



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 36

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

6 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
In the recent provincial budget government announced the introduction of a major \$12.5 million job creation programme.

To date, government has approved, through the Provincial Employment Programme, a total of \$5.5 million for the creation of approximately 1,200 jobs.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to provide hon. members with some specifics on the private sector employment programme. An amount of \$5 million has been allocated for this component of our job creation effort. The Private Sector Employment Programme is designed to enable private companies to share, on a 50/50 basis, the cost of hiring individuals on new jobs created by them in any sector of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, this subsidy can be provided between a minimum of sixteen weeks and a maximum of 52 weeks. However, there will be no minimum period of employment applied to students who will be attending a post-secondary institution this Fall.

In developing guidelines for this programme government has been very

aware of the bureaucratic nightmare that is often created in these types of programmes, often to the point that applications become so complex; regulations so rigid; that many entrepreneurs will not apply and many individuals do not qualify.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, we have developed a programme with the following guidelines for employees: (1) The individual must be a resident of Newfoundland and Labrador; (2) Not an immediate family member of owners/proprietors of the enterprises submitting the application; (3) Equal opportunity for employment to male/female residents; (4) 40 per cent of the jobs will be designated for youth between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five; and (5) a student who will be attending a post-secondary institution in the Fall.

MR. TULK:
Are these all the guidelines?

MR. POWER:
Those are the five criteria and that is to keep it as non-bureaucratic as is possible.

Mr. Speaker, for employers the criteria is quite simple. All private businesses in this Province are eligible to apply. Projects containing a training component are encouraged since this would increase long-term employment prospects for the employee.

Since the delivery of the Throne Speech at the opening of this session of the House of Assembly, officials in my department have been working diligently to put this programme in place as expeditiously as possible. Over the past couple of days, Mr

Speaker, more than 400 application forms have been distributed. An information sheet has also been circulated with the application forms.

Mr. Speaker, some application forms have already been returned and the first screening process will take place within the next day or so. I might say that that has already been done, and we will be in a position very early next week to announce the first jobs created under this programme. It is expected that the first project approvals will be announced early next week.

Mr. Speaker, all indications are that this job creation initiative have been very well received and the private sector has reacted in a most positive manner. Through a continued co-operative approach, this programme will be mutually beneficial to government, the private sector and potential employees.

Mr. Speaker, I also have included for the benefit of all members of the House of Assembly and the news media present, a list of the criteria we have outlined and a one page application form, as I say, to make sure that it is not bureaucratic and that all businesses, irregardless of the expertise that they may have available to them, will not require accountants and lawyers to fill out application forms for them. It is a very simplified form, with a list of some of the conditions on back that allow the agreement to be legal and to be binding on both parties.

So, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to a very enthusiastic response from the entrepreneurs in this Province to create some meaningful

jobs for the unemployed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for giving me an advance copy of the statement. First of all, the MHAs now have their answer. They did such an abysmal job last year of recommending the minister has cut out all the recommending. No more of this consultation approach, that is all gone; he does not trust the advice of the gentleman from Humber West (Mr. Baird) and the gentlemen from other parts of this Province.

They are going to pass it back to the bureaucrats and let them make all the decisions, number one. Number two, in the second or third paragraph of the minister's statement he mentions private sector employment. We want to say to him and to the administration he is a part of, that we feel that is a good emphasis, to involve the private sector on a shared job basis, a shared funding basis. We do hope, despite the piddling amount of funding that is involved, the principle is sound. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this works, that it is given a chance to work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister, when does the advertising start? Do we see his picture? If so, do we get the assurance that on the bottom of the ad it will say, 'Not inserted by the P.C. Association of St.

'John's East?' For a very small price I have a slogan for him. What better slogan than "Power From The East", with apologies to Robert Bourassa. I suggest that be in a separate ad.

Mr. Speaker, on page 2 of his statement he mentions the parameters, the guidelines. He said, in response to a very careful question from my colleague from Fogo - my friend from Fogo asked the minister, 'Are these all the guidelines?' - and I believe the answer was, yes. I would hope the minister would focus on this particular issue because he relates to entrepreneurs in the Province, including many in this particular Chamber. I have long felt that the legislative disabilities legislation is much too Draconian in terms of the exclusion it places on people who happen to be serving the public in the federal or the provincial Houses, who are unable to avail of government incentive programmes even though they have absolutely no conflict of interest in the matter.

MR. POWER:
May I clarify?

MR. SIMMONS:
When I am finished, yes, sure. I could point to people on this side of the House and on the other side of the House who are competing with people in various industries and who cannot compete on an even footing because they happen to have elected to serve the people of Newfoundland by sitting in this Chamber. I point particularly to people on this side of the House who, it cannot be argued, have any say in the decision-making of this particular government and yet they are excluded by a much too Draconian provision in legislative

disability legislation from even applying. So I ask the minister, and he has indicated that he might want to respond, and we would certainly give him leave to do so on this specific point, as to whether the legislative disabilities restrictions apply here to entrepreneurs who happen to be members of this House or of the House of Commons in Ottawa. And, of course, at the same time, residents of Newfoundland would be the first condition, an understandable condition.

Mr. Speaker, let me come, then, very quickly and finally to the bottom of that same page.

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

MR. TULK:
By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave.

MR. SIMMONS:
That is fine. We will get other opportunities, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
The minister has indicated that he wants to give leave.

MR. SIMMONS:
Notwithstanding, we will give the minister leave.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
Just to clarify a point, on the advice of our legal counsel who have drawn up the terms and

conditions of how basically this document becomes a legal document between ourselves as a government and the entrepreneurs applying, there is a provision, No. 20, at the very bottom that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) has just brought up which says 'No member of the House of Commons or the Provincial Legislature and no federal, provincial or municipal government employee shall be admitted to any share or part of this agreement or to any benefit arising therefrom.'

Obviously, that is there for a legal requirement, and there may be some acts of the Legislature that require that to be there. That notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, obviously if somebody wishes to apply we have tried to make the regulations as flexible as possible. So we will not prevent any entrepreneur in this Province from creating employment, and obviously if somebody wishes to apply I am sure government would consider it, based on the legal specifications that we have.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to apply to the minister's second statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

As I understand it, and I just do not have the quote here, we did agree at some previous occasion that the minister who made the statement would reply following the Leader of the Opposition or his spokesman, but that that person could not come back and reply again.

MR. SIMMONS:

We will say it outside the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will recognize the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We welcome the statement from the minister in as much as it is an indication that his department has a genuine concern in making monies available to put people to work in this Province, but I would like to register at least three concerns with the statement the minister has presented: The first would have to do with the lack of an actual programme for Summer student job creation. I think this statement and this programme will only cause more confusion for students who are trying to get Summer work to go back to school in the Fall. I have spoken to federal officials in the Canada Manpower Office and they are under terrible constraints because of the withdrawal of funds by the Province, \$1.5 million, and it is not clear how the minister's statement today is going to compensate for the vast numbers of students, especially in this city, who will be looking for Summer work.

A second concern I would like to register is a bias toward private employers and an implicit bias against non-profit and public institutions which in the past have provided very excellent opportunities, especially for young people and students during the Summer months. In general, we would like to raise the concern that non-profit and public institutions will be discriminated against in employment programmes when all money is going to the private sector.

Finally, I would suggest that

there are still questions about the minister's attempts to clear up the bureaucratic nightmare, inasmuch as it is very unclear from this statement how students or young people or other workers can avail of these jobs; he has given us the application form and the document for employers, but it remains to be seen. As has been already suggested, there should be an advertising campaign on how workers are going to get through this new bureaucracy to find jobs and to find locations of private employers who are involved with the programme.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the orders of the House require that I proceed at this point but I would hope that we would agree to a recess or something so that we can get some of the important ministers in here. We have some questions to put to persons who are absent. I see thirteen and a half over there. Mr. Speaker, can the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) indicate if the Premier is coming into the House?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

As far as I know.

MR. EFFORD:

His bodyguard is out there. He is walking back and forth the corridors.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the

Premier I would like to put a question to the Government House Leader. I refer him to that provision in the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord of last week which would permit the opting out by individual provinces from new national cost-shared programmes, programmes that are under provincial jurisdiction, understandably. Can the Government House Leader indicate whether the Premier agreed to the inclusion of that particular provision in the Meech Lake Agreement and if so for what reason? What possessed him to agree to that particular provision?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the agreement which came out from Meech Lake was an unanimous one expressing the consensus of the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the ten provinces. Obviously the Premier of Newfoundland was associated with that. What it is, as the Leader of the Opposition says, is there was a further refinement there, that is, the ability to opt out of new national programmes and get reasonable financial compensation provided that the province has a programme of its own consistent with - I think that is the exact phrase - national objectives. So there is no doubt that Newfoundland was party to that, and indeed the government have views that as reasonable. It may well be that a number of provinces, it may be that Newfoundland never will opt out. Of course, nobody can read the future, but there appears to be certainly nothing improper there in a federal, not a unitary state. What it is is reasonable

financial compensation provided that there is a programme in its place consistent with national objectives. I really see nothing objectionable in that and, yes, Newfoundland was party to that consensus.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the minister may see nothing objectionable, but given a government that has ballooned the deficit to \$176 million I could see it using the nickle and dime approach to government where it opts out of a programme to do with funding what it is doing with post-secondary funding now, siphoning it off for other purposes while pretending to observe national objectives insofar as the new programme is concerned.

The question is: Does the Premier and the minister and the administration of which they are a part not realize that such opting out does have the potential to undermine the ability of poorer provinces, such as Newfoundland and Labrador, to benefit from new national cost-shared programmes in, for example, health care and marriage matters and the administration of justice and post-secondary education? Does he not identify with the concern I have expressed, that that very power to opt out could undermine our ability to be part of national programmes, such as Medicare? I am not suggesting Medicare now except as a present example of one that we benefit from.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I do not think the position, as outlined by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, is accurate or that these consequences will flow. Because in order for a province to opt out and get reasonable financial compensation - nobody is going to opt out of a benefit unless there is some compensation - there must be in place a programme consistent with national objectives, which generally must mean a programme very similar which is aimed at achieving the same objectives, perhaps in a manner which a particular province might regard, under the circumstances, as more appropriate in that particular province's circumstances. But I do not see any problem in there, because in order for the opting out provinces to receive reasonable financial compensation they must have a programme which is consistent with the national objectives; in others words, the objectives of the national programme. So I do not see that as being a serious problem.

