety on CP Air. Now, Mr. Speaker, the old saying goes, 'The devil you know is better than the devil you do not know.' Harry Steel may have been bad but, I will tell you this much, when he was running EPA, it was run much better than it is being run today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very happy to support this particular petition presented by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). There are numerous situations, I am sure, which occur, and the airline industry tends to be the type of industry that keeps things quiet and tries to cover up situations that occur like this. It is surprising that the announcement was made, or that they did find out that the reason they could not take any more passengers on was because of a mechanical problem. If in fact this situation is correct, it is a very serious indictment of the airline industry, of CP Air, and of regulations that govern airlines and how they are being enforced. There is no way that an aircraft should be able to take off knowing it has mechanical problems, there should be other alternatives available to that particular airline.

I would like to point out that it seems that in the days of EPA the regulatory agencies did not mind hounding them unmercifully for everything that happened, but now that CP Air is providing the same service, there seems to be a little less attention paid to the situation. I am sure the Minister of Transportation will take this particular petition seriously and investigate this one case. Again, I would like to suggest that the investigation be extended to include other cases concerning safety that may occur from time to time in the service in

Newfoundland.

This particular service is important. It is perhaps more dangerous than some others in the sense that you are flying over a lot of very inaccessible areas. It is still almost a frontier-like situation. I, myself, have brought various airline matters to the attention of the Minister of Transportation having to do with inconvenience to passengers that may occur from time to time now that the international flights go through Torbay. I am sure the minister has investigated this situation and has a point of view to express on that. But where safety is concerned, I think the Minister of Transportation has a special obligation to investigate the matter and to make sure that aircraft are not flying when pilots or people in control know that there is a particular problem.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I gladly stand and support the petition presented by my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains. Before I speak on the petition itself, I would like to point out to him he may very well be replaced, physically, by another Tory from Torngat Mountains. Should something unfortunate happen to him, but there certainly is not a replacement that I know of who could fill his boots in this particular Chamber, nor represent his constituents any better than he does.

It is indeed, as outlined by my colleague, a very serious situation. Even though it is in the federal jurisdictional realm,

I will certainly be making representation, both in writing and personally, directly to the people responsible with Canadian Pacific Airways as it pertains to this particular flight, to try and ascertain whether or not this is an isolated incident or whether similar incidents have occurred from time to time.

The member for Gander (Mr. Baker) indicated that perhaps we are not as vocal with regard to Canadian Pacific as we were with regard to some problems associated with Eastern Provincial. I would just like to point out to him that when Eastern Provincial Airways was operating smoothly we did not find it necessary as an administration, or me as minister, to voice concerns publicly or privately with the company. But as soon as there were incidents brought to my attention by the travelling public and others as it related to problems that were occurring with regard to scheduling and other items, safety and so on, I was the first to bring those matters forward and I will do the same in this case, as I will in others.

So I would like to support the petition and indicate to the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and the people who signed the petition that I will be bringing this matter directly to the principals of Canadian Pacific Airlines to make sure that I get a full explanation of the problems that occurred on that particular flight and, also, whether there were similar incidents which were not reported and whether or not there should be some action taken to make sure that it does not reoccur.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Is this to the petition?

MR. FENWICK:
Yes, it is to the petition.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker
and hon. members. The reason I
wanted to speak to the petition
now is that in my district, which
is isolated - you can only get to
it through the air service of
Canadian Pacific - in the last
couple of months the number of
complaints about Canadian Pacific
service have just mushroomed well
beyond anything we have had before
that. I would say to the Minister
of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) that
there seem to be a tremendous
number of schedule delays
occurring over the last little
while, a lot of cancelled flights,
a lot of people staying in hotels
in Deer Lake for a couple of days
waiting to get to Labrador, and so
on. So he might ask a wider
question as to why the service
seems to be deteriorating.

On a personal note, my son was
also on the flight with the member
for Torngat Mountains and while
you may be able to replace the
member for Torngat Mountains, I do
not want to have to replace my son.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak
to the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Does the hon. the member for St.
John's North have leave?

MR. TULK:
No, that is enough.

MR. J. CARTER:
Now, Mr. Speaker, this is very
serious.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Leave has not been granted.

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

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

MR. J. CARTER:
This is one of the most important
petitions that have come before
this House. It shows the most
callous disregard for the safety
and convenience and comfort of
passengers and I think not to
explore this thoroughly or to take
some definite action is a
departure from our duty. I think
it is very, very serious, far more
serious than most people consider
it.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of
order.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, we recognize on this
side of the House that this is a
very serious matter. We also
recognize the point made by the
hon. the member for Torngat

Mountains, the Minister of Transportation, and the member for Gander. We gave leave to the member for Menihek because it happens to be his district and, therefore, the hon. gentleman should have something to say about it. But we think the point has been made. The hon. member is a backbencher in the government, if he chooses to try to get the Minister of Transportation to invoke an enquiry, fine and dandy. But there is no point of order. The thing has been explored here.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, our Standing Orders are quite clear, that the person presenting the petition speaks and then there is one speaker from each side. Unless the hon. member has leave, he cannot speak.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 1. The debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) and he has two minutes left.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In concluding my remarks on the Budget, I have to express some optimism that things will change economically for this Province. But they will not change because of this Budget. They may change because of things that are done outside this Province that affect us and affect our industries, but there is real lack of action in

this budget. There is a real lack of a commitment to do something to get the economy moving and to tackle the unemployment problem that exists. There is a real lack of initiative. It is a status quo budget. It is a budget that does not give any new ideas. It may expand on some old ones but these old ones have not worked. I want to bring that to the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) attention and to the government's attention. You have to come up with some new ideas and new initiatives and you have not done it. All we can do is hope that something is going to change but unless you bring forward some new initiatives or plans, we are going to go nowhere. It appears as if they are not going to.

Hopefully, things will take off one way or the other and eventually they will, when there is a change in the administration. I hope that the government heeds the warning signals from the offshore and heeds the warning signals that are in the economy today and the labour strife that is on the go and attempts to solve these problems because if there are no real attempts made, then we are going to be in a lot of trouble.

On that note, I would like to conclude my remarks.

Thank you.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a few brief remarks as it relates to the Budget Speech and the budget debate. Mr. Speaker, I would like to participate in the budget debate this afternoon from this side of the House.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to listen to some of the statements that were made by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). Mr. Speaker, while I know that it is unparliamentary to say that he deliberately misled the House, nor will I say it, but obviously there are some very serious questions which have to arise from the comments that the hon. gentleman made. I do not have my notes here right now, Mr. Speaker, but I refer him to his statements as it related to the policies of the federal government regarding the shipbuilding industry in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty whatsoever in saying that I, as one sitting in this House, have some great doubts about the shipbuilding industry or the lack of a shipbuilding industry in this Province but I think it should be certainly cleared for the record that the shipbuilding industry in this Province or in Canada, as the hon. member was referring to, was something that was started many, many years ago by a regime in Ottawa called the Diefenbaker regime. Mr. Speaker, there was a very substantial policy brought into place, highly subsidized by the federal government. However, what the member for Fortune - Hermitage refused, for some reason, to bring into the debate was that it was successive Liberal regimes that continued to erode that very positive policy and programme that were initiated for the shipbuilding industry by the

Diefenbaker administration.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Fortune - Hermitage was part and parcel of a government that continued to renege and remove the systems, in terms of subsidies, that went in. Just last year, under another regime, the subsidies were totally removed.

I disagree with that policy, Mr. Speaker, and at the same time I want to say that the record will show that the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), who now portrays himself to be the great saviour of the shipbuilding industry, that he, himself, Mr. Speaker, was part and parcel of a government that continued the decline of the shipbuilding industry subsidies in this country.

As well, Mr. Speaker, there were other areas that were dealt with over the past few days.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the ruling yesterday by the Speaker in this House of Assembly where he had to instruct three members of the Opposition to get up, because of what was said in the Estimates Committees, led by the Opposition House Leader, the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), they had to be instructed by Your Honour to stand in this House and to withdraw their unparliamentary language, their devious ways, Mr. Speaker, of trying to smear characters and their self-righteousness.

MR. BAKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

The recent rulings in the House, Mr. Speaker, indicate that a member of the House cannot impute motives. You cannot say that a person is devious -

MR. J. CARTER:

We are saying what the Speaker said.

MR. BAKER:

- and a variety of things. The member is now imputing motives to members on this side of the House. As well, Mr. Speaker, he is conveniently leaving out the fact that the Minister of Culture Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) was also asked to withdraw the same words. But he is imputing motives to members of the Opposition that are unworthy in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask you to ask him to withdraw.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), who was just speaking, was merely reiterating what the Chair itself has said, that the behaviour of the Opposition was unacceptable and demeaning to this House, and thoroughly abominable.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I do not believe that the Speaker

of this House chided the Opposition yesterday. I think what he said was that it is not proper in this House to impute motives. I think he not only included members of the Opposition, he included members on the other side of the House as well. I would say to the hon. gentleman for Burin - Placentia West that I do not intend to carry on with him over this. The Speaker will tell him when he is relevant to the budget, I am sure of that, and I fail to see what he said a few minutes ago is relevant to the budget.

But the other point is, Mr. Speaker, and the point of order raised is this: the hon. gentleman has accused the Opposition of trying to smear characters. There is no such nonsense. It is ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please! I have listened to the comments of hon. gentlemen on both sides. I can only say that my interpretation of what the hon. member was saying was that he was repeating a ruling made by His Honour yesterday. If my interpretation is right, then I would rule that he is not out of order. However, if he is implying wrong motives or unworthy motives of hon. members of either side, for that matter, then the hon. member I am sure is aware that that is not proper and that it is out of order.

