



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 6

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

6 March 1987

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that taking place at this moment at Hotel Newfoundland is an announcement by the hon. Gerald Ottenheimer, Minister of Energy, the hon. John Crosbie, federal Minister of Transport, and the hon. Marcel Masse, federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources -

MR. TULK:
You would not go down with them.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I only go where the Prime Minister is. First Ministers only talk to First Ministers.

- that eight new projects totalling \$66.6 million -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, there were people just coming into the gallery while I was speaking and I am sure they would not want to miss this.

Eight new projects totalling \$66.6 million have been jointly approved for funding under the

Canada/Newfoundland Offshore Development Fund. These projects, Mr. Speaker, are designed to give long-term economic benefits to the Province by establishing basic facilities and programmes in support of education, training, industrial infrastructure and research and development related to the offshore. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in recognition of their significance, I would like to provide the hon. members with details relating to them and ensure that they all have copies of this statement so that they can puruse it at their leisure later.

The first project, Mr. Speaker, relates to a \$2.7 million contribution to the Centre for Offshore and Remote Medicine and Telemedicine at Memorial University which will broaden and improve its various offshore related training, research and direct medical services. Memorial University has for the past decade been developing specialized programmes in offshore and remote medicine and telemedicine, and at present is the only university in Canada with substantial facilities in this field. This funding will be used to construct a new modern facility to house the centre and to purchase a full-scale hyperbaric - which we all know all about - medical chamber and other offshore-related medical equipment - big words, like 'marmalade'. Such support at this critical time in the Centre's evolution should enable it to become a world leader in all aspects of offshore and remote medicine.

The second project announced, Mr. Speaker, is a \$17.4 million research and development programme designed to establish a stronger petroleum-related R and D presence in the Province - \$17.4 million.

The Funding package of this \$17.4 million includes a \$5 million contribution to C-Core, the Cold Ocean Resources Engineering at Memorial University over a five year period to facilitate the acceleration and extension of its long-term research and development plan. This plan includes focusing on the safe and economic development of offshore petroleum resources and is comprised of three principal thrusts: Here is what the \$5 million will do: (A) a measurement of ice impact forces on various offshore structures; (B) the development of ice hazard detection radar systems; and (C) the conduct of ice scouring research on the ocean floor.

Also included in this R and D package is a \$7.4 million contribution to NORDCO to develop a Centre of Excellence in Marine Signal Processing and Remote Sensing at their headquarters. This Centre will be unique in Canada and one of the few in the world. The benefits to the provincial economy will be correspondingly significant. Beyond providing continuing employment for the corporation's highly qualified scientists, engineers and technicians over the next three years, it is expected that many new, long-term high tech positions will also be created with further spin-offs in the manufacturing and service sectors of the provincial economy.

I am pleased to add that an additional \$5 million has been approved to support a wide range of smaller-scale R and D projects which will facilitate the development of a world class capability in areas that are strategic to the development of the Province's offshore oil and gas industries. This \$5 million

is to go to the private sector. Specific proposals will be actively encouraged and solicited from the private sector and various petroleum related institutions in the Province over the next two years. In other words, there is \$5 million there now for various companies and other institutions to get funds to do other R and D projects which are going to be important to have done. So it is not just government, it is the private sector as well.

The third project, Mr. Speaker, is a \$3 million Offshore Technology Transfer Opportunities Programme designed to transfer new offshore-related technology and management techniques to the Newfoundland business community. This will involve the upgrading of professional, technical and managerial capabilities in local firms so as to place them in a better position to capture industrial and other business opportunities associated with the offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fourth project is one that I guess a lot of us here on this side of the House and I am sure all Newfoundlanders will be very pleased with, especially the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies. This is extremely important and it is very much a part of our reorganization of our post-secondary institutions. It is a \$21.1 million Petroleum Technology Training Programme for all of the post-secondary institutions in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The emergence of the offshore industry in Newfoundland has presented a challenge to the Province's educational and training system to provide our labour force with the skills necessary to take advantage of new and expanded employment opportunities. Funding announced today will be used to meet this challenge. If there are any students in the audience this morning I am sure they will be glad to hear about this, at least some of them who might be interested in going into these fields. Here are some of the priority areas that will be put into place in courses in the various post-secondary institutions around the Province: Engineering technology, welding technology, electrical and electronics technology - all related to marine and offshore - and crane operator training. Those will be the priority areas for courses now under this fund.

The fifth project, Mr. Speaker is a \$1.3 million Industrial Infrastructure Planning Program. This project involves the undertaking of pre-engineering and design work related to the possible Hibernia development sites at Argentia (major steel fabrication yard) and Adams Head/Come By Chance (GBS construction facility). So we got the engineering done there. This \$1.3 million will be used immediately to do engineering design work so that we have that work already done at Argentia and at the Adams Head/Come By Chance area so that if Hibernia is released in the next few months we will have that work done, bought and paid for, so that we can go to tender very quickly thereafter with the private sector. It is anticipated that some level of

government support will ultimately be required to develop these industrial sites in a timely manner and to take full advantage of local industrial fabrication opportunities associated with the Hibernia Project; hence, there is a need to undertake now some preliminary engineering work in relation to them.

The sixth project, and I know the hon. member behind me is going to be happy, Mr. Speaker, is a \$20 million Offshore Fabrication Enhancement Programme at Marystown Shipyard Limited.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In order to establish itself as a credible player in the offshore steel fabrication industry, Marystown Shipyard will need to embark upon a major upgrading programme, both in terms of manpower training and facility enhancement. Successful implementation of such a programme will place the shipyard in a position to capture a significant portion of steel fabrication work related to the Hibernia project. This in turn will place the Province in a strategically advantageous position to reap substantial long-term industrial and employment benefits from the offshore. Accordingly, a sum of \$2 million is being made available immediately to assist the shipyard in upgrading its engineering and managerial capabilities and to commence engineering studies to identify specific areas where its physical facilities are in need of improvement. An additional \$18 million for physical expansion and upgrading of the shipyard's facilities has been approved-in-principle and when the

results of the engineering studies are in, a decision to move ahead will go at the same time as a decision on Hibernia.

Mr. Speaker, a seventh project relates to, for the hon. member behind me again, the provision of \$600,000 for a one kilometre road to improve access to the recently established Cow Head oil rig repair facility at Mortier Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This road will be constructed during the Summer of 1987 and will connect the Cow Head Site with the Burin Peninsula Highway to make it an efficient access road for the going and coming of various large trucks and material that is needed at Cow Head.

The eighth project, Mr. Speaker, will provide \$500,000 for administrative support to the Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Development Fund Committee which has charge of the responsibilities of monitoring and controlling the implementation of the approved projects over the life of the Development Fund Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, these projects reinforce the fundamental strategy and direction that my government has adopted with respect to the Offshore Development Fund. Considering the five projects previously approved, in excess of \$100 million has now been committed from the \$300 million fund to implement programmes and projects which will place the Province in a strong position to gain long-term economic benefits from the development of the offshore.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down it is extremely important that you make haste slowly in this field to ensure that the projects that we are approving are fully researched, that when you announce them they are ready to go and that they are meaningful, concrete steps toward ensuring that we are going to be in the right place at the right time, technologically and in every other way, to take advantage of the offshore developments which will come our way in the not too distant future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that this Opposition is pleased with the announcements we have heard this morning. We are happy, of course, for the communities and the people who will benefit most from the projects, Marystown and the people who live on the Burin Peninsula and around Marystown. Of course, we are happy for all the people, Mr. Speaker, who will get jobs as a result of this announcement.

Mr. Speaker, one would have to say, though, that this is probably long overdue. It was only a few days ago that we wanted to know what was happening to the \$300 million. It is coincidental that the Premier would stand up a few days after the question was asked and outline \$66 million.

Mr. Speaker, there is something

significant in this statement. The people of Newfoundland are waiting out there with bated breath, and have been waiting for the past three or four years, for an announcement on when Hibernia will start, when we will have production on our offshore, when all our young Newfoundlanders will be able to come home, and when the jobs and the money and the revenues will be generated from our offshore that will help the way of life of the people of Newfoundland. What is significant in this statement, Mr. Speaker, is of the \$66 million expenditure, there is only the one expenditure - I will point it out in a minute - \$1.3 million, that directly affects the development of Hibernia, and that is a \$1.3 million Industrial Infrastructure Planning Programme: "This project involves the undertaking of pre-engineering and design work related to the possible 'possible' Hibernia development sites at Argentia." Now, one could argue that that relates directly to the development and the bringing into production of our offshore. The rest of the expenditures, Mr. Speaker, are expenditures that can be, and should be spent in Newfoundland anyway, and a lot of them are relative to our fishing industry, nothing to do with offshore or Hibernia.

Mr. Speaker, the \$2.7 million contribution to the Center for Offshore and Remote Medicine. We have a medical school down there, Mr. Speaker, where we are training doctors who leave Newfoundland and go around the world. We may well be training people - which will be good - who will work offshore elsewhere. What we want, Mr. Speaker, what we need from the Premier is an announcement that the jobs that we are getting these

people ready for will be there when they are ready so that they will not have to join the 20,000 who have already left Newfoundland

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

- so that these people we train in our offshore related activities will not have to join the 20,000 young Newfoundlanders who left Newfoundland in the last five or six years. It is good to train young Newfoundlanders. But, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland wants those young people trained so that they can work and live and help generate revenue in Newfoundland.

Somewhere in this statement I would have liked to have seen an indication that the Hibernia development was somewhere in the near future. I do not see it, Mr. Speaker.

"A \$17.4 million Research and Development Programme designed to establish a stronger petroleum-related research and development presence in this Province." Fine, Mr. Speaker, if there was no oil. If we knew today that we would not go into production of Hibernia for fifty years, it would still make sense to try to make Newfoundland a world class research and development area, which is happening here. But there is no reason for the people of Newfoundland as a result of this statement to feel any more secure about what the oil on the Grand Banks is going to mean to this Province.

The third project, Mr. Speaker: "A \$3 million Offshore Technology Transfer Opportunities Programme

designed to transfer new offshore-related technology and management techniques to the Newfoundland business community."

Mr. Speaker, we could use that if we had no oil. There are countries in this world which are training their young people to take jobs in industries that they do not have. Somewhere, sometime, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is going to have to stand up in this House and tell Newfoundland when we can expect development in the offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, \$21.5 million for Marystown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

No, I am ahead of myself, Mr. Speaker. "\$21.5 million Petroleum Technology Training Programme which will upgrade existing post-secondary technology training facilities and programmes." Mr. Speaker, again all we are doing is increasing the ability of Memorial University and our technical schools to train young Newfoundlanders for jobs in the offshore, jobs that for the past five years have been held out, and for this past year, Mr. Speaker, have not materialized. Every day, according to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie) on television a couple of nights ago, and according to our ex-Premier, the man who first told us we had oil, Mr. Moores - the hon. member laughs, but Mr. Moores, our ex-Premier, told this government -

MR. MATTHEWS:

Your leader told us that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- that we missed the window on offshore - now, Mr. Speaker, we lost the opportunity - 'and it may not come again', he said, 'in the near future.' Well, I am worried about the near future, I am worried and concerned about the future of these young people sitting in the galleries. Mr. Speaker, maybe these young people will take advantage of some of the opportunities that have been announced in this \$66 million, but the question is, will the fruits of their labour benefit Newfoundland? Will they be working in the Newfoundland offshore? Not according to ex-Premier Frank Moores.

Mr. Speaker, the Marystown Shipyard: The Marystown Shipyard was there long before we knew there was oil at Hibernia. Marystown Shipyard has been asking this Province to upgrade its facilities to permit it to be a world class shipyard.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:

Just one second to clue up, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, one can make the argument that the \$20 million going into Marystown Shipyard was needed and necessary irregardless of any offshore opportunities. Mr. Speaker, it is good to get this kind of development. We welcome it, and we are pleased for the people who will benefit from it. But it does nothing, Mr. Speaker, to ease people's minds in this Province who, as a result of the rhetoric of the past ten years, have pinned their hopes on Hibernia getting them out of the fiscal bind we are

into. Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just one comment before I start. I was wondering if the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) had had the name of his district changed, since the Premier referred to him as 'the member from behind me' on several occasions. Actually, I think it would be appropriate that we stick to legitimate names.

It is unfortunate that this package of money, this \$66.6 million, is likely to be about the major contribution to development funds this year, given the financial condition of the Province. In a sense, it almost seems to be pointing the money in the wrong direction, or not in the wrong direction, but perhaps there are other directions we would like to point the money into, for example, such as the inshore fishery and other aspects of our economy which I think desperately need the funds. Unfortunately, we are in this agreement. At the time it was signed, it looked like the Hibernia development would be imminent in terms of its development and it was a reasonable proposal then. Now, of course, the fear is that we may be training and preparing and engineering and gearing up, and everything else, for an industry that might be several more years in the future in terms of its development, if at all.