MR. SIMMONS:
One final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, all of the above, all of what the minister has said, depends on an exercise in good faith by the provincial administration. Now, given that this administration - I am not sure of the year - around 1982 or 1983 accessed from Ottawa 120 per

cent of the cost of post-secondary education by, I submit, putting up a number of false theses and parameters, and actually got more money than was accessible under the legislation and obviously siphoned it off to spend on other purposes, what guarantee does this House have that the same practice will not be followed, Mr. Speaker, in respect of this, where a province will opt out to get compensation and then that compensation, under the guise of pursuing a national objective, will be spent on some pork barrelling exercise aided and abetted by the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

That is the kind of concern we have, that limited amounts of money, whether they are federal or provincial, will get steered into areas that were never intended in an effort by the national government to meet national objectives insofar as new cost-shared programmes are concerned. Can the minister give us the assurance that the Premier, if he goes back to another constitutional conference and I hope he does not; I hope he sends the minister. Whatever gave the Premier the idea that he, with his abysmal labour record, could negotiate his way out of a wet paper bag let alone be a Constitutional fixer is beyond me!— but will the minister give the House the assurance that the Premier, if he goes back on another one of those trips to sanction this Constitutional Accord, will not participate, will not be party to any further erosion of this Province's ability to benefit from national cost-shared programmes?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House

Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, on a couple of the matters which are related to it and which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to, obviously the requirement of good faith, the government agrees with that. I think the hon. gentleman will agree that in a country like Canada, in a federal system, the whole workings of our country, to a very large extent, an important factor there is good faith. Not everything is tied down in law or regulation, but there is an element of good faith in intergovernmental relations and federal/provincial relations and that will always, I think, exist, unless things were so regulated as they are in countries which might be regarded as ideals in the hearts of some hon. people. I would imagine in the Soviet Union it would be very difficult for any of the so-called federal entities to act in a way which was not absolutely and rigidly controlled by the Central Government or the appropriate commissar, but in a country like Canada, a federal system, obviously there is an important ingredient of good faith. I agree there.

With respect to the EPF, Established Programmes Financing, as I understand it — and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is much more knowledgeable in this, as in many areas, than I am — the Established Programme Financing gives money for the health and education areas. The Government of Newfoundland has not misused any of those funds at all. I think the central part of the hon. gentleman's question was with respect to this being, or being interpreted by him as being an erosion, let us say, of, I

suppose, federal power, or an erosion of the power of the Central Government.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, no. Eroding our ability to access programmes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Right. He views this as an erosion of our ability to access programmes. I do not think that that is the case because any programme, and we are talking about new national programmes that come up, are accessible to all provinces. One would think ninety-nine chances - well one cannot put figures on it, but the vast majority of them Newfoundland would be participating in, perhaps all of them. And if a province does not, obviously no province is going to cut off its nose to spite its face, then it will wish to have reasonable financial compensation, and the only way of getting that is by having a programme in its place which meets the national objectives, the objectives of that national programme. So I really do not think that there is any erosion of the Province's ability to access federal funds.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if I may have just one quick supplementary in response.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

The minister is now coming to the kernel of the concern I have. I give him again the example of the Medical Care programme. I submit to him that there is a very real danger here of a balkanization of programmes such as MCP, and I am

not wanting to raise fears about MCP but about future programmes. So my question to the minister is this: Does he not see the possibility, under this provision in the Accord, that a programme such as MCP - but I say not MCP - can be such that if you are in Nova Scotia you have to be asked do you have the Nova Scotia plan, do you have the Ontario plan, do you have the BC plan? You will have a balkanization of what was intended to be a good national cost-shared programme as one of the spinoffs of this particular provision.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably true to say that historically, obviously historically, it has frequently been Quebec which has put forward this kind of a principle and they are the ones who are probably most interested in it. But I think the provision against the apprehension of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the safeguard against that is the fact that if a province opts out it cannot just opt out and get financial compensation. It has to opt out, and when it opts out, in order to get reasonable financial compensation, it must implement a programme which is consistent with national objectives.

MR. SIMMONS:

Whatever that is.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Now that does in theory give a certain flexibility to a province. And it may well be that in a country as diverse economically and linguistically,

demographically, financially and socially, in every way, a certain flexibility may be beneficial, as long as the objectives are the same, in the delivery mechanism or in the parameters. That is certainly arguable. But I think the protection of the national interest, for want of a better term, is the requirement that in order to access reasonable compensation there must be a programme in its place which is consistent with national objectives. Obviously only time will tell how it works.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), I would like to take a moment to welcome to the gallery a former MHA, Mr. Don Stewart.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I have a question for the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker.

The minister said that this budget, that is his most recent budget, is a beginning of a new message we wish to be heard and understood in our nation's capital. My question, Sir, to the minister is: Which message was the minister talking about? Was it a request for assistance towards paying off the enormous deficit on current account which his fiscal mismanagement has caused? Or was it a plea for the federal government's participating in his kick-start plan? Now which message was it that he wanted to be heard in Ottawa, or was it both messages?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps hon. members would forbear if I just for a moment make another comment, and that is that I do want to express my personal disappointment that the hon. member opposite recently declined to offer himself in whole to the people of this Province by not going for the leadership of the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Very disappointing. Very disappointing.

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. member and I for a number of years have had these sparrings in the House, and I have learned to value the quality of his questions and all the rest of it. I think that the Province is poorer because of his decision, but we will have to regretfully abide by his decision.

MR. SIMMS:

A very sad day.

DR. COLLINS:

On the matter of the question, the hon. member, a number of times now, has read out bits of the Budget Speech to me as a preamble to his questions, and it reminds me of the old saying, you know, about a dog going back to his vomit, that type of thing. But, anyway, the new approach to the federal government came out of our study, our considered analysis of where this Province stands today in regard to its relationship within Canada, and we determined and showed by factual evidence that we are not as far ahead in

1987 as I think people anticipated when we joined Canada in 1949. I think it was anticipated that our economic circumstances, our standard of living, the opportunities for our youth and so on and so forth, would be much nearer the Canadian average than they are in actual fact today and, as our factual analyses showed, there has been only a very gradual improvement in our relative position with the other provinces. And that has been very gradual all along. It is not as though there was a big leap forward in the 1950s or 1960s or 1970s or whatever, and now the slow down. There has only been a very, very gradual, slow, painful improvement throughout the years. And we are, therefore, saying that after this length of time, after this evidence, this long-time evidence before us, surely we must rethink how we deal with each other, or at least how this Province is dealt with within the Canadian context. That is why we went to the federal government. We say, 'Look at the evidence we are presenting. Sure things have improved in this Province, but the rest of Canada has improved at the same time so that the gap is more or less remaining as it was, perhaps a little bit less of a gap but essentially not much less of a gap. Can you sit down with us and go through your policy, go through the things that impact particularly on us, and see if we can get some real improvement there so that we do not have to wait another thirty-eight years before we get another minor improvement in our relative position within Canada?'

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I remind the minister that it is not my vomit, but his vomit that I am talking about here.

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister is this: Has the minister since his budget presentation met with the hon. Mr. Crosbie or the Federal Finance Minister (Mr. Wilson) or the Prime Minister to discuss the details and specifics of the kick-start plan or to calculate its cost or to determine the level of funding the federal government is willing to allocate, whether it is going to be 60/40 formula or whether it is going to be a 90/10 formula? Will the minister indicate whether or not he has met with any of his federal officials, particularly Mr. Crosbie, since the budget presentation to discuss the details and specifics of the kick-start plan?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
My first response to that, Mr. Speaker, must be that the Premier himself, who obviously was a major participant in this whole exercise - well, he was the prime mover, certainly he was the leader in this exercise, and the leader of this exercise from our side has met with the leader on the other side, i.e., he has met with the Prime Minister. The fisheries thing that the Premier came back and gave us such good news on was

part of our presentation to the federal government. So, I mean, on that basis certainly there is clear evidence that there has been contact. In my own case, yes, I have met with Mr. Crosbie, I think on about three occasions since the budget. I spoke with Mr. Wilson a few minutes ago, before I came to the House. So we are in frequent conversation, frequent communication by letter and where the opportunity presents itself, frequent face to face meetings.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I gather the key word in the minister's statement was that the wanted the message to be heard, because he certainly did nothing in terms of carrying the message directly to his federal counterpart.

So, Mr. Speaker, my question is this: If the minister has met with these officials, will he give the specifics of these meetings? Will he indicate at what level the federal government is willing to participate in this kick-start plan or whether they are willing to participate at all? That is the key question, Mr. Speaker. Otherwise, all the minister is doing is engaging in an exercise of prating, prattling, and saber rattling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am wounded by the hon. member's remarks, but I will nevertheless try to bear with my wounds.

The hon. member is giving the impression that he expected something to happen overnight. For instance, the Canada Assistance plan, which my friend and colleague in Social Services (Mr. Brett) is so much concerned with, is on a 50/50 basis. Now, the hon. member is giving the impression that those sorts of plans should overnight become 60/40 or 70/30 or whatever. That is not the way this thing works. What you have to do is you have to start a process, and to get attention, to get the process started, you have to make a big splash.

I do not know if you know the story of the fellow who bought a donkey and he could not get it to do anything. So he hit it over the head with a 2x4 and that got the donkey's attention. Then he could get on with what he wanted the donkey to do. So, when I said kick start, what I was referring to was to get the attention of the federal government by a very detailed presentation covering all the aspects of the policy areas that we wanted reviewed. By doing that, we did get the attention of the federal government and we got a very sympathetic hearing. We set in motion there a detailed study of the proposal we put forward, which is still ongoing, and, as I have mentioned already, we are already seeing some positive results from them.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista

North, a final supplementary.

MR. LUSH:

Is the minister now telling this House that he was doing in this budget what the Premier was doing some weeks ago when he said that this Province was going to be in a financial mess equivalent to the 1930s? Is this what the minister was doing? Was he engaging in an exercise of hyperbole and exaggeration?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

No, Mr. Speaker. What we were saying, and I will use an analogy that the Premier himself has used a number of times -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The donkey?

