



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 8

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

10 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to announce to this House the signing of the Canada Newfoundland Agreement Respecting Sulphur Dioxide Reduction Programme, which took place yesterday with my federal counterpart, the Minister of the Environment, Mr. MacMillan. This agreement commits Newfoundland to reducing sulphur dioxide emissions in this Province from a 1980 level just below 60,000 tonnes, to a 1994 target of about 45,000 tonnes per year, for a reduction of about 25 per cent.

Already, cooperation between the industrial sector and my Department has ensured that this Province is well on its way to achieving this goal. I am confident that by 1994 we will not only have reached our target, but that the technology will be in place to sustain this goal well beyond the target date. Mr. Speaker, this effort would not have been accomplished with such relative ease, without the cooperation of major industries in the Province and I wish to acknowledge industries' efforts at this time. Further, I want to

indicate to the House that pollution controls do not necessarily equate to extra costs for industries. Most of the technology that has lead to reductions in sulphur dioxide is also responsible for decreased use of fuel, resulting in considerable economic benefits to these industries.

The signing of this agreement acknowledges Newfoundland's commitment to control a pollutant that is the prime cause of acid rain. This agreement also places responsibility on the federal government to conclude similar agreements with all the other provinces from Manitoba East. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Prince Edward Island also signed yesterday, and I understand that Mr. MacMillan is in Ontario today doing the same thing with Mr. Bradley there. Further, and more importantly, the federal government is expected to pursue vigorously an agreement on similar controls of acid rain pollutants in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is widely acknowledged that the reduction of sulphur dioxide emissions in Canada only buys us limited breathing space from the ravages of acid rain. Ultimately Canada needs a similar commitment from the United States before we can say that acid rain in North America has been controlled. I have urged my federal counterpart to do his best to ensure that negotiations with the United States proceed as quickly as possible.

Yesterday's agreement on sulphur dioxide represents a significant step forward, particularly for Newfoundland. This administration can be very proud of the fact that

it is one of the first provinces in Canada to formalize such an agreement. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the minister for being so kind as to give me a copy of his statement before he presented it. I want to say to him that any action he takes as Minister of Environment to reduce the threat of acid rain in Newfoundland will be supported by this party and this caucus. Also, I want to say to him that any action he takes to strengthen the hands of the federal government in trying to negotiate an acid rain agreement with the United States will be totally supported by this party and this caucus. We encourage him to come on with this type of environmental control, and to continue this kind of effort.

I have to say to him, though, that I am disappointed that he was not as positive in another issue just as important, and that is that he made the unreasonable decision to withhold from the general public the details of the information contained in a study done of toxic waste in Come By Chance. I think the general public of Newfoundland, particularly in the environs of Come By Chance, is entitled to that information. That will be an issue that the minister will have to explain more fully at another time, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. One of the things we are going to be asking the minister for in the next couple of weeks are some details on who is doing the polluting and who is cutting it down and so on, because it is a bit light on details there.

There are a number of comments we would like to make, Mr. Speaker. One is we are extremely proud of our environmental legislation. It is some of the toughest in the country. But having said that, we are extremely disappointed that the enforcement of it is inconsistent. I will give you one or two examples: One is the decision to go ahead with the spray programme on the West Coast for what is very clearly a major problem, but without even any attempt to assess what the implications are of this spray programme.

I see the Minister of Forestry shaking his head. I agree that something has to be done, but the fact that nothing was done, that the approval was given without any environmental consideration, shows the hypocrisy of the department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
Before I sit down, one of the things I would ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to look at when he brings down his budget is

could he see that we manipulate the price of gas so that unleaded gasoline becomes less expensive than leaded. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is out of order in commenting on other matters.

Oral Questions

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). Will the minister tell the House what action he has taken to avoid a confrontation with the hospital support staff, a confrontation like the one we had last year with the MOS and the General Service union?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, we have had a conciliation officer dealing with the dispute between the hospital support staff, represented by NAPE, and Treasury Board, and the officer has carried out his duties in the normal manner.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Will the hon. the Minister of Labour tell the House whether or not the final offer has been made by government and that there is no way out, that there is an impending strike?

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, apart from the fact that we would not negotiate in the House, making offers is not my responsibility. We provide services to the parties in negotiations. The making of offers, Mr. Speaker, is the responsibility of the negotiators with Treasury Board.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. DECKER:
What measures are the government taking, in view of this hard and fast stand that they are taking with General Services, to ensure that health care in this Province is not jeopardized by a strike of support services?

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, there are adequate provisions in the Public Service (Collective Bargaining) Act for the designation of essential employees and related matters to take care of essential services in

the case of a breakdown in negotiations in the Public Service.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. How can the Premier continue to say that Newfoundland decides the mode of production in our offshore, when Mr. Crosbie, with Mr. Masse and Mr. Hopper, announced yesterday that the mode of production of the Terra Nova field without any reference to the Government of Newfoundland, indeed, without even notifying the Premier and his government that the project was going to take place?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, obviously the ministers and Petro Canada have in their own minds decided on what they are going to put in their development plan when it goes before the Joint Board and when it comes to the government, but because they say it is going to be a certain mode does not make it that way. The Atlantic Accord specifically stipulates what the procedures are for any development offshore, and one of those stipulations is that the Province has the final say over the mode of development. So whilst the federal government and their Crown corporation have a preferred position as to what the mode

should be, we are the ones who finally decide what in actual fact it will be. So I can only take the comments by the ministers and the head of Petro Canada to mean this is the mode that they are going to apply for in their development plan. Whether it is approved or not still remains to be seen until we see the development plan, and we have the final say over whether, in fact, their preference for mode will be ours.

MR. FLIGHT:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Is the Premier concerned that the method used by Mr. Masse, Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Hopper, in announcing the future exploration and development of the Terra Nova oil field, indicates that the federal Tory government is prepared to ignore him and Newfoundland when approving and announcing future offshore projects?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, Mr. Speaker, they cannot do it because the laws of the Atlantic Accord apply and therefore whatever Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Masse, Mr. Hopper or anybody else says is all subject to the Atlantic Accord, which means we have the final say over the mode, and they have to apply, even in the first instance, to get approval to drill those wells through the Joint Boards. So those wells cannot be drilled until the Joint Board agrees, and the development cannot

go ahead unless Newfoundland agrees.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Is the Premier concerned that the abuse he has heaped on Mr. Crosbie, accusing him of betraying Newfoundland, has resulted in Mr. Crosbie's decision to ignore him when making decisions affecting Newfoundland, and is the Terra Nova development the first costly example?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think the proof of the pudding is in the eating, Mr. Speaker, and we saw over the last couple of weeks, \$66 million for a development fund, two new wells on Terra Nova plus a commitment to go ahead to development. I think what I said over the last three or four weeks has had a very profound impact upon the federal government

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- an impact which sees \$66 million, an impact which sees two new wells being drilled that Petro-Canada were not going to drill, and a movement towards a development plan for a field other than Hibernia. So, I think my tactics have worked very well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary.

MR. TULK:

Do you wish to ask a supplementary?

MR. SPEAKER:

That was a final supplementary on that question.

MR. SIMMONS:

Could I put a supplementary to the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER:

All right.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I just wondered if he would indicate to the House, while we are still on the subject, if he is satisfied that yesterday's unilateral action in calling the press conference was inadvertent or deliberate and, in any event, what steps has he since taken, since that event took place, to help ensure it does not happen again?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We have communicated to the federal government, obviously, since yesterday that we thought it was totally inappropriate that the federal government do it this way, that obviously the Government of Newfoundland thought that we should have been consulted, and been a part of the overall press conference for that matter,

because through the Atlantic Accord, which is now the law of Newfoundland and very soon to be the law of Canada, the partnership is built into that Atlantic Accord and we have certain powers over what happens offshore. So we have communicated to the federal government our displeasure with the way in which the thing was handled yesterday.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand here a press release which the hon. John Crosbie made yesterday in which there is no doubt that he said Terra Nova will utilize either a semi-submersible base production system or a ship-based production system. Now that is not a statement of possibility, it is not a statement of intent, it is not a statement of what might be -

MR. FLIGHT:
It is a statement of fact.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
- but a statement of a decision. My question to the Premier is this: Does not the Premier see that this in direct and central violation of every principle and provision he tells us, and told us last year, was contained in the Atlantic Accord?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, as to Mr. Crosbie's

opinion, he does not have the power to decide upon the mode of development, nor does the federal government; it is the provincial government. So, Mr. Crosbie or Mr. Masse or Mr. Hopper can say what they like about mode, they can say what they like about wells and all the rest of it. There has to be a process under the Atlantic Accord: It has to go to the Joint Board, the Joint Board has to approve the new exploration programme, and the Government of Newfoundland, through the Accord, has to approve the mode, and we will not entertain what that mode is until we see their full development plan and industrial benefits package. So, Mr. Crosbie can say 'will be this' or 'will be that'; and it is just the same as somebody out on the street saying something about 'will be this' or 'will be that' when they do not have the power to deliver on it because the law of the land is that the Province decides upon the mode. So, Mr. Crosbie can say what he likes, or anybody else. It is this government, after we see the whole development plan plus the industrial benefits package that are going to come to the Province before any decision will be made on mode. So it does not bother me because the laws overrule Mr. Crosbie, as they do everybody else.

MR. TULK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Accord says the federal government 'will decide the mode and pace of exploration and production until national self-sufficiency and

security of supply are reached.' Now I would ask the Premier, have we not got here in The Atlantic Accord - the thing that he told us was the greatest thing since Confederation - an out for Mr. Crosbie to do what they did with the restructuring agreement in the case of FFTs, to tear it up because of the bad federal/provincial relations that exist between this government and the government in Ottawa?

MR. FLIGHT:

Right on! That is what I was getting at.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The difference between the restructuring agreement and the Atlantic Accord, Mr. Speaker, even though the restructuring agreement was violated and should not have been, is the restructuring agreement was not introduced into the House of Commons and not made the law of Canada, whereas the Atlantic Accord was. So there is a big, big difference between the two and we are completely protected. If the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) wants to condemn the Atlantic Accord, he will do so at his political peril.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we are obviously, as far as the federal government is concerned, not looking at perhaps

the greatest employment that we could get, but we are probably looking at a gravity based system. I do not mind my political peril when it comes to bringing out things in this Province.

Bill Hopper, the President of Petro-Canada -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This is a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I would ask the Premier is the statement made by Bill Hopper, the President of Petro-Canada, this morning, that Petro-Canada has no obligation to give Come By Chance first call on the production of oil from the Terra Nova field, indeed a reality, and is this not, again, in violation of what he has told us is in The Atlantic Accord?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hopper, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Masse and everybody else can say what they like, the laws of the Province and the laws of Canada will apply through the Atlantic Accord; every single clause, every single phrase will apply, and they can go out and make whatever statements they like. They have to go through the Joint Board, they have to adhere to the laws of Canada and the laws of Newfoundland, and that is what is so important about the Atlantic Accord.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Premier about the divestiture process with regard to Fishery Products International, and it has to do with the statements that he made yesterday. We have checked and we find that only 1.3 million shares are being offered for sale in this Province. My question to the Premier is, since that represents less than \$15 million worth of total equity of about \$175 million, and since even the employees' equity and the equity being given to the management people will not bring the ownership of Newfoundlanders up beyond about 10 per cent or 12 per cent of the company, and indeed the rest of it will be sold to Europe and outside the Province, is it not true -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
The question is coming now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE:
You are making a speech and breaking the rules.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I know the hon. member started by asking a question but now he is making a speech. I would ask him to direct his question, please.

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is would not the Premier acknowledge that this 10 per cent to 12 per cent ownership is not anything near adequate in order to make sure that Newfoundlanders have a significant

stake in our major fish company?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether it would or whether it would not. Yesterday the Leader of the NDP Party (Mr. Fenwick) asked me how we were going to ensure the provision that we had talked about for there being a majority of the Board of Directors resident in Newfoundland. I want to inform him now, because I did not yesterday - it bears on the same point of control and ownership - that in a piece of legislation that will very shortly be introduced into this House in this session there is the provision in this legislation that a majority of the shareholders have to be resident in Newfoundland. So it will become the law of Newfoundland and Labrador, which will ensure that a majority of the members on the Board of Directors are resident in Newfoundland. It is also in the Privatization Agreement between the Government of Canada, the Government of Newfoundland, and FPI. So we are protected on two fronts, a legal contract and the law of Newfoundland. So that should take care of that.

Now there are going to be shares provided - I have not checked as to how many; apparently the Leader of the NDP Party has. Whether 10 or 15 per cent, I do not know what the demand is going to be in the Province, whether the demand is going to be there to be able to get it up any higher. He talks about \$175 million. I thought it was between \$130 million and \$150 million.

MR. FENWICK:

It is \$175 million according to the brokers I talked to.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I do not know. I will have to check and see just how much is going to be raised. My understanding was it was between \$130 million and \$150 million. That is important because that will determine the percentages that the member is using. But whether, in fact, 10 or 15 per cent of the shares are owned by Newfoundlanders or Canadians or whatever, I think the important salient point is that if this company, which is now going into the private sector, can successfully raise the funds - it looks like they are going to be able to - and if we have provisions in there for the majority of the Board of Directors to be resident in Newfoundland, with nobody having more than 15 per cent control of the company in any case, then we have a pretty dynamic and good company for the offshore fishing industry of Newfoundland.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Since the Premier in his answer indicated he did not know what the demand is, I would like to inform him, by way of a question, that since we do know that the demand in the Province is twice as great as the share allocation, will he see that FPI will be willing to make sure that instead of 1.3 million shares that they have to offer the investment houses, that the number of shares available in the Province be equal to the demand that has been expressed for

them?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I cannot give that undertaking, Mr. Speaker, obviously, because the company has now been turned over to private hands. We have got provisions in here to protect ourselves and to protect the fishery. Whether we have 10 per cent of the shares that are issues or 20 per cent of the shares that are issues, whether we have to cover all of the demand in the Province, I do not know if that is a fair way of going. All I know is, to this point in time a significant number of shares are going to be offered in the Province so that people who wish to purchase shares will have the opportunity to do so.