Having said that, there are a few specific comments I would like to make about the proposal. One is that there is some money in there for safety development which we applaud, since this is just a little over five years since the Ocean Ranger disaster. It is, I think, appropriate that we turn our attention to the development of safety. In looking at the proposal it seems to me remarkable that although we are willing to spend millions of dollars towards it, it is primarily in the measurement of ice impact forces, the development of ice hazard detection, and the conduct of ice scouring research on the ocean floor.

Mr. Speaker, we still have the major problem of how to evacuate people from oil rigs when they get themselves into extreme difficulty. I think we all realize that within the last couple of days the last contractor that is drilling for oil announced the preferred orientation displacement system, the PROD system, as one means of evacuating the oil rigs. I would like to point out today that that system has not been tested 'not been tested' for list or trim conditions, it has not been certified by the Coast Guard to this present day, and it has been criticized by a number of professional agencies as not being appropriate. These include the Royal Institute of Naval Architects and the Ocean Ranger Commission Consultants of Hollobone, Hibbert and Associates Limited. So maybe one of the things that should be done with this fund is to perhaps put a bit more money into research, directly into the area where we know we have a major problem, and that is if a rig gets into trouble again,

how do we get the crew off that rig securely. So I would suggest to the individuals who are directing the money from this fund that maybe they should have another look at the disbursement of it to see that in the near future more money may be committed to this extremely important area of safety development.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling for Oral Questions I would like to welcome to the galleries twenty-nine Kindergarten to Grade IX students, and their three teachers, Graham Carey, Wesley Stagg and Edna Earle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome thirty-four Grade X to XII students and their two teachers, Mr. Stewart Marks, and Mr. Don Hodder from the Seventh Day Adventist Academy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To make a quick comment, I did read the transcripts from yesterday's Question Period and I would like to ask the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr.

Matthews) - I am sure he expects the question, or part of it - to inform the House in concise terms, in today's terms, for an update on what action he and his department have taken or will yet take with respect to the Innu hunters from Sheshatshit taking caribou from the Mealy Mountain herd, which, as you know, is protected by provincial wildlife laws?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for the question, at the same time welcome him back to the House of Assembly for this session, and to say that I have been monitoring this situation very closely since Monday. The hon. gentleman is correct in that we do have a number of Innu hunters - well, family members, actually - from Sheshatshit in the Mealy Mountain area and they have illegally taken in our estimate now in excess of thirty caribou. We have had our Wildlife Officers and members of the RCMP involved in great detail trying to bring this situation to a peaceful solution.

On Monday the officers approached the camp and were met with some degree of hostility by hunters and children and women. The RCMP, who, of course, have the greatest amount of training and experience in this kind of a situation, decided that they should leave the scene and try to initiate some kind of mediation effort to bring a peaceful solution to it. While I say that, Mr. Speaker, as Minister of wildlife it is certainly not our intent, or my intent, to turn a blind eye to the illegal hunting that is taking

place there. I just want to assure the hon. member that the breaking of our wildlife regulations and the laws of the Province will be met with the necessary action and that charges will certainly be laid.

MR. KELLAND:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
I thank the minister for that information. I just came back from the district, as you have mentioned, and there is quite a lot of unrest up there. Yesterday's transcript did not indicate it, but is the minister aware that it is a much more complex issue than someone getting meat for the Winter, or the rest of the Winter? It strikes me - and will the minister confirm this - that his government's consistent inability to deal with Native and other Labrador concerns reflects a sort of government attitude, which is perceived by Labradorians to cause a lot of these problems. It seems that you are sitting back.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
They do not recognize us, the Government of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:
I am asking the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, will the minister confirm, will he admit that it is the government's inability -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They do not recognize us.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker, I am not asking a question of the Premier.

MR. SIMMS:
You are questioning the wrong minister. You should know that.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:
Does the minister confirm, does he admit that it is the government's inability to deal with Native issues in Labrador that brings about problems of this nature? Or is the minister saying that he has adopted, or the government has adopted a policy -

MR. MATTHEWS:
We could argue on that.

MR. KELLAND:
Just a minute.

- to close your eyes, sit back and the problems will go away? They have not gone away yet, Mr. Minister. What is your answer?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking a supplementary question which he started about three minutes ago. Now a supplementary question is supposed to be a very short, to-the-point, follow-up of the first question. I think the hon. member should state his question.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, the point of order is well taken. I think the hon. member was taking too long to get to his supplementary question. So I would ask him if he would pose his question.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I could answer it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, if the hon. minister wishes to answer, that is fine.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I will gladly answer the question. The situation, what is happening in the Mealy Mountains, is no way any reflection on the ability of this government. What I, as a minister, and this government is trying to do is to prevent a situation that could turn into great hostility and confrontation, and instead of only having caribou taken illegally and hunted illegally we may see some injury to human life and maybe loss of life. As the Minister of Wildlife I think I am taking a very responsible approach to this, in consultation with the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge).

Now, we want to settle this issue, but, at the same time, with full concern for the wildlife resource of the Mealy Mountains where the numbers of that herd have been at a dangerous level for a number of years. At the same time we do not want to incite a problem up there where we see human beings being injured or whatever. So we are trying to deal with it.

As I said to the hon. member, we intend to lay charges because these caribou have been taken illegally. As I said publicly and in this House before, if the Innu hunt that herd with total

disregard, in a few years time we will not have to come to this House or any public forum to argue who has the rights to hunt the caribou because there will not be any there.

So the situation is not a matter of this government's inability to deal with the situation. If you have eighty or ninety people who go into a mountain area, a caribou range, and set up a camp illegally and dig in on the issue, then I do not think that in any way reflects the inability of this government because someone has a problem with Native rights and with low level flying. All I am saying is we have involved the RCMP in this issue because they have the most training and experience in dealing with situations such as this. Certainly, as Minister of Wildlife my officials are having conversation with Superintendent Leahy and other people, and we are certainly going to take their advice on dealing with the issue.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I commend the minister's concern about wildlife and human life, and I support that. Because of such a complex situation and a potentially dangerous situation, is the minister, himself, personally willing to go into Labrador in the very, very near future, meet with the Innu hunters and meet with the other concerned hunters and concerned people in Labrador, with a view to mediating at that level? Would the minister give a commitment to go into Labrador as soon as possible?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, today, as a matter of fact, there will be a representative of our Wildlife Division meeting with the people from the Innu in Labrador. We have been trying since late yesterday, last night and again this morning, to get a commitment from the Chief there to sit down and discuss this situation and see if we cannot resolve it as peacefully as possible.

As of my leaving my office this morning, we had not heard back. So we are still monitoring the situation very, very closely. We want to resolve it as best we can, as peacefully as we can, as I said before, but still to enforce the wildlife regulations and laws of the Province. That certainly will be done, I can assure him of that. I know there is concern in the areas as well from a lot of other people, from a lot of other communities. There is a meeting taking place tonight in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area.

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

With all due respect, Minister, I asked a simple supplementary in accordance with what an earlier government speaker corrected me on, my long drawn out question. The simple question is, and the point of order is, I asked you,

'Are you willing to give the commitment that you, yourself, as the minister responsible, will go in there.' That is the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. TULK:

You should do one thing or the other - answer him or sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, would the buffoon from Fogo please be quiet so I can answer the question, please?

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to deal with this situation as diligently and as cautiously and as moderately as possible, taking into all due consideration the wildlife regulation laws of this Province. But there is another form of life that I am concerned about, as I have already told the gentleman, in that we do not want hostility in there where we have eighty or ninety people in a camp who have confronted in essence enforcement officers of the Wildlife Division and the RCMP.

We are presently, as we have been since Monday, trying to have effective mediation, conciliation efforts deal with the issue. There have been community leaders who have blessed this event, this illegal activity, and that concerns me very much, and I am sure everyone in this House is concerned about that. Now if it comes to the crunch and we do not

resolve the situation over the next short while, I have no difficulty as Minister of Wildlife going in and talking to anyone. But the situation now, that the hon. gentleman has to remember, is that at present there is no one willing to talk to anybody. We made the approaches. We want them to talk. So if I go to Labrador it does not mean that anybody is going to talk to me because I am minister. It does not mean that. We have the RCMP and our wildlife people there, but because I go down as minister does not mean that someone from the Band Council of Sheshatshit is going to talk to me.

MR. KELLAND:

There are more hunters in Labrador besides the Inuit.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

You should have been in your district instead of Hawaii.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier and it is with respect to a new phenomenon in this Province called the Peckford Peter Principle. I would like to ask the Premier in light of the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) statements that none of our Newfoundland lawyers could handle this \$400,000 project to Newfoundland - in fact, I think he referred to our lawyers as merely

the common garden type - is the Premier seriously telling Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that he could not find, amongst the battery of lawyers in his own Justice Department or from lawyers in private firms across Newfoundland and Labrador, a Newfoundlander to do this half million dollar job? Is he telling us that he had no choice but to pass out this cash to his buddy in Alberta?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is so low, Mr. Speaker, it is not even funny. That is low.

MR. FUREY:

Answer the question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We have been using the Department of Justice lawyers here in Newfoundland - all Newfoundlanders, I think - and Newfoundlanders were used on our legal case on the offshore; we are using Newfoundland lawyers every day for many, many projects in this Province. Most of the projects that we do, undertakings that we have, are done by lawyers resident and practicing in Newfoundland, and we will continue to use them as we are using some of them now. Cabot Martin is being used right now on a consultancy basis to help us with the offshore negotiations. He is a Newfoundlander. He is being used and is being paid.

What we also needed, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to Hibernia and the whole offshore question, was some outside expertise, especially a

group of people who have been involved both with the federal government in negotiating oil and gas agreements over the years and who have been involved in the oil and gas industry worldwide. And this firm is not only doing legal work it is doing economic work as well, because this firm has been involved in economic analysis as well as legal analysis. A lot of the work that this firm is doing, now that Mr. Lougheed is a part of it, is in the economic field. We are doing work here in our Justice Department, Mr. Cabot Martin is doing work as a Newfoundlander, and we have hired this firm who are experts in the field of energy, especially oil and gas. Now, there is not in Newfoundland per se, in particular, a law firm that has been involved extensively in oil and gas negotiations and economic analysis. There just is not. Where there is any expertise we use it, but it is, in our view, essential that we also have, if it is available, expertise from outside who have been dealing with the federal government and with Energy, Mines and Resources, and who have been dealing with energy projects around the world. This firm has not only been dealing with Canadian energy projects related to oil and gas, but also worldwide. That is the reason for having Mr. Lougheed and his firm involved. But we are also using Newfoundland lawyers wherever we find that they have the expertise needed for this particular kind of issue we have here.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

The Premier tells us now, clearly, that he had full knowledge that he would probably would be engaging Mr. Lougheed's law firm. Now, in November of 1985 -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, order!

MR. FUREY:

- the Premier told us he would be paying him \$40,000 annually plus expenses.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Now my question is this.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have noticed on a number of occasions that when I call the hon. member to order he continues speaking. So I would just like to say to him that he is completely out of order in doing that and I hope will not have to draw that matter to his attention again.