DR. COLLINS:

No, it is not the donkey.

- is if you are drowning and you are a very poor swimmer, somehow or other you will likely keep your nose above water but you really will not save yourself, you need additional help, and that is the position this Province has been in ever since 1949 - not just recently, but ever since 1949. It was during the Smallwood years, it was during the Moores years, it was during the early Peckford years; all those years we had been just keeping our head above water, and barely so, and we are saying we need more than that now. We have seen that the policies, the practices and the procedures put in place ever since 1949 have not been sufficient. They had to be given a trial to see if they would be sufficient but we have now seen that they are not sufficient, so we are asking that something

additional be done to present methods.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask a question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), who is not in his seat, arising out of a statement made by the Minister of Social Services yesterday so I will have to go to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young).

MR. YOUNG:

You will be looking for a job after the next election.

MR. EFFORD:

The minister can listen now without worrying about my next election. Would the minister be able to give us an indication of approximately how many people are working within the civil service, around the Confederation Building, from his own district?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I trust that all of them working in around the Confederation Building are working.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services yesterday had high

praise for the Public Service Commission and the fact that the present administration brought in the Public Service Commission and at the same time confessed about partisan appointments. Rumour around the building is that there are approximately 129 people working from Harbour Grace and Upper Island Cove. In this building, by the way, not out around in other offices.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works, seeing that the Minister of Social Services gave high praise to the Public Service Commission, would he be able to tell the House if all of those people went through the Public Service Commission?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I could not give an answer, but I do know some of the qualified people and craftsmen from Upper Island Cove are working with the contractors here in this building, and I have nothing to do with that. They have been working with those contractors for years and those are probably the people you saw working from Upper Island Cove.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister cannot hear or he does not understand the question. The

question, very clearly and very simply, was the number of people who are working in the civil service here at the Confederation Building or in the departments - the minister knows full well what I am saying - did they or did they not go through the Public Service Commission?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I presume that all the permanent positions were advertised by the Public Service Commission and the people from Harbour Grace district qualified. I do not see why they should not get the positions.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). I would like to ask the minister, in light of the serious problems with snow clearance in the city of St. John's during the past year, which received much national attention, the incredible amounts of snow that had fallen in this city, in light of recent announcements by city staff that they are projecting cutbacks that will actually take place over the coming Summer months to the tune of \$3 million, and in light of the fact that the minister's department gave the city the smallest grant this year that it has received in many years and amounted to a cutback of almost \$1

million from the previous year, is the minister considering any special compensation for the city of St. John's to help it overcome its financial difficulties?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, we have had representation from a number of municipalities all over Newfoundland who are this year experiencing difficulty because they have gone over budget on snow clearing. We cannot, as a department, consider making up the difference of \$3 million to the city of St. John's because they have gone over the budget on snow clearing, because we do have literally hundreds of municipalities all around Newfoundland who are in a similar situation this year. It would be impossible to address every individual situation as a result of last year's snow storms. Last year was a very unusual year in snow fall accumulations all over Newfoundland and we cannot address every single problem in that regard.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

I would say to the minister that the situation facing this city is not only urgent and critical but is going to reflect on our capital city this Summer with tourism and development.

My question to the minister is has he had representation from members

opposite, who represent districts in the city of St. John's, or whether this government is actually intending to bring St. John's up to the level of unemployment and lack of services that exist in the rest of the Province and is not concerned about taking care of the population, the people, and the capital city of this Province? Has there been representation by the members for the districts in St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been on a number of different occasions. As a matter of fact, just about every member from the St. John's districts have made me fully aware of the problems St. John's is having. That is why this year, Mr. Speaker, we made \$1.9 million available to the city of St. John's for their capital works programme. That was, incidentally, the largest allocation from the Department of Municipal Affairs. It went to the city of St. John's this year, \$1.9 million.

So, Mr. Speaker, that comes about as a result of the representations that were made to my department by the St. John's members. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I have received no representation from the member for St. John's East.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

My question is for the Minister of

Education (Mr. Hearn). The Minister of Education will remember that last year, I think it was, after I had paid my school tax bill to the School Tax Authority in Conception Bay, the Trinity - Conception School Tax Authority, my wages were attached. Whether that was incompetence on behalf of the School Tax Authority or harassment of a Liberal member who opposes school taxes on that shore, this year, let me tell the minister, I received a bill from the Gander School Tax Authority which covers half my district. Is this incompetence? I still pay to the Trinity - Conception School Tax Authority. Is this another example of the incompetence demonstrated by School Tax Authorities or is this an attempt by the Gander School Tax Authority to try to garner from me, because half my district is in that Tax Authority jurisdiction and half in Trinity - Conception? Is this a new tack now by the School Tax Authority whereby they try to get two payments, one for Gander and one for Trinity - Conception just because my district happens to cover half of each area?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, certainly it is a question to be asked of the School Tax Authorities. I will, however, suggest to the hon. member that a phone call perhaps to both offices will make it quite clear as to which one would be sending him a bill. Certainly the member does not have to pay school tax to both authorities, but quite often you find that they have him registered as being in the school tax area and they send a bill. So if he is paying somewhere else, as many workers do, a notification to the

office and the thing can be clarified.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Section 53, subsection 2 of the Automobile Insurance Act, as amended, I hereby table the annual report of the Board of Commissions of Public Utilities on the operations carried out by the board under the Automobile Insurance Act for the calendar year 1986.

For information of hon. colleagues, the Public Utilities Board is charged the responsibility under the Automobile Insurance Act, as amended, for the general supervision of the rates and insurer charges or proposes to charge for automobile insurance which rates must be filed and approved by the board.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Today is Private Members' Day, and the motion is in the name of the hon. member for Bonavista North.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, if adopted or passed by this House could be one of the most productive things that could happen in this particular session. We, by acting collectively and by passing this particular resolution today and next Wednesday, could do something enormous for the people of this Province.

I have a strange Order Paper. One side is up and the other is not. We should see -

MR. SIMMONS:

That sounds like Collins' Budget.

MR. LUSH:

Yes. Let me take yours.

MR. CALLAN:

Here you go.

MR. LUSH:

So, Mr. Speaker, I was saying this resolution, if passed, could be the most beneficial thing and the most advantageous development in this session for the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. In essence, Mr. Speaker, it has to do with developing an economic plan for this Province which, in turn, will result in creating employment for the people of this Province. That is what a government's job is; that is what its task is; that is why they are elected, to develop the economy and to generate employment, to generate jobs for

the people it was elected to serve.

Mr. Speaker, how could anybody not vote for a resolution the objective of which is to create jobs? How could somebody not support a resolution that was designed for that very purpose. If accepted, the objectives will be to create employment and jobs for the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. That its purpose, Mr. Speaker.

Many times hon. members try to slither away and to crawl out under from supporting a particular resolution by disagreeing with some of the content within the resolution, disagreeing with some of the Whereases and disagreeing with some of the Be It Resolved.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I look down through this motion I see nothing in it at all that an hon. member could find disagreement with. Certainly nothing in it that is not factual. Everything in this resolution is factual. Let us look at it. It says:

"WHEREAS the province's Minister of Finance has announced an increased deficit for the 86/87 fiscal year." True or false? True, Mr. Speaker. I wish it were not true. But the Minister of Finance has announced an enormous deficit, a deficit that has escalated from \$41 million on current account to \$172 million. So, there is nothing inaccurate in that statement. We might not like it, none of us, but it is reality, it is the situation as it exists today in this Province with respect to its fiscal matters.

So, Mr. Speaker, "WHEREAS the province's Minister of Finance has announced an increased deficit for the 1986/87 fiscal year," true.

"AND WHEREAS the Province has the highest per capita debt in Canada, totalling the staggering and incomprehensible figure of \$4.487 billion. That's \$8,012.00 in debt for every man, woman and child." True, Mr. Speaker, a public debt of over \$4 billion and, on a per capita basis, it works out to \$8,012.00 for every person in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We have the third highest per capita debt in the nation, ranking behind Quebec and Manitoba. Correct. True. We might not like the statistic but it is true, it is accurate.

"AND WHEREAS the Premier recently asserted that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is heading for a 1930's style financial disaster in two years." True or False? Did the Premier say it?

MR. CALLAN:
Sure he did.

MR. LUSH:
The Premier certainly did say it. It caused a lot of furor around the Province. It generated a lot of concern but the Premier did say that. He did come on a couple of days after and said that he was engaging in a little bit of hyperbole and a little bit of exaggeration but why a premier of a province would do that. Could you imagine an executive officer of some company, the Minister now of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett), imagine what would happen to him if he said that about a company that he worked with, that in two years time that this company was headed towards bankruptcy? Imagine what would happen to him as an executive officer of that particular company.

Well, that is what the Premier

said, Mr. Speaker, that this Province was headed for bankruptcy. I did not say it, the Premier said it. The Premier said that, so that is correct.

"AND WHEREAS these statements by the Premier about the abysmal financial condition of the Province and the inaccurate financial forecast by the Minister of Finance are certain to erode investor confidence in the economy of this Province and adversely affect this Province's credit rating;

"AND WHEREAS the Province's financial plight has resulted in unprecedented and unequalled levels of unemployment, indeed, consistently the highest in Canada;

"AND WHEREAS the Provincial General Election was called to give the present administration a mandate to create jobs;" then we come into the Resolves. I just want to comment again on a couple of the Whereases.

"AND WHEREAS the statements by the Premier about the abysmal financial condition of the Province and the inaccurate financial forecasts by the Finance Minister are certain to erode investor confidence in the economy of this Province." Now, Mr. Speaker, I was just reading a short while ago statements by two financial agencies, I just forget their names now, but I was reading statements by two financial agencies that were very concerned about the minister's budget this year.

When they were contacted, I believe, by The Evening Telegram, one of the financial agencies was domiciled in New York, I forget where the other

was, but it was Moody's and when The Evening Telegram contacted both these agencies to ask them whether or not the statement issued by the minister, particularly with the Province's debt on current account, particularly whether this would affect the credit rating of the Province -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Standard and Poor's.