With regards to the rule of relevancy, I would have to say that it has been a wide-ranging debate and I have not heard anything from the hon. member yet that I would feel -

MR. TULK:

Keep a close ear, will you?

MR. SPEAKER:

- is necessary to be ruled out of order. I felt sure as he was making his remarks he was getting ready to come very close to the budget.

MR. TULK:

Keep a close ear, will you? Keep listening to him.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What we have just seen again is an attempt by the Opposition to do exactly what they have been doing, Mr. Speaker, at the Estimates Committees during the past month. Your Honour, you are right, I have not imputed motives, nor would I ever, Mr. Speaker, nor have I ever or will I ever impute motives. I am not structured, Mr. Speaker, in the same self-righteous manner as the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), the man, Mr. Speaker, with the evangelistic voice who tries to hide behind it and smear the character of every hon. member who stands in his way.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I ask to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am allowing the hon. member to carry on because I am hoping that I am going to clearly understand what he is talking about with regards to the hon. member.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I think that if the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) continues to interject, he should be named.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very relevant to the Budget. I am talking about the Budget Estimate Committees and the conduct, Mr. Speaker, of the Opposition that has been persistent in these Estimate Committees. Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour has ruled, we have had unparliamentary language. The imputing of motives by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) and the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) is indeed, Mr. Speaker, indicative, to some extent, of some members of the Opposition but certainly not all of them.

Mr. Speaker, as we get into the Budget debate and other debates in this House, I would ask all hon. members to seriously look at their conduct and seriously assess their conduct in this Legislature. I can tell them that that type of attitude, that that type of debate and that type of smear tactics by them does not do them any good. Mr. Speaker, I can say that, like all members in this hon. House, I have been guilty, in the heat of debate, of probably, Mr. Speaker, participating and being involved in debate when not standing up and speaking.

MR. J. CARTER:

Very rarely.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will admit that. I have, in the heat of debate, participated in that type of back and forth but never, Mr. Speaker, nor can anyone ever show, that I have personally attacked and tried to smear or ruin the character of individuals in this

House.

MR. J. CARTER:
Certainly not.

MR. TOBIN:
I am not saying that the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) did it the other day in his statement. But I am saying that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, went to whatever lengths possible to smear the characters of myself, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). That devious approach by a self-righteous member, Mr. Speaker, is intolerable and should not be permitted. I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, if he would in future restrain himself because personal attacks on behalf of any member does not do him any good. Mr. Speaker, I say to him as well that all of us in this House, who sit in this House of Assembly, have families back home and that type of action, that type of statement and that type of resolve by the member is not indicative of what the House of Assembly should be.

MR. J. CARTER:
It is disgusting as well.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, having said that, I believe that part of the frustration of the members opposite is that because of the economic times that we find ourselves in in Newfoundland, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the government of this Province have brought in a Budget that gives a good cross, representative of the needs of the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, in my own district I

think that we will reap the benefits of the Budget in a very significant manner. We will, Mr. Speaker, see the completion of the new Burin Peninsula Hospital this year, a hospital that was supposed to be constructed, has been talked about for a number of years, the hospital that became a political football of the Leader of the Opposition when he was the member for Burin - Placentia West and one of the many unkept promises of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry); one of the many jobs that the member pulled on the people of Burin-Placentia West. It was almost dealt with with the same contempt and arrogance by the member, when he represented that district, as when his constituents came to Confederation Building, the fishermen of that district. As I understand it, he was part and parcel of asking and carrying out the locking of the doors so that the fishermen could not get in. Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened.

As I said, the hospital in Burin will be completed this year and it will provide new services. It will go a long way to alleviate some of the great problems that the people of my district and indeed the people of the Burin Peninsula have had in the health field during the past number of years.

As well, Mr. Speaker, we will see in Marystown this year the construction of a new Creston causeway. That causeway, Mr. Speaker, is something that is badly needed and something that I have worked for for many years. Long before I came into the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, as a councillor and as Deputy Mayor of that town, I was actively pursuing it at that particular time. Now,

together with my colleague the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), we were able to bring that project to a beginning this year and hopefully we will see it completed next year.

As well in the Budget there are a significant amount of dollars funded for the construction of a new secondary processing plant at Burin and indeed an improved refit centre. It is my understanding that will cost somewhere in the area of \$12 million. That, together with the completion of the hospital, is certainly significant.

I might say as well that the secondary processing in the Fishery Products International Plant at Burin has become one of the leading secondary processing products produced anywhere in Canada. With the involvement now of the Canada Packers organization, this product is on the marketplace throughout Canada and has increased the workforce at Burin significantly during the past year.

Mr. Speaker, when I think about that I cannot help but reflect back and look back at the restructuring agreement of a few years ago. When I think of that, I recall when the former, former, former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. De Bane, at the time of the restructuring agreement, together with the former MP for Burin-St. George's, who is now the present member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), came to this Province, held a news conference and announced a unilateral plan of action that they had for the fishery in this Province to restructure it. When I look back at that, I think about the role that was played by the present

member for Fortune-Hermitage, when they announced that Burin was closed forever, lock, stock and barrel. The policies of the Liberal government of the day were supported by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), who was then the member for Burin - St. George's. When they announced that Burin would close, lock, stock and barrel, Mr. Speaker, everyone in Burin thought the day was over.

The people of Burin, Mr. Speaker, deserves a lot of credit for the battle they fought and for the victory they won. I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I know that the Premier of this Province is one man who fought a very hard, brave and courageous battle for the people of Burin and, as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, Burin is now a very thriving place with 300 plus now employed there. That is a long way from the dreams - that this administration never let succeed - the dreams of the member for Burin - St. George's, who is now the member for Fortune - Hermitage. He wanted to close Burin.

Mr. Speaker, as well this year in my district, we will be involved in the construction of two middle-distance trawlers that the provincial government initiated. Mr. Speaker, by the way - and the record will show this - the Liberal party of this Province has opposed this initiative. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that the people of my district will know when they go to work on the construction of these middle-distance trawlers that they are not there because of any support received from the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the Marystown

Shipyard are, as I said, involved right now is designing the middle-distance fleet and from that, Mr. Speaker the Marystown Shipyard will be going ahead and constructing the first middle-distance fleet. The Marystown Shipyard will again be the lead shipyard on the construction of the second trawler. They will be involving the shipyard in Glovertown, it is my understanding, in the construction of the second one as well, lending the expertise and knowledge of the Marystown Shipyard to that operation in that town.

Mr. Speaker, as well, there are several other issues involved in the provincial budget. Mr. Speaker, when one considers the times, we have nothing to say but it is a good news budget. I want to say that just recently I had the opportunity, together with some of my colleagues on this side of the House, as well as members opposite, to travel to Norway to look at the operation over there that involves the construction of the concrete platforms.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely unthinkable what is going to happen in this Province with the construction of that concrete platform. I was, Mr. Speaker, probably more pleased and certainly proud and honoured to have the opportunity while in Norway to meet with and I guess to talk with my good friends and many of my constituents from Marystown.

Mr. Speaker, the Marystown Shipyard last year signed a technology transfer agreement with Moss Rosenberg Verft Limited and that agreement has seen twelve professional engineers from the

Marystown Shipyard spending one full year with the Moss Rosenberg operation in Norway. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there will be eighteen of our management people trained in Norway on the construction of the concrete platform.

Since, Mr. Speaker, returning to the Province, I felt that it is indeed necessary, in my opinion, for the shipyard union to see the operation that is taking place over there. I have, Mr. Speaker, made representation to the government and to the Marystown Shipyard to ensure that a member of the Marystown shipyard union is accommodated and sent to Norway to look at the construction of these concrete platforms.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, further to the technology transfer agreement that has been signed by the Marystown shipyard and Moss Rosenberg Verft, we now have just about finalized a significant new operation, a significant new venture, that of Vinland Industries. Vinland Industries Ltd. will be owned jointly by the provincial government and Moss Rosenberg Verft and together they will be actively involved in the construction of the concrete platform. Vinland Industries will be pursuing the contract for the shaft assembly, Mr. Speaker, which is the mechanical outfit that will be in the legs of the concrete platform and there alone something in the area of 500 or 600 jobs will be directly involved throughout the whole term of construction. We will own 50 per cent of Vinland Industries. As well, the Marystown shipyard, which will be a separate industry, as it exists today, will be, I am sure, actively involved in pursuing contracts in the module

fabrication as well.

To give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of the magnitude of the concrete platform, the stairs and the railings alone on the concrete platform are equivalent in man hours to the construction of two of these huge supply vessels that you see. That is, Mr. Speaker, just an indication of the magnitude of that development.

Mr. Speaker, that concrete platform, a few years ago, everybody thought this administration was dreaming about. At that point in time we did not have any agreement with Ottawa. I am sure we all remember when the federal Liberals refused, Mr. Speaker, to give us any say in the offshore or any say in offshore management. Oh how I remember, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Chretien, the Minister of Energy at the time, issued instructions to Petro Canada, Mobil Oil and to others not to bring their semi-submersible drill rigs into Mortier Bay. How I remember the telegram that was sent off, Mr. Speaker, by the present Minister of Energy here in the House, the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), protesting vigorously that decision on the part of the oil companies and asking them, Mr. Speaker, to seriously consider refusing the instructions that had been given by the federal minister. I am sure it was supported by the federal member or if he did not, Mr. Speaker, he must have gone through some very trying time in these days as a member of the Liberal administration. I am sure we can all remember, Mr. Speaker, when they refused us any involvement whatsoever in the offshore development of this Province.