I will have to check over the next few hours and see just what the actual demand is. I do know that after FPI had done their presentation in the Province, and recognizing that there was an increased demand over what they had anticipated, that they were going to try to accommodate that increased demand. Now to what degree they have done that to date, I do not know. But I will take that under advisement and get that information for the hon. member. I know that they have increased the number of shares to Newfoundlanders to try to accommodate some of that extra demand. Because I think, if I am not mistaken, it might be a record for Newfoundlanders investing in a company, any company.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier pertaining to the treatment of cottage hospitals. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Orsborn Royal Commission Report, Recommendation No. 9 of Chapter 4, recommended that Come By Chance hospital be closed because Clarenville was opening, and also that the Grand Bank and St. Lawrence hospitals should close when the new regional hospital opens on the Burin Peninsula, let me ask the Premier how can the Premier and his government rationalize now keeping the two cottage hospitals open on the Burin Peninsula - they have closed Come By Chance, of course, along with the provisions of the Royal Commission Report - how can they even after the new regional hospital opens?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

One reason, Mr. Speaker, is population, that the population in the Grand Bank and St. Lawrence areas is much larger than in the Come By Chance area. That is one significant reason. A second reason is that the St. Lawrence Hospital is in a very different circumstance than Come By Chance was, or any other hospital, because it was given to the people of St. Lawrence by the Americans.

And, thirdly, in the case of Grand Bank, not only is it a question of population, but there is also a question of about 1,000 people working in two fish plants very near where that hospital is. So

we have to take those things into consideration. These are the factors that we took into consideration.

In the case of Come By Chance, the population density was in the Clarenville area. We wanted to build a new regional hospital, we wanted to attract specialists and so on, and that could be done much better from a population density point of view in Clarenville than in Come By Chance.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Premier.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows what he just said is full of holes, mostly untruths. I can table documents which can prove that, and I will do so. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Health this: In an effort to maintain consistency in regard to how cottage hospitals are dealt with in this Province, and in an effort to maintain his government's credibility, will the minister announce in the near future that the Cottage Hospital at Come By Chance will be given back the status that it has enjoyed for fifty years? Will the minister do that?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform

you that I cannot do that and there are obvious reasons which I have given before, and I will give you again. The Cottage Hospital in Come By Chance had reached the end of its tether. They were unable, and quite unable, to do anything in that cottage hospital that cannot be done in the emergency department at this particular time. Absolutely nothing! Statements have been made to the contrary, but they cannot be argued under any scrutiny of anyone who knows anything about what can be done in a hospital of that size with the training of the medical staff they have in a hospital of that size.

As a matter of fact, the number of people who are seeking primary medical care in that out-patient clinic is extremely low. I think that the numbers, which you are possibly aware of, would not warrant any further service at this particular time.

MR. CALLAN:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Health, then, if he is not prepared then to give back to Come By Chance the status of a cottage hospital, let me ask the minister is he prepared to give them a twenty-four clinic? They have an eight hour clinic, nine to five, now. Is he prepared to give them a twenty-four hour clinic? I have heard rumours of a sixteen hour clinic. How about that, a twenty-four or a sixteen hour clinic?

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

We have had numerous meetings in particular with representative groups from the Come By Chance area. There has been one other group which has covered what is known as the catchment area of Come By Chance. We have discussed it in detail, and in our latest proposal to a group out there we said, number one, we would assess the amount of work that is done in the Come By Chance clinic. That has been done. We have the numbers, w

have the other facts. There were some other complaints. We have investigated them.

We have also discussed the problem with the Clarendville Hospital and with the Clarendville Hospital Board. We have made a tentative offer. So if the people want it, first of all, we intend to appoint an advisory board in the immediate Come By Chance area, so that they can act as a liaison group with the Board of Governors of the Clarendville Hospital. We also hope that we will have the chairman of that advisory group as a member of the Board of Governors of the Clarendville Hospital.

Number two, we have offered them if they so desire - I repeat, if they so desire - that maybe we can stagger the hours of the clinics a bit without increasing the staff. As an example, open the clinic at 9 o'clock in the morning and go on until 5 o'clock in the afternoon; change it a bit if the people desire and if the numbers warrant it. Have one doctor on in the morning and have two doctors on from 2 o'clock onwards in the afternoon and extend the hours of the clinic. We have also offered

them, if they so desire - I repeat, if they so desire - if there is a wish and a demand, that the clinic can be opened on Saturday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
I am waiting for the answer.

DR. TWOMEY:
I am sorry. I wanted to give you the answers, but if it displeases you, fair enough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). It is a well known and a well established fact that the Minister of Finance cannot add, but such a decision has not been made on his reading ability yet. My question then, Mr. Speaker, to the minister is this: Would the minister specify the clause and/or clauses, subsection and/or subsections - in other words, give this House chapter and verse - of The Financial Administration Act or The Financial Administration Regulations which permitted him and his officials to set up a bank account in Japan in excess of \$100 million in such an irregular and

slipshod manner?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to a observation in the Auditor General's Report and, of course, there was a departmental response to that. I guess the point is that strictly speaking - technically, narrowly, sort of inconsequently, almost - certain regulations of The Financial Administration Act were not followed in the letter. What happened was that a particular bank account which was properly set up under the authority of Cabinet should have been put in place, shall we say, administratively by the Comptroller General, but instead of that it was put in place administratively by the Deputy Minister of Finance. Now, there is a fine distinction there as to what should have been done. It is an extremely fine line and, of course, I do not have to tell this House that not too long ago the Comptroller General and the Deputy Minister of Finance were indeed the one and the same person. It was only recently that there was a division of duties put in there. As the compendium states, we admit that there was an infraction, a technical, a very fine, narrow, technical infraction made, but it was made under full authority of Cabinet and we will ensure, as we have stated in the compendium, that that very narrow, technical infraction will not happen again.

MR. LUSH:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the minister gives the indication that he believes that Cabinet decisions supercede the laws of this Legislature. Does the minister indeed believe that, that decisions by Cabinet supercede the laws of this Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I did not say that and I do not believe that. What The Financial Administration Act does do is give a certain amount of flexibility to Cabinet in certain situations. For instance, in terms of instruments that we may invest public monies in, it lays out what these are and then says, 'and other instruments that Cabinet may so deem appropriate', you know, these sorts of things. So there is a certain amount of flexibility in The Financial Administration Act in terms of Cabinet authority.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister has admitted that at least there was an infraction of these laws, the Auditor General has stated that it was illegal, so in view of the fact that the Auditor General has stated that the procedure used was illegal, is the minister now going to follow the laws of this Legislature with respect to managing the financial transactions of this Province? Is the minister going to do this? If not, will he do the honourable thing, and the beneficial thing to

the people of this Province, and resign?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I really think we have to get back to first principles here. I do not know if the hon. member is aware of this - many people are aware of it - but there are two kinds of sins: There is mortal sin and there is venial sin. Now in mortal sin you burn forever in the fiery coals of hell. In venial sin, you might just have a safety match thrown at you for a short period of time. Now this particular infraction falls clearly into the category of venial sin and is a very, very minor, very small, very narrowly defined venial sin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a sin by any other name is still a sin.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You know all about that.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Who will you quote next, Voltaire?

MR. FUREY:

Well, Voltaire is better than Mickey Mouse.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, protect me from the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Who said, 'A rose by any other name'?

MR. FUREY:

Virginia Wolf, Brian, Virginia Wolf.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, no. She would not be in your stream of consciousness.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question, if I can get silence from the Premier's tongue there for a minute, is for the Minister of Justice. Does a Cabinet order or Cabinet approval supercede the laws of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the member for St. Barbe is not aware of the rules of procedure of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

I would remind the hon. member that, in addition to brushing up on his Virginia Wolf, he should refer to page 133 of Beauchesne where citation 360 says, "A question may not: Ask a solution

of a legal question, such as the interpretation of a statute," and so on and so on. Clearly the question is out of order.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Justice telling the people of St. Barbe, the district I represent, that I cannot ask her a question pertaining to law, ask her what is right and what is wrong for the citizens of St. Barbe? Is that what she is saying?

MR. EFFORD:

Here, hear! A good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of St. Barbe are intelligent people and they are well aware that if their elected member has any concern about the laws of the Province, has any suspicion that the laws of the Province are not being honoured, that the member has a duty as indeed does every citizen, to bring it to the police or the law officers of the Crown.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Labour. I would like to ask the minister, in view of a recent study that has been produced by the Fisheries Research Group of Memorial University, which documents many horrific stories of lack of protection for the workers in the offshore, has he had a chance to review the report, and if he is making representation to his federal counterpart to bring forward legislation to protect the offshore workers in occupational health and safety?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the report that the hon. member for St. John's East is talking about. I have been questioned about it by the media. It is a matter of opinion. It really does not affect the operation of our Occupational Health and Safety Division in what they do in health and safety. We have a vigilance, Mr. Speaker, in the fishery, and there is some ongoing work. There has been great co-operation by the Fishermen's Union in dealing with occupational health and safety matters in the fishery, both in the inshore and the offshore, but the report that the hon. gentleman is talking about is really irrelevant to this kind of thing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

I would like to ask could the minister inform the House if he has knowledge of the status of legislation that the Federal Department of Labour has been promising to bring forward for offshore safety in the fishery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the connection between the question that the hon. member is asking. But there is a former employee of the Ministry of Transport who chairs a committee which is looking at safety in the offshore, but there is no question of the jurisdiction of our Occupational Health and Safety legislation to fisheries. That has not been challenged and ours is being observed there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) concerning the -

MR. BAIRD:

The frost bite.

MR. EFFORD:

- concerning the frost bite, if you want to put it like that, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Social Services, yesterday in answering questions and in his interviews on

the news media, stated very clearly that the things that have been happening in his department, as far as the escapes of boys from the Boys' Home and the loss of life and the tragedy that we saw take place in the group home, was a fact of life. I would like to ask the minister is he telling the people of this Province that these things are a fact of life, that they are going to happen again, and that he is not going to take the responsibility and do something to ensure that these things will not happen again in the future?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, there was one tragic loss of life from the Whitbourne Home last year and that, to the best of my knowledge, is the only tragedy that has ever occurred in this Province since we have had correction. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this is something to be taken lightly. I am not saying that, Mr. Speaker. Of course it is always serious when children escape custody, but the hon. member is suggesting that there is lack of supervision or that we are non-caring, and that is not the case. What I am saying is that these are not seasoned criminals, Mr. Speaker. These are, most of them, really misguided children. That is why we were against The Young Offenders Act in the first place, because we do not really believe in the incarceration of young children, and that is what is happening. So we are not going to take twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen year olds and clamp iron on their wrists or put chains on their feet, this sort of thing.

We try to treat them as they are, as misguided children, hopefully to rehabilitate them with our programmes and our services, and get them back in the community as quickly as we can so that they can live normal lives and grow up to be normal people. Mr. Speaker, really the hon. member is just, as he did most of last year, making mountains out of molehills again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. EFFORD:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

For the young lad who died in Whitbourne -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

- and the young girl in the group home -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

- you have a responsibility to the people of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I have spoken to the hon. member twice, and that should not be necessary.

MR. DECKER:

A point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have been looking through Hansard in the last few minutes. I notice that the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) yesterday stood in this House and made the statement, 'I think that there is probably no more dangerous bunch of quacks loose in society today than chiropractors.'

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was referring to a professional group of people in North America. These chiropractors have six years of training, by and large, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I just cannot see how the hon. member's privileges are affected by any hon. member making comments about a group of individuals outside this House. If the hon. member has any other development on that theme, I am prepared to listen to it.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, the statement that the hon. gentleman made is irresponsible, totally irresponsible, and casts a bad reflection upon this hon. House, of which I am a member. I do not want a professional group -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must say there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege. What the hon. member said the hon. member is entitled to say.

Petitions

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition from Churchill Falls within my constituency signed by fifty-five residents and because it deals with a matter which comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I have provided him a copy of the petition. It reads as follows: 'The petition of the undersigned being residents of Churchill Falls in the electoral district of Naskaupi.

Humbly sheweth that we petition the elected member for the Naskaupi district and the members of the House of Assembly to make change or addition to the Public Service Pension Plan to show the following:

PURCHASE OF PRIOR SERVICE:

That any person being formerly employed by the Federal Government as a member of the Canadian Armed Forces who being honourably discharged (released) and not receiving a pension for this service may purchase time served in the Canadian Armed Forces up to a maximum of nine (9) years and eleven (11) months pensionable service and said cost of same to be based on the salary being paid

at the recommencement of the latest period of employment under the plan.

EARLY RETIREMENT:

That early retirement be available to any member covered by this plan who has a minimum of twenty-five (25) years of pensionable service and has attained the age of fifty-five (55) years.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.'

Mr. Speaker, this was quite a long time in reaching the floor of the House of Assembly in the form of an acceptable petition, but I can briefly explain that. My understanding is, from the organizer of the petition, that the first petition was passed to my predecessor some time ago, the former representative of my district. The petitioner was unable to determine exactly what had happened and I informed him, on a constituency trip to my district, that I would be happy to present the petition in the House as soon as I could be provided with it. Now, when it did arrive initially it was in the form of a photocopy, which I understand is not acceptable to the House, and was not in the proper format for acceptance, and through the course of a period of time we eventually had a new petition in proper terms and signed with the fifty-five original signatures returned.

However, when it did reach me it was in the Summer, after we had closed our last Spring session, and in consultation with the petitioners they felt that it would be appropriate if we could present it in the House and they agreed that whenever the House reopened we would present the

petition at that time - a bit of a circuitous route to get here. We did not sit in the Fall, as you know, and this is the first opportunity I have had to present this.