MR. FUREY:

My question to the Premier is why did not the Premier, when he announced in this House that he would be paying Mr. Lougheed \$40,000 annually plus expenses, tell the people of Newfoundland then that he would possibly be engaging this law firm to the tune of \$500,000?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is because we did not know at that time. Mr. Lougheed is being paid \$40,000 a year to be a part of the negotiating team. He attends all of the meetings that are held

between the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) for Newfoundland and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Masse) in Ottawa, attends additional meetings on behalf of Newfoundland in our dealing with Ottawa and in our dealings with companies, has attended almost all of the meetings of the offshore negotiating team here in Newfoundland as well as the meetings with the companies and the federal government together. That is his job, and to give advice through that. As we went through the negotiations it became obvious - I can give a list of other studies that are going on this day through the Petroleum Directorate in addition to with what is going on with Mr. Peter Lougheed's firm; there are many other studies going on - that it was necessary to get some other in-depth analysis done, not by one person but by a firm of people, a group of people who have done extensive work in this area. This firm has done extensive work and is recognized, not only in Canada but around the world as being very, very expert to do that kind of work for us. Mr. Lougheed's job is one thing and that is to be a part of the negotiating team, to advise me and the Minister of Energy, and to be in on all the meetings between the federal government and the companies. For example, this week, I guess we have been on the phone to Mr. Lougheed, myself and the Minister of Energy, perhaps six or seven times. I have been on the phone three times myself. He will be meeting with us over the next couple of weeks and when we get into negotiations he will be there. That is his job. Then we have some complex economic analyses to do, so we have our own team do it through the Department

of Finance and then we bounce that off, we give it to Mr. Lougheed's firm and ask them to go through it and give us their outside opinion on the analyses that we have done so that we are sure of our numbers and sure of the approach we are trying to take.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. We have situations in this Province that I am personally aware of where a construction company faced bankruptcy while they were waiting to be paid by the Newfoundland government, waiting for the budget to come down. We have municipalities that have not been able to maintain basic services because the government advised them they had to wait for the budget until a vote was funded. Why the urgency in paying Mr. Lougheed's law firm \$400,000 over and above the \$40,000 that Lougheed himself had already earned? Why the urgency that required a Special Warrant when the budget would have been brought down in a month and he could have been paid as he should have been paid? Why the urgency for that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The member for Windsor - Buchans astounds me. Do you pay for work done in 1986-87 out of the budget

for 1986-87. If we did not pay now for a bill that came in in 1986-87, the Opposition would be asking us in July how come you paid Mr. Lougheed's firm for all the work that they did in 1986-87 out of the money in 1987-88. All the municipalities are getting paid for whatever they are entitled to for 1986-87 out of the 1986-87 budget. If anybody has bills into the government for work done in 1986-87, we try to pay it out of the budget for 1986-87 because that is how we budgeted it. For the member for Windsor - Buchans to suggest that we do not pay people when they send bills in and we wait for another budget even though the work was done in the previous year, sounds to me like the member for Windsor - Buchans has not been in this House very long.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, when the issue of Mr. Lougheed's contract was raised last year - as a matter of fact, I had the privilege of raising the issue in the first place - the then Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) pointed out that we were lucky to be getting Mr. Lougheed's advice, his expertise, but that he was going to do four reports a year and the reports would be available to the House of Assembly. Now, I ask the Premier, where are the four reports a year that Mr. Lougheed was supposed to prepare for the Newfoundland Government for \$40,000 over and

above the \$400,000?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That is a different question. All of a sudden the member for Windsor - Buchans escapes from the mistake he made in his previous question when he was asking about something being paid next year for work done this year. He was not long moving away from that one, Mr. Speaker. Let me remind the member for Windsor - Buchans, when he talks about money going to law firms, that his own leader over there did not do too bad the last couple of years as it relates to the Ocean Ranger.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:
It was not taxpayers' money.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is the pot calling the kettle black, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is impossible to hear what is going on unless the members on the right give me an opportunity to hear. So I would ask them to please keep reasonably silent.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) says it was not taxpayers' money. What

did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) do only use government stationary to go to solicit more business for his law firm?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Used government stationary. If that is not taxpayers' money I would like to know what it is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
How low and dirty are we going to allow him to go?

MR. TOBIN:
The truth hurts!

OOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it is called tit for tat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, we will undertake to get the report for the hon. member. No problem.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the Premier through you that we have Mr. Cabot Martin at \$150 an hour, we have Mr. Baugh from Calgary, the Chairman of the Petroleum Directorate -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

This is a final supplementary, but the hon. member is making a speech.

MR. FLIGHT:
- and we have Mr. Lougheed who has got a contract for \$40,000.

MR. SPEAKER:
Would the hon. member please pose a question?

MR. FLIGHT:
My question, Mr. Speaker, is - and the Premier should be able to answer it - what specifically did Mr. Lougheed do for this Province that required him to rake an extra \$400,000 out of this Province, at a time when the Premier was telling Newfoundland we were going bankrupt, that Mr. Martin could not do, that Mr. Baugh could not do and that all the lawyers in Newfoundland could not do?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is not Mr. Lougheed that the \$400,000 has gone to. It has gone to a law firm of I do not know how many - eight, ten, maybe fifteen - who have been working on economic analysis and legal opinions for the Province on the various proposals. It is not to Mr. Lougheed, it is to a firm. As the Leader of the Opposition told us last year when we questioned him on the Ocean Ranger, 'I did not get those hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars, it went to my firm.' That is what he said, 'It went to my firm. I never got it. I hardly got a cent out of it.' Of course, he never did tell us how much he got out of it. That was the way that he approached it. So it went to the

firm, and that is number one, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:
Who knows how much you get from the PC party every week.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is all public.

MR. BAIRD:
And it is none of your business.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is all public. What I get from the P.C. Party is public. I have made it public. It is all public. The press all know how much I get.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me finish answering the question, because there were three parts to the question. One was that Mr. Lougheed was getting \$400,000. That is erroneous. That is going to the firm. Mr. Lougheed is getting \$40,000 a year to do negotiations with our negotiating team, with the companies, and with the federal government.

Secondly, he brings up Mr. Baugh. Mr. Ted Baugh is Chairman of the Offshore Petroleum Board, which is paid for by the federal government 50 per cent,-

MR. FLIGHT:
And by Newfoundland.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
- and by us 50 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I cannot shout over these people.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Baugh has a mandate on the Atlantic Accord. He is not responsible for negotiating. He is getting paid by both governments. He cannot negotiate the offshore agreement. If the hon. member is the Energy critic, will he please read the Atlantic Accord and the regulations so he will know the responsibility that Mr. Baugh and the Offshore Petroleum Board has? They have no responsibilities to negotiate the agreement between the two governments and the companies. So he is wrong on that score.

Thirdly, Mr. Martin is doing work for the government, is on our negotiating team, because he has had a history, since back in 1972, of being a part of it from a legal point of view. But Mr. Martin does not have the expertise in the economic field to do the economic analysis that it is necessary to do on all the complex range of taxation systems between the federal and provincial governments that have to be incorporated into the fiscal regime. He is a legal advisor, Mr. Speaker.

So, the three parts to the hon. member's question are completely erroneous, crazy, foolish, silly-

MR. FLIGHT:
But the \$400,000 is not erroneous.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
- and I am really sad to think

that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans has been in this House this long and he still does not know how the government operates.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the hon. the Premier. Last year we were told \$40,000. Now we discover it is \$400,000. Like the deficit, Mr. Speaker, it is still escalating. Has the Premier calculated just how much Mr. Lougheed is ultimately going to cost this Province, and will the Premier give an undertaking to put a cap on the amount of money that this Lougheed scandal can eventually cost the Province of Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, you cannot put a cap on it, like we cannot put a cap on other things. We cannot put a cap on it because you do not know how much work you are going to be asking them to do. We could have asked his leader the same question, to put a cap on how much they were going to get from the Ocean Ranger thing.

MR. CALLAN:
How low can you go. That is a personal attach.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I am sure we would have gotten a good answer to that. No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot put a cap on it. It is impossible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I cannot answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Why will the members opposite not give me an opportunity to respond? I do not say anything when they ask the questions.

MR. TULK:
Good job you do not.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, may I have the protection of the Chair please?

MR. SPEAKER:
I asked earlier during Question Period if we could have at least reasonable silence.

MR. FUREY:
(Inaudible), Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I did not get that comment, but I will check it out in Hansard.

I am asking again for the hon. members on my right to please keep silent when an answer is being given to a question.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, in trying to answer the question that was posed by the member for the Strait of Belle

Isle, no, we have no intention of putting a cap on it, because it is unrealistic to put a cap on it, because you do not know from time to time, during the negotiations, what additional work you are going to need to have done in an expert fashion to ensure that in your negotiating posture you are going to be getting the best deal for Newfoundland that you can. So that is an unrealistic thing to expect.

It is not a scandal, it is money paid for work performed. And we will continue to pay for work that is performed to ensure that we have the best advice and the best information at our disposal.

As it relates to all the money going out, the \$29 million in Special Warrants that we mentioned the other day, \$27 million has been found in countervailing savings where we did a better job on other things, this saving money, so it is only really \$2 million.

MR. DECKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
I ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, if he refuses to put a cap on the amount of money that this Lougheed scandal will ultimately cost the Province, will he concede that this scandal could well cost the people of Newfoundland \$10 million?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Why in his question did he only say \$10 million? Why did you not

say \$50 million or \$100 million to make it more dramatic? I mean \$10 million is not really enough to get your question on the news at noon time. I mean, if I were a member in the Strait of Belle Isle's position I would never have said \$10 in my question. I would have said \$50 million or \$100 million because then I would have made sure I made the news dinner time.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Education. As we all know, last September saw the end of a very bitter strike between the public service unions and the government, and I was hoping, and I think everybody was hoping, that conditions would return back to normal. I have in my possession here a copy of a letter from his deputy minister, Mr. Wheeler, dated February 18, to one of the employees in his department as a written reprimand for being off work during the illegal strikes. My question to the minister is this: What purpose is served five months after the strike is over, after the collective agreement has been concluded, that these disciplinary measures should be sent out to the employees in the Department of Education?

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take the question under advisement. It is the first I have heard of it. I have not seen the letter and I

would appreciate it if the member would supply me with a copy. It is certainly not the policy of this minister to reiterate on anything that has happened in the past. In fact, I think relations in our department before, during, and after the labour dispute, have been quite good. I am amazed to hear of such a letter.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary is to the President of Treasury Board if he is here, or anyone else who wishes to answer in his behalf. It is my understanding that not just the Department of Education but in fact all departments of government will be sending out letters like this to individuals who were involved in the illegal strike. Is there someone on behalf of the government who will answer -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. FENWICK:

If is the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, there is no need for that.

MR. FENWICK:

Is there someone on the government side who can tell us whether or not in fact these letters are being sent out to every single individual who was on strike?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

I will take the question as notice for the President of Treasury Board. I am sure he will respond to the hon. member.

MR. FENWICK:

There he comes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave. There is only time for a quick question and answer.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question was to the Premier, but obviously the Premier has left his seat so I will ask the Acting Premier, possibly, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Possibly I can agree somewhat with the amount of money that they have spent seeking expertise and advice from within the Province and from without the Province, because obviously the members opposite do not know what they are doing. The question to the Minister of Finance, with all the millions of dollars sent out -

The Premier is in the House now, Mr. Speaker, so I put it to the Premier with all the millions of dollars spent out in studies and in seeking advice, would the Premier explain to this House of Assembly and to the people of the Province why there are in the vicinity of 80,000 people in this Province unemployed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, primarily because years ago the Liberal Party did not get this advice and therefore gave away the Labrador power which leaves us with very few job opportunities in Newfoundland, put us \$49 million in debt at Come By Chance oil refinery \$49 million, which we are trying to pay off today, and ignored the fishery. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Question has elapsed.

ooo

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

I trust the Chair is ruling on whether or not this is a point of order, or I may have to use a point of personal privilege. However, if I may explain, in the initial response by the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) to my first question, he welcomed me back into the House of Assembly. There is nothing wrong with that. I have been out of the House of Assembly for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. In his final remark, as he sat down, and it somewhat cheapens my image of and my previous respect for the minister, he made the comment, "You should be in your district instead of Hawaii." Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to clarify that.

Mr. Speaker, you can confirm to the members of this House that I informed you, through my office, when I was leaving St. John's last week to return to my district for a very personal matter, which I do not intend to go into here, that your office was informed of the reasons. I was in my district the entire time for a purely personal matter of great concern to me and of great concern to members on the other side of the House, in fact. I totally object to that sort of a cheap shot by the minister. We get along well, generally speaking. I would ask him to withdraw that kind of remark, because it does imply that -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just a minute, you are abusing the rules of the House.

MR. KELLAND:

On a point of personal privilege. I have asked the Speaker's rule on that, Mr. Premier.

MR. FUREY:

Relax, 'Brian.'

MR. KELLAND:

The implication was that while I was out of the House, for the last three or four days, I was in Hawaii and not in my district. That is totally incorrect, Mr. Speaker, and you can certainly confirm for the House that I did advise you where I was going and why I was going. It had nothing to do with vacations which are taken when the House is closed.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier to that point of privilege.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This is an abuse of the rules of this House. If every time some hon. member gets up, in the heat of debate, and in the cut and thrust of debate across this House, where one member says something to the other, they are going to get up on a point of privilege, there is no prima facie case here to establish that there is a point of privilege. The hon. member would do better to either stay in this House or go back to his district and take Beauchesne and the Standing Orders and read them, so he knows what the rules of this House are, so he does not abuse it, so we can get on with the business here. This is terrible.

MR. KELLAND:

To the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, briefly.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am prepared to rule on that. There is no point of privilege. There is no prima facie case. There is no point of order. I think the hon. member took the opportunity of explaining his position in relation to a comment that was made by the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. The hon. member did write to me that he would be away from the House.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Address in Reply, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, as is normal and

customary in the first few speeches in the Address to the Throne Speech, I want to congratulate the two new members in this particular setting, the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long). I am sure that they will make a great contribution to the future proceedings in the House.