Then when we received that, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier of this Province and the Minister of Energy and other people in the administration were saying that we wanted a concrete platform, even the Opposition in the Province did not support it. Their own leader, Mr. Speaker, who today is Leader of the Opposition, as Minister of Mines and Energy, what did he do when the going got tough or the tough got going, yes, he did what he is good at, he ran. He ran, Mr. Speaker, and not only did he do this party and this government a service, he did the people of Newfoundland a service by removing himself from this line of negotiations that were taking place.

Mr. Speaker, despite the Leader of the Opposition, and despite the member for Fortune - Hermitage, who for so long was part and parcel of the Liberal administration in Ottawa, and despite the Opposition, yes, we do have an agreement that Mobil Oil has agreed to construct the concrete platform and to use that as the mode of development as it relates to the Hibernia operation.

MR. BAKER:

Boring.

MR. TOBIN:

Oh, the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), Mr. Speaker! He is certainly well briefed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

He would not support a public inquiry in the EPA pullout.

MR. J. CARTER:

No, no.

MR. TOBIN:

No, well I mean, Mr. Speaker, it

is obvious that the member did not support the public inquiry. At that time he was not involved in provincial politics, he was involved in municipal politics.

MR. J. CARTER:

He sold out his district, down the river.

MR. TOBIN:

No, I do not totally blame it on the member for Gander, Mr. Speaker. At that time he was involved in municipal politics.

MR. J. CARTER:

He was spineless.

MR. TOBIN:

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, he had some heavy influence from an outside source, from Ottawa, a source, Mr. Speaker, I am sure he probably knows better than anybody else in this House. There were some strong outside elements dictating to the member for Gander who was then in politics, saying, 'do not upset the apple cart, do not embarrass me here now,' said George. Then, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. J. CARTER:

George? George who?

MR. TOBIN:

- he had the biggest Liberal of all and that was the Mayor of Gander, Mr. Sheppard. He was then and he still is, Mr. Speaker. We saw how, I believe, he played politics, aided and abetted by the Baker brothers and we saw, Mr. Speaker, how he, together with the other member of his council basically deserted that town when, Mr. Speaker, EPA was pulling the plug on Gander.

MR. J. CARTER:

Not a word then, not a word.

MR. TOBIN:

When this government, Mr. Speaker, was asking for an inquiry, it was the Gander Town Council - it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, and I should be careful, I am not totally correct on this - but it is my understanding that the Gander Town Council refused to support this government in asking for an inquiry.

MR. SIMMS:

That is right.

MR. TOBIN:

The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) says that is right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has almost elapsed.

MR. J. CARTER:

Oh, by leave, by leave! Forever! By leave!

MR. TOBIN:

Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks. My friend and colleague for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) is eagerly getting ready to put forward his arguments in this debate. I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, again by asking all members in this House, on both sides, and I consider myself in this, when it comes to personally attacking and trying to smear the characters of others, whether it be in the budget debate or the Estimates Committees which have taken place, when that type of smear tactics was used by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), I ask all members, Mr. Speaker, to restrain themselves and not to perform in the same way as the self-righteous member, the member

of double standards for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand to support the amendment so ably put forward by my colleague, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and seconded by myself. It said that this House condemns the government for their failure to do anything to deal with the real problems of the Province, particularly that of unemployment, especially as it relates to the youth of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, what I find hard to accept about the Budget is the name put on it by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the 'Good News' Budget. At the same time they brought in the good news Budget, Maclean's Magazine had an article on the front page of their magazine entitled, "A Province In Despair."

MR. PEACH:

That was not Bay d'Espoir, was it?

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, at one time, I thought the Premier did not have very good judgement. When the member for Carbonear was elected, I honestly felt that gentleman should have been in the Cabinet. But I know now the Premier was right, the hon. gentleman does not have the ability to be in the Cabinet. As a matter of fact, I

even thought the member for Carbonear might have been made flunky for the Premier. That would have been a good job for him. I now feel he does not have the ability to do that job, either. I think the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is a much better man, and I think the Premier does have good judgement. I did not think that at one time.

Anyway, at the same time as this good news Budget came down, this article in Maclean's stated, "The Province already has the dubious claim to the highest cost of living in the Nation. Unemployment stands at nearly 21 per cent and federal transfers of cash and other government spending comprise a stunning 80 per cent of the provincial economy." And the Minister of Finance would bring in a budget and have the audacity to say that it is a good news budget. I do not know who he expected to believe it was good news, or who was getting the good news.

At the same time as the Budget came down, we had a labour crisis in Newfoundland, he had forced the members of NAPE into a strike situation because he refused to negotiate with them, and he had them out on strike for five weeks. I do not know, but maybe this is the way they hoped to be able to balance the budget or come up with a surplus, on the backs of those people they forced out on strike for five weeks. Maybe that was why it was going to be a good news budget. It was good news for the Minister of Finance and members opposite, because they were going to get their surplus off the backs of the people who were forced out on a strike.

We have seen the Premier portrayed as 'The Fighting Newfoundlander.' Over the last seven years, up until the election of 1984, he was a fighting Newfoundlander, alright. We have no problem with his being a fighting Newfoundlander. We just heard the member for Burin - Placentia West talk about the offshore oil and the resultings benefits we will get. I hope we are going to get some benefits from it. This 'Province in despair' needs any benefits it can get from anywhere. I hope the Premier's has not lost any opportunities because of his attitude over five of the last seven years. That is my only concern. I hope that sometime in the future we will not be able to look back and say that this government did lose an opportunity to have an offshore agreement, have oil flowing into Newfoundland and refined in Newfoundland. During five of the last seven years that the Premier has been here, we had this situation where any discussions with Ottawa came as fight and bluster. Negotiations were something we did not hear about. His attitude was we must put this thing through, we are going to fight. Now there has been a bit of a change.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have to accept whatever is given, and the greatest example of that, I guess, is the forestry agreement which was signed yesterday. We saw the minister stand in this House many times during the past year talking about protecting the interest of Newfoundland by negotiating over a cup of tea with the federal minister. Then we saw the Premier stand there yesterday, and I am sure he took what was given him, he had not read it, and say that we now have an agreement. He

tried to justify it today, mind you, but he did not have any input into it, he just took what was given him. This has been this government's attitude for the last year and a half.

I tried to question the Premier today on 120 workers in Bay d'Espoir who were employees of the Department of Forestry. No matter how much the minister and the Premier try to get out of it, they were employees. They paid into the pension plan and into NAPE, they had seniority within the department and were called back and now we see a devious plan by the minister and the Premier to put those men out of work, have them reclassified to be hired through manpower, CEIC. They say there is lots of work for them through CEIC. The only thing I would point out to the minister - as he was saying that today he was not standing, he was sitting in his place - is that in order for those workers in Bay d'Espoir to qualify under a CEIC programme they must, first of all, be unemployment insurance exhaustees. That is the first criterion. Those 120 workers will draw unemployment insurance until November of this year - that is for the minister's benefit, in case he does not know - and, after that, they will then qualify because they will have become exhaustees. I will tell you what they will qualify for, Mr. Speaker, they will qualify for welfare. That is what those people are going to qualify for.

In an area where you have 4,400 people, men, women and children, a work force of 1,800 and 1,500 or 1,600 out of work, they do not have a chance of being hired back for about two years. So you have taken away the dignity of an

unemployment cheque from those people who had had at least some semblance of a normal lifestyle. They always worked for ten or twelve weeks a year and then got their unemployment, so they had the dignity of drawing unemployment rather than the indignity of going to the welfare officer. What this government has done today is condemn those 120 workers in Bay d'Espoir to welfare. They can try to make statements and fudge on it and say they did it this way, or there is lots of work for them. There are 1,200 jobs. If the Minister of Forestry is going to speak, maybe he will get up and tell me what those 120 workers are going to do when their unemployment has expired and they qualify for CEIC. Maybe he will say he is going to rehire those people first, maybe he is going to make jobs for them.

MR. WARREN:

What are you going to do after the next election?

MR. GILBERT:

What I did all the time, Sir, and what I will continue to do. It is you I am worried about. I always have a way to make a living. I am not depending on this for a living so if the worst should happen, I will go back to what I was doing and I will not even hire him back.

The next thing we go to, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about agreements with Ottawa is the highway's agreement. We heard the minister say in this House yesterday how he had signed a \$180 million highway's agreement which he was so proud of, yet I heard the President of the Newfoundland Road Builders Association say that this highway's agreement would only do the surface, that instead of

\$184 million over five years \$180 million a year for five years was needed to bring the Trans-Canada up to the standard the rest of the provinces of Canada enjoy. Then I asked what the minister was doing about a subsidiary agreement for secondary roads and his answer was that sooner rather than later he hoped he was going to have an agreement signed. When I asked him during the Estimates Committee on the Department of Transportation how many kilometers of gravel road there were in the Province, he answered very quickly that there were 3,400 kilometers of gravel road. But when I was reading the estimates for 1983 - 84 I saw that this question had been asked and I figured, maybe the minister had made a bit of progress. Here is a good yardstick. So I took a question from the 1983 - 84 estimates committee and I asked the minister and he very quickly came back with 3,400 kilometers. Progress? This is the sort of progress we can expect to see from members opposite.

Right now we find the minister is unable to get a secondary roads agreement signed. We have the Burgeo highway which should be classed as a major highway in Newfoundland because of the fact that that whole area of the South Coast exists because of the Burgeo Highway. The fish plants are in operation there and because of the condition that highway is in, the fish plants are in jeopardy; the workers who are employed in those plants in Burgeo and Ramea, their jobs are in jeopardy. Maybe they are trying to do with the fishery workers in Burgeo and Ramea what they did with those 120 workers in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. Maybe that is the nefarious plan they have, let us put all of Newfoundland out

of work, let us put all of them on unemployment; let us not have 50 per cent unemployment, let us go for the works, let us go for 100 per cent, and with this attitude that is now evolving, they are working towards it. Everything seems to have happened in the last couple of years with this great spirit of co-operation we have between the federal government and the provincial government. Since September 1984, it seems that Newfoundland somehow or other comes off with the short end of the stick. When we had the blustering and the shouting and the screaming we sort of expected it but now, when we have this great spirit of cooperation, having tea with ministers and stuff like that, we expect something better.