I would like to say that my understanding of the plan as it exists now, or any reciprocal agreements with other agencies in the provincial government or with Crown corporations, is that wartime service is covered. However, peacetime service with the Canadian Armed Forces may not be covered. I think this is the message that they would like to have recognized. I will be corresponding with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) about this in greater detail, but I understand that they want to get those who have peacetime service with the Canadian Armed Forces, the Department of National Defence, the plan would be adjusted to have the reciprocal agreement in there to recognize that.

Of course, the early retirement portion of the petition is quite self-explanatory and one which would be of benefit not only to my district. It just happens that in Churchill Falls there are a number of people who have Canadian Armed Forces time in, but in peacetime, who cannot take advantage of buying back that previous service and adding it to their pensionable service with CF(L)Co, and perhaps, as is suggested in Section 2 here, be able to take advantage of early retirement with twenty-five years pensionable service and a minimum of fifty-five years of age. I would perhaps elicit a response from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and say again that I will be corresponding with the minister in more detail later.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, it gives me great privilege to support this petition presented so ably by my friend and colleague, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), on behalf of some fifty residents of Churchill Falls. I do so so gladly and so willingly because of my early connections with the town of Churchill Falls, having lived there for five years, from 1967 to 1972, during the period of the total development of that great hydro development. I went there, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning and stayed till its finish, so I have many fond memories of Churchill Falls under that huge hydro development, one of the largest hydro developments in the world, if not the largest in the world.

Mr. Speaker, more precisely to the prayer of the petition, these persons are asking that years of service in the Canadian Armed Forces be counted up to the maximum of nine years and eleven months which is, in my view, a very reasonable request and one that I can support and endorse wholeheartedly. As the member so capably pointed out, the problem here is related to the fact that wartime service is credited, but it is the peacetime service. Now I, quite frankly, do not see a large difference in terms of helping a person to get their life straightened out and to plan for retirement. It seems to me if a person has served ten years in wartime service it should not be counted any more valuable than ten years in peacetime service in

terms of the value that it has for the particular individual. That is certainly not to downgrade wartime service, Mr. Speaker, but any person who enters the military is obviously prepared for wartime services. So it happens, under the circumstances, that at a particular point in time wartime service was not required and that they were serving in peacetime, which is also very important and very noble.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can certainly support the prayer of this petition, realizing the difficulty that it places a person in. For example, supposing a person had served in the military for twelve to fifteen years. They have given a good portion of their lives and, I understand now, they are not able to get any pension for that particular period of time. So if they were able to purchase a maximum of the years required, they would be able to straighten themselves out in a fairly adequate manner. Also, tying this into the company scheme would certainly help a person to be able to pay up for, if you will, the lost time, in a way, that they made up while serving in the military.

So, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great privilege to be able to support the prayer of this petition of these residents of Churchill Falls, these concerned residents who recognize this or see this as a problem to them in terms of planning for their retirement. I hope that some members opposite, specifically the minister responsible, will certainly take hold of this issue and demonstrate their concern for this particular issue and certainly have it referred to the appropriate federal department. Thank you

very much.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, just very briefly on the petition. I do not think it clearly states in the petition that the petitioners are presently members of the Public Service, but I presume that is the case.

MR. KELLAND:
They are with CF(L)Co.

DR. COLLINS:
Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think there may be a certain amount of misunderstanding in that and I would welcome further clarification from the hon. member. Because the way I read it here is that the individuals, presumably, were not vested in the Canadian Armed Forces pension plan. There is a Canadian Armed Forces pension plan. I do not know the details of it, but I presume they were not vested in that plan or they would be receiving a pension. What this is saying essentially is that they be allowed to purchase those numbers of years in our plan.

Now, to purchase years where there is not any reciprocity in place is very, very expensive on the individual, because he not only has to pay his contribution, which in our plan is 6 per cent of salary, but he also has to pay the government's portion. So that would be 12 per cent of salary which is usually very expensive and, in actual fact, is hardly worth the benefit. That is in purchase. Now, if there is reciprocity in place, of course,

that does not apply. We do not have reciprocity with the Armed Forces, and, indeed, no provincial government does for those who served in peacetime. Only the federal government has reciprocity in that case. The Armed Forces, themselves, do not want reciprocity because it is not a one way street. If we gave them benefits, they would have to give us benefits. And as their plan is very much more generous than ours, it would be very costly for them to give benefits to our public servants who enter the Armed Forces.

So, it is a rather complicated area. I would welcome further clarification from the hon. member. I certainly will have our Pension Committee study the matter and if I can have some addresses - there are names here but no addresses, but I am sure we can get them through the hon. member - I will be glad to send back the results of our analysis.

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Order one.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order one, Address in Reply.

The debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Stephenville.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure again to speak on a document which is supposed to be

the plan. I would like at this time also to welcome the members for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons), and St. John's East (Mr. Long), to the House of Assembly. I did not get a chance to do it earlier. I hope that they have a pleasant stay and accomplish a number of things for their districts.

One of the things about the Address in Reply is that you get a chance to say some things about your district which are quite pertinent and which also are affected by legislation and new programmes which the province brings in.

Before I get into that, I feel that this blue book which is supposed to be the plan for the year to help tackle the problems of unemployment is not an adequate booklet to really deal with the problems and will not be for a number of years. There are some initiatives which I will certainly pat the government on the back for, but there is still not the real sense that the problem of unemployment is going to be dealt with in this Province.

I am amazed at some of the things that you keep hearing and the stats that keep coming out. Just recently it was reported that over 50 per cent of the population filing income tax returns in this Province are reporting UI earnings which mean that 50 per cent of the people in this Province have an income that is based on unemployment insurance at some time during the year. It is a shocking statistic. It is a shocking reminder of the economic doldrums that this Province is in.

What I was hoping to see from the

Throne Speech was a goal set in mind of where we would be within the next year, or within the next couple of years. But it is a booklet which describes a number of initiatives which we have not seen yet and which we are supposed to be seeing in the next little while, which do not go far enough. Some are positive but they do not go far enough to really deal with the major problems that are out there. I was looking forward to seeing something but again, it is unfortunate, especially the overall emphasis.

The first line talks about jobs and obviously the unemployment rate has not gone anywhere but up since the last Throne Speech and the one before that, so if you are talking about where we are at the end of it and if you want to give it a grade, we still not have not improved on our past achievements, if you want to call them that.

I would like to get into a few things. One of the things I noticed in the Throne Speech highlights were that there are three major potential developments which are being vigorously pursued, these being Hibernia, a pulp mill for Labrador and a NATO base at Goose Bay.

One of the things that I am greatly disturbed at is that the Province would not consider a proposal which is ongoing right now for the town of Stephenville in Bay St. George for a sea cadet base. There is an intensive lobbying effort at the present time going on with the federal government to try and achieve that base for the Stephenville area on the West Coast.

We have had meetings in Ottawa

with federal department officials and with federal ministers. We have dealt with provincial officials on a very ad hoc basis. The co-operation I was looking forward to was going to be great indeed, but thus far it has not been. I am going to be having some major questions in the very near future as to the emphasis. I was hoping to see it on this Throne Speech highlight page, but I did not. I am disturbed because of it. I am looking forward to the explanation from the provincial government as to why it was not mentioned.

The sea cadet proposal that is presently being put forward to the federal government would see the establishment of a sea cadet base in Newfoundland and Labrador for the first time. It would include 700 staff with the facility. It would include 100 to 150 permanent jobs in the area. It would include military expenditures or defence expenditures, since defence seems to be the nicer word, defence expenditures in the area of \$2 million to \$3 million.

It is worthy of note that in this Province last year defence construction by the Defence Department was zero, when it comes to new expenditures on construction. I think that is a disturbing thought considering there was \$15 million spent in Atlantic Canada. All three other provinces got at least \$3 million of this money and, we in Newfoundland and Labrador, the outlying region of Canada, we are not able to ascertain a dollar. I am very disturbed it with.

Many people from the West Coast are hoping to see this become a reality. The case we have is a very good one. It goes very well

with the Throne Speech but the Throne Speech decided not to put anything about it in. Maybe it is because it is a Liberal initiative. I do not know. I hope it is not the case.

In relation to the sea cadet base we have in this Province over 63 per cent of sea cadets in Atlantic Canada. Out of the four provinces, that is what we have them in Newfoundland and Labrador. The Stephenville area is a former military base. It has many advantages for such a facility. The military have been in to look at it. They did an analysis of it. They have even budgeted looking at the costs involved.

I am very disturbed at the provincial government's response. I am hoping that they are putting their best foot forward. I have put two questions on the Order Paper and I am looking forward to a response that they have had meetings with the federal minister in Ottawa and also saying that they have sent correspondence to Ottawa indicating their support so I know for sure that they are doing something with it. If we are to attain it, it is an initiative that could put Stephenville and Bay St. George in a much better economic environment. It would improve the economic situation a great deal.

It is an initiative that we have tried for the last year to put forward and I am hoping that the provincial government will see fit to include it in its next Throne Speech highlights. I am very disturbed that it was not there. I was very disturbed to see the lack of action thus far, and I am looking forward to seeing more.

There are a number of things affecting the Stephenville area. We have a hospital which needs to be upgraded. It is a forty year old facility. It has been there since the Americans left. There have been a few dollars put in to maintain it, but it is now to the point where the facility is need of drastic upgrading so that good health care service is provided to the area. Since 1980, in seven years, they have seen very little expenditure put into the institution so that they could do something with it.

It is unfortunate that health care in Bay St. George is going to start suffering because of the lack of space and because of the requirements that they are not able to meet. I am hoping that the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and the Cabinet will have considered this facility a priority when it comes to their budget this year since it does affect two members of governments in their region, including Port au Port and St. George's. I am hoping that the government will see fit this year to bring monies in in their budget to deal with the health care situation in Stephenville, Port au Port, and St. George's.

Again, it has been seven years. I think it is time. They have set it up and put in a good plan. They do not want a big bundle of money all at once. They want to do it gradually, over a period of time. But if something soon is not done we are going to be in the situation where emergency funding is going to be needed to repair our situation out there. It could be detrimental to the people of the area.

Another thing I would like to see

from this Provincial Throne Speech is more emphasis on putting infrastructure in local areas for development. In my district, for example, we have the Abitibi Price mill in Stephenville. We also have a fish plant that has been very successful in the last year in creating employment. To get there you have to drive over a road that is deplorable and it is causing a great expense for both the workers and for the businesses in the area.

There are over 500 to 600 jobs in the area and we cannot get the provincial Department of Transportation to take responsibility for the road even though many of the workers are from the minister's district. It is something that we have been bringing up in the past. I am hoping to see that in the budget this year. I hope that the provincial government has decided to make infrastructure in local areas a priority.

One of the things I would like to mention also, considering the new legislation coming in, which is talked about in the Throne Speech, is the community college system and the proposed changes. There are many concerns that have to be addressed here. I am looking forward to seeing the legislation so that we can view it to see what changes are going to be made.

Concerns have been expressed to me thus far about the community colleges presently. The Bay St. George Community College in Stephenville, which was the leader, as a matter of fact, in this Province, started out on a small scale basis and has built itself up to be probably one of the best institutions in the country as related to community

colleges. It is a leader in the Province and a leader in the country, but their autonomy may be affected somewhat for programmes. I want to make sure, and I will be bringing those concerns to the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), that that autonomy is not affected; that the community college and its staff are able to do the good job they have done over the past number of years in bringing in programmes to the local area and to helping the community education of the area, especially people who want to get back into school. The community college has done a superb job. Its staff and Mr. Fowler out there, the head of the college, has done a superb job in getting the college to be a number one institution.

I will be bringing certain concerns to the minister as to new programmes that will be brought in. I am hoping that Stephenville will be the beneficiary of a new act. I hope that the minister will take these concerns under advisement.

One of the many things that I must bring up related to the Throne Speech is, especially in Stephenville, we have a very big social conscience. As a matter of fact, I am very proud of the area. Over the last year and a half we have had a number of institutions open up, a juvenile assessment center which is taking care of young people. We have had a community employment corporation created by the initiative of the local people in the area which has opened up dealing with the handicapped of the area, doing a very good job. It just recently had its official opening.

We have also had the Status of

Women office, which has recently opened up, to again help the women of the area. I think that more centers should be set up across the Province to deal with the womens' issues in this Province. I do not think there is enough being done to deal with them. I am looking forward to their lobby on March 23 when they will be coming in to address the politicians of Newfoundland and Labrador with their concerns.

We have also had the opening of Westbridge House, Mr. Speaker, in Stephenville. It deals with people who have had some trouble with the law and it is trying to rehabilitate them.

So I think I have every right to be proud of the Stephenville area and its accomplishments in the last year and a half. I think it has one of the biggest social consciences in this Province. I wish the Throne Speech had one because we would probably be getting a lot further ahead in the future.

One of the things that I also want to bring up concerning development, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Harmon Corporation in Stephenville, Bay St. George, has served the area well over the past number of years. It is now on the verge, well, we really do not know. We are getting all kinds of questions marks and we are getting a lot of different information coming from the provincial government as to the status of the Harmon Corporation.

The Harmon Corporation was set up to deal with the economic development of Stephenville and Bay St. George. It has done a very good job, and now we see its future in doubt. We also see the

future of the facilities that they have in doubt. I am very concerned as to what decision will be made by the provincial government in relation to that.

The Stephenville area has been hampered somewhat in the last number of years because of a lack of an industrial park. It is the only urban center in the Province that really does not have one that can address and bring in business into the area. We have had examples of businesses coming into Stephenville and then just moving on because there was not enough land in the area to address their problems, and to invite them in. In this Province we have got to make it inviting for businesses to come in.