On that note I also want to congratulate the NDP Party in their recent achievement and recent accomplishment in being recognized as something. I do not know exactly what it is. I am not sure that they know themselves but they have been given some official recognition. I believe that that is going to serve politics in this Province well. The fact that we now have the NDP Party recognized in this House, some people get afraid over it, you know. It was inevitable.

We have had an NDP Party in Canada for a number of years, and obviously it was inevitable that they were going to end up in this Legislature. I welcome them, and, as I have said before, I believe that they are going to make a great contribution to political debate in this Province. I would hope now that these two members will help us along our way to political reform in this Province because we surely need political reform. These extra two gentlemen might help us to bring the government to their senses and bring about some political reform so that we can operate effectively and efficiently in this House according to the wishes of the people that elected us. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope it will bring about that.

I think it will bring about

healthy debate because it will now force all political parties to delineate their political philosophy more concisely and more precisely. Mr. Speaker, it will put the Tories on the far right where they belong and it will put the NDP on the left and leave the middle ground to the Liberals that they so rightfully own, Mr. Speaker, not by philosophy only, but by actions that have been seen throughout this country, the Liberal party squarely in the middle.

I get amused by the fact that the other two are trying to squeeze us out. Mr. Speaker, as long as we have the members that are presently in this caucus there is no way that any political party is going to squeeze us from the center. There is no way. Mr. Speaker, it will do that. So I welcome the NDP party to the House and I believe, as I have said, it will have these great benefits.

MR. FENWICK:

Before you go any further, it is the NDP or the New Democratic Party, it is not the NDP party, please.

MR. LUSH:

Okay, sorry. The New Democratic Party. Again, I am not used to having to refer to that. I apologize and I can assure the hon. gentleman that it will not be said any more, it will not be said any more not by this hon. gentleman - the New Democratic Party.

I wondered though whether both hon. gentleman of the NDP really reflected upon and thought about why the government was so generous in complying with their wishes in recognizing them. I wondered whether they ever thought of that

and I would ask them to certainly give great heed to the old adage, 'Beware of Greeks bearing gifts.'

At one point I got a perverted notion thinking that maybe the government thought if we give the hon. gentlemen enough rope, they will hang themselves. In any event, maybe that is a perverted notion. I do caution the hon. gentleman to beware of why the government uncharacteristically complied with their wishes so quickly and so promptly. In any event, Mr. Speaker, without belabouring the point, I certainly am proud as one member of this House that they do have their rightful recognition. As I say again, I hope that now that both groups together will certainly push this government for political reform. That is the important thing that we got to have, political reform in this House.

One of the most backward houses in all of Canada with respect to political reform is this present Assembly. This is one of the most backward parliaments in all of the jurisdictions throughout Canada. I would hope that this government will move quickly on the issues that we have identified and that we will continue to identify and press for so that we can all do our jobs effectively and efficiently.

MR. CALLAN:

Do not hold your breath.

MR. DAWE:

That is an awful statement.

MR. LUSH:

That is right. I do not want to get into that at this particular point in time. I want to get to the Throne Speech.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to condemn the initiatives and the policies that are enunciated in this particular document, as little as they are, as minimal, and as miniscule as they are. It is not my intention to condemn them because any initiative taken by this government has to be lauded and praised and commended. So it is certainly not my intention to condemn the initiatives taken but rather to emphasize that they do not go far enough to meet the needs of our people in the Province today. That, Mr. Speaker, will form the theme, if you will, in my approach to this whole Throne Speech today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if hon. members have noticed, I think the change and shade of colour is very significant. I think it symbolizes, illustrates and demonstrates what is happening to the government today.

You will notice in 1985 it was dark, dark, deep Tory blue. You will notice in 1987, it is getting a lot lighter. I think that symbolizes the fact that this government does not know where it is going politically. You never know, the next Throne Speech could be pink because it is changing. Now I do not know what 1986 was like but I did notice when I was reading the Throne Speech this dramatic change in colour from the Throne Speech of 1985 to the Throne Speech of 1987 and I think that is symbolic of a government that does not know where it is philosophically; a government that is waffling and searching as to where it should be. 1986, yes, it is much the same, no that is a little deeper altogether, it is really deep Tory blue the 1986, it was deep Tory blue, but the 1987

one a tremendous change. So that demonstrates it, Mr. Speaker, more emphatically as we can see. As I have said before, I think this symbolizes what is happening to the Tory Party, waffling and searching.

The Premier did say he was trying to move to the centre. Imagine a Tory Party moving to the centre in the political spectrum. No, Mr. Speaker, the presence of the N.D.P. now will force us all to take our rightful position in the political scheme of things.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech itself was one of the longest, one of the most boring, one of the most uninspiring Throne Speeches I have ever had to sit through in this Honourable House. Its only saving grace, Mr. Speaker, was that His Honour did a marvelous job reading it and that obviously came from His Honour's vast experience as a politician and he was able to give it the right intonation, the right announcement, the right modulation for otherwise, it would have put us all to sleep. If read by a less capable gentleman we would have all gone to sleep in this Honourable House.

Mr. Speaker, what did it say in fact? What did it say in essence? I see the Throne Speech divided into two parts. Part one was the normal, typical diatribe that this government has been producing. The usual rhetoric, self-glorification, backpatting, backslapping, the Premier taking credit for everything that has happened in the Province in the past few months. Mentioned as successes, proclaimed successes, purported successes was Fishery Products International, the new gold mine on the Southwest Coast,

the reactivation of the fluorspar mine at St. Lawrence, the rehabilitation and the modification of the paper mills at Grand Falls and Corner Brook, the employment opportunities at the Marystown Shipyard and the start of the rehabilitation of the Come By Chance oil refinery. The Premier tried to take credit for every development and every activity that happened in this Province in the past twelve months. He tried to take credit for everything except the high snowfalls and the freezing rain that we have had all Winter.

Mr. Speaker, I say this to the Premier and to hon. gentlemen opposite, if they are going to take credit for the sunshine, they have to be blamed for the rain. I am going to get into the rain shortly, Mr. Speaker.

Part two of this document, Mr. Speaker, was the weakest. That, I suppose, dealt with the government's economic strategy, its economic plans, its economic revival and job creation programmes. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was the Throne Speech that everybody in this Province has been waiting for. This was the Throne Speech that the people of this Province, particularly the unemployed people, had been looking for for months and months because this was the Throne Speech that was going to respond to the Royal Commission on Employment and on Unemployment. This was the Throne Speech that was going to demonstrate how effectively and how far the government was going to go in acting upon the recommendations of the House Royal Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what did they finally get? Mr. Speaker, what

did they finally get when this Throne Speech came? What were they waiting for? They were waiting eagerly, expectations raised so high, because in 1985 the Premier called an election on the heels of signing the Atlantic Accord, the biggest development in this Province since the completion of the Newfoundland railway. So the Premier decided he would take advantage of that, and he called an election, an unnecessary one, mind you, but he called the election. What was the election called for? To give the Premier a mandate to create jobs. I did not think that a government had to ask for that mandate, to create jobs. I thought that was an understanding. I thought that was a natural responsibility.

MR. TULK:

We would let them do it.

MR. LUSH:

That is right. We did not stop them. I thought that was a natural responsibility for a government to create jobs. But they asked for the mandate to create the jobs. And, of course, they were going to create more jobs than ever we had seen before. Why? Because they had a Tory government in Ottawa. They had their buddies on side there. They were going to inflict prosperity on us, along with the Premier.

So here we were waiting for this tremendous job development programme, waiting for this infliction of prosperity. The Premier got the mandate and what happened? He did not know how to handle the mandate that he had received. He did not know how to get this Province moving. They had no ideas of the kind of economic policies and financial

programmes that they had to put in place to create jobs in this Province.

So, how did the Premier get himself off the hook of this great commitment to the people of this Province of job creation? A favorite ploy by government, ineffective governments, inefficient governments, incompetent governments, a favorite ploy, set up a Royal Commission on employment and unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not believe, really I tried to put the best foot forward and tried to use my best motives, that the Premier had not done this as a ploy, as a stalling tactic. I did not believe that. I really believed that the Premier would heed the recommendations of the Royal Commission. But if this is any indication of how serious the government are with respect to adopting the recommendations of the Royal Commission, then, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that this effort was a total waste. I am afraid that the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment was a waste of the time and effort of the Commissioners, a waste of the time and effort of the people who appeared before that Commission, and more significantly, a waste of the millions of dollars that we have spent on this Commission.

Did we ever get the figures on this Royal Commission, as to what it cost? It was over \$2 million. So, Mr. Speaker, if the extent to which the government are going to act upon the recommendations of the Royal Commission is illustrated in this Throne Speech of 1987, then I reiterate and I repeat, the effort was a wasted one. The time and effort put in

by the Commissioners was a wasted one, and the \$2 million of taxpayers' money that we spent has gone down the tube.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the recommendations by the Commission they did decide to act upon. The first series of recommendations that they decided to act upon had to do with education. It says, "The Royal Commission emphasizes the importance of the education system in economic development." So, of course they are going to do certain things.

I want to refer to the paragraph on page 11 which says, "Teachers too will be required to possess not only the traditional skills but also an improved ability to stay current in an evolving school system" - Fine! - "while being challenged by economic and social changes faster and more profound than have occurred at any previous time in our history. In consequence, My Government, in conjunction with the Memorial University of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Teachers Association, will undertake a major review of the teacher training programmes at Memorial University."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether hon. members have recognized it. Did they have some say in the preparation of this or is it just a one man show? I do not know to what extent Cabinet Ministers and backbenchers have an input into the preparation of the Throne Speech because I have never been there but I certainly would not be a part of a team that did not allow me to have some input, to have some influence in what went in there.

So I do not know whether hon.

gentlemen realize but this paragraph is an insult to the Faculty of Education. Why single out, why specify the Faculty of Education as needing a review? Is that the only faculty in that university that needs a review? Why identify that faculty? I know it is an important faculty, Mr. Speaker, but what I would suggest is that they have an entire review of the total university, of all faculties and all programmes.

MR. BAIRD:

In other words, you agree with it but it does not go far enough, is that it?

MR. LUSH:

Of course, and I hope that I have made myself clear. I think by singling out the Faculty of Education it is an insult, as if they were not doing their job, as if their programmes were inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that for the future development and for the future education of the young people of this Province, we do not only need a review of the Faculty of Education, we need a review of all faculties to ensure that all faculties are keeping abreast of technological development and that our young people are being adequately and properly trained for the future. So I disagree with the singling out and the identifying of the Faculty of Education only.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a great enlightenment from the Royal Commission. They needed a Royal Commission to tell them that. They needed a Royal Commission to tell them that we needed to look at our educational system.

Then it comes on to talking about

the community colleges. We are going to have three. We do not know how much they are going to cost. We have no idea what types of programmes are going to be in them. We do not know who the instructors are going to be, where they are going to come from, whether they are going to come from the university, the present staff there now, or whether they are going to be new jobs or whether they are going to be brought in from other parts of the world. We have no idea of what is going to happen with respect to instructors, no ideas about what kinds of programmes they are going to offer and, of course, we do not know where they are going to be located. I expect there is lobbying going on now. We do not know where these three are going to be located. That is going to be interpreting information.

Maybe the next person on the government side who speaks can answer some of these questions on whether there has been a cost analysis done of these three community college. What is that going to do to the university? Is that going to water down the resources of the university? Is that going to make our university less effective? It should not, if we have the financial resources to do it. But I am wondering whether we have the financial resources. Certainly it cannot downgrade the already very restricted style in which the University operates right now from a financial point of view particularly.

Mr. Speaker, then it moves into jobs. What are the initiatives with respect to jobs? Well, Mr. Speaker, it talks about the Royal Commission again and how it certainly addressed this problem and certainly urged the government

to do something about job creation in this Province. So it states that the government would introduce a comprehensive package of programmes which are designed to improve the Province's effectiveness in creating meaningful jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, if they call this a comprehensive package, then there is no doubt that this Province is going to be suffering from high levels of unemployment for a long time.

What is the first initiative? "First, commencing in April of this year, My Government will be instituting major creation initiatives in the form of long term projects in such areas as park improvements, silviculture, fisheries enhancement, agriculture, and tourism." Now, Mr. Speaker, did we need to spend \$2 million on a Royal Commission to come up with that great enlightening job creation programme. Park improvements, Mr. Speaker: What great creativity, what great innovativeness! Park improvements, Mr. Speaker, have been going on since time immemorial. Park improvements!