The spirit of co-operation between the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development's department and Ottawa seems to shine forth every once in a while. As a matter of fact, it was only last week that there was an ad in one of the papers from a group of farmers on the West Coast asking where the forestry agreement was, did he lose the forestry agreement between Ottawa and St. John's? This sort of speaks, I think, for what the people of Newfoundland think of members opposite and their government.

We saw the federal government ride roughshod over the provincial government on the Fisheries restructuring agreement; they broke it without even bothering to consult with them, if we can believe what the hon. the Premier said, and gave permission for factory freezer trawlers to fish in Newfoundland, even though it was one of the things enshrined in

the fisheries restructuring plan.

Now, back in September 1984 we heard the cry go up as the crusade for prosperity went across this Island. I believe it was 'Mr. Peckford' and Mr. Mulroney. Mr. Mulroney made the statement that he was not afraid to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland. I will tell you right now that he had better start showing it, because he certainly has not shown anyone in Newfoundland what sort of prosperity he is inflicted on Newfoundland. The voters in Prince Edward Island showed them a couple of weeks ago what they thought of the prosperity he was inflicting on P.E.I. It was quoted rather openly that it was not provincial issues that lost the election there, it was the relationship of the federal government to the provincial government. Again, they are friends, and if you cannot trust your friends, who can you trust?

This good news budget that the Minister of Finance brought in, what did it do for the 50 per cent of the people who are unemployed in Newfoundland? They say 21 per cent is the nice official figure. We went through this this past Winter and we announced last month that there are over 100,000 unemployed. If you take out of that your seasonally adjusted figures, you are down to 21 per cent, to 23 per cent. What we have right now is 50 per cent of the people in Newfoundland unemployed.

So what did this budget do for the 50 per cent who are unemployed in Newfoundland? In his collection of revenues to run the country, the first thing the Minister of Finance did to help those 50 per cent who are unemployed was

increase the sales tax on building supplies from 8 per cent to 12 per cent. Mr. Speaker, if that is good news, I am sure the majority of Newfoundlanders who have to repair their homes this year or who were thinking about building houses, do not consider it good news.

I have said to the hon. the Minister of Finance that instead of increasing taxes on building supplies, he should reduce taxes on building supplies, or eliminate them altogether, on locally produced lumber, to create some badly needed employment in the forest industry which needs a shot in the arm, when you take into consideration that 75 per cent of the lumber we need in Newfoundland is imported. And, as I explained to the minister, the lumber industry in Canada is a West to East sort of proposition. Lumber starts off in British Columbia and is sold at a price, and as it comes across Canada, until it gets to Sydney, the price is dropped. Finally, when it gets into Sydney some owner of a lumber company out in B.C. says, I have four cars of lumber left, I must phone a lumber dealer in Newfoundland and say I will give it to them for the freight, or whatever the case, so this lumber ends up in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is what we call dumping.

MR. GILBERT:

That is what we call dumping, as a matter of fact, and our sawmill operators are put into a situation where they cannot compete against this. So my suggestion to the minister, when I questioned him on this sales tax, was to help eliminate unemployment in Newfoundland by dropping the sales

tax on locally produced lumber and possibly put 1,000 Newfoundlanders to work. Now his idea was that he is a member of this great Canadian nation and he does not want to do anything to get Canada upset. I ask him, if he does not want to get anyone upset about that, why does he not get upset about the dumping practices going on for bringing lumber into Newfoundland? They are not competitive, so the sawmillers and the people employed in the sawmilling industry in Newfoundland are not able to make a living. That was the first bit of good news in his budget. If he cut this tax, I say again, at least another 1,000 Newfoundlanders would find employment and there would be higher production by the local sawmill industry and, instead of producing 25 or 30 per cent of the lumber we require in Newfoundland, we could produce up to 60 per cent of it, as far as I am concerned.

What was the next thing the budget did that was good news for the people of Newfoundland, the 50 per cent who are unemployed? There was not one positive idea in the budget as to how government was going to solve unemployment. In any other province of Canada, the Newfoundland rate of unemployment would be considered a crime. You take the areas that I have already mentioned in this House today, Milltown, Morrisville, Head of the Bay and St. Alban's where the unemployment rate is 95 per cent among adults and 100 per cent among the youth. Yesterday Milltown made the news because a poor disillusioned boy dropped out of school. He thought to get a little bit of sympathy, a little bit of understanding. He had to barricade himself in a store and say he wanted a helicopter to take

him out of there. Now, Mr. Speaker, is this how everybody has to get out of there? Can they not do something to create employment? A sixteen year old child has to barricade himself in a store to get attention, to say he wants a helicopter to take him out of there, when Bay d'Espoir is one of the most beautiful areas in Newfoundland. The only reason they do not want to stay there is there is nothing for them to do. One hundred per cent of the youth in Bay d'Espoir are like this poor young fellow who had to take those drastic measures yesterday.

Was there a positive word in this budget to help the people of Bay d'Espoir? We heard the member from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) talk about the great shipbuilding industry that is flourishing in Newfoundland. I would like to remind members opposite that there is a shipbuilding yard in Bay d'Espoir, too, and it has not had any work for the last year and a half. If the member for Burin - Placentia West thinks that the shipbuilding industry is in such great shape, maybe he should talk to the -

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Woodford):

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

MR. TOBIN:

It is not my intention to take up the hon. gentleman's time, but I did not say the shipbuilding industry was flourishing in Newfoundland, in fact I said the opposite. I would go as far as to say that I am not at all satisfied with the policies of the federal government as they relate to the shipbuilding industry in this

Province.

MR. GILBERT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, it seemed to me that he went on about building two trawlers in Marystown, and from that I assumed that he thought the shipbuilding industry was in pretty good shape in Marystown.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order, just a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A very judicious ruling. I can assure you, Sir, that Haystack should be proud of their native son. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about shipbuilding, if there are two ships being built in Marystown, I would like to see one ship being built in Bay d'Espoir. Possibly, I would then be able to say something positive about this Budget, say that there is some good news in it. But it is certainly not good news for the people of Bay d'Espoir, there is nothing good in it.

We heard today that there is no good news in it for the 120 workers in the Department of Forest Resources and Lands; they are out of a job and are going to have to go on welfare. It is not good news for the people who live

in Burgeo, not good news at all, because there is nothing in the Budget to say that they are going to do anything to upgrade that road. We heard the minister say in this House yesterday that he was hoping to get a secondary roads agreement signed, but it is certainly not good news for the people of Burgeo.

It is not good news for the majority of people in Newfoundland. The second way that they are going to raise revenue is they are going to increase the premium on insurance. That means that most of the people in Newfoundland who have any kind of insurance, and most of us do, are going to be hit with an increase in the premium tax on insurance. So this, to me, would seem to be an odd way to spread good news to the Province.

The other bit of good news it spread was they were going to increase the tax on loose tobacco. Now, most of the people I am talking about in Newfoundland, have very little enjoyment, because 50 per cent of them are unemployed. So one of the very few enjoyments a lot of those people have is smoking, whether you agree with smoking or not. They had to give up tailor-mades, Mr. Speaker, because they were taxed out of smoking them. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands can smoke his tailor-mades, he is making a lot of money, but the 50 per cent who are unemployed in Newfoundland, they have to roll their own, and now we find that loose tobacco was taxed in the good news budget, fifty cents a tin I understand.

I noticed that members opposite cheered when the Minister of Finance said in his Budget Speech

that he was putting a tax on loose tobacco but not on beer. Can you imagine that? They cheered because there was no tax on beer, when already beer is selling for \$13.80 a dozen. That is the only bit of enjoyment that 50 per cent of the population on unemployment or welfare get. Everybody is entitled to some enjoyment, whether or not you agree with alcohol or tobacco. They cheered when they learned the tax on beer would not be increased this year. Good gracious! God knows, we are paying enough for it, Mr. Speaker.

Then they increased the license and registration fees on everything that those 50 per cent who are unemployed have to buy and have to pay. Everybody has to have some sort of license; they have to go to the government for some sort of license or registration fee.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at this Budget, we see all the points outlined and it starts off with things that have happened - "The year 1984 saw the beginning of the end of that dark night and today, on behalf of a battle-scarred but victorious government, I rejoice in proclaiming, Mr. Speaker, the certainty of a new era in the fortunes of the long-suffering people of this Province."

MR. TULK:

What are you reading now?

MR. GILBERT:

That is the opening lines from the Minister of Finance's Budget. Now, Mr. Speaker, could how anyone be hypocritical enough to introduce a budget and call it a good news budget to introduce a new era into Newfoundland because of this thing they started in 1984? We know what started in

1984. We see a government that did not know how to negotiate originally forget that they ever fought and which now, like a bunch of sheep, takes anything the federal government inflicts upon them. What the federal government is inflicting on Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not prosperity, it is depression and degradation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

All they can do is just stand there and take it. We have the Premier who stands up and defends all these great agreements he is making with Ottawa, and we find that the good news is that 'Mr. Peckford' does not talk anymore, Mr. Mulroney tells him what he has to do. I fail to see how anyone in Newfoundland can recognize this budget as a good news budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Woodford):

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say a few brief words in this debate. First of all, I want to take the opportunity to comment on the matter raised in the House earlier today by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) with respect to the incident concerning the CP airline activity that he described earlier when presenting a petition. I want to support him. I did not get an opportunity during the presenting

of the petition, but I certainly want to support the prayer that was contained in the petition when it called for a request to our colleague, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to look into this particular matter. In addition to that specific incident that the member for Torngat Mountains referred to, I am sure we have all have experiences ourselves in recent weeks with continual delays and cancellation of flights for whatever reason, unknown reasons usually, and we never can seem to get answers. I have experienced it personally but, in addition to that, I have had numerous constituents mention it to me.