MR. LUSH:
That is it, Standard and Poor's.

Both these agencies said they were very concerned and they would give a more definitive answer in a month's time after they had talked to the minister and his officials, but they said they were very concerned and overall they were disappointed with the budget, they were disappointed with the deficit that the minister had perpetrated on the people of Newfoundland and that they were going to respond.

Well, that is a question we are going to have to get into shortly to find out whether they have indeed responded to the minister and what the nature of that response was. Mr. Speaker, they certainly let it be known they were indeed concerned about the financial crisis the minister has placed upon this Province. They were concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it says, 'WHEREAS the province's financial plight has resulted in unprecedented and unequalled levels of unemployment,' that has to be a concern. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that correct? Is that accurate? The unemployment levels in this Province - certainly brought about by the economic malaise that this government have put this Province

in - the unemployment levels, are they not the highest in Canada? Is the unemployment rate in this Province not the highest in Canada?

I have here the unemployment rates for March, the month of March, the actual figures. The unemployment rate in Newfoundland for the month of March was 24.4 per cent. That is what the unemployment rate was for the month of March. It is unprecedented in this Province that enormous rate of unemployment, that disgraceful rate of unemployment, the highest in our history, the highest in Canada. Time was when I was spokesman on Labour and Manpower, when we had both these departments combined, time was just about any month at all under this administration I would say that the unemployment rate is almost double the national average.

Well, today it is more than double the national average. One could say today that it is coming close to tripling the national average. The national average in the month of March was 10.8 per cent and the rate of unemployment in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador 24.4 per cent. More than double, Mr. Speaker. If this government keeps on going the way they are going, if they are not willing to create more jobs for the people of this Province, if they are not willing to take bold steps, if they are not willing to take some initiatives more than what they have been taking, we are shortly going to be able to say that the unemployment rate in this Province is triple the national rate. That is where we are going, Mr. Speaker, fastly getting there as the figures will substantiate.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the facts, no

question about the validity of any of these statements. All of these statements are accurate. Every one of them. All of the WHEREASES are absolutely and totally accurate and I challenge any person to point out how it is that any of the WHEREASES in this resolution, to point out how any of them is not accurate. Mr. Speaker, they are completely and totally accurate, every single statement in the WHEREASES.

Now after leaving the one on unemployment the next one says, 'WHEREAS the Provincial General Election was called to give the present administration a mandate to create jobs.' True or False?

MR. CALLAN:
True.

MR. LUSH:
Absolutely true. That is the Premier's own words. He was looking for a mandate to create jobs. Now, did he create jobs. No, Mr. Speaker, hardly, with the kinds of statistics that I have just read out when the unemployment rate in March is 24.4 per cent. Mr. Speaker, to point out the travesty of that figure, let me inform hon. members of how many people that number represents in terms of numbers of people, 24.4 per cent. It represents 53,000 in this Province, 53,000 people were unemployed in the month of March, that is according to the criteria used by Statistics Canada. We know that we can put 10,000 to 15,000 easily on top of that figure because they are not included, discouraged workers. So we are looking at possibly close to 70,000 people in the month of March and as of today unemployed in this Province.

MR. MATTHEWS:

What about new entrants in the work force.

MR. LUSH:
Oh, yes, wait until when?

MR. MATTHEWS:
No, I said new entrants in the work force.

MR. CALLAN:
Wait until the cows come home, he should have said.

MR. LUSH:
And then, Mr. Speaker, 70,000 people -

MR. MATTHEWS:
He does not want to talk about that.

MR. LUSH:
- unemployed and then the government have the nerve to waste and squander money on this advertising, telling the people in Newfoundland that they have created, how many jobs? for last year? Last year how many jobs did they create? Well, 2,088 with 70,000 people unemployed. What a scandal, what a sham, what a scam, Mr. Speaker, to waste the people's money on advertising this hoax, Mr. Speaker. It is a hocus-pocus, this is what it is, trying to bluff the people of this Province that they have created jobs.

MR. CALLAN:
With their own money.

MR. LUSH:
And, Mr. Speaker, to make it worse this is what it says, at the end of the advertising: "That's a grand total of 2,088 new jobs created in the last year or so." That is what they have created, Mr. Speaker, when the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment said this government

should be generating 10,000 jobs per year over the next little while if we hope to do anything with resolving this crisis of unemployment. This is when I come to the BE IT RESOLVED, Mr. Speaker.

It says; "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this government set up a select committee of the House to develop a sound, practical and comprehensive economic plan for this Province based on the recommendations of the House Commission on Employment and Unemployment."

There are no dollars involved, Mr. Speaker. Here we have the document. We have the plan. We have the blueprint. It is now a matter of the government having the political will to put together a committee so that we can decide on the recommendations of this Royal Commission that we believe that this Province needs to have initiated to put into effect the recommendations we believe are necessary to develop the economy of this Province and to create jobs for our people. It does not mean a dollar, it just means utilizing in a more practical and in a more utilitarian and in a more functional way the skills and talents that are already present in this House. Because, Mr. Speaker, it looks like the government is not going to act on the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said in my opening remarks today, by accepting this resolution we can do something advantageous, we can do something beneficial, the most beneficial and the most advantageous step that we could take in this session.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:
By leave!

AN HON. MEMBER:
There is no leave.

MR. LUSH:
I just want to finish on the two remaining sections.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member's time is up. Leave is not granted.

DR. COLLINS:
Just a few minutes, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave.

MR. LUSH:
There are three Resolves here. The most salient one obviously is setting up this committee. That is the most salient resolve. I just want to read the other two.

It says, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that government, as a means of direct stimulus to the economy and as an encouragement to small business and the creation of jobs, immediately move to a reduction in the provincial sales tax." I elaborated on that, Mr. Speaker, over the past number of months now pointing out the reasons for this and pointing out how it can be done, suggesting that our retail sales tax, now at 12 per cent, has reached the point of diminishing returns. We are minimizing the disposable dollars that people have in their pockets to spend in the economy, thus the high tax is stymieing and stifling the economic growth of the Province.

The last one: "AND BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that government, as a means to promote private sector growth and expansion, give a tax credit for investment made in local companies." I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that would be a good measure. I believe the Minister of Finance should look at it. It has been done in Quebec with a great degree of success and it will have a double-barrelled advantage. It will help keep money in our Province, and also help the expansion and growth of local companies. I believe that the minister should seriously look at that based on the success of this measure in Quebec. It might be in other provinces. I am not aware. But I know it is in Quebec and it is having an astonishing success in that province.

Of course, the tax deduction that we would be looking for, Mr. Speaker - maybe it should have been pointed out in the resolution - is give a tax credit for investment. Naturally the tax credit would come from the province's share of the income tax we would have. If we could convince the federal government, that is fine. But I think in Quebec it is done from the provincial portion of the income tax.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank hon. gentlemen for giving me leave. Since they so generously gave it to me, I will not tax their patience further, or I will not misuse rather, because I am not taxing their patience, I am sure I am very interesting. I will not misuse the time they have given me.

I just want to conclude then, Mr. Speaker, by saying that setting up this Committee to look into the

recommendations of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment could be the most beneficial thing and the most advantageous activity to come out of this House, not only in this session but, Mr. Speaker, in sessions for a number of years. We can certainly do this and prove that we got our heads together and did something that is going to benefit the people of this Province, namely in helping to develop the economy and to create jobs for our people.

That is the job of the government. That is the job of all of us. That is what they sent us here for, and I hope that all hon. members will see it in this light and support this resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I could not do other than applaud that address. What an address! It only goes to show that it is a great shame the hon. member has not tossed his hat into the leadership ring. Again, it is crying out for redress after a speech like that. However, one does have to remember that we have had eight Leaders of the Opposition since 1979. So even though the hon. member has not tossed his hat in this time, I am sure there are going to be lots of opportunities, and probably quite soon, for him to do so. So we will look forward to seeing the hon. member put himself forward in the proper manner and give other rousing speeches, such as he has just given, in a leadership role.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I guess we should look on the positive side. I have studied this resolution in some detail and there is one positive thing in it, the last thing that the hon. member mentioned, the tax credit for investments made in local companies. The hon. member is quite right obviously, that that initiative has been pursued in Quebec and in other provinces also. As the hon. member will remember, we referred to it in the budget speech. So, even though this is a positive thing in this resolution, I am afraid to say that it is coming rather late in the day because we already referred to it in the budget speech, that we were giving this whole matter study and we were setting up a task force to look into this matter further and to get the details in place.

MR. LUSH:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

The point of order is this: The minister says this comes late because this was in the budget. I want to remind the hon. minister that these resolutions are prepared in advance of the budget.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

No, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. I will just say, however, that the budget is prepared well in advance of the sitting of this House. So I still

hold that he is johnny-come-lately on this one.

Anyway, that sort of scheme has been put in place in some of the larger provinces at an earlier stage than we have gotten on to it. Now, that is not that we are dragging our feet, really, because it is easier, much, much easier to put that sort of scheme in place in a province that has its own stock exchange. Of course, Quebec has its own stock exchange, Alberta has its own stock exchange, Ontario has its own stock exchange, B.C. has its own stock exchange, and technically and administratively it is much, much easier to do. It is somewhat difficult to do it in a province that does not have its own stock exchange. For instance, Nova Scotia would like to bring this in, too but they do not have their own stock exchange. They have laboured over it, and I think it was last year they indicated they were doing a study on it, and this year they have indicated that they now have a task force going on it.

It is particularly difficult in provinces where you have relatively small business sectors that have public corporations in them. If your business sector is essentially of a non-incorporated nature or if it is of a private corporation nature, it is difficult to bring in this sort of scheme. But, despite all that, as I say, we feel that we can bring in something that is not the same as Quebec but with the same objective in mind and tailored to our particular circumstance here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is about the only thing that is good in this resolution, and it is already in the budget. Let us just go through the rest of it again. The

increased deficit that was announced in the budget - someone just coming in from Mars, or somewhere like that, and reading that resolution would say, 'My heavens, Newfoundland is the only place that has an increased deficit this year.' In actual fact what do we find? We find that almost all provinces have an increased deficit this year. As a matter of fact, even the federal government, in terms of its projections of a couple of years ago, is projecting an increased deficit this year compared to those earlier projections. An increased deficit is not desirable, obviously, it is something that we certainly do not want, but it is certainly not particularly unique to this Province at the present time, and it is something that our budget projections and our budget thrust indicate that we will get it under control at the earliest possible moment.