I do not really see where there have been that many initiatives in this Throne Speech to deal with that type of thing, especially when it comes to the area that I represent, an area which has bounced back from many economic disasters over the years like the closing down of the American base in 1966 and the closing down of the linerboard mill. It has bounced back to be a stable town but it needs a push; it needs some help. I am trying to be optimistic that this Throne Speech and the future budget will bring in some measures that will help that but my optimism evades me after a while when I see what has been happening in the past number of years.

Those are certain concerns that I have in the area. I have two communities outside of Stephenville, Coal Brook and Noels Pond which has certain needs that need to be addressed. I am hoping a silviculture will be in the budget for the Coal Brook area so

that we can see some jobs created there and the replanting of trees in the area which will help create employment for the 100 residents of the area. Also, in Noels Pond we have a flooding problem there which we have been trying to deal with for the past number of years. I am hoping that moneys will be made available in the future to the provincial Department of Transportation.

I want to pat the provincial government on the back. I do not do it too often but I do it when it is warranted. I take exception to the NDP's comments on entrepreneurship. I feel that entrepreneurship is the way to go in this Province in many ways. I think that is a programme that should be brought in throughout the community colleges, throughout the high school system to at least give students an opportunity to see what the business world is like, to at least see how business operates and also to give them some thoughts about maybe creating meaningful employment on their own. That type of idea, I think, should be put more forward in the high school system and in the community colleges system.

As a matter of fact, in Stephenville they have the first entrepreneurship course offered in the Province. It is a two year course dealing with people who would like to start their businesses, Mr. Speaker. I am very happy to see that Stephenville again has been a leader in the community college system in putting forward a programme that is attempting to deal with or put people out there who are going to deal with their own problems. I think that is one of the ways we can go. So I commend the efforts of government

on doing that very thing. I do not think they are going far enough but at least it is a start and for that I give a positive pat on the back.

I think that if we are to get anywhere in this Province we are going to have to deal with our economic climate, which is not very good. We are going to have to deal with it by educating our people as best we can. I do not think there has been enough emphasis on the educational aspects in trying to get people to go on their own and to start businesses. We have made a start but it is one that has been late. We have got a lot of catching up to do and we have a lot of problems to deal with at the present time.

One of the biggest things, Mr. Speaker, is how sad it is to see federal/provincial relations in this Province at the present time and what has happened to the way they used to get on. For many years we were hearing that once you had a government in Ottawa that would be of the same stripe that we would get a lot more cooperation and that we would see the unemployment situation in this Province start to get a little better. We would see more jobs created.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that we see the situation as it is today where we are worse off than we were five or six years ago when it comes to economic development. The Throne Speech is fine to put out in a nice blue booklet, nice and shiny, Mr. Speaker, but when half of our money comes from the federal government and they are now treating us like we do not exist, then you got some questions to ask as to where we are going to

be next year.

One of the things is that fifty cents out of every dollar is from the feds. If they decide that they are going to cut us out a bit, perhaps gradually, or if they decide that because of our attitude or our decisions not to bother with them and them not to bother with us like this is a little game, then the situation in this Province is going to be one that is going to get worse and not better. I have seen many quotations from the past federal election where provincial cabinet ministers were going around the Province talking about going with the federal Tories in Ottawa and how good it would be to see them inflict prosperity on us and realize the regional disparities of this Province. I was taken aback by the holding hands they did when they were going around this Province trying to get these two governments elected.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they got them elected alright but the results have been very evident and they have been very sad. Again, unemployment in this Province is 21 per cent. The performance indicator for me for a government is its unemployment level and whether or not it goes up or down. You can blame who you want. You can say, 'Well, we have been in a recession.' I have heard we have been in a recession since 1979 or 1980 and he is still blaming it on the recession, Mr. Speaker. I have some major questions.

I wonder is we are ever going to get out of the recession. Some parts of Canada are doing very well. They have made initiatives on their own in trying to deal with the problem. As I was

looking over the Throne Speech highlights, Mr. Speaker, a number of the things they are talking about were things that we talked about in Opposition. I think the Liberal Opposition should be looked at as a very positive force in the Province for bringing in some ideas that have, at the very least, been looked at by this government. They have taken them and used them, and, I mean, that is the rule of an opposition.

The new Youth Entrepreneurship Programme was a Liberal initiative that we brought up in this House of Assembly. We brought it up in the House. We questioned the minister on it last year. We hounded them on it, Mr. Speaker. We finally got them to take it and use it and I am very happy to see it. I will pat them on the back for it. I think it is great, but I tell you, if we had not brought it up, they might never have heard of the 40 per cent unemployment in the Province, Mr. Speaker. I am very happy, like I said, to see them do it but again, I think we can pat ourselves on the back here on this side of the House as it was something that we talked about many times in this House of Assembly and also around our caucus table, talking about the youth of the Province. We have also been talking about entrepreneurship and that type of thing over here and we have suggested a number of things that they finally have decided to take and go with.

I see no mention though, Mr. Speaker, of dealing with the federal government. I do not know if they have a new programme for that one. Maybe they should hire some new negotiators or some new personnel people for the Province because it looks like we had

another major highlight yesterday of federal/provincial relations and how we are going to get along in the next little while. They come down here, from Ottawa, announce a big lot of money for the offshore and do not even invite the Premier of our Province to go and sit down with them.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I would be more than offended. I would be wondering where we are going in this Province as to getting along and trying to get what we can out of the federal government and trying to get the unemployment rate in this Province to go down instead of up. I can see that certain people in this hierarchy of power have decided that they do not like each other, that the Province can go away and sink where it wants to. 'I am not going to give in,' Mr. Speaker, 'and the other fellow is not going to give in so that is it. It is just too bad. You are just going to have to put up with it and that is all you can do.'

We saw an example of that yesterday which is profound, Mr. Speaker, because just two short years ago all we were hearing was, 'No problem, we are going to hold hands from here on in. It is going to be smooth sailing and whatever you want you can have.' That is what they were telling us in Ottawa and we were down here saying, 'Yes, no problem at all.' We gave them the mandate, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province gave them the mandate, both provincially and federally, to see what they could do.

Well, one of my colleagues said to me this morning, "The proof is in the pudding," Mr. Speaker. At 22 per cent unemployment, still as high as it ever was, and probably

going to get worse; our dismal financial situation which was announced by the Finance Minister; the bankruptcy situation that we might have in the Province, as announced by the Premier; these are real reasons for optimism. I did not see no mention of those highlights in the Throne Speech and I am wondering where those words went that were uttered just a few short weeks ago by both ministers of government. It is a bother, Mr. Speaker, because you want this Province to move up and out of the gutter where it has been for so long with its unemployment rate and with the situation of being a have not Province.

Now we see the bickering going on between two parties of the same stripe who decided, because of personality conflicts, that the Province can go and just waste away. No problem! When we let our tempers get lower we will bother to talk to each other, and then maybe we will deal with a few problems. We will get around to it later on.

There is no mention in this Throne Speech about federal/provincial relations and how they are going to deal with that; not a mention of strategy, not a mention of how we are going to go at them. Are we going to let them walk over us? The biggest thing, Mr. Speaker, is negotiation. You have to negotiate, even with your worst enemies many times, Mr. Speaker. How do you gauge your accomplishments? I mean, we can go and bawl and shout and scream and everything else about whether or not they are wrong or they are right or we are wrong or we are right, but when it comes down to it, when you sit down at the end of the day, what is the result of

what you did, and was it a planned strategy or was it just a flying off the handle, like we sometimes have seen them normally do? If that is what it was, Mr. Speaker, they have dented us so badly down here it is going to be a long time before we are able to recuperate.

It is an unfortunate situation and the people of my district are going to suffer for it, and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are going to suffer for it, because we have a provincial government that really does not know how to deal with any federal government that happens to be in Ottawa. They blame everything on everybody else and do not bother to look at their own situation, even when they admit to a dismal financial picture, even when they admit that there may be a bankrupt situation. They do not even want to take credit for their own statements anymore, Mr. Speaker.

I have major problems with looking at a Throne Speech that talks about highlights. I gave some positive comments on some of the things they brought in. The end result is the unemployment rate in this Province; where is it going to be in about twelve months time?

I am not too sure we are going to be any better off, Mr. Speaker, from the way we are starting off, when we see the federal government coming down here announcing a project, and the mode of development, without even giving the Premier twenty minutes notice. I can see that we are in good hands for the next twelve months, Mr. Speaker.

I am looking forward to this blueprint that they are having put in place, I am looking forward to the unemployment rate dropping in

this Province, and the financial situation getting better. I can see that is all going to happen, Mr. Speaker, from the way things have started off again. I can see it is all going to happen. We, in the Opposition, intend to keep pursuing and making this government accountable because we have no choice. For the good of the people of this Province, they have to be held accountable. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech debate. I want to, first of all, commend the mover and seconder of the motion on Opening Day.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
I think, Mr. Speaker, if you check the record you will find that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands has already spoken in this particular debate. I understand one only gets a chance to speak once. Hansard will show that the minister adjourned the debate.

MR. J. CARTER:
To that point of order.

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

MR. J. CARTER:
It is my understanding that the member was absent when his slot came up. In fact, I took his speaking slot yesterday when I spoke. I think that if he did speak it was merely to show his intention of speaking on the next day. I think it is most uncharitable not to allow a member his time. We are all entitled to half an hour on the Speech from the Throne. I admit that this is an amendment and one could argue that since the main motion will come up for debate that the slot is still open, but the point is that when an amendment is disposed of the main motion is disposed of equally quickly.

I think, quite apart from the rules, common decency and courtesy and the give and take of fair play would dictate that the minister have the same opportunity to speak as the rest of us have.

MR. FLIGHT:
Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that if the minister speaks it will be with the leave of this side of the House. It will not be by right, because the minister has already spoken in this debate. The motion is not amended, so he is speaking to the main motion. He has already spoken. I agree with everything the hon. member said. He stood up, not knowing he was going to be out of the Province on Monday - he should be in more control of his agenda - he stood up and adjourned the debate. There were other

people who wanted to lead off the debate today, but the minister adjourned. So, Mr. Speaker, the minister did not stand up and ask leave to speak in the debate under the circumstances, and maybe he should, and maybe this side will give him leave.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Energy.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the Chair might wish to adjourn to check on this, but my memory tells me that our precedents will show, if the Chair looks back over the past few years, that where a member has moved the adjournment of the debate what in fact that means is that he has the right to lead off the next time. If he is not here, then obviously he cannot exercise that right and anybody else then recognized by the Chair speaks, but he does not lose his right to speak when he is here.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is not true, 'Gerry', and you know it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, that is a difference of opinion. But I think it will be shown that during the past few years the practice has grown up. I do recall an instance, and I think it was an Opposition member - I do not know if it was last year or the year before - moved the adjournment of the debate, he was not here the next time, somebody over here spoke, and I believe the point came up, 'the hon. gentleman is not here', and it was agreed that he did not lose his right to speak. If he were here, then he has the right.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, there was no question of leave in this particular instance. This is what the Chair will have to determine. That is the matter at point. If we say 'by leave', there is no matter at issue. I mean, the hon. member and I are whistling. That is the point at issue, and I think if Your Honour checks he will find that a practice has developed whereby a member moves the adjournment of debate, is not then here to exercise that right of leading off the next time the motion is called, but that he does not lose his right to speak at a later date. That is the point at issue and I think Your Honour will find - it might be difficult, because our indexing in Hansard is not outstanding. That is no criticism of Hansard, but somehow it is difficult to get specific points in the indexing. But I think that the record will show that. At least that is my memory.

MR. J. CARTER:

If I might, further to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Let us try this on for size: Allow the member to speak without prejudice. That is to say, if he speaks now he is not creating a precedent and that will give the Chair, Your Honour, lots of time to check out what the President of the Council (Mr. Ottenheimer) has said and we can defer the resolution of this problem until tomorrow or the next convenient moment.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I will recess the House for a couple of minutes and check the records before making a ruling.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

To the point of order raised by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans, it appears that the hon. minister did speak in debate and in order for the hon. minister to speak again, leave must be granted by the House.

Does the hon. minister have leave?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, by leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point, Mr. Speaker, we have no difficulty with giving the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) leave to speak in view of the circumstances, we just make the general plea that we hope such compassion prevails when the shoe is on the other foot and a member on this side of the House through no fault of his own - either the business of the Province or the business of his district - is required to be away from the House. So in that context we would be delighted to give the gentleman for Grand Falls leave, especially the gentleman for Grand Falls.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made clear I welcome the Opposition's offer to allow the minister to speak by leave, but I think it should be recognized that it is unencumbered leave and not sleazy leave that may be withdrawn at any moment if the minister says something that the members do not approve of. If they give leave, it must be leave for the full thirty minutes.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Let there be no doubt, we are not playing games with the gentleman for Grand Falls. We said that it will be unencumbered leave. And there can be no doubt in the minds of the people in this House that the fact that I gave it makes it unencumbered. Had the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) given it, then other terms, maybe the one he used, could have been implied.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I must say I am somewhat hesitant, because even though the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) has indicated that it will be unencumbered leave, you never know what might transpire in the Legislature.

MR. BAIRD:

Nail him anyway!

MR. SIMMS:

I did not want to participate in a small, petty game, and I was not quite sure if that is what was being tried, because the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. FLight) certainly indicated during the first part of the debate on the point of order that he would not give leave for me to speak when asked. So I had seriously considered not accepting the leave, because when I speak in the House I want to speak by right and not by suffrage or anything else. I feel strongly that the fact that I adjourned the debate on Friday should not have precluded me, notwithstanding Your Honour's ruling, and I respect that ruling.