So I would support the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains in his request in that petition.

MR. TULK:

You are making a good speech. Can you get someone in here? I do not want to call for a quorum.

MR. SIMMS:

My colleagues are like the hon. member's colleagues, they are within the precincts of the House. They have the speaker turned up on 10 in our common room and I am sure that they are listening to every word I am saying.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who I know listens intently when I speak, because generally, anything I have to say is of some significance and carries some weight, I am sure. Mr. Speaker, he speaks privately to me many times outside the House and commends me on my actions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the budget, if I may. As we all

know, debate during the budget debate, at least, is pretty wide-ranging and hon. members are entitled really to speak on any matter they wish.

I want for a few minutes to refer to some of the comments made by previous speakers in the debate. I did not have an opportunity yesterday to hear members speak in the debate because I was participating in some other activities relating to the portfolio of Forest Resources and Lands, including the opening of a new Forest Protection Centre out in Gander. So, unfortunately, I was not able to be in the House to hear some of the comments that were made. I did have a chance to read Hansard concerning some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) with respect to the signing of the new Forestry Resource Development agreement that the Premier referred to in a Ministerial Statement yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, there are an awful lot of inaccuracies in the comments made, both by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), which I noted in Hansard. I just want to refer to them.

First of all, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) refers to the agreement and I quote him from Hansard when he says, "My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) referred to the 1981 - 1985 Forestry agreement. It was a four year agreement, Mr. Speaker." That is what the member for Fortune - Hermitage is quoted in Hansard as saying. He goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, a little later on, "In fairness to him" - this is

the Premier - "and to get our facts completely straight, the four-year agreement ultimately became a five-year agreement. It was initially a 1981 - 1985 agreement. Last year, you will remember, the Tory Administration agreed to the agreement continuing for another year. That was not difficult when you realize, Mr. Speaker, they did not put any extra money into that agreement."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two points I wish to make here, two very important points. One is that it was not a four-year agreement. It was a five-year agreement signed in January of 1981 but retroactive to April of 1980. So the member for Fortune - Hermitage calls it a four-year agreement. It was not. It was a five-year agreement.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

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

MR. TULK:

We have given the hon. gentlemen time enough over there, Mr. Speaker, I call for a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Shall we dispense with the time limit and count the House? Could we count the House please.

I declare there is a quorum present.

The hon. the Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, to repeat then the point I was trying to make. The member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) yesterday said that the last agreement was a four-year agreement and he said, "In fairness, to get our facts straight, that four-year agreement ultimately became a five-year agreement. It was agreed to extend it by one year." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is totally inaccurate.

The last agreement was a five-year agreement that was extended for one additional year making it a six-year agreement. It was an agreement that was effective April 1, 1980 and expired March 31, 1985 and extended to March 31, 1986. It was a six-year agreement.

Now he said, "It was not difficult, of course, to get the extra extension when you realize that they did not put any extra money into it." That too is inaccurate because, Mr. Speaker, we put \$2.5 additional millions into the agreement. Now, the agreement that we are talking about, the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement, signed effective April, 1980 signed in January, 1981 retroactive to April, 1980, was an agreement for \$52 million. He says, 'we did not put any extra money in it, therefore there was no problem to get an extension.' That is not true. It was extended and there was \$2.5 million additional monies put into it. The agreement because a \$54.5 million agreement over a six-year period.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to

determine what that works out to on an average annual basis. Six years, \$54.5 million is roughly \$9 million a year. Now, you do not have to be a mathematician to figure out those statistics. That is point number one.

Where the hon. members, by the way, are getting confused, is that that Forestry Subsidiary Agreement, which is an agreement, by the way, that deals with research and development, human resource development, all kinds of other activities in an all encompassing agreement, that is one agreement. That is the one we are talking about. The hon. members, of course, added to that agreement a separate agreement which was negotiated and signed in 1983 for a three-year period for F.E.S.P. which was \$7.9 million. That was signed in 1983, Mr. Speaker, and it had nothing to do with the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement, which is what we are talking about here. That money, of course, was negotiated separately, was administered separately, and had nothing to do with the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement. So let us get that particular fact straight, Mr. Speaker, once and for all so that there is no confusion; so that there is nobody misleading the House. Those are the facts and the agreement we signed yesterday was for a four year period, \$48 million, \$12 million a year. Three million dollars a year more than the last agreement we had on the average with an increase of about 30 per cent overall.

MR. TULK:

Where is your F.E.S.P. agreement now?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is well

known, it has been public. Maybe the hon. members need a lesson and instruction on the F.E.S.P. situation.

The F.E.S.P. project was a separate agreement negotiated between two governments to try to address a specific problem, regional unemployment problems in areas that would not be prioritized under a forestry subsidiary agreement because under the forestry subsidiary agreement, silviculture efforts are addressed mainly for the industrial areas, where the newsprint paper companies are and where the major bulk of the sawmill operations are. That is the kind of silviculture activity that comes out of your all-encompassing forestry subsidiary agreement.

The F.E.S.P. programme was one that we negotiated with the federal government of the day and which tried to address high unemployment areas, areas where perhaps the forestry resource, if there was one, might have benefitted but perhaps where there was no particular forestry resource user, at that particular time. It was not necessarily close to the mills, close to the sawmills or anything. So we negotiated the F.E.S.P. programme. It was agreed to have a F.E.S.P. programme for a period of time as a pilot project because the idea was that the federal government would some day, if it was proved to be beneficial - the F.E.S.P. programme - would some day want to incorporate that programme and put it into an all Canadian programme where all the provinces of Canada could perhaps share in an experience that we had down here. F.E.S.P. was recognized as a very highly successful programme to address the needs of areas which

had high unemployment but not necessarily a major forestry resource. That was a totally separate agreement for a totally separate reason.

Mr. Speaker, the F.E.S.P. programme expired in 1986. It was a three year agreement signed in 1983, subsequent to an earlier one, by the way, signed for three years before that to, but it was a pilot project. It was successful, so the government now and of the day decided to use that F.E.S.P. project as a good example of what could be done all across Canada and therefore, when it brought down the new CEIC job strategy programme of last year, there was, for the first time in Canada make work programmes, in those types of programmes, for the first time allocations specifically made for forestry projects. It was never done before. Now, this year, Mr. Speaker, for example -

MR. TULK:

You have taken Canada Works money and put it into forestry and you have less money.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

It was put into forestry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

You received less money.

MR. SIMMS:

No, we did not. That is obviously not true. It must be really strange to sit in Opposition because every day all you ever hear is criticism, criticism, criticism.

I remember the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) when he was

elected leader of that party, he said to the press, 'I will not act the way that Mr. Neary acted as leader.' They said, 'Well, how will you differ?' He said, 'I will not criticize and I will not have my people criticize for the sake of criticism.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that is one statement that the Leader of the Opposition made that will surely come back to haunt him because that is all you ever hear from that side. I do not know if it has something to do with the Opposition syndrome or what it is. You never, ever hear them make a positive comment.

We signed yesterday, Mr. Speaker, a major forestry agreement which is probably - I am sure it is - the largest forestry resource development agreement we have ever signed in this Province, giving us more per year than we have ever had in any year previous. Now, I think that is something we should brag about and be proud of. Hon. members opposite, of course, seem to think they have got to criticize. Let them criticize, Mr. Speaker, it is like water off a duck's back and I suggest that the hon. members are not scoring any points out in the Province by taking that kind of an approach.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have explained the situation clearly.

By the way, under the CEIC programme, where there have been funds allocated specifically now to address requests for forestry projects, up to now there have been about \$2 million in projects approved under CEIC, which, by the way, is approximately the same annual amount of money that we spent on the F.E.S.T. programme. So, a good bit of the slack has, in fact, been picked up with

almost the same amount of money. So what you have to do, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) and other members over there who are trying to find some way of criticizing for the sake of criticizing, instead of doing that, they should get off their behinds, go out and do their jobs in their constituencies. Encourage community-oriented groups in their constituencies to apply for some of these funds as has happened, by the way, in Bay d'Espoir. The hon. member should know there is already one project approved.

The hon. member, the forestry critic, the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Alyward), I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, is doing his job. He just got approved over in his area, St. George's/Stephenville, a forestry project for approximately a couple of hundred thousand dollars to employ I think it is thirty people for twenty weeks doing something productive. They are doing something related to silviculture and forestry. That is what has to happen. Any community organization in the Province can do that. And, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, if they do, we will be able to get more done in forestry, more than we have ever had done before.

Now, one final point on this particular issue. I want to say this and I want to make it public now. We have alluded to the fact that we are anxious to get a substitute programme for F.E.S.T., in addition to what CEIC is doing, because we still have some problems with it, I admit. We would prefer to organize and direct those projects, as we did under F.E.S.T. They are now being done by community organizations,

in conjunction with my department who offer the expertise. We are not sitting back on that. We are also attempting to try to get a substitute F.E.S.T. type programme.

We have had preliminary discussions with federal officials. I have had a preliminary discussion with my federal counterpart. The Premier and I have also talked quite recently to Mr. Crosbie, along with the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and we will be trying to negotiate some kind of a programme that will address that void, if you want to call it a void. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have made those points very clear.