Now, the second WHEREAS says, 'the highest per capita debt in Canada.' I think the hon. member when he spoke adjusted that. He said, 'We do not have the highest per capita debt, we have the third highest.' And that is quite true. So what is written in here is inaccurate.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I do have to point out that when we presented the budget we dealt with the debt situation in the Province in some detail, and I would direct the hon. member's attention and any other members' attention, who feel so inclined, to the tables in the budget document. In this table you see that our public debt in terms of direct debt, and I think that figure that is quoted there, \$4 billion and \$8,000 per capita, is not direct debt only, it is

also contingent debt, debt where we give a guarantee. The vast majority of that debt we will never have to pay. It is the municipalities, it is the Crown corporations, it is the school boards, and all that sort of thing, who will pay that debt. We just stood on the back of notes in regard to that debt.

You get a much better picture if you look at the direct debt of the Province, that is the debt that the Province itself will have to repay, is obligated to repay. Now, I admit that if a Crown corporation defaults on one of those contingent debts - say, Hydro does not pay its debt - and we are guaranteeing it, obviously, yes, we will have to repay it. But in most cases, obviously, that is not going to happen. That is only a very small risk if you look at the total amount of continued debt. There is only a very small proportion of that we will ever stand in risk of having to repay.

So if you look at the direct debt, what we will have to repay ourselves, you will find that from 1965 up to 1976 there was a fairly steep incline and then there was a plateauing. From 1976 right up to 1983 the real direct debt, looked at on a per capita basis, and that is the best way of looking at it, it is the most accurate way of looking at it, plateaued, there was no change. As a matter of fact, there was a small decrease.

Now since the recession, since 1983, the direct debt is rising again. But that recession now is disappearing. We were slow coming out of the recession, but we have come out of it and we are advancing again. Other parts of Canada are advancing at somewhat the same pace as ourselves, others

are advancing at a slower rate, such as Alberta at the present time, and some are advancing a lot quicker than we are, such as Ontario and Quebec and so on. But nevertheless we are advancing. We are sort of in the middle there somewhere in terms of advance, so I would expect that graph, in the near future, to again turn down or at least plateau.

Now, if you look upon it in other terms, you will also find that, say, from 1963 to 1968 the growth of debt on an annual basis was over 20 per cent in that earlier period. In the 1960s the annual growth rate of direct debt on a per capita basis was about 20 per cent. You will find that from 1978 to 1983, in actual fact, as I mentioned earlier, there was no growth, there was actually a decline in the growth rate, if I can use a sort of Irish expression that way. And even in the most recent time, with the recession in place, the growth rate only went up to 8 per cent per annum, and that must be compared with the 20 per cent per annum in the sixties.

So I think that this WHEREAS that has to do with direct debt is not giving an accurate picture of the debt circumstances of the Province.

The next WHEREAS, '1930's style financial disaster', in Question Period we dealt with that. If we do not do something and are just going to limp along the way we have done every since Confederation, there is a chance, if world economic events turn down in a severe degree, that we will get into real deep trouble. You cannot just go along with your head barely above water forever and expect to weather all sorts of storms. It is not reasonable. You have to do better than that.

You have to have a bit of leeway, a bit of flexibility, a bit of cushion to put up with the bad times.

And that is what the Premier referred to when he made that remark. It was a remark made during an interview, and often remarks made during interviews are not always totally accurately reported, they are not always taken in the right context. And, anyway, someone making a remark in an interview is different than making a remark in a speech, where there is a lot of consideration given before hand, you are reacting to a particular question.

MR. LUSH:

I do not know, because I cannot get interviewed.

DR. COLLINS:

So the Premier's remark was accurate, was correct, but, nevertheless, he did say he did not want to give a false impression by people focusing on that remark alone. The point about it is we have to make arrangements in terms of our relationship with Canada, in our Terms of Union, in how the Terms of Union relate to our fisheries, in how the Terms of Union relate to defence expenditure in this Province, in regard to the transportation facilities that we can put in place in this Province, in terms of the help we get from equalization and other grants in this Province related to the needs of doing things in this Province to catch up with the rest of Canada. All these sorts of things have to be adjusted. They cannot be left the same as they have been left since 1949 or we will always be marginal in this Province and any downturn in the world's economic events is likely to put

our head under for a bit. That is what the Premier was referring to, and I think it is not what we expected, not what our people expected when we joined Canada.

When we joined Canada, everyone knew we were far behind in social infrastructure, in social services, in economic opportunities, in economic development, and so on and so forth. Now, in many respects, our social infrastructure and our social services have improved immeasurably. But, of course, other provinces have improved also, so there is still a little gap there, but I think there is a lesser gap on the social side than on the economic side. On the economic side there is almost no closing of that gap. Despite all the schemes that have been put in place by the federal government, by the provincial government, by Liberal administrations and by PC administrations, there has not been a good enough return from all this and that is not good enough for our people. You only live so many years in this world and you have a right to have the expectations that other people living the same number of years in this world have. Why should people in Newfoundland have to put up with lesser prospects of personal economic growth and personal lifestyle growth than anywhere else? They should not have to. So that cannot be a built in part of the Canadian Confederation. We reject that. We want built into Canadian Confederation enough opportunity for the people of Newfoundland to be able to have as good a chance at the good things of life as anywhere else in the country or, indeed, anywhere else in the world, and we are not going to get that if we do not change what has

been in place since 1949. We have had thirty-eight years to see if the present arrangements would bring about a marked improvement and thirty-eight years have shown us that they are not sufficient to do that, so we would be neglectful, we would be remiss, we would be silly if we just were content with that. We have to strive to improve those arrangements, to change them so that we will have, over the next ten years, a more rapid closing of this gap that exists between us and the rest of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, again, another WHEREAS. 'Unprecedented levels of unemployment'. We have horrendously high unemployment in this Province and everyone is striving to do something about it. We are very sad about it and we want to improve on it, but we must be accurate. It is not correct to say unprecedented levels of unemployment because, again, in the document called The Economy of 1987, which was submitted when the budget was brought down, there are a couple of graphs in this which show that in actual fact the unemployment rate is coming down. Now, granted it went up quite steeply, but since 1985 it has turned downward. So it is not correct to say 'unprecedented'. There were worse situations a little while ago. There is some improvement in recent times. In other words, as the Chinese say, a journey of 1,000 miles has to start with the first step. It looks as though we have taken a first step or two in the hard, hard journey to get on top of our unemployment situation. But we have taken the first few steps, and the figures confirm that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the budget we

have tried to do what we can to hurry up that process. I made a note, while the hon. member was speaking, as to the measures that we have initiated to improve on our employment opportunities in this Province. There is \$40 million in this budget in direct employment stimulus terms, opportunities for people to get employment. Under the Community Development Programme, \$29 million; under the shared cost Employment Enhancement Programme, \$2.5 million from the provincial side; under the Province's own Employment Initiatives Programme, \$7.5 million. In the Private Sector Employment Initiatives Programme that the hon. the minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies released the other day, \$5 million; in NLDC, the Business Equity Programme, \$2 million; the Venture Capital Programme, \$1 million; the Youth Entrepreneur Programme, \$500,000; and in NLDC and RDA, their financing programmes to help employment, \$2.5 million, adding up to \$40 million in those programmes alone.

Now, those are not the only programmes. We have assigned \$49 million out of the offshore development fund for various capital works over the next year. Not all that \$49 million will be for wages and salaries, obviously, there are other aspects to it, but there will be considerable spin-off employment from that. In this budget we have allocated \$19.5 million to the Hopebrook mine. Again, not all that will turn up in pay packets, but there will be considerable employment and considerable wages turn up out of that.

In the new community college system we are putting in \$5.7

million this year. Again, there are many parts to that programme, but that, again, is directed very much toward employment in the short-term and in the long-term. Another example is the Marystown Shipyard: We are putting in there out of this budget \$2 million in a federal/provincial programme to help out with the trawler construction operation to help the business plan of FPI. So, in that area, \$76.2 million. As I say, I am not implying, whatever, that all that \$76.2 million will turn up in pay packets. There are capital expenditures as part of that, and so on and so forth, but it is all directed towards employment and a good part of it will, in actual fact, turn up as wages and salaries.

Again, in transportation - I will not belabour this - there is \$79.1 million being spent through this budget on transportation programmes and ventures of one sort and another, \$79.1 million. So if you add all that up, if you add the direct funding of employment programmes, \$40 million, the other ones I have mentioned, offshore and Hopebrook and so on and so forth, \$76.2 million, transportation - my friend and colleague, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) here, spends every waking hour wondering how he can improve the transportation facilities in this Province, wondering how many jobs he can get people involved in in that regard - \$79.1 million, you get a total of \$195.3 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not performance I do not know what is.

MR. SIMMS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Thank you.

MR. SIMMS:
Are you finished?

DR. COLLINS:
Not quite. Mr. Speaker, I only have a minute or two, and the hon. member wants to set up a select committee to evolve an economic plan. I think what I have said here, what the budget has said, what we have indicated in our brief to the federal government and our communications with the federal government, there is in place already an economic plan. We do not need a select committee to redo the work that the whole structure of government has been doing over the last while, in difficult circumstances. That plan is in place. It is going to need a lot of work to make it come to fruition, but the plan is there. I see no value in setting up a select committee.

In terms of the provincial sales tax, I have spoken on that so many times I am sick of it myself. I do have again to reiterate that our 12 per cent is high, but it is not as high as in the U.K., it is not as high as in most parts of Europe, it is only 1 per cent higher than New Brunswick, and you cannot relate the level of retail sales tax with the opportunities for economic growth. Alberta, for instance, has no retail sales tax. Their economic growth at the present time is terrible. Ontario, on the other hand, has 7 per cent and their economic growth is enormous. So there is really no real relation between the two.