In any event, I do want to have a few words to say on behalf of my constituents who elected me to speak in the Legislature on their behalf and I will accept the offer, at the present time at least, of members opposite to allow me that privilege.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note, though, throughout the course of this particular point that it was my friend from Windsor - Buchans, my seatmate from

Windsor - Buchans, who constantly talks to me about doing little favours for him and for his constituents in Windsor - Buchans, who is constantly harassing me to do things of that nature, who first of all indicated that I should not speak in the debate. Now, I do not know why he would fear my speaking in the debate. I mean, I am not going to say anything about the member for Windsor - Buchans, or at least I was not going to say anything about the member for Windsor - Buchans, but I just might now. Since the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), who is the Deputy House Leader for the Opposition, has indicated that it will be unencumbered leave, therefore, I will be able to say whatever I want to say without fear of being interrupted. Just generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Throne Speech I want to say this, and I mean it sincerely, that I believe that this Throne Speech brought down by this government and read by His Honour is, in fact, the best Throne Speech that I have seen in this Legislature in eight years, and I say that having been a member of government for the last eight years. Generally speaking, you see a Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, that outlines in general terms what the government's approach will be for the coming year.

MR. TOBIN:

What did he say about the (inaudible)?

MR. SIMMS:

I am going to get to what the member said. This particular Throne Speech outlined for the first time that I can remember a tremendous number of specific programmes that will, without any

question, benefit the people of this Province in many ways. I just want to run through some of them fairly briefly. I did have the chance to read the hon. member for St. John's East's (Mr. Long) speech of yesterday. I regret I was not here to hear him make his maiden speech. I gather it was a very good speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, it was not.

MR. SIMMS:

Some say it was a very good speech. The Minister of Mines speech (Mr. Dinn) I read, and he said it was a very good speech, others say it was not. Irrespective of that, I regret I was not here. I did notice that he had some comments to make about some of our successes. One in particular that I take great issue with him on is the question of whether or not the takeover of the mill in Corner Brook by Kruger was in fact a success. In reading between the lines of his comments yesterday he indicated that it was not the success that we were touting it to be for a very specific reason. Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon. member is only a new member and I know he has not been involved in politics all that long, but surely, Mr. Speaker, if any individual who looks at what happened and what has happened in Corner Brook with respect to the Kruger takeover of that mill and can still say that it is not successful, then surely he is saying it for partisan reasons and for no other reason.

If you talk to the people in Corner Brook, the mood over there is an upbeat mood, without a doubt. In fact, I think there is one more employee working there at that mill than there was when

Kruger actually took it over. They have done a magnificent job of modernization which surely will secure the jobs of hundreds of workers over there, and I do not believe it is fair for anybody to suggest, for whatever reason, that it has not been a success. Now, if he wants to make a complaint about something that had been done with respect to employees or whatever, that is a different situation. But clearly his comments in his speech suggested that it was not a success, or certainly not the success we were saying it was, and I disagree strongly with him because I believe it was and is a very good success and will continue to be, Mr. Speaker, for that entire region.

What is happening over there, of course, we all know now is as a result of efforts by this government, by the municipal government, by members from the area and a whole range of people, groups of people, who have worked together for the last couple of years to overcome that tragedy that occurred when Bowater decided to pull out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Throne Speech, members opposite have been consistently getting up and saying there is nothing in it. Well, Mr. Speaker, that obviously is not very accurate. The member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), whom I was not going to say anything about, as a matter of fact, but I think I will now -

MR. FLIGHT:

Why do you not? I gave you leave (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, you see, there

he is over there threatening me - 'I gave you leave, I can withdraw it.' That is exactly my point. When I speak I want to speak because I am speaking on behalf of the people of Grand Falls who elected me to speak, not because the member for Windsor - Buchans is giving me the right.

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the minister cannot accuse me of things I did not do. I did not say to the minister, 'I gave you leave and I can withdraw it.' I know I cannot withdraw it. I know it was unencumbered. The minister is bluffing, Mr. Speaker, when he says that I said that. I did not say that. I said I gave him leave and I gave him leave. I did not say I would withdraw it or I could withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it is similar to the former point of order which I already ruled on.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There he is again, out of order, wrong, incorrect, and he will continue to do that. He will continue to do that, I predict. Throughout the course of my comments he will be interrupting, he will be trying to do everything he can to make a fool of himself, and thus far he has been doing an excellent job.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor - Buchans says, with respect to the Throne Speech, in The Grand Falls Advertiser, dated March 2 -

MR. DAWE:

He said there was not a thing in the Speech about partridge, and if there was he could not find it.

MR. SIMMS:

Wait now. He is desperately trying to get some media coverage, by the way, desperately. He is upset because he does not get any media coverage in Grand Falls. I am not surprised he does not. I mean, you have to say something, Mr. Speaker, or do something in order to get media coverage.

Here is what he said about the Throne Speech: "'Nothing in the Speech to make area residents dance in the streets', Windsor - Buchans MHA". Do you know why he said that, Mr. Speaker? Here is why he said it: "He noted that several issues were not mentioned in the speech at all. He pointed out that nothing had been said about the water treatment plant for Grand Falls."

MR. DAWE:

In the Throne Speech?

MR. SIMMS:

In the Throne Speech now, Mr. Speaker! Here is a member of the House of Assembly, who has been a member for years and years and years, who should know better than to expect to see something about a water treatment plant for Grand Falls in the Throne Speech.

I will say this for the member, that perhaps he might want to sit up and take note when the Budget Speech comes down in a few weeks time, and see what he has to say about it then. Then he said, Mr. Speaker, "There was no mention in the Throne Speech about the regional incinerator in Grand Falls."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. member, I am sure, I am certain that the hon. member did not really expect to see that in the Throne Speech, the water treatment plant and the regional incinerator. "All that was in the Throne Speech were Band-Aid announcements. Those kinds of things cannot continue to occur."

Now, contrary to the coverage that the hon. member got, which was totally negative, totally irrelevant, nothing to do with the Throne Speech at all, was another quote from The Grand Falls Advertiser of the same date, and I might say, a little further ahead in the paper than the hon. member's - I think he was on page 17 or something. This particular story was on page 2, and the headline says, Grand Falls Area To Benefit From New Initiatives. Simms Meets Local Media. I thought it was an excellent story, a fair story, and it covered all of the tremendous items that are outlined in this Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, just so we cannot be accused of being partisan in this - he says one thing and people think he is right, and I say one thing and people say I am right - let us have a look to see what the editor had to say. The editor of the paper is a non-partisan individual.

MR. FLIGHT:

What a (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Is the member for Windsor - Buchans suggesting that Editor of the paper is not non-partisan?

MR. FLIGHT:

That is not true.

MR. SIMMS:

I did not think he would.

MR. FLIGHT:

He would rather have you than Blackmore, you know.

MR. SIMMS:

So what? Who cares about that? I know hundreds of people from Windsor - Buchans who would prefer to see somebody else here besides the hon. member, too, somebody who could deliver.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I indicated, and this is for the benefit of my constituents. They will see what I had to say in the paper, and they will see what the hon. member had to say, too. But here he is interrupting me again. I mean, Mr. Speaker, he said he would not, yet he has been at it ever since I started. He cannot control himself. The hon. member cannot control himself.

Anyway here is an independent assessment of the Throne Speech. "There is a lot to be said for what was contained in last week's Throne Speech. For one thing" - a fair statement - "the provincial government appears to realize there are no magic answers to turning the economy around, although to hear some of the rhetoric from the Opposition one might be inclined to conclude they would prefer to offer the Province something clouded in sugar candy. Cotton candy, as we all know, is a little sponge sugar that is fluffed with a lot of air."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent statement. I wish I had said it myself. I intend to write the editor and send him a complimentary letter.

MR. FLIGHT:

And tell him (Inaudible) was involved in 1972.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, there is the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) again, barking and squawking. My God, he just cannot stop. He just cannot stop!

"We agree with the provincial government that a slow, well-calculated approach is what is needed and we feel that is what was offered in last week's Throne Speech."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a non-partisan, independent viewpoint judging what the member for Windsor - Buchans had to say about The Throne Speech, the lack of mention of a water treatment plant and the regional incinerator and stuff, and what the member for Grand Falls had to say when he said that the area is going to benefit from all the initiatives in The Throne Speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans to get up afterwards, or whenever he dares stand, and he will have his rights, there will not be anyone over here interrupting him or bothering him, there never is -

MR. TULK:

Oh, you will be sick then.

MR. SIMMS:

Let me see what the member for Windsor - Buchans says about these non-items, nothing in The Throne Speech.

MR. TOBIN:

Where does he want the prison?

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member can deal with the prison issue. I am sure he will, when he speaks in the Throne Speech. I think he has turned around totally now and says he wants it in his district, which is a reasonable compromise.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, first of all, what does the hon. member think about the decision to establish a regional community college in Central Newfoundland with the headquarters to be located in Grand Falls? Does the hon. member think that that is nothing, that means nothing to the young people of the area? I remember the hon. member clamouring for that.

MR. FLIGHT:

When are you going to do it?

MR. SIMMS:

I remember the hon. member clamouring for that.

MR. FLIGHT:

When is it going to happen?

MR. SIMMS:

It will be done. The hon. member need not worry. I know he would like for it not to be done - but it will be done - so he can try to score a few cheap political points out of it.

How about this, Mr. Speaker? Here is a programme announced in The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, and I am anxious to get his response to it for a very important reason, and it is this: "New, longer term

resource based government sponsored programmes in areas such as parks, silviculture, fisheries enhancement, agriculture and tourism." I will be anxious to hear what the hon. member has to say about that. That is nothing, that is nothing in The Throne Speech, nothing to make the people dance in the streets about.

But, Mr. Speaker, we will see when projects are announced if the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans suggests that his constituents should not be interested in these jobs that will be created. We will see.

MR. TOBIN:

That is what he is saying.

MR. SIMMS:

We will see. That is what he is saying now. We will see what he says when it happens. All he can say over there is, "When is it going to happen? When is it going to happen?" It will happen, Mr. Speaker, sooner than he thinks.

Mr. Speaker, how about the financial assistance to investors and entrepreneurs that was announced in The Throne Speech? How about that? The hon. member does not think that the 50/50 salary subsidy programme announced is not a good programme.

MR. FLIGHT:

We will see how many goes in Grand Falls.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member will see them in Grand Falls, too, Brother, you need not worry about it. This member, unlike the member for Windsor - Buchans, can deliver programmes that are announced in The Throne Speech. But he is against that. That is nothing to

dance in the streets about. "Nobody is interested in that", he says.

MR. FLIGHT:

Why are you attacking me?

MR. SIMMS:

Because the hon. member is the one who has been attacking me.

How about this one, Mr. Speaker? The member for Windsor - Buchans says there is nothing in The Throne Speech. We are going to expand the terms of reference of the Rural Development Loan Board. The Rural Development Loan Board is going to be expanded so that businesses in the service sector will now be able to apply for financial assistance from that board.

That, Mr. Speaker, is something that has been sought after by members on this side of the House, I know, and by a lot of people in the Province for years and years and years. The Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, their terms of reference -

MR. TULK:

How long will it take for that to happen?

MR. SIMMS:

Now the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has got to come in and support the member for Windsor - Buchans. There are not enough over there barking, he has to come in and do it too. The member for Fogo will have his chance to speak, I am sure, but as usual he will say nothing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. minister is debating, please?

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A new Youth Entrepreneur Programme, one that they started, he says. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of other things in that Throne Speech. The hon. member knows full well there are a lot of things in that Throne Speech, so it is unfortunate that he would go out into the area that he represents and mislead the people, unknowingly, probably.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, no!

MR. SIMMS:

So, the hon. member now admits he knowingly mislead the people of Windsor - Buchans. That is a very good statement for him to make. I am anxious to see how he is going to squirm out of that one. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, to go out and mislead the public, knowingly, as he now admits, to say there is nothing in the Throne Speech, is wrong. That is not true, not fair and wrong. Mr. Speaker, it is also appropriate for members, when they speak in the Throne Speech, to take the opportunity to talk about things government has done to assist their particular constituency, help it improve, see it grow, see it prosper. Mr. Speaker, I can speak with a considerable amount of pride about what has happened in my district of Grand Falls.

MR. FLIGHT:

You want the population (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, there is the member for Windsor - Buchans again. I do not know what is wrong with the man today. He usually only interrupts ten or twenty times

during a speech. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this about what the government has done in the Grand Falls district for the benefit of the member for Windsor - Buchans. For sure he will get up, criticize and attack all of these things and say, 'that is nothing', but, Mr. Speaker, a \$20 million expansion programme to the Central Newfoundland hospital I consider to be a fairly significant something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

A \$20 million expansion to the Central Newfoundland hospital: I can think of a lot of places in this Province that would love to have that kind of an expenditure on their particular hospital facility, including Your Honour. I am sure he would like to have that kind of money spent in his district.

Mr. Speaker, we have also contributed several thousands of dollars to the Mary March Museum will be a major tourism benefit to the area, including his area. He says it is not major, Mr. Speaker, yet he is on the air every chance he gets clamouring about it.

The Abitibi-Price people, Mr. Speaker, have just completed a \$50 million modernization programme that this government contributed towards which will provide a considerable amount of security. That will provide a considerable amount of security and will ensure that that mill is able to compete on an international level and maintain the jobs that are there for years and years to come, despite objections from members like the member for Windsor - Buchans. Mr. Speaker, we had

\$500,000 last year in Grand Falls on road improvements, something that I am delighted to be able to indicate to members here today.

MR. FLIGHT:

You are pork barreling.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, now he says I am pork barreling. A minute ago he was saying I could not deliver on any of the programmes. I wish the hon. member would make up his mind, Mr. Speaker. It is impossible for him to make up his mind, because he simply does not have one. With respect to community development projects -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Your time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

How unfortunate! A lot of my time must have been used up in the debate on the point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if his time is up, that is it.