Silviculture: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is certainly welcome news, because this government has not spent too much money on silviculture. But again we did not need the Royal Commission to tell us that we needed that. The loggers in Gambo and Indian Bay have been telling me this for years, that we need silviculture and a more effective forest management programme in the area of Bonavista North. We did not need to spend \$2 million on that. Any logger in Gambo, Indian Bay, Hare Bay, Centerville, any logger there could have told the government that.

Mr. Speaker, did we need the Royal Commission to tell us that we needed job creation with respect to fisheries enhancement? Did we need the Royal Commission to tell us that we needed jobs in agriculture and tourism, that that was an area in which we could employ Newfoundlanders? Mr. Speaker, that is something for the people who waited in this Province, to hear about a job creation programme, awaiting the government's response to the Royal Commission. Here we are going to get involved in job creation in park improvements, fisheries enhancement programmes, agriculture, tourism, and silviculture. Mr. Speaker, the government to my knowledge has been in those areas for some time.

Then the second initiative is the one with respect to the private sector involvement and the new programme which will be established to be cost-shared on a 50/50 basis, something that we have recommended actually along those lines for a long time. I commend the government on this particular initiative. I commend them, but did we have to spend \$2 million? Did we have to have a Royal Commission? Did we have to spend \$2 million on a Royal Commission to tell us to take action in these two areas? Mr. Speaker, it shows a government bereft of ideas, bankrupt of ideas to have to wait for a Royal Commission before they could announce these rather skimpy, rather miniscule job creation programmes for the people of this Province.

Then, Mr. Speaker, they go on to talk about their community development programme, the social services programme. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the government

should boast too much about it.

MR. BRETT:

No, we will (inaudible.)

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I will say this to the hon. minister: Again, I commend any initiative to create jobs for our people, but I am not so sure that this programme is as effective as the minister would like for it to be. The programme pays too little in wages. As a matter of fact, I am presently working on a case, Mr. Minister, where a lady is working on this community development programme where her salary is \$15 a week better than if she were on social services, if she stayed home on social services, \$15 a week better. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK:

And no drug card.

MR. LUSH:

No drug card and none of the benefits that one receives when they are on social services. I think this needs to be looked at. What is the motive to go to work? A person can stay home in bed and collect just \$15 less by getting up every morning at 7:00 a.m. and going through the traffic and all the frustrations that come from a working mother with a home to maintain and, after all of this effort, \$15 a week more. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with the programme, nothing wrong with the programme.

MR. BRETT:

That is \$60 a month.

MR. LUSH:

Is the minister saying that that means that that is good?

MR. BRETT:

I am not saying it is good. I am saying it is better than staying home (inaudible.)

MR. LUSH:

What the minister does not realize that it puts these people in a more frustrating position than they were before because before they got the job, they had a drug card or if there was any excessive medical bills, they would be taking care of. If they ran into trouble in other areas, maybe the government in an emergency case came to help them but, once they got on these programmes, they are on their own and for \$15 a week more, they are supposed to be able to take care of all of the financial problems, of all the needs that they will encounter with that \$15. No, Mr. Speaker, it is too, too little. All it does, the other negativity about it, is take them off social services for a few weeks and then put them on UI.

The programme that I do like, Mr. Speaker, again, it is related to education, is the teacher aid programme. But again they are only there for ten months. They have a programme they can put them on for ten months to fit in with the school year from June to September. But after being there for ten months doing a great job, these teacher aids feel proud about the fact, as the minister indicated that they are working, making a contribution. But at the end of the ten months they are laid off and put on UI. So, Mr. Speaker, there are some deficiencies in this programme, but again, I welcome the programme to an extent. I would hope that the minister will look at improving it to see if we cannot give them a few more dollars and to see if we cannot turn some of

these jobs into permanent jobs.

Maybe it the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) that will have to do that to make these teacher aids, that are certainly needed, maybe he can make these permanent. Would the Minister of Education look at helping the Department of Social Services who have gotten those people in there as teacher aids, but the problem that most of them find is it is a deadend, it is a dead street, Mr. Speaker. At the end of ten months, they are going to be laid off.

MR. WARREN:

His time is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

I do not think so. I will certainly take the advice of Mr. Speaker, but not the -

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. member has about twenty-five minutes left.

MR. LUSH:

So, Mr. Speaker, I just make those suggestions in the hope that the minister will try to improve that programme, improve it in terms of its remuneration, in terms of its salary, and improve it in terms of trying to find long term employment for these people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech goes on to address the guaranteed income, if you will. It says, "Directly related to this theme is the question of an appropriate income support system that best fits the particular characteristics of our situation. Both the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment and the Forget Commission on Unemployment Insurance have made recommendation in this regard." So both these commissions looked

at that. Again, that is an idea being espoused by the Liberal Party for some time, a security income system or a guaranteed income. Now what is this government say they are going to do?

Well, first of all, they give us an ominous sign. They say, "This is a most complex issue." Now, if it is a complex issue, forget about it with this crowd. It will never see the light of day because they could not deal with a complex issue. That is to signify the bad news, Mr. Speaker. "This is a most complex issue and one which comes under the responsibility of both the Federal and the Provincial jurisdictions."

MR. TULK:

You could have another federal/provincial row out of that.

MR. LUSH:

That is right.

"I am happy to announce that My Government has established a task force of ministers and officials to fully analyse these proposals in preparation for constructed discussions with the appropriate federal authorities to see how such a programme can be established without destructive social impact." I will make a prediction: This government, in its life, because its life is not very long, will never deal with this issue. That is my prediction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Now, let us see where else they have gone, Mr. Speaker. The other area on which they could not act until they spent this \$2 million and got the recommendations of the

Royal Commission was to look into the government lending agencies, Rural Development and the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. They had to await this study. What they are going to do of course, it says, "First, the Regulations of the Rural Development Authority are being amended, and appropriate funding provided, to allow an expanded lending programme to include service sector enterprises."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is something that all hon. members I am sure have encountered before. We thought that the Rural Development Authority was too restrictive in its lending policy. We recommended that over the years and they have had all sorts of businesses to apply but to be told that it was restricted to the manufacturing industry.

Well now, they have finally seen the light of day and, again, I commend them on that initiative, Mr. Speaker. That is a good thing. It is a good initiative.

"Second, the term lending programme of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation will be broadened to include assistance to industries and economic enterprises in the service sector." That is a good move. It only puzzles me why it was not made before.

MR. WARREN:

What in the Throne Speech do you not like?

MR. LUSH:

If the hon. gentleman heard me in the beginning I gave the preamble and pointed out what it was. It was not so much that I did not like what was here, it was number

one, what was not here and whether or not this government was going to produce on what they had here. According to the past performance of this government, in terms of measuring up to the promises made in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, I am not very hopeful.

So, for the hon. gentleman, I will say it again, I am basically making two points about the Throne Speech: One, I am not condemning any of the economic measures that are in it, I am saying that the government did not go far enough. That is my condemnation. They did not go far enough, they did not go far enough in terms of carrying out the recommendations of the Royal Commission. And secondly, it is my doubts that they will measure up. Those are my concerns, Mr. Speaker.

The question that must be asked, Mr. Speaker, is particularly with respect to jobs. We have here a promise of 6,000 jobs. The question that must be asked and I hope hon. members will address it, is this above and beyond the normal programmes that the government would do in all of these areas because I have known activities, particularly in the Summer and all of these, park improvements, a little bit of silviculture, fisheries enhancement, agriculture and tourism. Now, is this just the ongoing programme or is this above and beyond? Are these 6,000 jobs above and beyond what the government would have done anyway or what they did last year? We do not know.

The other question, in terms of my lack of confidence in the government carrying out these rather few measures, is this: Has this Premier or this government

every made promises with jobs before? Have they ever done that? Is this first time ever they said they were going to do something with jobs? Is this the first time that they said that they were going to create jobs? Is this the first time?

MR. TULK:

Since 1979 we were supposed to get 40,500 jobs.

MR. LUSH:

Ah, ha, Mr. Speaker, that is the rub. In 1979 the Premier came out and said he was going to create 40,500 jobs. What happened? From 1980 to 1986 the Province lost 3,000 jobs. We lost 3,000 jobs in the span or in the lifetime of this particular Premier. In the lifetime of this particular Premier, we have lost 3,000 jobs.

MR. TULK:

And that is not you saying that.

MR. LUSH:

That is not me saying that. That is the House commission and it is proven by Stats Canada. It has been known for some time. They lost 3,000 jobs. Translated into a percentage, we had a net loss of 1 per cent during that period. We had a net loss of 1 per cent whereas the nation had a net gain of 6 per cent. This Province had a net loss of 1 per cent with jobs and the nation had a net gain of 6 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, yes, we have talked about jobs before. It is a question of credibility. Will this government keep its promise and measure up to its Throne Speech commitments of creating 6,000 jobs? Will they do that? I certainly hope they do and I hope that I do not have to stand in this House next Spring to say and

to come back to commitments that were made, to come back to the commitments, re the community colleges and the commitments to, re the review of the Faculty of Education and commitments, re the fine tuning and the beefing up and making the rules more flexible with respect the lending agencies of the government. I hope that all of that will be done but, Mr. Speaker, I am not too hopeful. The economic and financial initiatives in this Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, will do very little to decrease unemployment levels in this Province. It will do very, very little.

Mr. Speaker, very significantly as well were issues not addressed in this Throne Speech. For example, Mr. Speaker, the inshore fisheries. I am not so sure that the industry was mentioned, the inshore fisheries as such. I am not sure that it was mentioned in the Throne Speech in terms of the initiative taken by the government to help this industry to get going.

We mentioned FPI but there was no mention about the inshore fisheries. This is the kind of ideas we get from hon. gentlemen opposite. They are trying to duck out from their responsibility by saying that their fight, re the Canada/France agreement, is their effort, is their idea of helping out the inshore fishery.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the extent of their policy, as important as that is in terms of having a supply of fish available for our inshore fishermen, that is certainly important, but, Mr. Speaker, this government cannot get of the hook by playing a rhetorical game like that. Mr. Speaker, that is just words and we

want action. Well, there was no mention of it.

Another issue, Your Honour, that should have been addressed in this Throne Speech was the financial position of this Province. Now, normally one does not talk about a financial situation in a Throne Speech. That is left to the budget, but it was most important that there be some specific statement made about the financial position in this Province in the Throne Speech because just days before the Throne Speech, we had the Premier making these erratic and irresponsible statements about the financial position of this Province, about how we were going to be in the same economic mess that we were in in the dirty thirties; that we were going to be in the same economic mess that caused us to lose our Responsible Government when we were taken over by a Commission of Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are really dramatic statements.

MR. TULK:

I wonder would people look for a commission now.

MR. LUSH:

I do not think the people will look for a commission now. I think they will look to this side. They will look for people that can carry on the job.

The Premier made these erratic, irrational and irresponsible statements. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine what would happen to a business if the chief executive officer went on and said that about their particular business, 'that within two years they would be bankrupt.' How fast would that expedite the path to bankruptcy? They would be bankrupt within two weeks,

overnight. Well, the Premier made these remarks. But then he comes back the next day and says, 'well, really it is not that bad. I used a little bit of histrionics, a bit of exaggeration, a bit of hyperbole, a bit of theatrics and this kind of thing to try and convince the federal government of how serious the financial situation of this Province is.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say what the Premier did was cause the federal government to lose all confidence in the Premier. He must have lost all credibility with the federal government. He certainly lost it with the people of this Province and he certainly lost it, I am sure, with the federal government when we have a Premier, the chief -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I wonder if Your Honour would try to maintain some sense of order in this House because it seems as if we have a Cabinet meeting going on over there.

MR. FLIGHT:

We cannot hear a word, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would ask the hon. gentlemen to my left to please keep their voices down and sit in your seats.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, then the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) comes on to back up the Premier, comes on to say that the Province is in a financial plight. He goes on to say that the deficit will be increased. The hon. gentleman

projected a deficit in May of \$49 million. In the Spring the hon. gentleman announces a deficit of \$49 million. In his mid-term report, he mentions a deficit of \$53 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, That is not too bad, I suppose, the Premier says, on a \$2 billion budget. That is not too, too bad to predict that you are going to be \$49 million, and then, in mid-term, to be \$53 million. But, Mr. Speaker, hear this! The minister received a transfer payment from the federal government that was not expected, that they did not count on, that they were not supposed to get because of - I was going to say manipulation of the figures but that is not the right word - something with the population. The population was up or something. Because of the method in which they calculate the transfer figures, the federal government discovered that they owed Newfoundland \$32 million. The minister got \$32 million that he did not count on in his estimates, that he did not anticipate. And the deficit was still \$53 million, even considering that windfall.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise just because I got the tail end of some garbled story over there. I did not want the hon. member to confuse Hansard with all sorts of strange, weird, and convoluted statements. So I would just wonder if he would go over and ungarble that last comment he made.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order?