We have done studies and we have shown that we cannot at this particular time reduce our provincial sales tax without enormously increasing the deficit which no one likes, and that the hon. member has already complained

about. We will increase that level if we reduce our retail sales tax because we will not get enough spinoff return from the reduction to make up for what we lose. We have done any number of studies on that. At the earliest opportunity, we will reduce the taxation on our people including retail sales tax, but now is not the time, unfortunately and regrettably.

Mr. Speaker, I do have to say that I will vote against this resolution because it adds nothing and there are many fallacious remarks in the WHEREASes. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Before recognizing the hon. the member for Port de Grave, I would like to welcome to the gallery Mayor Caleb Ackerman from Glovertown in the historic district of Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
Now we will hear it.

MR. EFFORD:
Well, if you want to sit and listen, but like everybody, you will probably run out with the rest of the ministers.

MR. SIMMS:

They are all listening outside.

MR. EFFORD:

They are all listening outside, I am glad to hear.

MR. SIMMS:

The Press Gallery is full.

MR. EFFORD:

"WHEREAS the province's Minister of Finance has announced an increased deficit for the 86/87 fiscal year: and

"WHEREAS the province has the highest per capita debt in Canada, totalling the staggering and incomprehensible figure of \$4.487 million. That is an average debt of \$8,012 for every man, woman and child making up this province's population."

Mr. Speaker, I think that sums it up in its total, what the problem in this Province really is. I think the Minister of Finance, in the summation of his twenty minute confession of failure, that is all you can say, twenty minute confession of failure, said it all when he said, he would vote against this resolution.

If that is trying to solve the problems taking place in this Province, the high deficit and the 40,000 or 50,000 who are unemployed, the fact that the minister before he really takes into consideration and listens to all speakers has his mind made up that no matter what somebody else says, he is going to vote against it. Mr. Speaker, I would say that

MR. SIMMS:

You have your mind made up that you are going to vote for it.

MR. EFFORD:

No, I am listening to what is probably a better solution from the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). He may have something to add to this.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, like he normally does.

MR. EFFORD:

He may have something constructive like he normally does to add to this and to improve it. There is nothing can be done by either side of this House that cannot stand for an improvement, and I am sure it is quite clear on the other side because everything that they have done over the past several years can stand a lot of improvement. And if not so, we would not have the high number of people unemployed, the high deficit and the high unemployment rate that we have in this Province at this particular time.

This Province and the government's financial affairs are like any corporation. It is a business. In every business you have to have people who are able to manage and know how to handle the financial situation of the Province. It is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that what is happening in this Province is no management. Management is the problem here in this Province today. The people who are in charge in the Department of Finance and the Minister of Finance himself has confessed on numerous occasions that he does not understand the world economy, he does not understand the financial position. If you do not understand that, how can you properly manage a particular department?

Government is not an institution

any more than any other business. It is a large corporation that has a influx from taxes, from federal subsidies and from other incomes well over \$2 billion dollars a year. Those are a lot of dollars to have in a province with a population of approximately 600,000 people, yet, our deficit is climbing at an enormous rate and reached almost \$4.5 billion. Now, we do not see under the present management or administration any way possible to get that deficit down because what is taking place is the short-term job initiative. Short-term jobs and the ten week or twenty week syndrome is not going to turn the economy around in this Province. It is only going to add to it because the type of living that those people are under, the type of standard of living, the income that those people are receiving is an income that is going to make them more dependent on the public treasury.

Eighty per cent of the jobs created in 1986 was through the Department of Social Services where the average income received, the average income from a particular family through the ten weeks was about \$2,000. Then, they had to go off that and their income is reduced down to \$125 a week federal unemployment insurance but, at the same time, everybody knows that you cannot survive in this day and age on an income of \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year. So the provincial treasury has got to subsidize. How do you say that, they are not subsidized because they are on unemployment insurance, but they are.

They are subsidized in their rental income to a tune of an average of \$300 a month; they are subsidized in their drugs, for an

average family drugs in a lot of cases in my dealing with the Department of Social Services you are talking \$150 to \$200, \$300 a month, you are talking a total across the Province of millions of dollars. They are subsidizing their lights; they are subsidizing their heating and this is all a drain on the public treasury, this is all a further addition to the fact of where we are standing in our public debt.

How do you solve that? Number one, you must create some employment. Employment is not taking the tax money and handing it out and sending a few people out on the side of the road to clean up the ditches or to clean up graveyards or to paint senior citizens homes or whatever. That is necessary, but it not going to ensure or it is not going to bring down the debt and it is not going to turn around the economy of this Province. You cannot do it by taking away. You got to add to the economy and there is only one way to add to the Province's situation and that is to start creating long term jobs.

Now, we have a situation in Newfoundland that because of our geography, we have a problem with creating long term jobs, but we have natural resources. One of the greatest natural resources that we could have from anywhere in the world is swimming around the shores of Newfoundland. If any other country in the world, England, Russia, United States, had the natural resources that we have swimming around our Province's shores, they would have minimum unemployment rate of about 7 per cent to 8 per cent, yet we have up to 40 per cent.

What happens to our natural

resources? Every other country in the world is reaping the benefits from our natural resources floating around our shores.

We are not getting the benefits from our fishery and until Newfoundland and until Ottawa who has now, you can say, total control of what happens to the fishery, until they stop and think and realize and until Newfoundland gets more control of the regulations, more control of the input and more control of the stocks themselves so that they are produced - when they are caught we have them come to shore to our plants and jobs are created there - that is when the economy in Newfoundland is going to turn around. That is where we are going to see economic development, instead of now. To give an example, out in Port de Grave district we have a total of eight fish plants in that district. The district is only five miles from one end to the other, but we have a total of eight fish plants which can employ up to a maximum of 2,000 people. At any given time in any given year over the last six or seven years they have not been opened any longer than two months, two months maximum employment. Why?

We cannot get access to the stocks. Those plants cannot get access to the stocks to create employment. If over a two month period those plants were putting into the payroll \$2 million, that is a fair amount of income for a small area. But, take those same eight fish plants, and instead of putting people to work for two months we put them to work for eight months, which is what we should be getting, we would have \$8 million circulating in that district. That amount of money

being spent in the area from at least those number of jobs created in the fish plants would mean for every job created in the fish plants, we would have another 1.5 jobs created in the private sector. So you are talking approximately instead of 2,000 jobs, you are talking approximately 3,500 people could be employed for eight months of the year, if we had access to the stocks. We are not only talking cod. There are many, many different species of fish in the waters swimming around Newfoundland. The problem is that we do not have access.

Now, 3,500 jobs in a district the size of Port de Grave is one tremendous amount of jobs and that is only an example of what is happening around the Province. I think if we look co-operatively at it we would all agree on it because FPI proved it. FPI proved that you must get access to the stocks and you must get the plants upgraded in order to put the people to work. They did it and they proved that it is successful.

That is fine for the areas who are dependent on the offshore fishery, but what about the areas that are dependent wholly and totally on the inshore fishery? We, as a government, provincially and federally, have totally neglected that particular part of our Province and that particular part of our population. If we have 20,000 inshore fishermen in Newfoundland and they had access to the stocks, they could place another 15,000 or 20,000 plant workers to work. Instead of working two months out of the year, or three months out of the year, we could put them to work eight months out of a year and

then the economy of Newfoundland, because of the new dollars, because of the markets, because of the product that is being produced in Newfoundland, then the economy could start to turn around. We would be not draining on the Public Treasury.

The number of people who are depending on the Provincial Treasury now to subsidize their income, to subsidize their drug card, to subsidize their heating bill, to subsidize their clothing bill, would now be self-supporting. They would be earning a decent income.

An average employee in a plant, at the high peak of the season, is making anywhere from \$250 to \$375 a week. That would give him a better rate of unemployment. They would be drawing around \$192 or \$200 a week unemployment in the Winter months, instead of drawing on the Treasury now for \$124 a week. So that amount of income in itself would tremendously turn around the economy. Because of those numbers of jobs created around the Province - I used my own district earlier as an example, creating up to 3,500 jobs - Province-wide you could create, through the private sector because of the amount of money that is being brought in by the fishery and by the production in the fishery in Newfoundland, you could create probably another 8,000 or 10,000 in the private sector.

That is a very simple process of getting our unemployment figures down from 50,000 to 60,000 at any given time during the year to at least 20,000 to 25,000. That is a major, major decrease. That is the type of governing that the people of this Province are looking for. Now, that is one

example.

Let us look at another example which the Minister of Finance alluded to this afternoon. He said under no circumstances could he decrease the sales tax. He even used an example from European countries. So did our minister in Ottawa use an example of Third World countries, comparing them to Newfoundland, just recently. Now, the Minister of Finance states very clearly that because taxes are high in foreign countries, or because the taxes are high in New Brunswick and they have not worked, that we cannot decrease them in Newfoundland. Well, that is hogwash!

If the economy in Newfoundland - this has been proven. If the minister had done his study, he would find very clearly that there are a large number of people in this Province who have savings deposits. The average saving deposit among a percentage of Newfoundlanders is very, very high. The reason being, if you talk to any bankers or you talk to any financial people, is the people are not encouraged to spend their money. A lot of people could take the numbers of dollars that they have in their savings accounts to do some repair work around their homes, to do some building, to do some travelling, or whatever, around the Province. But, because of the high tax rate, they are not encouraged to spend. The name of the game is to encourage people to spend money. When people spend money in the building trade, jobs are created. It is very, very simple. You do not need to be a genius and you do not need to be a doctor to understand that. Obviously, the Minister of Finance does not understand it.

We stated very clearly last year, when the tax on building supplies went from 8 per cent to 12 per cent, it would decrease the spending, and it did, in the private sector. The private sector did not do as much renovations last year on their homes, on their boats, on their cabins, or whatever else they have to spend money on, because of the 4 per cent increase. If that tax had been lowered, if it had dropped 1 or 2 per cent instead of increasing 4 per cent, the government could have generated more revenue because there would have been more money spent. And 5 or 6 per cent of \$20 million spent out of the savings is better than 12 per cent of \$4 million. Very simple mathematics. Very simple economics. But, the minister and his Cabinet and his government and his colleagues do not understand that that is what is needed to encourage people to spend money. The only way you can turn around the economy is to create jobs.

Now, of course, the Minister of Public Works does not understand finances. Most of the time he reads his paper upside down.