MR. SIMMS:

No, it is not up. You see, Mr. Speaker, there is the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) - he is not even in his seat - practicing unparliamentary practices and he should know better. He is the House Leader for the Opposition. He is now going to rush up and try to interrupt me again to use up the last few minutes I have, Mr. Speaker. One of the major and most significant accomplishments for this government in Grand Falls has been, and will be, the

establishment of the regional community college, and the member for Windsor - Buchans knows what I am talking about. The very fact, Mr. Speaker, that Grand Falls was selected as the headquarters for that community college, I think, is a feather in the hat of a lot of people: the municipalities out there, the municipal governments, and the Chambers of Commerces. The MHAs, particularly the member for Grand Falls I say modestly, and Exploits (Dr. Twomey) of course, had a lot of input into seeing that decision come about, and I know that the people of that area are very pleased with that decision.

MR. FLIGHT:

When are we going to get some water?

MR. SIMMS:

The member asks, When are we going to get some water? Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say this to the hon. member, and I will say it very slowly so the hon. member will understand what I am trying to say to him.

Mr. Speaker, whatever happens with respect to the water supply for Grand Falls, Windsor, and Bishop's Falls will happen, Mr. Speaker, because of overwhelming efforts by the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) and the member for Grand Falls. It will not be because of overwhelming efforts by the member for Windsor - Buchans, whatever happens, if it is positive. Mr. Speaker, I tell the hon. member that you would not announce a water treatment plant, you would not announce the problem with the regional incinerator in the Throne Speech.

MR. FLIGHT:

I would.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, the hon. member probably would, because he does not know the difference, Mr. Speaker. That is precisely the point.

I look forward to the Budget, Mr. Speaker, when those kinds of items come down. I also look forward to some funding for the southeast arterial road which is a major trunk link that is required, a \$3 or \$4 million expenditure. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to a lot of other things happening as well.

MR. FLIGHT:

What about amalgamation?

MR. SIMMS:

If the hon. member is prepared to give me leave, I will be happy to go into the issue of amalgamation. But if I do that, I would expect the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans would then get up and go into a ten or fifteen minute dissertation on his preference as to the location for the prison for the Province of Newfoundland.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, because of all the interruptions from the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), in particular, and because of the time that was used up in debating whether or not I should have the right to speak in this hon. House, unfortunately, my time is now expired, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, I would like to welcome to this hon. House Mayor Rodger Fitzgerald; Councillor, Levi Matthews; Town Clerk, Verley Matthews from Musgravetown in the historic and

great district of Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

After having to sit here and listen to the last hon. member talk for thirty minutes I am reminded of a line from T.S. Elliot, "Like rats' feet over broken glass in a dry cellar."

Anyway, I have been in this House now and I have heard three Throne Speeches. I thought that I would possibly, before I started to get into the 1987 version that comes from over there, look at 1986 and see if they have fulfilled any of the promises that were made in the 1986 Speech from the Throne. That might be interesting, but I think I would have to start off with the opening paragraph if I was going to talk about 1986 and compare it to 1987, as far as the Throne Speech is concerned.

It says, "The new spirit of federal - provincial understanding and co-operation has clearly emerged across this Nation since that time in September, 1983. We now have a federal government that is sensitive to the circumstances, needs and aspirations of all regions and walks of life in this country. Acrimony has given way to harmony, flexibility has replaced resistance, and co-operation characterizes this new 'rapprochement' with the federal government." That, I think, was the first thing that I looked at in the 1986 Throne Speech when I said, 'I have got to

speak on this thing, so I might as well look at see what happened before.'

Now, that was the start, in 1986, of the Throne Speech. So we saw provincial - federal relations reach a new time low since 1984, when in 1986 they were praising them. The other interesting thing about it is that we heard the Premier come to the press a few days ago and announce that he really had better relationships with the Trudeau government the last two years they were in power than he has with the Mulroney one since they came in in September, 1984.

When I see a Throne Speech that starts off like that, when the Premier admitted, after the Throne Speech that really he did have better relationships with Ottawa when the Liberal Government was in power, it seems to me that right from the start it was a deliberate attempt to mislead the people of Newfoundland. So I then went through it with a sort of a jaundiced eye, and I said, 'I must really see what was promised last year and what really came out of it.'

The next thing we noticed in the 1986 Speech was that they strongly supported free trade even before they investigated what it was really going to do for Newfoundland. They supported it and said, 'Yes, it is going to be the greatest thing that ever happened to Newfoundland.' We find now that the rest of the provinces in Canada were sort of reluctant to give wholehearted endorsement, but thought that they should investigate it before they accepted it, but no, with this great relationship that we had with the federal government last

year, we decided to accept it. Now there has been a lot of second thoughts and second guessing, even though, our government in this Province has decided that free trade is going to be a great thing for them.

DR. COLLINS:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. GILBERT:

No, thank you. You will have lots of time to speak afterwards.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You cannot answer it.

MR. GILBERT:

I can answer any question they can send from over there.

The next thing that was discussed in the Throne Speech last year was the Atlantic Accord legislation. We know that was a great success. It was announced and Hibernia was going to be concluded. There was going to be jackhammers going and welders going. The offshore was going to be developed within the next couple of months. We heard the Premier announce that he had hired Mr. Lougheed at \$40,000 a year to be a consultant to ensure that this deal went through as quickly as possibly. So we saw a bill that was passed last week illegally through this House, or without going through this House, by Warrant, for \$400,000 to Mr. Lougheed for work that he had done. I wonder what his bill would be if they had been successful in concluding a Hibernia agreement? I would hate to think what it would be.

The Atlantic Accord was suppose to be the greatest thing that ever happened to Newfoundland. We saw another example of this great

federal/provincial agreement yesterday when we saw the Federal Minister (Mr. Crosbie) and his cohorts from Petro Canada announce the continued development of the offshore, that our Premier said that he was not aware of until twenty minutes before it was announced. It is a great relationship we have between Ottawa and St. John's, or Newfoundland and Canada, with this new feeling that was talked about in the opening paragraph of the 1986 Throne Speech.

We heard of the development fund. Every once in a while we heard a little bit of tokenism when they announce programmes under the development fund. One was announced on Friday. It was \$20 million for development in Marystown. The only thing they neglected to say was that \$18 million of it will not be spent unless Hibernia goes on stream; \$2 million of it is going to be taken up by engineers and people like that in St. John's. It is not going to create any jobs. No jobs at all are being created outside St. John's, but in St. John's the jobs are going to be created for management people again, but nothing beyond the overpass again. There are no jobs for the people of Newfoundland who are living on unemployment and welfare. They told us last year that a Hibernia agreement was eminent. We are still waiting for that.

The other thing they talked about in the Throne Speech last year was a strong inshore fishery. We knew how strong that was. We know what happened to that last year. They talked about a middle distance fleet. We have not heard much about a middle distance fleet lately, and we do not even know if

it is going to be viable if it ever did come to fruition, but it is one of the highlights of the Throne Speech last year.

Aquaculture - that was going to be one of the highlights, and they talked about the millions of dollars that was spent in Bay d'Espoir. Now we find that the hatchery is complete. The smelts are ready to be transplanted into the cages.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Smolts, smolts.

MR. GILBERT:

You let me say it my way, and if you are not smart enough to figure it out, that is all right. Anyhow, the smelts are ready to be transported to the actual salt water to start to grow. We find now that the Department of Fisheries have gotten involved in it and they build cages in St. John's to be transported by truck down to Bay d'Espoir to be put in the water in Bay d'Espoir where we have 90 per cent of the people unemployed. The only people in Newfoundland who have ever had any experience in building those fish cages are the people in Bay d'Espoir. Ten of them have been in here to the Marine Science Institute and received training and they know what a fish cage looks like, yet the Department of Fisheries decided that they were going to build them in here. When I asked an official of the department he said it was done because they had the power tools, they had the material and they had the labour and they had the supervision in here. When I asked the minister, he did not know if they were being built here. So there seems to me to be some sort of a break down in communications.

Last year the Fish Growers Association down there formed a co-op, an association to get ready for when the smelts were coming from the hatchery so they would be going into the pounds in Roti Bay and in the Bay d'Espoir area and they would be ready to go. They were told by the Department of Rural Development then that there was going to be seed money available for them and not to bother to go through to the feds because the provincial government would have a lot better terms for them and be able to give them money at better terms than the feds.

Now we find that we are six weeks away from going into the second stage of production, shall we say, when we are getting ready to grow those things and the Department of Rural Development has said 'No, we have not got any money.' The minister told me in the House yesterday they are going a different route right now.

The only thing is there is about forty people down there in Bay d'Espoir that wanted to get involved in fish farming, that we are led to believe by the minister that funding was going to be available and now we find that there is no money available. So it is something that I think shows again what is happening.

The Throne Speech talked about the emphasis that this government was going to put on aquaculture. We have this pilot project going in Bay d'Espoir where we have unemployment rate that is higher than anywhere else in Newfoundland and yet we find that the government are not ready to go into the second stage and into the actual production of fish, which seems to me to be indicative of

the way that this government carries out their business. They have lost the will to govern. They are not providing any guidance or leadership. They said, 'Okay, the fish hatchery is there now.' We know that one of the statements that come from over there is 'fish swim.' This is about what they know about aquaculture. This is what they have done with it.

We have heard the government over there talking about participation in management to our fish reserves. That was one of the things that was in the Throne Speech last year, Mr. Speaker. Now we know what they have done with management to our fish reserves. This House was called back in Session primarily to debate a resolution condemning the federal government for signing an agreement with France about our fish reserves. The only thing about it is we came back and we debated it for a couple of days and then, all of a sudden, there is no need to debate this all-party resolution to go Ottawa, there is no need to debate this any more. Now what we are going to do is we are going to go to the Throne Speech.

I feel strange about this. Why was it all of a sudden when we came back and the Premier said that this House was going to debate an all-party resolution, which was going to Ottawa, have we stopped debate on this very important resolution? The problem is still there, Mr. Speaker. The French are still raping the cod stocks in 3Ps. The reason I thought that we came back in this House, the salient point was to get this resolution and to show the federal government that this House was unanimous in its support

and condemnation of the action that they had taken when they signed this, by now, infamous agreement with France.

Our provincial government, the hon. members opposite, have for some reason decided that this is not important anymore. Now we have adjourned the debate on the resolution and have gone into The Throne Speech. To me I think somebody should answer the question, somebody should be made to tell all members of this House why they do not want to carry this resolution to Ottawa. Is there something that the Premier and his Cabinet is trying to hide about this? Is there some reason why debate has stopped on this? Questions should be asked and answered as to why we are not debating the fishery resolution right now. I think someone should be able to answer. There is something there that we do not know about. Maybe it is a rotten fish, I do not know, but there is something there in this situation about why we are not debating this resolution right now.

The other thing that was in The Throne Speech last year, Mr. Speaker, was a resurgence in the mining industry. Shortly after that the Daniel's Harbour mine closed. St. Lawrence opened but now we heard the minister announce yesterday that there were layoffs at St. Lawrence. You know it is interesting to see a resurgence like that. The one thing that they did say which was positive, I must say, is the fact that the Hope Brook mine has started up. It is not mining yet, it is in the construction stage. The positive point that I might add to that is that the Town of Burgeo did get hydro extended from the provincial grid which means that Burgeo will

obtain cheaper hydro than they had previously. So this is the one positive thing that I see from the Hope Brook mine to this point. But it certainly was not the resurgence in the mining industry that was alluded to in the Throne Speech.

The next thing that was talked about in The Throne Speech last year was forestry. It said that, "My Government takes great satisfaction in the recent and expected developments in the forest industry," a new subsidiary agreement. Well, the only thing about it is when finally that agreement was signed it was touted by members opposite to be, again, the best thing that ever happened to Newfoundland. As a matter of fact it sort of felt like the old lamps for new theory because they stood up in the House and they said, Mr. Speaker, that the agreement they signed was the best forestry agreement they ever had. You know, this seventy/thirty agreement that they had signed last year was much better than the ninety/ten one that they had signed five years before with the previous Liberal Government. In other words, now the provincial government has to pay 30 per cent of the forestry agreement where the one they had signed with the previous federal government, the Liberal Government, was ninety/ten. The provincial government only had to pay 10 per cent and the Premier stood up and said in this House it was the best that they had ever signed.

I can assure you, Sir, that the 120 forestry workers in Bay d'Espoir who were laid off because a forestry subsidiary agreement expired last year and this government has been unable, because of the relationships that

they developed with the federal government to get another subsidiary agreement signed, you cannot tell those 120 workers in Bay d'Espoir that are laid off, their unemployment has expired and now have to exist on Social Services, you cannot tell them that forestry has made any great steps in Newfoundland and you cannot tell them that that agreement was a great agreement. There is just no way, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundlanders will accept that the forestry agreement they have right now is a good agreement.

In The Throne Speech last year they talked about and gave lip service to the development of small business in rural Newfoundland. Yet the Rural Development Association stated in their brief to Cabinet this past December that it was a case of political apathy and bureaucratic aloofness that was causing a stagnation in development in rural Newfoundland. This would seem to me again to cast doubt on the Throne Speech in 1986. The Throne Speech said in 1986 that they were developing small business. This would seem to me that really they were not.

The next thing that they talked about in the Throne Speech last year, Mr. Speaker, was the Royal Commission on Unemployment and Employment. That report was finished in August of 1986. We on this side responded to the 247 recommendations and we think they were pretty good recommendations. Many of them were ones that we had made. This government opposite took that report in August and yet did not see fit to call the House back to debate any of those recommendations and to do anything at all about the unemployment which happens to continue to

rise.

The whole idea before the last election in 1985 was to have this commission struck to find out what were the problems in Newfoundland? Why was unemployment so high? The idea was to take the recommendations of this thing carte blanche and to use them to cure the problems. Yet we find, although it was mentioned in the 1986 Throne Speech and in the 1987 Throne Speech it was given three or four lines, really, none of the recommendations were put into place. They talked about job creation in 1986. You know how successful that was when you see the unemployment rates for Newfoundland right now.