Mr. Speaker, there is another forestry issue that I would like to address before I get into some general comments on the budget itself and that deals with the hotly-debated topic which arises occasionally with respect to the Federal Forestry Centre. It is always a great topic of debate for members opposite. Ears perk up everytime it is mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, what I found rather amusing, by the way, was my colleague, the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Alyward), responding to the statement the other day on the spray programme which my colleague, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) introduced on my behalf because I was in Corner Brook. He said, 'We are for the protection of the forest,' relating to the spray programme. Now I do not know if that means he supports the spray programme or what. 'We are for the protection of the forest but, we are for protection of jobs.'

That is fine. 'One of the points that has to be made is if better management and better management techniques were followed, then you would not have to go to such extreme actions to protect the forest.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not entirely accurate to say that if you carried on with better forest management practices you would not perhaps have an infestation. That is not quite accurate or fair.

But then he goes on to say, as an example of what he means, 'If we had a Federal Forestry Centre in Corner Brook, which could help watch the forest industry in the Province, you might not have to wait and take this type of extreme action.' What a silly kind of a comment. I have to say to my friend for Stephenville, that is really not a brilliant kind of a statement to make. I do not think it is, in any event. I mean, to suggest that if you had the forestry center, which now is in St. John's, with the scientists and everything, over in Corner Brook, then you would not have to spray really does not make much sense.

Just to stick with the forestry center issue, if I may, because I know the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Alyward) would like to address it perhaps when he speaks in the budget debate.

MR. TULK:

He already has.

MR. SIMMS:

I am sorry I missed it. I did not read it.

MR. TULK:

Get back on course now.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, we are on the amendment now, the non-confidence motion, which, I might say, Mr. Speaker, right now, that I am opposed to. I am against, totally, the amendment, whoever put it forth.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, here are a few points about the forestry center, if I can try to make it without being interrupted too often. First of all, the decision with respect to the movement of the forestry center, which had been announced on the eve of a federal election by Mr. Tobin, was not cancelled by the federal government, it was deferred. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there were three categories, some projects proceeded, some projects were cancelled, some were deferred. This particular project was deferred. Now that is point number one, Mr. Speaker. By the way, contrary to the myth that the hon. the members opposite try to perpetrate when I do go out around the Province, I do revive it every time I meet with the federal minister but there is no change in the position. I have tea, occasionally I have coffee, with the federal minister.

The second point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we are supportive of that move. Obviously, we supported it when we moved our own group of people over there but do not forget it is not a provincial government decision. It is a federal government decision; it is their decision to make and all we can do is encourage them one way or the other and fight for it and bring it up every time we meet, which we do. That is point number two. Do not forget, Mr. Speaker, it was this provincial government that fulfilled its end of the bargain

when it accepted the challenge of the federal member, Mr. Tobin, over there, something unfortunately I do not think we have gotten full credit for. There is no reason to blame the provincial government. I do not know why members opposite blame the provincial government. We did our part. Let us examine Mr. Tobin's part. He issued the challenge.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

First of all, we are not blaming the hon. gentleman, we know he is doing his best. It is his best that we are concerned about because his best does not seem to be good enough. Secondly, I remind the hon. gentleman that even though he did his part, as he says, by moving the provincial arm of the service to the West Coast, we were told in April last year that if you put a Tory government in Newfoundland to coincide with a Tory government in Ottawa, everything would go well. That is what is bothering us. Nothing seems to be going well.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. Obviously, the hon. member is offering some information.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, when you make some

reasonable points it is not hard to tell when you are making them because hon. members opposite all of a sudden jump up and make a speech under the guise of a point of order. Obviously, it was not a point of order. The hon. member must get an opportunity, I am sure, sometime to speak and he can address these kinds of comments. I would appreciate it if he did it then rather than take away my time.

Mr. Speaker, let us get back to the point I was trying to make. In response to the challenge issued by Mr. Tobin in October of 1982, this government did respond positively. He said, 'You move your people to Corner Brook, I will get the forestry center in Corner Brook.' So what happened?

The provincial government accepted that challenge, moved its forestry headquarters to Corner Brook, much to the chagrin of a lot of employees, by the way, who were not happy at all, but we did it, assuming Mr. Tobin would be able to deliver. Mr. Tobin made the challenge. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was October of 1982 when Mr. Tobin promised he would get the forestry center. Between October of 1982 and May of 1984, approximately one year and a half went by when Mr. Tobin was the federal member, when the Liberal party was in power in Ottawa, he had a year and a half to deliver on that commitment. What happened? He could not deliver.

Then, Mr. Speaker, what did we see? We saw on the eve of a federal election, May of 1984, Mr. Tobin once again made another vague promise. He said they had money and he would move the Forestry Center. What did we see then shortly after that announcement? Of course, a month

later, a few weeks later, an election was called.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members opposite, in putting questions to us, should put questions to their friend in Ottawa, to Mr. Tobin.

MR. TULK:

That is beside the point!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Ask Mr. Tobin why he did not deliver on a promise he made in October, 1982 when he had a year and a half to deliver.

MR. TULK:

What about the promised prosperity?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair has been very, very lenient with the interjections. Let us keep some kind of order.

MR. SIMMS:

So, Mr. Speaker, I heard with some interest my friend from Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), the new Forestry critic, quoted publicly over on the West Coast last week or two weeks ago saying that he was going to revive this issue. Well, I suggest to the hon. member for Stephenville, Mr. Speaker, that if he is going to revive the issue, let him revive it with the appropriate party, -

MR. TULK:

The Tory Party.

MR. SIMMS:

- the government that has to make the decision on that center, which is the federal government in Ottawa. I suggest to him the best

way he could revive it is to ask the national forestry critic for Canada who happens to be the same Mr. Tobin, the member for Humber - Port au Port, who has never asked a question in the House of Commons of the federal Forestry Minister since he has been there. Now that is a fact. He has never asked a question of the federal Forestry Minister. I am telling the hon. member, that is accurate, that is true.

So, Mr. Speaker, why does he not ask some questions up there and why do the members opposite not ask Mr. Tobin himself why he could not deliver in that year and a half that he had to do it?

Mr. Speaker, just to conclude that issue, we have nothing to be embarrassed about or ashamed about. We fulfilled our commitment. We showed the people of Corner Brook where we stood on the matter. We moved our people over there. We have supported the people of Corner Brook by doing that and making that particular move and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition can continue all it wants to cloud that issue, play politics with it but those are the facts and the people in Corner Brook know that those are the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I had only intended to have a brief preamble really and address a couple of points that were raised in the debate by other members but I wanted to touch on the Budget debate itself if I may, and speak in support of the Budget presented by my colleague, the Minister of Finance who, by the way, puts a lot of this together in consultation with the acting Minister of Finance, the first alternate Minister of Finance. Hon. members would not

know who that is I suppose.

By the way, I do want to offer my congratulations to the new Finance critic for the Opposition. I must admit for once the Leader of the Opposition has made a very, very wise choice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

The gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is a gentleman's gentleman. Despite the fact that the Minister of Finance did not have too many notes, one thing I will say for him, Mr. Speaker, his approach in debate is certainly different than most other members opposite in that he does put forth suggestions. In other words, he is constructively criticizing, which is what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said he was going to do when he was elected Leader of the Opposition. I am referring, of course, to the member now for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), the former member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Only four minutes left? It must be an error, Mr. Speaker. I have not spoken for twenty-five minutes, have I?

MR. TULK:

By leave.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, they may not want to give me leave once I get into this.

Having commended the new Finance

critic who is doing an admirable job, I do want to begin my remarks on the budget itself, even though I only have four minutes left, -

MR. EFFORD:

That is long enough.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

- by roughly quoting, Mr. Speaker, if I may, from his inaugural speech as the Finance critic. He talked about the budget, billions, billions. He said, 'Most of us on this side cannot comprehend what they are talking about.' Now, that is the first admission he made. This budget is in billions. You are talking about billions of dollars. He said, 'Members on this side cannot comprehend when you are talking about billions of dollars.' We have a budget of \$2.5 billion, Mr. Speaker. So, his having admitted that, therefore, my conclusion then is that anything that he had to say during his comments on the budget or anything that his colleagues may have to say on the budget will be totally irrelevant by the admission of the Finance critic, who says, 'We cannot comprehend anything when you are talking about billions of dollars.' And, here we are, talking about a \$2.5 billion budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

I think, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite again are being touched by my speech, and it is obvious because of the outburst by the

member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), which is unlike him, by the way, these days.

I do not want to talk about when I was in the Chair, but I remember when I was in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, that Your Honour now occupies - I had the honour of being there - I had to call to task the member for Fortune - Hermitage on many occasions.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No!

MR. SIMMS:

Well, on some occasions. He used to always butter up to me, Mr. Speaker, by saying, 'Well, Mr. Speaker, you are my cousin,' and all this stuff, 'I apologize.' But it is not like him the last couple of sessions. The last couple of sessions you do not see this outburst, but there was a rare one there a moment ago!

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not have time to go into all the good things that are in this budget, but I do want to mention a few. I want to address a few that are in there for my district, the district of Grand Falls, if I may, just to mention two or three things.

I do not have time to go into this national report that says, 'Newfoundland is doing more than most for the poor, study says.' I do not have time to talk about Liberal philosophy in dealing with budgets when the new Liberal Government in Quebec announces cutbacks. I do not have time to go into all that stuff, Mr. Speaker, but I do have time to mention that in this budget that my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) presented, there was \$4.5 million for the

extension to the Central Newfoundland hospital for which we fought out there for years and years and years, and now finally it will be delivered.

I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, as well, about the half million dollars in the budget - and in the Forestry agreement, by the way, that you have all been ridiculing - a half a million dollars in there for an extension to the Wooddale nursery out near Grand Falls, meaning an additional ten greenhouses that will supply the seedlings for our programme for a number of years to come, I hope.