MR. YOUNG:

I never went bankrupt like you did.

MR. EFFORD:

Would the Minister of Public Works mind repeating that statement, that you have not went bankrupt like I did?

MR. YOUNG:

Or your firm.

MR. EFFORD:

Or my firm. Would the Minister of Public Works like to stand on his feet and say that or come outside in the corridors and say that? That is not irrelevant. That is

making a very serious false statement against a member of this House. That is a very serious statement so the minister had better be very careful about what he is saying.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) threaten either.

MR. TULK:

He has not got what it takes to stand up and say it outside the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I know I only have a couple of minutes left so, in conclusion, what we have to do is try and convince the government because in a very few months, during the next general election we will have our opportunity to prove that we are much more capable of handling the administration of the Province than the people who are presently occupying the chairs.

Tables will be turned, the economy will be turned around and then we will get our chance to prove to the people that we are the alternative and we are much more capable. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that we do, on this side, fully support this resolution and I hope, as the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) and other people get up and take an opportunity to speak, they will come out with some new additions and some constructive ideas that can better stimulate and create more jobs that are badly needed in this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. TOBIN:

Who told Clyde he is going to get paid?

MR. TULK:

When he gets to be Premier you fellows will pay.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I realize how difficult it is for Your Honour to hear when there is shouting back and forth in the House and I appreciate your intervention. Members only have twenty minutes to speak in this debate on Private Member's Day so I would appreciate the opportunity of adding my two cents worth. I sat and listened with great interest to part of what the mover of the resolution said, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), but I listened with even greater interest to what that world renowned economist from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) had to say in this particular debate. I must say, Mr. Speaker, if ever I heard a simplistic solution to all of the economic problems and difficulties that this Province -

MR. EFFORD:

I did not say all, I said two.

MR. SIMMS:

Now, I sat without much interjection, with respect -

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands has already been one minute into his speech and now he is giving misleading information. This is my point, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands knows full well that I did not stand on my feet at any time during my twenty minutes and give an indication that I was giving a solution to all the problems. I very clearly stated two possible solutions to some of the problems. Now, if the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands wants to continue, fine.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

We sat and listened to him and we can certainly interpret what he had to say, as I just did, and that is the way I interpreted it. He was sort of giving us the answers to the problems and they were certainly simplistic solutions. Anybody who would suggest simplistic economic solutions to the difficulties that this Province faces and the difficulties that we have faced over the last thirty-eight or thirty-nine years, is probably being very simplistic themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we have here? We have here a resolution put forth by the member for Bonavista North which incorporates in it a number of 'Whereases' which really reflect the opinion of the members of the Opposition. They do not necessarily reflect all facts. Some are facts, the deficit has increased and so on and so forth, but they are really reflections of the hon. member's interpretation or opinion on what

has been said in the recent budget by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance has already spoken in the debate and pointed out quite clearly that the difficulties we face are accumulative. He did not blame it on any particular administration, any government or any party. He said they have accumulated over a period of years especially since we joined Confederation and we have not received all of the benefits from Confederation that most of us, I guess that 50-odd per cent that voted for Confederation thirty-eight years ago, suspected we would get.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member says one of the problems we have in this Province is that there is no management being provided, in other words, a direct accusation that the government is not managing the affairs of the Province properly. I would dispute that on the simple basis of three elections, Mr. Speaker, when this government's record went up against the record of the members of the Opposition and in all three cases this government was re-elected. I suggest to you, Sir, that the people of this Province are not going to support a government that is mismanaging its affairs. I think that that is a good reflection of the understanding of the people and also a reflection of the confidence they would have in the Opposition party being asked to form a government. So he says we provide no management, ministers cannot manage their departments, and that is all fine rhetoric, but if that is so, Mr. Speaker, the question you have to ask yourself then is what is the alternative? If the alternative to this particular party forming the government, providing good

management, are the members opposite, which I assume is what the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) was trying to say, I think that I do not need to say very much, Mr. Speaker. There is enough evidence, especially in recent weeks, about how the party opposite is able to manage its own affairs, let alone manage the affairs of the Province, and that is the suggestion the member for Port de Grave was making, 'They cannot manage it over there, we can manage it.' We have certainly seen evidence of how members opposite manage their affairs within their own caucus, and I think the public are well aware of the abilities, of the lack of abilities, I guess, or capabilities of members opposite to form a government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he also spoke about the direction that this government is headed in or has been headed in. I think he was suggesting that all we are interested in is short-term jobs. Short-term, for the short-term. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a bit misleading. I am sure the hon. member is aware of it. I would not expect him to give praise or anything like that for anything positive that we do because I guess an Opposition member somehow is inflicted with some kind of a mood or a feeling that he must criticize, must criticize everything. No matter how positive it is you have to find something to criticize. I suppose that is part of the thing of being a member of the Opposition. To suggest that all we are doing is creating short-term jobs, that that is all we are doing, is not fair nor is it accurate, Mr. Speaker. The jobs directed at the long-term is what we have been trying to do, long-term strategy.

Those jobs development, the Provincial Job Initiatives Programme, where we provided millions of dollars, some \$7-odd million in projects related to the resources of this Province, therefore trying to ensure long-term viability of the resources and industries associated with the resources such as those in the forestry area, such as those in the agricultural sector, such as those in the fishery sector cannot simply be called short-term jobs. They are jobs, in the initial outset, seasonal in nature because we cannot harvest trees in January when we got ten feet of snow to plough through, and you cannot fish if the bay is frozen over with ice, and you cannot plant vegetables when there is frost on the ground and in the ground. So, by its very nature, Newfoundland has a record and historically have to be involved in seasonal work. That is unfortunate but it is a fact. So the jobs that we have announced, that \$7 million of job initiatives to create several hundreds of jobs in the forestry, agriculture and fishery sector, whilst they are short-term jobs initially, they are meant to enhance the viability of the long-term nature of those types of sectors. I am sure the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) well agrees and well understands what I am saying.

I also want to point out, by the way, that the programme announced by the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies today, the fifty/fifty salary subsidy programme, if you will note the criteria in the application - I do not have one in front of me now - as I recollect it the minimum that the applications will be given considerations for, as I recall,

are four months, and those that are longer, for twelve months or proposed jobs for a twelve month period of time, will be given the priority. So, I mean, that is an indication that our interest is not only in the short-term jobs, trying to paint fences and all that sort of thing. I think what we are proposing and what we have proposed merits some commendation and credit.

So the minimum is four months for an application, and are proposing longer-term jobs for at least a year will get priority. So I think that is the right direction to move in, as opposed to painting fences and that kind of thing. And the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) suggests that they agree with that kind of thrust. But the hon. member for Port de Grave did not give any credit towards that, he just sort of indicated that our whole philosophy is directed at short-term, ten week jobs, cleaning up ditches and painting fences and that is just not accurate nor is it fair.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting topics that comes up in this House, and I believe the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) is a frequent criticizer - if there is such a word. Criticizer is a word?

DR. COLLINS:

Yes. I think so.

MR. SIMMS:

That is acceptable.

DR. COLLINS:

Or critic.

MR. SIMMS:

Critic, that is the word I am looking for. If there is a frequent critic of the Community

Development Programme under the Department of Social Services it is the member for the Strait of Belle Isle. I have heard him on occasion, and I hope that he will interrupt me if I am inaccurate, but I believe he is a critic of that programme and feels it is not really that beneficial.

The amazing thing about it, Mr. Speaker, if you reflect, and Your Honour is only a young man but I am sure he might recall a few years back when people in this Province were severely chastising the government, criticizing the government and encouraging the government to put people who receive social assistance to work - I mean, that was the hue and cry for years and years and years in this Province - and this administration, Mr. Speaker, did just that. The monies that would normally be given out in social assistance and welfare payments were now being put into something worthwhile, job creation for these people who unfortunately, because of their problem in life, were not able to find employment and had to accept social assistance, were now going to work for that social assistance.

But, Mr. Speaker, not only that, not only did they work for a period of time to help give them back some dignity, not only did they work but there are a number of success stories associated with that programme, a number of success stories where people who were employed on the community development project, an AID project, because of that experience they gained picked up a job in the regular work force. Now there are success stories like that which obviously always get passed over in rhetoric and debate, but that is a fact. And I

talked to one recently, in fact, a woman who had been working as a typist on a community development project for twelve weeks, ten weeks, whatever it was, and the employer liked her work so much and was so happy with her work habits and so on that he, the employer, offered her a job full-time after the community development project completed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other examples of that. I am not suggesting for the minute there are thousands but I know there are many.

MR. TOBIN:

In Marystown, part-time jobs have gone down and full-time jobs have gone up and it has gone up.

MR. SIMMS:

The member, of course, being a former social worker, would certainly be aware of success stories like that.

So to heavily criticize the community development project, you must remember how the programme developed,-

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

- and the programme developed years ago because people asked for the department to put people who were on welfare to work, and that is exactly what we did.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We have a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I apologize.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands knows full well that if he is to stand there and talk to this resolution we expect constructive ideas out of him. I did not stand on my feet and criticize the Department of Social Services for the jobs in the Community Development Programme. What I did say is that a better solution is indeed of the long-term job rather than the short-term job, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

As usual, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. If the hon. member wants me to make some constructive criticisms I would ask him to give me the courtesy I gave him and let me use my twenty minutes in speaking.

MR. EFFORD:

You were attacking me.

MR. SIMMS:

I am not attacking the hon. member. I could not care less about the hon. member for Port de Grave, I could not care less. So why would I attack him? I am certainly quoting him.

MR. TOBIN:

You are making a good point.

MR. SIMMS:

I am interpreting.

But there was a criticism of that programme, and the hon. member I am sure would have to agree. The member for the Straight of Belle Isle is very quite but I know that he has criticized the programme. But you have to remember how it came about, and it came about for a very specific reason, and this government should take some credit. Rather than be defensive on that programme, we should be proud of it and we should be bragging about it, because we are employing thousands of people who otherwise could not get any employment, giving them some dignity, putting them back to work, which is what the public wanted a few years back, and at the same time a number of them have been successful in obtaining full-time jobs through the employers that they worked for on the Community Development projects. So that is point number three.