They talked about chronic care for the elderly. We now how successful that is. There was a report commissioned by the Department of Health, as I understand it, back in 1985, and I have asked the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) for this report many times. Again, it is not available. So we have to resort to the Freedom Of Information Act to get a report to set up the study to health care needs in Newfoundland. I can tell you about chronic care and senior citizens homes. You cannot tell the people in my district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir that there has been any great improvement in that. We still do not have a senior citizens home on the South Coast of Newfoundland from Grand Bank to Port aux Basques. So it seems to me they really did not make too much progress in that.

Now the Throne Speech for 1987 started off by saying that the average employment was supposed to have increased this year. I do

know, Mr. Speaker. It is hard to tell 90 per cent of the people who live in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir that there has been any increase in employment this year. Statistics that I get from manpower certainly does not indicate that it has an effect in my district. Maybe in some way it has but it seems to be a shadowy sort of thing that they are talking about.

The next thing that comes up in the Throne Speech of 1987 is talk about Fisheries Products International and the success it is. Now, all of a sudden, we going to privatize Fisheries Products International. Now tell me, we have a company that for one year has had a pretty good track record, and without doubt, Fisheries Products was a success last year. The Premier, every once in a while when I ask him a question, gets up and he says how I am a businessman, I should know better and all of that. Well, I am, and I am really not ashamed to say I am a businessman. I am one of the few people in this House that has operated a successful business and I did it without any government help. I never asked for any grants or anything in my business, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

But the Premier mentioned that I am a businessman as if it was something bad. I would like to tell him no, there is nothing bad. Unlike him, I have never taken a government cheque. He has had his nose in the government throw all his life. He has never had to go out and sign his pay own cheque.

MR. J. CARTER:

Trough.

MR. GILBERT:

You would not know anyhow, because there is no savoury in it. What would you know about it?

Anyhow, he always had -

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. member is making the most outrageous statements. He is referring to the hon. the Premier, who at one time was a public servant, and therefore he had his, as the hon. member says, nose in the trough which is another way of saying he is taking public monies under false pretenses. That is what everyone understands with the phrase 'nose in the trough.'

Now, I think that is not only a disgraceful statement to be made in regard to the Premier, but it also is a disgraceful statement to be made in regard to any public servant. I think the hon. member should retract that statement and apologize to this House.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has missed the whole thrust of what the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir said. He said, quite clearly, that this

Premier has never worked in the private sector. He said, quite clearly, that had this Premier had to go into the private sector to establish his own business and to try to make a go of it, he could not make a go of it. That is clearly what was said by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order, but a difference of opinion.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I realize there was no point of order. I thank my colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Fury) for protecting me. I felt quite sure that what I said was that the Premier has never had to look over his shoulder to see if there was a bank manager coming or never had to sign a pay cheque on the front. That makes an awful lot of difference. I have and I know what it is about.

I talked about Fishery Products. I think what has happened with Fishery Products, Mr. Speaker, is that the one year has been taken as instant success. Now we must sell it, get rid of it, and hopefully it will fly on its own. I, as a businessman, would like to see a longer track record. I would like to see Fishery Products operate for a period of four or five years so we would be able to trace exactly what it was doing in the world markets, rather than have it sold after one year. I do not want to be in a position in a couple of years time after the

election, and we are over there in the government, that we have to bail out Fishery Products International again. I am protecting my own interests in many ways by asking that this be held off.

Mr. Speaker, we talked about the forestry programme in the 1986 Throne Speech, or your government did. In 1987 they still talk about a forestry programme. They say that it is going on to greater and greater things. As far as I am concerned I do not think that it is any better than last year. We heard the Minister of Forestry say he was unable to get a subsidiary agreement signed. One of the recommendations of the House Commission was that they try and get a new FESP agreement signed. Now they have not been able to do that, and that means that the 120 workers in Bay d'Espoir that were laid off by the Department of Forestry last year are still not convinced that the forestry situation in Newfoundland is going to be any better this year if they are on welfare. This time last year at least they were on unemployment. Now, because of this great forestry agreement we have in Newfoundland, they are on welfare. You cannot convince them, Mr. Speaker, that the forestry situation is getting any better in Newfoundland.

The next thing they talk about in the Throne Speech in 1987 is the Come By Chance refinery. Now, this is an interesting thing, this Come By Chance refinery. The thing that happens is, first of all, when we ask questions to the Premier about the labour unrest that is there, again, it is something that his government is not prepared to act on or assume any responsibility for. It is a

situation where the government is not prepared to take any responsibility for anything. They have to turn and blame it on somebody else.

When you ask a question about the labour unrest, the first thing that happens is the Premier jumps up and says that he took over a \$48 million debt that was left there by the previous Liberal government sixteen years ago. This is fine. He talks about this and he says it happened. This is fifteen years ago. The one thing the Premier was so proud of when he was going to blow our minds in Gander was that he was going to open this refinery again. This was the 'blow your mind' statement that he was going to make. That was the whole deal that he was going to blow our minds with, opening this. Then he talks about creating 200 jobs by reopening this Come By Chance refinery.

The point that I would like to make, Mr. Speaker - this is the whole point - is, he is so glad to say that there was \$48 million left by the previous Liberal government, but if they had not left it, where would the 200 jobs be coming from right now? This is the whole deal that we find with members opposite. They are locked in history. So if the thing had not been developed, there would not be any 200 jobs now.

There is one thing we can say about the previous Liberal government, they left something for those guys to work on. The only thing is they have not been able to work on it. Now, that is where the big problem comes in.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. GILBERT:

That is too bad. I am almost finished. We have the Hibernia development, and I do not think that is one bit closer than it was last year.

They talk about Labrador development. Forestry was talked about for Labrador in the 1986 Speech. It is still talked about in the 1987 Speech. I wonder is it any closer.

They talk about growth potential in our service industries. I wonder, when you find that we are sending to New Brunswick to buy nets to put on fish cages down in Bay d'Espoir, what sort of growth potential is in our small manufacturing industries?

MR. TULK:

'Dave,' that is not important. It has to be Hibernia or Churchill Falls.

MR. GILBERT:

I know.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, last year after we heard this 1986 Throne Speech it was followed by a 'good news' Budget. Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to say the Throne Speech this year certainly does not seem to me to be any more positive or have any more meat in it than the one in 1986. So I look forward with suspended animation to what the Budget is going to be called this year, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pass on my congratulations to my hon. colleague, the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons), in his reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am sure that the hon. gentleman will be a great addition to the House of Assembly as a whole, and, in particular, to his district, and will serve the Province well. I just want to pass along my congratulations to him.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) on his maiden speech the other day. Any member, first elected to the House of Assembly, regardless of what party line, Mr. Speaker, I think it is an honour, and I am sure that the hon. member, as well as my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, will be a welcome addition to the House.

Mr. Speaker, a few words on the highlights from the Speech from the Throne. Reviewing some of the government's major employment successes of the recent past, Mr. Speaker, some of the things that were mentioned were, notably, Fishery Products International, which was one of the first ones. On that, I do not think it will take too much time, Mr. Speaker, to explain how that was so successful and what has been happening there in the past year alone, just one year. It is just

a short while ago, Mr. Speaker, that there was so much negativism in the Province with regards to the fishery, especially all the plants that were taken over by Fishery Products International over a year ago. To look at it then, and to look at it today, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is certainly something that is a really positive thing for the fishing industry in this Province, and the Province as a whole.

Regardless of what is going to happen with the sale of Fishery Products, in the Report on Employment and Unemployment, Mr. Speaker, one of the recommendations there states quite clearly that the government should divest itself of some of the private plants in the Province and Fishery Products is no exception. I think that there was a lot of government money put into this from Fishery Products over the past year and rightly so, Mr. Speaker, rightly so. It has been done in the past, not only with the fishery but with other things in the Province. I do not have to name them. They have been reiterated over and over and time and time again in this House and it is one of the most positive things that has happened in the Province over the past years. I think there are greater things to come from that, Mr. Speaker.

But on that note, I think that the inshore fishery as well should be given the same attention that was given to Fishery Products in dealing with the offshore and what have you. I do not think we can pat ourselves on the back as a government or as fishery organizations in this Province and say it is finished. We will not.

That is evident, Mr. Speaker, from

the comments made by this government in the past few weeks with regard to the monies that will be taken from the sale of Fishery Products International and put into the inshore fishery in this Province. It was one of the stipulations that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and the Cabinet as a whole, made to the federal government in order to sign that deal for the sale of Fishery Products as a private sector. That tells and augers well, Mr. Speaker, for the inshore fishery as well in the Province because of the funds that will be put into it over the next few short months.

One of the other things mentioned was Hope Brook Gold Incorporated, Mr. Speaker. Some of the things the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) dwelled on was the Hope Brook gold mine, the Kruger thing, the Come By Chance refinery and a few others. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, the Hope Brook gold mine is another positive thing over the past year. Just look what happened. The mining industry in the Province and the exploration that was going on in the Province over the past few years seemingly was going nowhere. Look at it today. Just because Hope Brook is started - I think the grading of that ore was something like 11 grams per ton which was about the lowest you can go in making a mine viable, especially with no traces of any other mineral. So this project is off the ground, Mr. Speaker. It augers well for the mining industry in the Province and I am sure for the exploration that will be taking place over the next year.

On that note, Mr. Speaker, I have a few figures on the mining activity and on the exploration

activity in the past year. Up until the end of September, there are some 31,285 claims that are in good standing throughout the Province. That is at an all time high and it is about 3,000 more than the total at the end of 1985. So, Mr. Speaker, that speaks well for exploration.

In the Southwestern part of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleague here to my right will be pleased about that, at the Cape Ray gold deposit Northeast of Port aux Basques, there was some 700 tons of grading and the grading was at 9 grams per ton and that particular discovery, Mr. Speaker, contains traces of other mineral which should make that viable. So they are doing more drilling there in the upcoming year and I am sure that is going to be another bright spot for the mining industry in the Province.

The Western/White Bay region of the Province, Mr. Speaker, is a part of one of the greatest districts in this Province, a part of a district, Mr. Speaker, that I represent in the District of Humber Valley. There is quite a bit of activity going on in the Sop's Arm, Jackson's Arm area and it looks good.

The Baie Verte Peninsula area, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. FLIGHT:
(Inaudible) Piccadilly.

MR. WOODFORD:
The Buchans, Red Indian Lake area, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
Big mouth is over there.

MR. WOODFORD:

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) certainly has not got to be told about anything with regard to the Buchans area. He knows quite well what happened over the years. The ASARCO Company, Mr. Speaker, in Buchans over the years they did mine - and as far as I am concerned I said before and I will say it again, they did hygrade the Buchans mines, all of them, Rothermere, McLean's Shaft, Lucky Strike, the whole works was all hygraded and there is enough ore left in that - they pay for their overhead, Mr. Speaker, every year just in the gold they took out of the Buchans mines which was -

MR. SIMMS:

Tell him how your people are being pestered by the people in Buchans to run against the member the next time.

MR. WOODFORD:

- which was to the tune of \$13 million to \$14 million a year and that was back in the early sixties, Mr. Speaker. So you can just imagine what was left there. So, BP Selco, because of the fact it took over the mineral rights from ASARCO there not too long ago in conjunction with Price (Abitibi), they have started to go over some of the cores from the Buchans deposits. They number some 300,000. So without any further exploration with regards to diamond drilling, they can just examine the cores and tell pretty well exactly what is going on where the cores were taken from.

MR. SIMMS:

They want him to run in Buchans the next time against you 'Graham.'

MR. WOODFORD:

Bay d'Espoir and the Burin Peninsular area, Mr. Speaker, the

Kim Lake and Little River area Northeast of Bay d'Espoir are looking good. The hon. member for that area was just on his feet and I never heard any positive remarks from him whatsoever.

The platinum exploration in the Province, Mr. Speaker, the industrial minerals and exploration development, you can go on and on, Mr. Speaker. Just a few notes on what is happening in the mining industry in the Province, Mr. Speaker, and that is just mining.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, pertaining to the district itself, I have been notified that there has been quite a few claims staked there over the past year and there are something like eight different companies going to be drilling there this Summer, just in the Sop's Arm, Jackson's Arm area of my district. So that looks well for the 1987-88 season. One of the other things mentioned was the St. Lawrence fluorspar mines was no good, eighty odd employees and now there were a few people laid off so everything is negative. Nothing only gloom and doom, Mr. Speaker, but there are still fifty odd people working there. Some of the comments made were that the only thing there that can be seen is the graveyard. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would have been there.

MR. TULK:

Who said that?

MR. WOODFORD:

I just forget. It was a quote. I cannot remember exactly. The Baie Verte asbestos mines, Mr. Speaker, the money that was put into that by the provincial government over the past year as far as I am concerned is money well spent.

Another town that was dying and is now rejuvenated, Mr. Speaker. I do not think you can talk to anybody in the Baie Verte area today that would say that those monies were wrongly spent.

Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, Mr. Speaker, what more can be said about it? The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) mentioned it earlier there in his speech. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) yesterday figured that Kruger was no good. It saved the City of Corner Brook, Mr. Speaker, and not only the City of Corner Brook. It has to be remembered that the whole Western region of the Province and down the Northern Peninsula where the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) if from, all down the coast, all out through the East part of the Province, it was a blessing for the whole Western region and the Northern Peninsula area because all the wood that is cut in those areas, Mr. Speaker, is sold to Kruger in Corner Brook or the Price mill in the hon. member for Stephenville's (Mr. K. Aylward) district. The wood goes to either one of those mills and there is quite a bit of it.

In fact, as of now, Mr. Speaker, with the modernization to the mill in Corner Brook, the yards of both companies now are pretty well empty when it comes to wood. In the upcoming year there should be a real good cutting season for the loggers and the pulp wood operators in the whole district. Like I said before, it not only saved the city of Corner Brook but the whole Western region.