There is funding in there for the Mary March Museum which always was an albatross around the neck of the community out there. When I was Minister of Culture, I was proud to be able to announce the takeover of that facility and made it a part of the Newfoundland museum. Work on that project is ongoing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

How much money?

MR. SIMMS:

Tenders have not been called but there is work that has to be done, \$100,000, somewhere in that area, roughly speaking. Now this is the inside work that is going to have to be done in terms of fixing up the display areas. It will become a very nice facility and it will be a part of the Newfoundland provincial museum which is, I think, very good as well.

MR. BAKER:

What are the goodies for Gander district?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, in Gander district yesterday, I am proud to say - and

I was disappointed my friend from Gander was not able to make it. I did send him an invitation, by the way. I was not partisan. I sent him an invitation. I sent his brother an invitation. Neither of them showed up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

After the fact.

MR. SIMMS:

No, not after the fact, before it. This was for the opening of the new Forest Protection Center out in Gander at a cost of over \$900,000. We opened that facility yesterday under the cost-shared agreement, which was something, I think, that the member can be proud of. He should, by the way, the first opportunity he gets go up and have a tour of the building. It is an excellent facility. He should go up and have a look at it, go up and have a tour. I left a message for the hon. member to be shown around when he gets the chance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the minister conclude his remarks?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. More, more!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up a lot of the time of the House.

MR. TULK:

You do not have anything else to say.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh I certainly do have lots more to say, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to take up the time of other members of the House who want to speak. Let me just mention the Forestry Center again. The member for Gander should take a look at it. It is a beautiful facility and that is just one of a growing list of things that have been happening in Gander, as the hon. member knows, over the years under this particular administration. The hon. member is well aware of that. I would not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Gander were to one day pick up his lot and move over here on this side of the House because he sees that goods are being delivered with us. He will move over with us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that takes care of the Gander question that was popped there by the members opposite. By the way, I did invite the Mayor of Gander, much to the chagrin, I suppose of my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), to stand in the picture with myself and the federal representative to cut the ribbon. I thought that was fair enough and no big problem with that; no big deal. I think the mayor appreciated it. Mind you, I did not invite him to speak at the function but that is because we were trying to keep it short and brief but he was there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us just run over some other things. If hon. members opposite do not think I have anymore good things to talk about in the Budget, let me just run through some.

Under the Budget this year there will be \$88 million spent in school construction and \$220 million on highway improvement. There will be \$80 million spent on housing and land development; \$18 million spent on industrial parks and \$33 million spent on municipal water and sewer programmes and paving programme. There will be \$16 million over the next couple of years on that expansion to the hospital in Grand Falls. Modernization at the Abitibi Price Mill is still ongoing. The Botwood chronic care facility, Mr. Speaker, \$7 million will be spent I think in total. The Memorial University Fine Arts School over in Corner Brook, Mr. Speaker, \$5 million; new constabulary building in Corner Brook, \$3 million; new highway depot in Deer lake, \$5.7 million; renovations to the Bay St. George Community College over in the hon. the member for Stephenville's district, another Liberal district - I will have to have a look at that one I think, review that one again - \$1.2 million; Stephenville harbour development, another project in a Liberal district, \$4.5 million. Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of goodies in this Budget.

The best test of whether this Budget is an acceptable Budget or not is to test the public views, to test the public opinion out there and to gauge what the public reaction has been. I challenge hon. members opposite now to tell me honestly when they stand up in this debate whether they have heard the types of kinds of criticisms that we have always had in the past on a Budget.

MR. EFFORD:

You are not serious!

MR. SIMMS:

You tell me.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

There used to be flurries of criticism, Mr. Speaker, in the past and we acknowledge it on this side. But, Mr. Speaker, that has not been the case with the presentation of this Budget. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has done a significantly admirable job in the presentation of this Budget. Hon members opposite know it and the alternate minister of finance has done a good job working in consultation with the Minister of Finance. Hon. members opposite know it, Mr. Speaker, it burns them, it galls them because they cannot find anything significant to criticize in this Budget. They know it, however, because of the Opposition syndrome, they are stuck with this feeling of having to criticize simply for the sake of criticizing and that, Mr. Speaker, in itself is extremely unfortunate.

Hon. members opposite want to give me some more time and I am happy to take it, Mr. Speaker. I have all kinds of material. Let us deal with the deficit. Mr. Speaker, the deficit projected for 1984-85 was \$87 million. What did the Minister of Finance do? The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, was able to reduce that deficit to \$57 million. Now, how can members opposite say that we have not practiced restraint and have not been fiscally responsible? They cannot say it. Now, that is that issue of the deficit and, by the way, to follow up on that, the minister has projected a lower deficit for this coming year and I venture to bet that he will hit the nail probably right on the

head since he has done such a tremendous job over the last eight years.

Mr. Speaker, let us deal with health care. I am sure my friend and colleague the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) would not mind me venturing into his territory for just a moment. Look at the way this government responded to the Green Paper. This government, the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Health, put out a Green Paper asking the public for their opinions and suggestions as to what we could do to best handle the health care system in this Province. What did the Minister of Health and the Minister of Finance do? They accepted the wishes of the people of this Province. They accepted their representations and decided not to implement the suggestions that were in that Green Paper. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a government that responds with feeling and listens to the public, in doing so, they rejected all the suggestions.

What else does the hon. member want me to talk about? Let us talk about education briefly, a 6 per cent increase in the operating grants for all the school boards; a special \$1 million grant programme for boards that are really in need, something new and additional. The \$20 million school construction programme, by the way, Mr. Speaker, was to conclude in the last fiscal year and it was extended for an additional year.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about something new. The hon. member asks what is in there that is good. If the hon. member disagrees with it, let him get up on his feet and say so.

Mr. Speaker, there was all kinds of programmes announced in that Budget with respect to employment, all kinds of them. It dealt with the forestry programme and hundreds of jobs in silviculture. It dealt with the job strategy programme to which we are contributing and for which there will be hundreds of jobs. It talked about the tremendous programme administered by the Department of Social Services, that community development programme that members opposite criticized because we take people of welfare.

MR. SIMMONS:

And put them on U.I.

MR. SIMMS:

That is where the hon. member is wrong. I know that is what he would like us to believe and everybody out in Newfoundland to believe but that is not totally accurate.

MR. SIMMONS:

Not one of them (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, he says not one person has ever gone back into the work force after being on one of those community development projects. Would the hon. member be prepared to stand up in this House and apologize for misleading the public if I am able to bring in some examples for him? No, I suggest the hon. member would not because, Mr. Speaker, he knows that that is not an accurate statement at all. The hon. Minister of Social Services will give the percentage one of these times. But to say that every single one of them went on to the

UI rolls is wrong. It is totally inaccurate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I addressed health care briefly, as it applies to Grand Falls, but let us talk about the \$6 million in there for the Burin Hospital, to serve the South Coast of the Province.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMONS:

The gentleman speaking should not skate over this social services. He knows it is an absolute disgrace what is going on there. I can give him examples. One, a young girl down in a small community in my district some weeks ago called a woman up and said, Look, all I have to do is come over and sit in your shop for ten weeks. I do not have to do anything, I will not get in your way, but I am told if I come over and sit there for ten weeks you can say I am working for you and I will get my unemployment. That is what is going on. It is a disgrace!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, just listen for a minute. Look at the tactics.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is a disgrace! It may not happen in your district, but it

happened in mine.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, if I can get a word in here?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Now, here are the tactics used by members opposite. The hon. member gets up and talks about one specific individual -

MR. SIMMONS:

I can give you more than one.

MR. SIMMS:

- one specific person who is employed on the community development project. How many people are employed on the community development project this year? Does the hon. member know?

MR. SIMMONS:

12,000.

MR. SIMMS:

12,000, and he talks about one individual.

MR. SIMMONS:

I can give you many.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can give him many too; good successful stories. This programme is a programme the people of this Province wanted, and they showed they wanted it. It is a programme we introduced prior to the 1982 election and prior to the 1985 election. We almost wiped out the members opposite in 1982, and we had a massive majority in 1985.

MR. POWER:

(Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS:

'Charlie', your problem is that you cannot take criticism. It is a disgrace. You would run it like the same way you would run a home for custodial care.

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there is another outburst by the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Let us see some of the maturity he talked about a little while ago. The hon. member should relax now.

Let us get on with another point and see if I can raise something else. Let us talk about the health care again, about the Capital Health Care programmes that are on going.

MR. SIMMONS:

What about Social Services?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, we have addressed that.

MR. SIMMONS:

Do not try to get out of it.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member can get up and speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

God knows he can speak. We have heard him speak many times. He never says anything, but he can speak.

What about the \$6 million for the Burin Hospital? Is that not good stuff in the budget? Is that not good? Hon. members say there is nothing good in the budget. What

about the \$4.5 million for the Grand Falls Hospital extension? What about that? What about the \$1.5 million that is there for the Baie Verte Hospital? What about that? What about the \$3.5 million I mentioned for the chronic care home in Botwood, and the 105 beds for the Agnes Pratt Home, I guess it is, and the Bonavista Home? What about all of the additional beds that are going to be put in Placentia and Carbonear, Mr. Speaker, and Bay St. George? Mr. Speaker, what about all those things? Are they not good things in the good news budget?

MR. CALLAN:

That is housekeeping stuff.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, I see, that is housekeeping stuff. God help us if hon. members opposite ever get elected to form a government in this Province and consider all of those things to be housekeeping. Hon. members opposite know the difference. The Liberal Reform member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) knows the difference of that. It is better than housekeeping, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are small business programmes which the hon. member for Bonavista North criticized, 'nothing in the budget for small business programmes, nothing at all.'