MR. LUSH:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, on top of that then we hear Mr. Crosbie saying last week that the minister was given \$46 million to help reduce the deficit. Forty-six and thirty-two, that is seventy-eight they have received, \$78 million. Then, on top of that, we hear that the minister went to Ottawa again after that and asked for \$150 million to bring down the Province's deficit. So, Mr. Speaker, the minister is going to have a lot to answer for when we get into the Budget Speech.

MR. SIMMS:

Why are you into this now in Address in Reply?

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I got into it because there was such a feeling created in this Province about the financial mess that we were in by both the Premier and the Minister of Finance that it should have been alluded to in the Throne Speech to allay the fears of Newfoundlanders and the business community. To try and keep the investment climate half decent in this Province, the Minister of Finance should have insisted that there was some statement in the Throne Speech about the finances of this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, no mention of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, with the financial mess that we were in, it was little wonder that when the Premier heard of this Canada/French fish deal that he said, "I am going to get onto this issue," in his Machiavellian style. There is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that he lashed onto that to try and wiggle and squiggle and divert and digress public attention away from this issue. Who would not? What government would not? Found in this political mess, who would not try and put it under the carpet by resurrecting this red herring, Mr. Speaker, of the Canada/France deal?

Let me say from the beginning, Mr. Speaker, that there is no one, but no one, in this Province, but condemns that agreement, no one but no one condemns that deal.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You are coming clean early.

MR. LUSH:

We will be telling you about the Premier coming clean too in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, this was the issue that they were going to wrap themselves in the flag again, to stand up for Newfoundland and to be proud to be Newfoundlanders. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, if I were in the hon. member's position, in a Province that has got the highest unemployment in Canada, that has got the lowest per capita income, that has got the highest public debt in Canada, Mr. Speaker, I would stand up for Newfoundland too. If I were deciding the public policies of a Province that had the lowest average income in Canada, that had an income several thousand dollars below the poverty line, I would stand up for Newfoundland too.

But with these, Mr. Speaker, startling economic figures, do you think anybody in Newfoundland is believing that these people are standing up for Newfoundland? They should not be sitting down! They should be standing up for twenty-four hours! Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, these statistics do not make me proud to be a Newfoundlander. The highest unemployment in the country, the lowest per capita income, the largest public debt per capita. These are some things to make you proud to be a Newfoundlander. Mr. Speaker, indeed the actions of hon. members opposite make me ashamed to be a Newfoundlander.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened on the Canada/France fish deal? Did the Premier do the honourable thing when he found out this, to open this House and to get the ideas and the suggestions of all members? I mean certainly goodness out of seventeen people we would have some ideas, we would have some suggestions, Mr. Speaker, but no a complete disregard, complete disrespect for the House of Assembly! Why? Because the Premier could not stage the fight as well in this House, Mr. Speaker, he could not manage the press as well, calling press conferences all over the place, calling press conferences in this city, on national open lines, Mr. Speaker, on national television, gone to Ottawa. The matter was debated everywhere publicly, but where it should have been debated, in this House, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

But it is being debated now. What are you talking about?

MR. LUSH:

Oh, of course! After the fact, Mr. Speaker, after the Premier thought he made his political point, after he thought he convinced the Newfoundland people, but he would not open the House.

Mr. Speaker, that is a sign of the arrogance of a government when they deny the people the chance of public debate in their Parliament on an issue as large and of the magnitude of this problem. To not open the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, demonstrates the arrogance of the government. It also demonstrates the insincerity of the Premier. It also leaves room, Mr. Speaker, for a suspicion of motives when we get onto an issue like this and to not debate it where it should have been. I believe that had this House opened and got an all-party resolution and come up with other suggestions and other ideas of how we could deal with this issue, that possibly we could have solved it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Machiavellian tactics of the Premier, the sabre rattling, Mr. Speaker, do not seem to have worked.

I was highly amused at the Premier when he came from the Premier's meeting saying what a great victory it was. He got these premiers together in this great meeting and, of course, they also had their own personal little gripes, they did not like the lack of consultation, they did not like that, and the Premier's Tory buddy tried to make the people believe that it was a great meeting too. 'Oh yes, we agree that the federal government should have consulted with Newfoundland, and we want them to consult with us too. Oh yes, but we cannot get into that France deal that is a little too

messy. But we ask that you review it, Mr. Prime Minister.' What a great victory. Yes, Mr. Speaker, what a victory it was. So the Premier, Mr. Speaker, used the wrong approach, as he has done so often in the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was no mention in the Throne Speech of how this government intends to improve labour relations in this Province. Mr. Speaker, we have got a refinery opened that this government had no more to do with than I have had to do with electrical developments in Moscow. They had no more to do with, it fell into their laps and they did not have sense enough to be able to establish the right labour conditions under which this development could take place. They did not have sense enough! They got one big job that came to them and they did not have the intelligence or the common sense enough to get that thing developed smoothly!

I know it came through a lack of experience. They were never used to having job creation of that magnitude. Mr. Speaker, there was no reference to labour management relations in this Province, no mention of the efforts that the government are going to take over the next little while to try and make labour relations reach a level that will encourage development in this Province, that will encourage investors to be here, that will allow labour, management and government to work cooperatively together. What time are this government going to do something about this? What time are they going to do something?

Are they just going to let labour relations in this Province go on and deteriorate? Mr. Speaker,

there is a great educational programme needed here and it has got to be done cooperatively between government, business and labour. It is time that this government got moving instead of just letting things go without any action.

Mr. Speaker, in summation I want to say that I do not think that the initiatives taken in this budget are going to go very far in terms of raising the levels of employment in this Province. I do not think the initiatives are going to go very far, they are too little. But that is not to condemn the job creation initiatives, it is to say that we believe that it represents little or no action at all with respect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. It must be an insult to the commissioners. It looks like a total waste of money if this represents the degree to which the government are going to act on these recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, we need a new fresh vision in this Province. We need a new vision. We need a more enlightened view of Canada. We need a government that is going to be determined to work hard in cooperating with the federal government. We need a government that, in cooperation with the federal government, is going to ensure that we get all of the finances that we are entitled to by right and all of the finances that we are entitled by the responsibility of the federal government to make better, to raise the levels of employment in this Province.

We need a provincial government that is going to act seriously. We need a provincial government, Mr. Speaker, that can negotiate

effectively and efficiently with the federal government. We need a government that will take fresh and new approaches to economic development in this Province. The old tired approaches, Mr. Speaker, have not worked so we need new approaches and new techniques. We need a government that is more conciliatory.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. LUSH:
I am just going to finish, Mr. Speaker.

We need a government that is going to be more conciliatory and more productive in terms of its dealing with the federal government and with labour in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, if this does not happen I have great fears as to what is going to happen to this Province economically, financially and socially.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, I believe I should congratulate the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). He is one of the most intelligent, one of the most honest members of the Liberal Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe I would like to start off with the last subject the hon. member was speaking about, and that was the French cod war and the fact that the House of Assembly should have been called together. I have a copy of a letter that was written to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on February 13 by the Premier of the Province. The Premier at that time suggested to the Leader of the Opposition, and to the Leader of the NDP, that we all should join together, have a two day debate and send a unanimous resolution to Ottawa.

It is quite interesting to note that the Leader of the NDP Party agreed that we should go as a united voice from this Province to the federal government in Ottawa. Now, what did the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Barry) do? I understand, Mr. Speaker, from **The Sunday Express** says that the Liberal Caucus have been talking about their leader and that most of the members of the Liberal Party did not know what their leader was doing. I will come to that a little later, Mr. Speaker.

However, the Leader of the Liberal Party wrote back to the Premier on the same day and said, "Yes, we agree but, hold on now, in order for us to agree to let you open the House we want to talk about other things, such as keeping in mind that all members must be given sufficient time to address this important issue and, considering that the House has not been open since last June, other important business, as well."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is other important business but the business that we wanted to discuss at that time was one very important issue, and that was the

French cod war. And on top of that he had another stipulation: "Open the House but bring the media into the House."

Now, here is a man, the leader of a particular party in this Province who has aspirations of one day becoming Premier, but Mr. Speaker, I am sure members of this hon. House, and members opposite, know deep down in their hearts that the present Leader of the Opposition will never, never become leader of a government in this Province of ours. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why that leader will not become Premier is as Barbara Yaffe has reported in **The Sunday Express**. And, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that about a month before this came out in **The Sunday Express** the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Barry, was quoted as saying that the government members were raping the Opposition, government members were taking members away from them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to believe what the Leader of the Opposition is saying because this paper says there are two members opposite who have confided in Barbara Yaffe that they are not pleased with the leadership of their party. Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe there is one other member recognizing that he may not be pleased with his leader. Mr. Speaker, there are only two have confided in the reporter, but how many others over there are very unhappy with their leader?

I understand further, Mr. Speaker, that after the by-election in December the caucus meeting was not called by the leader, the caucus meeting was demanded by a

member of the Opposition after the devastating blow suffered by the Liberals. Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, one caucus member said that at the December 10th. meeting 'Members of the caucus took him by the scruff of the neck and gave him a good shake, and I think it was necessary.' Just imagine, Mr. Speaker! Talk about a caucus getting upset with their leader!

The caucus member went on further to say, "We told him, 'Look, man, you really have to do something about your image'. Everywhere we go people are saying, 'You have a leadership problem.'" Now, Mr. Speaker, that is enough to say about the leader at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I like to remember that just a few years ago there was an individual, a leader of an Opposition party, a most statesmanlike person, a famous politician, and if that man had been leader of that particular party when this letter was sent on February 13, I am sure that hon. gentlemen would recognize that the people of the Province should come before any political party. This is one thing that the Leader of the Opposition and his members are forgetting, that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are much more important than any political party. I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to a gentleman who is no longer with us. I think it is only right, Mr. Speaker, at this time that the House should recognize the contribution that the late Don Jamieson has made to this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Jamieson was a friend of mine,

and a very inspirational leader to anybody who worked with him. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if he was in the position of the Leader of the Opposition, when he had the opportunity to come out and support all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, he would not have done what that hon. gentleman opposite has obviously done.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing I have to tell hon. members. A few days ago, the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) asked the Premier a question on local preference. The Premier explained that there are one hundred and ninety-odd people working at the Come By Chance refinery and only 5 out of 195 were from outside the Province. Now, let me say just one thing. In the two by-elections in December, where did the Liberal Party go for a campaign manager? Have a guess at where they went.

MR. BAIRD:

Where? Where?

MR. WARREN:

It was not outside the Overpass, it was not on the West Coast of the Province, it was not in Labrador, it was down to the United States of America. They went to the United States of America for a campaign manager.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? What?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, that is right. That is right. A fellow by the name of Mr. Goff, or Mr. Coff, something like that. But that is who they brought in, presumably a very powerful campaign manager, for the two by-elections. God help the Liberal Party! When you can come third in two by-elections, it is

not too bad of the campaign manager. So, Mr. Speaker, I thought I should let the people in the House know that the Liberal Party does believe in local preference.

MR. DINN:

The only job they created was a twenty-one day one.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, a twenty-one day one and we do not know how much it costs the Liberal Party to get this influential individual from down in Massachusetts. But I have a feeling, and I have to say this, fellows, that this is why they took their leader by the scruff of the neck, the rest of the caucus did not know this individual was going to come in. This is one of the reasons they were so upset with their leader. Their leader said he was willing to take anybody in who can help him, so this, maybe, is one of the reasons why they took their leader by the scruff of the neck.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have another fifteen or twenty minutes, and I think it is high time for us to talk about the positive points that have been brought forward in the Throne Speech. I must say that the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) was very complimentary on some of those initiatives.

For a number of years, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development has been initiating programmes in this Province, and I am sure the minister can tell me the number of people who have gone to work, the number of jobs that have been created in this Province. But we still have a high unemployment rate, so we came

in with an extra initiative to include the service sector. Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased to be associated with the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), a minister who knows rural Newfoundland, a minister who knows Labrador, a minister who will get down in the ditches any time and meet with the ordinary man and woman in the street, anywhere at all. He will go out and talk with them. The hon. Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development is one of the better ministers who has supported urban and rural Newfoundland that Newfoundland has ever known.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I think members opposite -

MR. TULK:

He is bucking for a raise.

MR. FUREY:

You will get your raise tomorrow.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I think we should recognize that this government is committed to rural Newfoundland and Labrador.

Very shortly we will be instituting programmes for the community colleges throughout the Province, another initiative of this government. If you look across the House you will see only five members over there, and I can tell you, hon. friends, that two of the five are very unhappy. Yes, there are two very unhappy ones over there, Mr. Speaker, but I am not going to say who they are. In fact, a couple of them left when I started speaking

because they knew I was going to refer directly to them.