In my area in particular, Mr. Speaker, the Deer Lake area, the White Bay area and in conjunction with the sale of the Corner Brook

Bowater mill to Kruger, which is Corner Brook Pulp and Paper now, the Main River project is coming on stream. Mr. Speaker, there is 1.8 million cords of wood in the Main River project alone. They started off with a twenty-five year supply of wood and now that has gone from twenty-five to fifty-two years with the excellent silviculture programmes that are being put in place by the provincial government as well as with some help from the feds. So, with an ongoing silviculture programme and keeping tabs on the spraying of the budworm and the looper on the West coast, the forestry industry is going to be something to look forward to in the future on the Westcoast of the Province and the Province as a whole because of the Grand Falls area as well.

On the Marystown Shipyard, Mr. Speaker, some of the announcements made over the last few days will tell you what has been happening there and what the future is for that area of the Province.

All those things, Mr. Speaker, are tied in with the announcement yesterday with regards to the Petro-Canada thing and the delineation wells that are going to be drilled on the Terra Nova structure. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, those wells will prove to be successful and then they will start with the construction of the platform and the pumping of oil out of the Terra Nova structure. That will lead, Mr. Speaker, to more jobs in the Province and more particularly to the Marystown Shipyard, the Placentia area of the Province as well and Come By Chance.

On the Come By Chance oil refinery, Mr. Speaker, yes, the

announcement was made that was going to blow our minds. Maybe it did not blow our minds, Mr. Speaker, but that, in conjunction with the other things I just mentioned, can surely blow your mind, especially with what is going to happen over the next year or so with some of the more positive things that have come out of the Throne Speech. Two hundred jobs, Mr. Speaker, how can we just take for granted 200 jobs. Let us face it, 200 jobs in this Province today or in any Province or in any part of the world, Mr. Speaker, is something that we should be proud of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

It is full-time, it is year round, it is something permanent and some consistency, Mr. Speaker, and it gives the people in the area some security. Except for the labour problems at Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker, everything else went right to T. I think the NDP of this Province are soon going to have to - nothing fixes so intensely in the memory as a wish to forget it. I just cannot forget some of the comments made by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) the other day. I just cannot do it and that is why. It is there, it is something that you just cannot let go.

To say, Mr. Speaker, that some of those projects are not a good thing for the Province - I do not think he said it. Going back to what the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) said, I do not think really, I suppose he is a new member of the House, like myself. I only have two years on him that is not much but, in any case I think the NDP in this

Province, Mr. Speaker, are going to have to stand up and take a stand one way or the other.

They are supposed to be representative of the labour movement in the Province. Now, the labour movement in the Province, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, are people who are working and people are not working. You are still labourers or workers whether you are off on unemployment or working. Now, in every case that I see looking around the Province, Mr. Speaker, is that if you are working, for instance at the Come By Chance oil refinery, well, you are not supposed to be there, you are doing something wrong, you are crossing picket lines, someone else is supposed to be in there. Well then, who is supposed to be there? If you are representing the labour movement in the Province, let us face it, there has got to be a happy medium somewhere. Someone has got to be allowed to go to work. There is a right to strike in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and I think there should be a right to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Socialists do not believe that though.

MR. WOODFORD:

On the Hibernia thing, I mentioned the Terra Nova structure earlier. Mr. Speaker, over the next few months I am optimistic that there should be something on the Hibernia one, if so, that will certainly top up the Terra Nova announcement.

The pulp mill for Labrador, Mr. Speaker, is another positive thing

that this government has been working on. With some help from other parties in this country, that will probably be a success.

The NATO base for Goose Bay which the hon. member's party is supposedly against, Mr. Speaker, is another plus and another positive thing for the Province with approximately 1,000 or 1,200 jobs.

So what have you got to do, Mr. Speaker, to try to make people realize that there has been an effort made. There are going to be efforts made in the future and we are just going to keep plugging at it. As was said earlier, you have to take it step by step, Mr. Speaker. Things just do not come overnight. Those kind of jobs we are talking about are not six weeks, eight weeks or ten weeks. We are trying to get out of that, as was stated also in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. We are trying to get into something long-term and all of the things that I have mentioned today so far, Mr. Speaker, are long-term. There is some permanency to all of them.

"Recognition of the enormous potential for smaller scale developments in the Province, in particular in service industries, small scale manufacturing and secondary processing, tourism and aquaculture."

The service sector, Mr. Speaker, in the Province is something that has been neglected over the years. We have a tendency to look at the big, Mr. Speaker, and overlook the obvious. It has been shown in this Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, and it has been shown over the last couple of years what has been happening to the service

sector in the Province. It is growing.

Economists in the industrial world never did recognize the importance of the service sector. Adam Smith, in his Wealth Of Nations referred to services as a parasite, adding no productive value to the economic activity of society. Karl Marx, in Das Capital, as the hon member should be well aware of, saw service industries as the embodiment of an inquisitive and consumptive excess which both fuel the exploitive and colonial nature of capitalist organization and assured its eventual demise in self-destructive individualism. Mr. Speaker, to this day the capitalist organization has not collapsed and the parasite has grown to be much larger than the host organism.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to add to that it said, 'The main, common characteristic is that they do not result in a finished product for consumption.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, to add to the comment on the finished product for consumption and just speak on the service sector in the district of Humber Valley alone, the Deer Lake Airport, there are 101 to 117 jobs directly affiliated with the Deer Lake Airport in Humber Valley. Mr. Speaker, that is a part of the service sector.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford)

is making a great speech and I am trying to hear him, but it is very difficult to hear him over the goings on that are going on between the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) and the Premier's flunkie.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Surely the hon. House Leader opposite is being facetious, because he was not paying any attention to the speech at all. I think that he just wants to interrupt a telling speech on the part of the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I do not think the two hon. members there were causing any unnecessary interference. I had no difficulty in hearing the hon. member. The hon. member may continue.

MR. WOODFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to touch on that again, Mr. Speaker, as I said, there is approximately 101 to 115 jobs directly affiliated with the Deer Lake Airport. The Deer Lake Power Company, Mr. Speaker, an offshoot from the sale of the Kruger mill in Corner Brook, a profit a couple of years ago of some \$13 million. Mr. Speaker, that is located in Deer Lake and it supplies all of the electricity for the Kruger mill in Corner Brook. The workers there in the service sector, the transportation workers in the highways depot in Deer Lake, on

which we just spent some \$6 million is putting up a new building for the Deer Lake area, they are a part of it. We have the teachers, Mr. Speaker, we have all of the people in the government offices. The Deer Lake area alone, Mr. Speaker, is based primarily on the service sector, and it is permanent, it is year around.

We have some seasonal jobs associated with the service sector, the Deer Lake Motel, for instance, and the Driftwood Inn. The Irving Station there, I was talking to the manager just the other day, twenty-nine employees, and in another month or six weeks, possibly, they have to take on another twenty-two. You know, that is just an example of sixty or sixty-five people working in just one little part of the service sector, there on the highway in the Deer Lake area. Mr. Speaker, all that has to be taken into consideration, and it is year round, permanent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I mention the Deer Lake Hotel and those other places, the restaurants and the gas stations, they cannot survive if people have no money to spend. So where are they getting it, Mr. Speaker? It goes to show that the economy there, Mr. Speaker, is on the upswing. If I get up this time next year to speak, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that that will be increased by approximately 10 to 15 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit down without mentioning agriculture. In the Throne Speech: "Establishment of an Industry - Government Task Force on Agriculture to recommend long term agricultural policy and strategy for the Province." Just talking

about the dairy industry, Mr. Speaker, three years ago, in Humber Valley, there were three dairy operations. Today, Mr. Speaker, there are thirteen, producing approximately 3.8 million liters of milk for the Province. The projection for the next three to four years is some 6 million liters, just in Humber Valley alone, comprising some twenty-one to twenty-two dairy operations. This is year-round. It injects a real catalyst into the economy in that area. In the communities of Cormack, Reidville, and Howley, Mr. Speaker, in the Summer months especially, there is practically no unemployment whatsoever.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Twenty-five million liters a year are produced there.

MR. WOODFORD:

The minister has the figures there, 25 million liters a year, province-wide. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, in a short while, approximately a month, we may be able to see some other things that will be positive to the agricultural industry in the Province happening on the West Coast of the Province. I cannot say which particular town right now, but hopefully within the next month to six weeks we will be able to make a positive announcement on that. There are some 1,000 jobs in the dairy industry alone.

The broiler industry, Mr. Speaker, that has been picking up. There is not only the abattoir in Corner Brook, there is the one in St. John's. They have been going back and forth. There is some \$1.3 million in the payroll in the Corner Brook one alone, Mr. Speaker, so that augers well.

The Rural Development Authority, Mr. Speaker: Last year in the Budget the Rural Development Authority's loan limits were increased from, I think it was, \$25,000 to \$50,000, and the Farm Loan Board's was increased from \$30,000 to \$75,000. For the past year it is unreal the positive effect that that has had on the district, and, I would say, the Province as a whole. Some three hundred and sixty-odd thousand people in the Province live in towns that have populations of 5,000 or less, and 182,000 people in the Province live in towns with populations of 1,000 or less, so pretty well all of us have something to do with the rural areas of the Province.

This year, to add to that, the Rural Development Authority is going into the service sector. Going back to what I said earlier about the service sector, it just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, how important it is. Just about every day of the week I have three or four calls on the service sector part of it, because there are people just waiting, biting at the bit, to try to start other industries, other businesses and to expand on some of the ones I just mentioned. Now that is another positive step.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation programmes in the service sector: Again the service sector, Mr. Speaker. Before, the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation was something the same as the Rural Development Authority, they just catered to anything to do with manufacturing or processing. Now it is expanding into the service sector, and they also, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Speaker, take equity financing into any

business, thereby, after so many years - it is something the same as the Venture Capital Programme under the Department of Development the last couple of years - the businessman can buy back his equity in the business after four or five, five or six, six or seven years. So that is another positive step, Mr. Speaker.

I do not have the time this evening, Mr. Speaker - you would probably have to start at three o'clock to get through by six - to mention all the positive things that could come out of this Throne Speech.

The Business Equity Programme, Mr. Speaker, how could you forget it? Another example, the new Youth Entrepreneur Programme, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, over the last couple of years there has been one out by the feds and I had some students in my district, Mr. Speaker, take advantage of this programme whereby they got a loan of \$2,000 or \$3,000 to set themselves up in business in the Summer months, and they paid it back in the early part of the Fall when they went back to school, and that has worked quite well. I had one individual in the district who took over the operation of a community park. He got a loan of \$2,700, I think it was, from the Department of DRIE, he stocked his canteen and other things that he had there, ran the park, paid back his money in the Fall of the year and came out of it with a \$4,700 profit. So, Mr. Speaker, that is an example of what we have. When we speak about the youth in this Province, Mr. Speaker, it is not very often we something positive about them.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are probably out of work.

MR. WOODFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are probably out of work. There are a lot of others out of work but they have the knowledge, and they have the talents, and they can certainly run a business as well as anybody else in this Province if given a chance, Mr. Speaker, the same as everybody else.

"Introduction of "one stop shopping" for Government's Financial Assistance Programmes: That, Mr. Speaker, is a must. We have people in this Province calling me and calling, I am sure, other members of this Legislature any day of the week wondering what this programme can do for them and what the other one can do for them. Well, Mr. Speaker, this will be a short-cut. They will be given the information, and all they will have to do then is contact us and ask us for some help to get through the bureaucratic red tape and the roadblocks that are set up along the way, which is what turns people off, Mr. Speaker. This is one of the other things we have to address, and I am sure we have been doing it time and time again, month after month, year after year, and I think with so many things coming out of this Throne Speech based on some of the things in Building On Our Strengths and the Commission Report on Employment and Unemployment, Mr. Speaker, that we are finally bringing in something that is going to benefit everyone, youth and adults, as well, in this Province, and add to the business sector, thereby creating long-term and permanent jobs, Mr. Speaker, that can add to the economy of the Province.

On the district as a whole, Mr. Speaker, before I finish, I would

just like to say that over the past two years it has been a real pleasure working for the people of Humber Valley. They are excellent people to get along with. You have to communicate with people in order to hear their views, and sit down and talk to them to get their concerns and take them back to this hon. House, or to whatever government department is involved.

The tourism sector, Mr. Speaker, mining, forestry, agriculture, the fishery, what have you, I have them all in the district of Humber Valley. I am not that familiar with the fishery part of it. I am getting there but, nevertheless, there is a lot to learn. There always is, Mr. Speaker, when you have growing businesses.

For instance, tourism. We have all kinds of opportunities in tourism that we are missing out on. Another example of the service sector. We have people now in my district spending over \$1 million of their own money, Mr. Speaker, in a tourism facility right in the Cormack/Deer Lake area: swimming pool, cabins, tennis courts, riding trails, picnic tables, convenience store, what have you, people who are well-known in the Province, Mr. Speaker, and I do not mind naming the Lettos from L'Anse-au-Clair, in Labrador, good business people in the Province, well-respected people who are putting their money where their mouths are, Mr. Speaker. And there are other people as well, but I do not have the time to name them here this evening, Mr. Speaker.

On that note, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I think The Throne Speech is a positive thing and it is something that we can certainly build on over the years

ahead. So without hesitation, Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I am claiming my right to speak twice in this debate and I am quoting Standing Order 53(a) which I will read briefly. "No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood, but then he is not to introduce any new matter, and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, I merely rise on a point of order to establish my right to speak twice in this debate and I will exercise it at some future time.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

First of all, there is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is referring to a part of his speech that was misunderstood, or to explaining part of his speech that has not been reported correctly, or something like that. That has not happened in this case. As usual the hon. gentleman is just trying

to be a nuisance.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. CARTER:
I believe I have been
misunderstood and misquoted in
some remarks that I made yesterday
and at some point in the future,
when Your Honour decides whether
or not I may exercise this right,
I will do so. I merely rise to
make the point now.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, it does
not appear to me that the hon.
member has the right to speak on a
second occasion in this debate.

It is now six o'clock.

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