Mr. Speaker, a lot of the silviculture programmes alone will be done by private operators, private entrepreneurs. There is help for small business. The Rural Development Loan Board has increased its loan capacity, the Farm Development Loan Board has increased its capacity; there is more emphasis in the budget on tourism, which will be beneficial

to small business. Hon. members opposite should read the budget and should ask appropriate questions. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, they have been going to the Estimates Committees and they have not been asking good, solid questions, they have been trying to score political points and that is why, when you do polls, they are showing up at 7 per cent, and because they are totally wrong.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite should go out to Terra Nova district this year and spend a couple of days at the national park having another closed-in brainstorming session. Surely between all of them they would find a brain they could have a storming session over and then change their strategy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They can visit my House.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, visit the hon. member's house. I say quite sincerely to them they - I should not say it to them, I should not tell them, my friends here will get upset - honestly and sincerely should review their strategy. They should! They are supposed to be an alternative government. How do you get to be an alternative government? You get to be an alternative government, Mr. Speaker, by offering alternative programmes. Do members opposite offer alternative programmes in this House? What do they do? They criticize for the sake of criticizing, which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said he would never do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get on to a favourite topic of mine, if hon. members are still prepared to give me a bit of leave, and that is the

forestry and the development of the forestry resource in this Province. I want to address a number of things. First of all, I want to address the spray programme which was announced last week.

MR. WARREN:

They are all for that.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not know. That was my first question. I would really like to see the official position of members opposite put forth with respect to the spray programme. The member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) said in responding to the statement, 'We are for protection of the forest.' Yes, but are you in favour of the spray programme? Does the hon. member think it is necessary to have the spray programme? He goes on to talk about better management and management techniques but, Mr. Speaker, is he aware that at a national forestry congress a month ago, where there were some 400 to 500 people in attendance, including representatives of some of the more senior environmentalist groups in this country, there was, for the first time, a national recognition and an indication and a recommendation that the use of pesticides to protect the resource is indeed a good and effective forest management tool? That is the first time that that has ever been said, especially with environmentalists involved.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

It was not said there.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, that is not true. The hon. member was not there. It is not true. There were many people there from environmentalist

groups who said, for the first time, that this has now been recognized.

I want to know from the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) if, when he speaks as the official Forestry critic, he will come out fair and square and tell this House and the people of this Province if the Opposition feel it is extremely important to protect that resource and that the best way of doing it is by undertaking the type of forest protection programme that we have undertaken in the last couple of years, in particular, against the hemlock looper.

Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member responds, he should be aware that the use of fenitrothion is the only chemical that is registered by Agriculture Canada for use against the hemlock looper.

MR. BAKER:

How is it Manitoba used Bt, then?

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member is not listening. I said fenitrothion is the only one registered with Agriculture Canada for use against the hemlock looper. The hon. member is shaking his head. Does the hon. member want to say that is not true?

MR. BAKER:

Why do they not use fenitrothion?

MR. SIMMS:

They do not use fenitrothion.

MR. BAKER:

No, they use Bt.

MR. SIMMS:

If the hon. member will wait, I said fenitrothion is what we are using. Fenitrothion, by the way,

is much more effective than Bt against the hemlock looper, much more effective, number one. Number two, Bt is a lot more expensive. The hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker), I am sure, is aware of that. But it is not nearly as effective as fenitrothion against the hemlock looper. The hon. the member for Gander may not have been aware of that, but that is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, we were virtually left with no choice in attacking this serious insect threat, practically no choice at all, because of the fact that fenitrothion is the only chemical that is registered.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Your time is up.

MR. SIMMS:
Hon. members would like to hear somebody from the Opposition speak, I gather. Is that what you want?

MR. BAIRD:
No, carry on.

MR. SIMMS:
Okay. Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite know that I can go on and on and on, and I know they want me to and the reason is obvious. They have nobody on that side who is prepared to speak, that is the real reason. They are suggesting I should not be unfair to members opposite, that I should sit down and let members opposite speak in the debate. The reason I stayed up for an extra twenty or twenty-five minutes is because I have a funny feeling that there is nobody on that side of the House who is prepared to speak in the debate. That is why they have been encouraging me to stay up. If hon. members want me to carry

on and on, how about if I ask leave to call it six o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No, no.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I need to collect my thoughts. I do not want to be repetitive.

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

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

MR. TULK:
Yes, there are people over here who are prepared to speak and if the hon. gentleman cannot get his thoughts together, then he is going to have to collapse in his seat.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
There is no point of order is there, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
I did not hear Your Honour. Thank you for that ruling.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want anybody opposite to think that I cannot go on. I have not even gotten into the Liberal Party, under 'Mr. Barry's' leadership in the 1985 general election, making the second worst showing of any Liberal Party in any general election since Confederation in terms of the popular vote in this Province. I have not mentioned that yet, Mr. Speaker. I have not

mentioned that 'Mr. Barry' frequently talks about his party being on the way up. For his information, in 1949 the Liberal Party got 110,000 votes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member is straying from the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

I do not want to suggest for a minute, Mr. Speaker, that you made a hasty decision. I would not want to suggest that. I mean, it is possible, His Honour just came in a few minutes ago and took over the Chair. I understood that this is the budget debate and for as long as I can remember, debate on the budget has been very wide-ranging, including partisan political comments, and anything at all can be debated, Mr. Speaker. I would like to raise it as a point of order, and perhaps Your Honour can give me your views on it.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. gentleman is running out of time

and he is trying to use points of order to get him up to 6:00 o'clock. He has nothing to say. The truth of the matter is, what he just did was question Your Honour's ruling and he should be asked to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, a budget debate or any debate on a finance matter is far-reaching, but I think the hon. minister was getting very specific about a particular item. I would ask him to stick to a far-reaching and wide-ranging debate on the budget itself.

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

I must say there are times, Mr. Speaker, when I hear some of your rulings, that I am reminded of some of the ones I had to make when I was in the Chair. I must say, you have to try to please everybody.

But the point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that whilst the Liberal Party is -

MR. TULK:

Now!

MR. SIMMS:

Wait now, I am trying to make a point here.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order? I have not said anything yet.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Far be it for me to even suggest that the ruling of the Chair be questioned, but I must record my disappointment that the Chair restricted the gentleman for Grand Falls. I was waiting to hear what he had to say about the Liberal Party, because it would help me put in context his comments to me and another gentleman, in 1975, when he assured us, in our concern to get him to run as a candidate in the election, that 'Yes, I indeed intend to run, but I have not made up my mind which party.'

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, Mr. Speaker. Am I blushing, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, that is not entirely the way the discussion went.

MR. SIMMONS:

What way did it go?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, let us put anybody here in this House in my place. If you were invited up to a room in the Mount Peyton Hotel prior to the 1975 election, eleven or twelve years ago, and you were going to be asked to consider running for that party - now just consider this - what would your response be if you were sitting down with Ed Roberts,-

MR. PEACH:

Who?

MR. SIMMS:

- Roger Simmons, and Freeman White?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

The House Leader gave the right answer. He said, 'I would not have gone.' But he had a big advantage over me, Mr. Speaker. He knew all these people, he knew their capabilities, and he certainly knew their possibilities of forming the government in 1975. I plead ignorance to that part, I did not know. I apologize, and I ask my colleagues on this side of the House to forgive me, please. I assure them it will never, ever happen again.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, they wanted me to run so badly I remember the President of the Party, Mr. Stirling, who later became Leader of the Opposition, phoning me and saying, 'Have you decided?' I said, 'Well, I think so. He said, 'Well, perhaps I will have to talk to Ed about giving you a Cabinet post.' I said, 'From what I am hearing there is not much point in offering me a Cabinet post, because it looks like you are not going to have a chance to win much of a majority anyway.' That is precisely what happened. You can ask Mr. Stirling that. I have reminded him of it.

MR. SIMMONS:

By that time you were going around Badger with an axe looking for one yourself.

MR. SIMMS:

That is right, looking for a Cabinet post.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there are a few secrets I have. Actually, I did tell a lot of people that, by the way. I told some of my closer friends that story. I think I might have told the member for Humber West.

Mr. Speaker, while I still have a

couple of minutes, I want to express my congratulations to the Corner Brook Royals.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I, as a member of this House, had given leave on the understanding that the member was going to be saying reasonably nice things about us. He has become very, very devastating. We just cannot take it any more. We have to protect ourselves, so we are taking away leave at this point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

I understood the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage was Deputy House Leader for the Opposition. Now, I mean, on this side of the House, those kinds of decisions are made by the House Leader not the Deputy House Leader. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if he can speak for everybody on that side of the House. I know members over there -

MR. DECKER:

I concur with the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMS:

That figures.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

There is no point of order, but I understand that leave has been withdrawn.

MR. SIMMS:

Shame on you! Shame on you!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Before I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, I think I should address spraying for the member's benefit. Spraying is like using abortion for birth control, Mr. Speaker, it works, but had some previous action been taken, it would not have been necessary. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I now adjourn the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

After that constructive comment and observation, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we look forward to hearing the hon. member next week.

Before I adjourn the House, I advise that at 7:30 this evening, the Resource Committee will meet here in the House to continue its review of the estimates of the Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy.

Tomorrow morning at 9:30 here in the House, the Resource Committee will meet again to continue the review of the estimates of Mines and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

Tomorrow evening at 7:30 at the

Colonial Building, the Social Services Committee will be continuing its review of the estimates of the Department of Education; that is marked 'tentative', subject to change. It could be. The House will be advised tomorrow if there is any change.

Tomorrow evening at 7:30 in the House, the Government Services Committee will review the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

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

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