MR. TOBIN:

Give it to 'Chris'. Give it to 'Chris'.

MR. WARREN:

I was doing okay before my hon. colleague came in, and now he is trying to force my hand. I know who the two individuals are, but I cannot tell you.

Now, there is also one other person who is conspicuous by his absence in the House, who is very unhappy over there also. So I will leave it to the imagination of hon. members. The hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) - now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), there is a horse of a different colour. Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that all hon. gentleman, those four in particular, are concerned about their districts. They are concerned about what is going to happen in Newfoundland and Labrador in the next ten or twenty or thirty years. I would suggest to the four hon. gentlemen, do not follow a leader who is going to lead you nowhere. Do not follow a leader who will lead you down the garden path. You four gentlemen are too bright, are too intelligent, you have too much to offer to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to follow a leader who only has one thing in mind and that is to be able to sit in that chair there, which he will never do.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed in The Evening Telegram yesterday evening an editorial, and in

response to a question from the member for St. John's East yesterday, and a question from the member for Naskaupi today, I would like to table this editorial just in case hon. members did not read it. Mr. Speaker, it shows that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth has taken the most responsible position that a politician in this Province can take.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

This concerns the illegal hunting of caribou in the Mealy Mountains. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not condone or support illegal hunting in this Province. Mr. Speaker, does the member for Naskaupi support the stand that the minister has taken on the illegal hunting of caribou in the Mealy Mountains? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, has the member for Naskaupi - I understand he has been in his district for the last three days - met with the Indian groups? Has he talked with them and asked them not to go in there because they are doing something illegal? They are his constituents, not mine, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the member for Naskaupi that he take heed of this, that regardless of whether they are his constituents or not, they should not be allowed to break the law.

MR. SIMMS:

If you would give leave to the hon. member, he could answer the question.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I will give the hon. member leave if he can tell me he

has met with the Indian leaders down there concerning the illegal hunting of caribou? I will give leave if the hon. member wants to answer.

MR. KELLAND:

I would not (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Well, the answer speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get off that subject. I have already played my cards.

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

I had some difficulty in understanding what the hon. member said. I gathered he was talking to me, but I had some difficulty in understanding exactly what he was saying. Perhaps he would repeat it. I am not sure what the hon. member said there. He asked some sort of question of me, but I am not sure what it was.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for asking me to repeat it. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a straightforward question. I will do it word for word for the hon. gentleman. I understand he is hard of hearing, and that is understandable. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if, within the past two or three days, he has met with leaders of the Indian group in Sheshatshit concerning the illegal hunting of

caribou they are engaged in the Mealy Mountains?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi, with leave.

MR. KELLAND:

I do not intend, of course, to do my share of the Address in Reply at this point in time, but just briefly I can tell the member from Torngat Mountains that while I was home on a personal matter I did have the opportunity to talk to some hunters in the Naskaupi district. I will not be more specific than that at this time. Some Labrador hunters did mention some of their concerns to me. Somewhat limited time did not allow me to speak to every single hunter in the district, but that should suffice at this point in time. Action is being taken by me, of course, as is normal and is usual in my district, and sometimes in the Torngat Mountains district as well, quite frequently of late, to do certain things. Labrador hunters, people who were born in Labrador and who have hunted for generations in Labrador and their descendants, I met with them, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

So the answer to my question is no.

I thank the hon. gentleman. Here he is getting up this morning and asking the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) if he would come down to Labrador to meet with them when he, their member, never met with them himself. Well, well, well! I cannot believe it! I think it is utterly disgusting that a

member's own constituents are either afraid to meet with him or do not want to meet with him. It has to be one of two things.

MR. DINN:

Or he could not care less.

MR. WARREN:

Or he could not care less. And he comes into the House of Assembly today and asks the minister if he will go down. Sure you know the minister will go down, but you meet with your constituents first and find out what the problem is, my baby.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the Throne Speech but before I do, on March 4 in The Evening Telegram there was something else I found most interesting. I do take the opportunity once in awhile of reading The Evening Telegram and I noticed a students' petition strongly protesting the fishing agreement, 336 students from Corpus Christi High School in the district of Carbonear. Even students have protested this agreement with France, but the Liberal Opposition does not want a unanimous decision going to Ottawa. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope they learn a lesson from the students in our high schools throughout Newfoundland and Labrador.

We have letters here from the Mayor of Cartwright in support of what the government has done, and we have a letter from Black tickle. Mr. Speaker, what district are those people in? Those people are in a district that is presently represented by a

Liberal member. I should tell hon. members opposite that I do not think that district will be represented by a Liberal member after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I should say, also, that the district in Labrador West, called Menihek, will not be represented by an NDP member either. With the stand the NDP has taken against jobs in Labrador, with the stand they have taken against military activity, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. gentleman from St. John's East that he is only here for a short time. So enjoy your two years, because that is all you are going to have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, in Labrador City and Wabush, the two mining towns, everybody is trying to hold on to a job as long as they can and here we have the two members opposite, our two Socialists, trying to stop anything happening in Labrador. Here we have a chance of some 3,000 jobs. I must say to the hon. member for Naskaupi that I think he is really in support of NATO happening. I think we all should give the member for Naskaupi a round of applause.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

The Indian people do not support the project.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon.

gentleman, if he will be quiet for two minutes, that I had the opportunity of living with the Indians in Davis Inlet for two years, and, let me tell you also, my friend, that those Indians in Davis Inlet do not agree with what your party is doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Because you are taking the attitude that you do not want anybody to work and do good for themselves. That is the attitude you are taking. I am telling you now, my friend, that the Indians in Davis Inlet do not agree with you or your party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I would be only too glad, Mr. Speaker, to go to Davis Inlet with the hon. member some day and have a debate on that issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Now, would you come? I am satisfied to go, Mr. Speaker, and show the hon. gentleman what those Indian people in Davis Inlet are going through, the difficulty they have today in getting a meal.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And there is clean water in Davis Inlet.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is clean water in Davis Inlet. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. gentleman is a bit upset because he cannot get the Indians in Davis Inlet to agree with the

Indians in Sheshatshit. That is the problem. There is only a little tiny group there and he is trying to get them to agree with others, but, Mr. Speaker, they have a little bit of common sense I should tell the hon. gentleman, much more common sense than the hon. gentleman has.

I should tell the hon. gentleman, before closing, that I would be only too glad - I will tell you what I will do, Mr. Speaker, I will make the hon. gentleman an offer, and it is a good offer. If an election is called tomorrow, I will take the hon. gentleman on in any seat in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I will take the hon. member on in any seat in this Province and I will show him that when he runs against a person who is determined to do his best for the people, he has no chance of sitting in the House of Assembly once more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. WARREN:

If I may have thirty seconds to conclude?

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. WARREN:

Thirty seconds to conclude. I will conclude in thirty seconds, Mr. Speaker.

Also in The Evening **Telegram** on

March 4 there was a big headline saying, "Where to be on December 31, 1999." Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I will make a prediction. Because this is New Year's Eve and Ronald Reagan has been invited to attend and Bob Hope has been invited to attend - and do you know what, Mr. Speaker? 1999 is only twelve years hence - I am going to predict that our Premier will be still Premier on that day and will attend that same gathering.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, obviously that must be what we call putting your seat on the line. I am a new member, I am not sure how that thing is done but I have heard about putting your seat on the line so I am looking forward to the new -

MR. BAIRD:
You have to be a new member because you will never be an old one. Your time is short.

MR. DECKER:
I am looking forward to the by-election, whether it is in St. John's East or whether it is in Turncoat Mountains, as a former member used to refer to the district.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the House a few minutes before the Speaker's party arrived this morning and, as is normal on such occasions, there is usually a bit of friendly banter back and forth across the

floor. It is always nice that we take each other and our ideas on from time to time, but we still are human beings and we still can throw a bit of friendly banter across the way before the formalities of the day start.

The hon. the Premier engaged in the banter this morning, Mr. Speaker. He was asked how he is doing with the rabbits this year, and when he answered he made a prophecy, albeit unwittingly. He said, Mr. Speaker, that it seems that the rabbits have finally got his number. They have finally got his number, they no longer get into his slips, they no longer get into his snares, and he is not able to catch them anymore. He only got two or three and he had out over 100 snares.

The rabbits of this Province, Mr. Speaker, have finally got the Premier's number. And after the hon. gentleman made that statement, I thought to myself, how long can you fool people? How long can you bluff people? How long can you attempt to trick people before they finally catch on to what you are doing and avoid your snares completely?

Now I can imagine what the Premier is doing because I too, and a lot of us, of course, being baymen like the Premier, know what it is to catch rabbits. We know what it is to put out the ordinary snare. We know what it is when you get the cagey old rabbits, that you will put out a straight garden. I am sure the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) knows what a straight garden is when it comes to catching rabbits.

Then there is the ultimate, Mr. Speaker. The ultimate is when you tail the pound. When you tail the

pound that is the ultimate. That is the offshore oil of rabbit catching. That is the ultimate trick, the ultimate way to catch the rabbit in your snare. The rabbits, in the Premier's own judgement, have finally gotten his number.

Now, Mr. Speaker, over the years this Premier has been attempting to snare votes. He has been going out attempting to trick the Newfoundland people into voting his party back into office. And, Mr. Speaker, he has done a good, successful job of getting the Newfoundlanders to give him votes. He has been doing a good job of snaring them into his slip and making them put him back into power. To snare the Newfoundland voters, just as to snare rabbits, he used a slip and the garden and the pound. In like manner, he has other little techniques that he uses to snare the Newfoundland voter into returning him to office.

I call the Speaker's attention to the snare of offshore jurisdiction. Offshore jurisdiction was one of the techniques that the Premier used to lure the Newfoundland voter into his trap, to lure the voter into voting in a specific way. Now I was involved in the 1982 election when offshore jurisdiction was the big issue. The Premier, very cunningly, convinced Newfoundlanders that if you were a Tory you were for Newfoundland getting jurisdiction of the offshore. If you were a Liberal, you were not; you were against Newfoundland, you were a traitor. You were against Newfoundland getting jurisdiction if you were a Liberal.

Mr. Speaker, I have to compliment the way that the hon. the Premier

managed to manipulate the press, to manipulate the minds of the people of Newfoundland. Now notwithstanding he had a lot bigger budget coming right out of his own office, an unlimited budget, as he has today, he managed to have at his disposal all those press agents in his office who could pump those press releases out. Now, even while I compliment him on brainwashing so many of my fellow Newfoundlanders, I have to remember that he was assisted by an unlimited budget. Unlike the Premier of Nova Scotia, unlike the Premier of Ontario, unlike any of the other Premiers who have a limited budget for the Premier's office, our Premier can devote as much money as he likes to sending out his propaganda. So maybe that might explain why he managed to convince the people of Newfoundland that if you were a Liberal you were against Newfoundland having jurisdiction over its own offshore.

I ran into him in that particular election, a provincial general election, and, to tell the truth, Your Honour, I used to have to ask myself, 'Do I really want Newfoundland to have jurisdiction over the offshore?' I mean, I knew right from the day that I was born, right back through my ancestors, we were pro-Newfoundland. But the Premier manipulated the minds by manipulating the press, by setting a snare, the same kind of snare as he has been setting, Mr. Speaker, to catch the rabbit. But the rabbit has gotten his number. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are a good many Newfoundlanders today who, like the rabbits out in Green Bay, have finally gotten the Premier's number. They go up to his snare and they look and they laugh and

they turn away.

Another one of the snares that the hon. Premier used was the Crusade for Prosperity. Everybody remembers the Crusade for Prosperity. I think, Mr. Speaker, that would have to rate as a straight garden of the rabbit catching business. That is not the best trick, not the worst trick, but the middle trick. The middle snare is when you use the Crusade for Prosperity. Let us consider the Newfoundlanders he was speaking to, the Newfoundlanders the Tory party took over in 1971 or thereabouts who had an unemployment rate of - what? - 6 per cent, 7 per cent, 8 per cent, somewhere in that vicinity?

MR. TULK:

Five per cent.

MR. DECKER:

Five per cent. Thank you, Colleague.

He took over a Newfoundland which had an unemployment rate of about 5 per cent. Even in 1971 we were not prosperous by any stretch of the imagination, Your Honour, we were not prosperous, but ever since the beginning, I suppose, of our inhabiting this Province, this Island, we, as a people, have been trying to improve our lot, we have been trying to improve our financial status. Many of our forefathers had to leave this Island and go elsewhere to try to improve their lot. And then, Mr. Speaker, we became a part of the great nation of Canada, and for a lot of people there were some disappointments because we thought that we would finally all be wealthy again. The closest time we ever came to actually being wealthy, though, was during the

Smallwood era. The highest rate of employment we had in the construction industry was during the Smallwood era. The people of Newfoundland still were not satisfied because they were brainwashed into believing that somehow things could get better, Mr. Speaker. This Crusade for Prosperity, which was picked up a few years ago, convinced people that things could be better. Newfoundlanders with a history of being a little worse off than the rest of the continent were glad to latch onto anything or anybody who could improve their financial lot in this Province. So when the hon. the Premier set this snare of convincing everybody that here was another chance to have some wealth, this snare ended up trapping some of our Newfoundlanders. Mr. Speaker, all that I can see of this infliction of prosperity, all that I can see that this crusade has done, all that I can see that the Tory party has been doing since 1971 is tearing down the companies that Joey Smallwood put into this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a lot of rigamarole these last days about the oil refinery. I can remember when every Tory speaker that you would confront anywhere in this Province would say that Come By Chance would never work, that Come By Chance was a poor vision, that Come By Chance was just another big waste of money on the part of Joey Smallwood. Mr. Speaker, this is not the case.

This is a part of this newspeak. Mr. Speaker, when I speak of newspeak, I refer to George Orwell author, of Nineteen Eighty-Four. There were three nations, and two were perpetually at war. The speaker, Mr. Speaker,

was up praising up the Nation of Oceania, and he was into his speech about half an hour praising Oceania when someone plucked on his coattails and said, 'We are no longer at war with Oceania, now we are at war with Atlantia.' That speaker went right on without breaking his speech, and he started to praise up Atlantic and to condemn Oceania, which he had just been praising. This is the kind of silliness that we see every day in this Province, Mr. Speaker. A couple of people who are supposedly intelligent, supposedly formally educated, supposed to have a few clues, can get up and they can spend eleven, twelve, fourteen years saying that Come By Chance was a disaster, that Newfoundland should not have an oil refinery, that there is nothing out in Come By Chance only wasted money for Newfoundland and that we have to get rid of it, we have to sell it for scrap. But like the speaker in **Nineteen Eighty-Four**, Mr. Speaker, someone realizes that maybe there is an election in this, maybe there is a way to get a few votes in this, and without stopping for breath they changed their tune and said, 'What a wonderful thing Come By Chance is.' It is going to be reactivated. It has 165 jobs now and it is going to give 200 jobs when it is in operation.' That kind of manipulation, that kind of hypocrisy, that kind of insincerity, Mr. Speaker, is like the snares that the hon. the Premier set for the rabbits. And just as the rabbits in Green Bay have finally gotten the Premier's number, the people of this Province and the people of Come By Chance have gotten the Premier's number. They realize that he is not going to bluff them any more by talking about Come By Chance.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, Come By Chance was a good idea. Come By Chance was a good idea in the 1960s. And if had not been allowed to sit idle, if it had not been allowed to rust out, Mr. Speaker, over these last ten years, it could have been in operation and it could have paid for itself during the high oil prices of the 1960s. But, no! The Come By Chance thing was turned down not because it was a good idea or not because it was a bad idea; it was turned down, Mr. Speaker, for the same reason that the Labrador linerboard mill was closed out. It was closed down because it was started by a Liberal. It was not judged on its own merit, it was judged on its politics, Mr. Speaker, and that is not good enough for this Province.

Mr. Speaker, another snare that the hon. Premier uses to bluff people into re-electing him and putting him back in office is the snare of local preference in hiring, the snare in Newfoundland preference. Now we have just seen this, I suppose, more vividly than ever before within the last few days in this Province. Newfoundland over the years, because we did not have the chance, we probably do not have as many neurosurgeons, say, as New York City would have. We do not have as many heart specialists even as South Africa, where Christian Bernaard could transplant the heart, went out and did a lot of research in heart transplants. We do have too many Christians Bernaards in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe one thing that we can be proud of, one group that we certainly can be proud of without taking any back seat to anybody, is the legal profession in this Province.

The legal profession in this Province is second to none in the world. We own the largest geographical part of our Province today, which is the Labrador portion of the Province, Mr. Speaker, because of our lawyers. The Labrador argument was presented, was defended on our behalf by our own lawyers. They outsmarted every other legal opinion that was brought to that case, Mr. Speaker. That shows the caliber of the legal profession in this Province, and not only in the last four or five years. The legal profession in this Province has never had to take a back seat to any other legal profession in the world.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the legal profession in this Province has had more Rhodes scholars per capita than anywhere else in the world. So why is it that the Premier, on the one hand, can get out and talk about his local preference policy, and then right in the one particular part of our Province where we have experts, the legal profession, he goes and pays out nearly \$500,000 to a firm from Alberta? It is a snare to trap Newfoundlanders, to trap us and our votes. But nobody is deceived, Mr. Speaker. Everybody knows that the real reason Peter Lougheed and his firm were retained for the offshore had nothing to do with the ability of his law firm or the ability of the law firms in Newfoundland. Everybody knows that. The real reason that Peter Lougheed and his firm were retained, Mr. Speaker, was because Mr. Lougheed is a Tory and because the Premier knows that some day he, himself, is either going to resign, retire, or be thrown out of office - I do not know which it will be, but I assume it will be one of them -

and he thinks that, if that day is going to be soon, he already scratched Mr. Lougheed's back, so there will be some back scratching in return.

That is why Peter Lougheed was retained, not because the legal profession in Newfoundland could not do the work that he is supposed to do. Let us not deceive ourselves. Let us not be foolish. The people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, have gotten the Premier's number. They are not going to be entrapped in his snares anymore.

Another one of the snares that the Premier has been using - and it has only happened in the last six months or so - is he is harping on this 'blow your mind' nonsense. It is again his way of manipulating the press. He stopped making his announcements in the House of Assembly, and he makes them now to the press. When the press has had its field day with them, as an afterthought he brings them into the House of Assembly. He comes up with this big suggestion that he is going to blow everybody's mind, he is going to make an announcement that will have such a far reaching impact that Newfoundlanders will be incapacitated in their minds, their minds will be blown.

After that theatrical event, Mr. Speaker, the word reached the Strait of Belle Isle district that the Premier was going to announce that he was going to put a causeway from L'Anse-au-Loup to Flower's Cove. Now this piece of knowledge reached me, Mr. Speaker. I was given this particular piece of knowledge. I said, 'Son of a gun, he has stuck something which indeed is going to blow their minds.'

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the impact that a causeway across the Strait of Belle Isle would have on the climate of this Province, would have on the ocean currents of this Province, would have on the social structure of this Province! Can you imagine it, Mr. Speaker? You would change the climate of the Northern Peninsula. It has been suggested that we could have weather which is comparable to Florida on the Northern Peninsula.

DR. COLLINS:

Do you believe in all that?

MR. DECKER:

I was thinking, Mr. Speaker, to answer the Minister of Finance's question, about starting a tourist resort up in the Flowers Cove area, and I am sure that the subsidiary agreement on tourism, the Federal/Provincial Tourism Subsidiary Agreement would have made money available to start a tourist resort up there.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I could see to say about putting this causeway across the Strait of Belle Isle was, 'Son of a gun! He indeed is going to blow people's minds!' And I was waiting. Now here I was caught in a quandry, Mr. Speaker. I heard this firsthand information, and here is the quandry I was in. If I were to announce it first, then probably the Premier would not go ahead and put the causeway across the Strait of Belle Isle. If I were to run with the announcement, like the one which the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) is going to make in a few days about a chip plant - I know about it - but if I run too fast I am afraid he might cancel it.

If I were to run about the causeway, probably the Premier

would cancel it. If I were not to run and announce it, then the people on the Northern Peninsula would say, "Decker, boy, why did you let the Premier make this announcement?"

So, Mr. Speaker, inadvertently I let slip that the Premier is going to put a causeway across the Strait of Belle Isle, and you know, Your Honour, what happened to the causeway. Because of me and my big mouth the Premier did not put the causeway across the Strait of Belle Isle. He changed his mind, Mr. Speaker, and he said the announcement was not really the causeway after all, what he was going to do was reactivate the Come By Chance oil refinery. What a letdown. But I feel guilty, I feel bad for the people of the Strait of Belle Isle, but I am sure that Newfoundlanders yet unborn will thank me. Generations of Newfoundlanders yet unborn will thank me, Mr. Speaker, because in going prematurely with that announcement that the Premier was going to put a causeway across the Strait of Belle Isle I squashed it. And in so doing I have saved, Mr. Speaker, thousands of Newfoundlanders who today would be going around with empty, hollow heads, whose minds would have been completely blown.

So the only redeeming factor, Mr. Speaker, is that I can be thanked by generations yet unborn for saving their ancestors' minds from being blown because, had I not intervened, the Premier would have blown the minds of a lot of people.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that during the last mini-Cabinet shuffle -

MR. TULK:

The what?

MR. DECKER:
Mini-Cabinet shuffle.

MR. TULK:
Why? Did they move somebody?

MR. DECKER:
- they made the Premier Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Now I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that one of his duties would be to make sure that there are good relations going on between Newfoundland and Ottawa and between Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island -

MR. TULK:
That is the reason they have Ottenheimer down with Crosbie this morning.

MR. DECKER:
- between Newfoundland and Alberta. What we need is a conciliator, a reasonable person. The former minister -

MR. TULK:
Mr. Ottenheimer? Oh, very well.

MR. DECKER:
- suited that very, very well, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is wise on behalf of the Premier to always pick men of the calibre of the former Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) definitely, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), any of those men could be great conciliators who could make sure that there are easy going relations among the Province and the provinces and between the Province and the federal government.

MR. TULK:
But Haig can only conciliate after you are dead.

MR. DECKER:
But, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine putting the Premier as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs? Can you imagine the fights, the racket that that is going to cause? It would be like putting an elephant in a China shop, Mr. Speaker. There will be no peace. There will be no reconciliation. There will be no conciliation. Mr. Speaker, we have to be thankful that he only made himself Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Thanks be to someone he did not make himself Minister of International Affairs. Can you imagine what would happen to this world if our Premier had to negotiate an arms deal with Gorbachev? We would soon know whether or not nuclear weapons have the power we think they have. We would have a Third World War. We would have a Third World War because that Premier has proven over and over again that he cannot negotiate. He could not negotiate with Trudeau, he could not negotiate with Turner, he could not negotiate with Clark.

Speaking of Clark, who was the worst Fisheries Minister Canada ever had? Was it Romeo LeBlanc? Was it Walter Carter? No. According to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, we all know who the worst Fisheries Minister was. The man who is presently the Lieutenant-Governor of this Province, when he was Minister of Fisheries the Premier said - and it is on record - 'He is the worst Fisheries Minister that this nation has ever had as far as Newfoundland is concerned.' And you would put that honourable fellow Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs?

Mr. Speaker, someone has used the old tricks too long and the

rabbits in Green Bay have gotten his number, and the people of Newfoundland have gotten his number, because the people of Newfoundland and Labrador realize, Mr. Speaker, that eventually, in the middle of all this sham and bluff and trickery, someone is going to have to stop playing political games and get down to business and govern this Province. There is more to getting elected than just getting your name on the front page or just getting your name in the Sunday Express. The thing to getting elected, Mr. Speaker, is to govern and someone has to govern this Province eventually.

MR. SIMMS:

Are you finished?

MR. DECKER:

Finished.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate on the Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands has adjourned the debate.

MR. SIMMS:

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

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

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. P.J.McNicholas, Speaker

Leo Barry, Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (Lib)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Flight, Graham (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi
Long, Gene (NDP)	St. John's East
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2...

Member

Matthews, Hon. William (PC)
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)
Morgan, James (PC)
Ottenheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)
Parsons, Kevin (PC)
Patterson, William G. (PC)
Peach, Milton (PC)
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)
Reid, James G. (PC)
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC) ,
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)
Tobin, Glenn (PC)
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)
Woodford, Rick (PC)
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)

District

Grand Bank
St. John's Centre
LaPoile
Bonavista South
Waterford - Kenmount
St. John's East Extern
Placentia
Carbonear
Green Bay
Ferryland
Trinity - Bay de Verde
Baie Verte - White Bay
Lewisporte
Grand Falls
Fortune-Hermitage
Burin - Placentia West
Fogo
Exploits
Humber East
Torngat Mountains
Mount Pearl
Humber Valley
Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Social Services
Hon. John Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Finance
Hon. Ron Dawe	Transportation
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines and Energy
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Energy/ President of the Council/ Government House Leader

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. William Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Energy
Hon. Charlie Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
Hon. Len Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Health
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	President of Treasury Board
Hon. Haig Young	Public Works and Services