I have not even got an end to my comments yet because I am trying to respond to some of the things the hon. member had to say. Something else the hon. member had to say, and I am a bit surprised that he would even bring it up. I hope he is not going to interrupt me again on a point of order and say, 'I did not say that.' Give me a chance to get through it. He talked about this Province not being able to gain control or hold control of her own natural resources. Now he talked about that, suggesting that this government - obviously that is whom he is chastizing - has not done the job of getting control of its natural resources. Now, that has been our philosophy, that has been our direction ever since we came into power. The hon. member must see that. But I wonder how somebody from that party could get

up and make that kind of a comment when you consider what happened with Churchill Falls. Now, you consider that if you talk about giving away a natural resource, and consider what party was involved in giving away that natural resource.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman. As a matter of fact I was listening to the hon. -

MR. TOBIN:

You fought us on control of the offshore. You were allied with the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, do I have a chance to speak or do I have to listen to that over there?

MR. SPEAKER:

You have the opportunity to speak.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman. I was listening to his speech with a great deal of interest. The Churchill Falls deal, as he will recall, since he refers to this party - I want to correct him on this information - as having given it away. Now, the facts stand for themselves. There is a record of a vote in this Legislature that was taken on the Brinco deal, on the Churchill Falls deal, and the hon. gentleman, if he looks it up

and does a bit of research, will see that if it was given away it was given away by both the Liberal Party and the Progressive Conservative Party, because it was a unanimous decision to accept the deal.

I want to listen to the hon. gentleman's speech, but he should get his facts straight.

MR. SPEAKER:

On that point of order, there is no point of order, just a difference of opinion.

MR. SIMMS:

It is almost laughable to hear the member for Fogo get up and try to defend that. The vote in the House, by the way, that vote that was taken in the Legislature had nothing to do with the power contract, absolutely nothing to do with the power contract. The hon. member should do some research first before he makes those kinds of comments because they are rather silly and not accurate. That had nothing to do with it, and it was taken after the fact, in any event.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fogo is going to speak in the debate, I presume. He is probably going to speak next, I gather. So I find it unfortunate that he would interrupt me, when I have only have four or five minutes left, rather than use his own time after I have finished speaking.

MR. EFFORD:

It is boring.

MR. SIMMS:

If he thinks this is boring, you should have heard your own.

He talks about more control over

the fishery, which is something, of course, that this government agrees with. Our position on that issue is quite clear. In fact, the Premier of the Province was very successful, just in recent days, in getting the topic of control over the fishery on the agenda for the next set of Constitutional talks. That is a big step ahead on something that I know the hon. member is proud of the Premier for.

I did not hear too many complimentary remarks coming from that side over it, but I am sure they do.

And we have lots of other examples in the fishery, with the restructuring of FPI, and the secondary processing plant in Burin. I mean, there are all kinds of success stories, so somehow to suggest or imply that perhaps we have not been doing enough in the fishery is just not accurate, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to take the last couple of minutes I have to briefly remind members opposite of the programmes that are being brought in in this budget. Now I do not know, I mean, I can only assume members opposite did not even read the attached document.

MR. EFFORD:

Oh, yes.

MR. SIMMS:

They could not have read it, Mr. Speaker. Because to say we are not bringing in any programmes to encourage employment is just not true, it is just not fair.

MR. EFFORD:

I did not say that.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, the hon. member now is sort of backing off, saying he did not say that. But I had the impression, Mr. Speaker, after listening to him for twenty minutes he was certainly suggesting it.

MR. EFFORD:

You should take it and read it.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I read it many times.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are bringing in all kinds of programmes that will help encourage employment in the Province, and I am sure the hon. member knows it. The provincial Employment Initiatives Programmes, I just went through those in forestry, agriculture, and fishery. The \$5 million announced today by the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies for a 50/50 salary subsidy to encourage entrepreneurs in this Province to go out and hire new people, create new jobs. I mean, what is that if it is not a positive initiative? Surely that has to be acknowledged as a positive initiative, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we have a Renewed Business Equity programme; 'Direct Equity Capital Investment will be made available to new or expanding enterprises where Newfoundland and Labrador residents are holding the controlling interest.' We have additional funding for The Venture Capital programme, which has been quite successful up to now, but we never hear members opposite talk about. I doubt if they know anything about it, to tell you the truth.

We are bringing in a corporate

income tax holiday. When was the last time I heard the member opposite praise the government for bringing in that three year tax break that we are offering to qualified entrepreneurs?

DR. COLLINS:

Have not heard a word.

MR. SIMMS:

Have not heard a sound. The Youth Entrepreneur programme is to allow young people in this Province themselves to go out and establish small business and create new jobs. Never heard a word about it, Mr. Speaker. The one-stop shopping project, which they laughed, is turning out to be a huge success, by the way, and there is a lot of interest in it. And the extension of the loan programmes at Rural Development and NLDC into the service sector has to create jobs. So I mean all of those initiatives, Mr. Speaker, create jobs.

So let me just say in conclusion - I know I only have a minute left, Mr. Speaker - that with respect to the resolution itself, that the government set up a Select Committee, I have to agree with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I mean, here is a government elected by the people only two years ago, given a mandate to manage the affairs of this Province, and what they are suggesting we should be doing here is a responsibility of the government. So what need for a select committee? They talk about expenditures and wasteful expenditures. It would cost another, I suppose, few hundred thousand dollars for a Select Committee to travel all over the Province and this kind of thing, maybe travel outside, maybe travel to England or whatever. I mean,

it is a great chance to travel, but that is about the extent of it.

MR. TULK:

You should look at some of the trips taken by you over there.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, this minister does not take a lot of trips, Mr. Speaker.

So the first part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support. The second part, the retail sales tax reduction, I do not need to add to what the Minister of Finance has said today, and on many other occasions. If we could do that, and we felt confident that it would stimulate the economy and that we would not lose a lot of revenue and that our deficit would not get higher, I am sure we would do it.

DR. COLLINS:

We would be delighted.

MR. SIMMS:

But we cannot do it, according to the studies that we have seen.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, just finally, that the government give a tax credit for investments made in local companies. Now that is the third part of the resolution. But did not the member for Bonavista North read the budget at all?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

I hear in the wings, Mr. Speaker, the well known politician, a well known individual who is seeking the nomination for our party -

DR. COLLINS:

The periodic House Leader?

MR. SIMMS:

No, no, the other chap.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Hickey is in the area, and we want to wish him well in his endeavours.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the final part of the resolution calls for a tax credit for investments made in local companies. I mean that is in the budget. Did he not read the budget?

MR. LUSH:

Take responsibility for it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is not in the budget.

MR. SIMMS:

It is in the budget.

MR. LUSH:

Take responsibility for it.

MR. SIMMS:

I see. So, I mean, that section of the resolution is redundant. The second part is not possible. And the first part is the responsibility of the government anyway, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. LUSH:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Before he rises on his point of order, let me just say -

MR. SPEAKER (Mitchell):

There is no point of order. The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMS:

May I just say in conclusion, then, that I will vote against

this resolution with enthusiasm.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

What is the little rhyme, Mr. Speaker? "The fish she does not cackle/ 'Bout her million eggs or so./ The hen is quite a different bird,/ One egg and hear her crow." You see, Mr. Speaker, the fish is a Liberal and the hen is a Tory. That is the difference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Hon. members come up with a programme called the Community Development programme, and like the hen they cackle and they crow. Let me tell hon. members who invented the Community Development programme. Maybe hon. member are not aware of who created the Community Development programme. Maybe they do not know who originated the concept of working for welfare or working for dole in this Province.

MR. WARREN:

Clyde Wells.

MR. DECKER:

No. Close, but not quite. If hon. members were to take a stroll downtown and come to the street called Cochrane Street, Cochrane Street, as Your Honour knows, is named after a governor - not Lieutenant-Governor - of Newfoundland, Sir Thomas Cochrane, who was the governor of this colony in the years 1825 to 1834.

It was Sir Thomas Cochrane who introduced to Newfoundland the concept of working for dole, working for welfare.

Then those hon. members come in with this Community Development programme. They have stumbled upon something new, something never tried before in the history of this great Province, in the history of this Province that was once a country. Never before in the history of Newfoundland did we have such progressive legislation whereby people get out and work for their welfare. It was introduced by Sir Thomas Cochrane, who was the Governor of Newfoundland between 1825 and 1834.

MR. WARREN:

You are right, That is close to Clyde Wells.

MR. DECKER:

Let me finish the story, Mr. Speaker. When Sir Thomas Cochrane was called back to England from this country, he walked down Cochrane Street, which was not paved at the time. It was a very rocky street. On the very street which today bears his name, the St. John's people pelted him with stones. They pelted him with stones, Mr. Speaker, and they showed their contempt for a man who would bring in such a backward step. Because to make people work for dole, Mr. Speaker, is completely contrary to the whole concept of welfare. If you put people out fencing graveyards or digging ditches and filling them up again, you are doing absolutely unnecessary work. Work, Mr. Speaker, if it is anything, must be meaningful.

Adolph Hitler, in the Second World War, invented work which had no meaning when he put his prisoners

to work digging ditches and filling them up again. There is lots of work which has no meaning. We can get it any day. Any day at all I can take people down and ask them to dip out St. John's Harbour with water buckets. There is no one who will deny that it is work, Mr. Speaker, but it is meaningless work. I can put people to work digging ditches and filling them up again, but it is meaningless work. I can bring in a backhoe and do more in one day than fifty men can do in a month, because work must be meaningful.

The whole reason that I have criticized, as the hon. minister so rightly pointed out - and I take praise for it, and I want the world to know that I am criticizing this Community Development programme by calling it what it is - is because it is nothing but a means which has been invented by this provincial government to give people ten weeks stamps, to unload them from the responsibility of the Minister of Social Services and put them over on the federal government, on the unemployment insurance roles.

Now, that is all that the Community Development programme is. Number one, it is not progressive. It was started by Sir Thomas Cochrane, a former Governor of Newfoundland, but, Mr. Speaker, it shows the mind frame of members opposite. It shows that they look to the past. Every problem they are confronted with, they look to the past. The word 'Progressive' should be deleted from the title Progressive Conservative. It should be removed. Mr. Speaker, if I were allowed to attend some of those Progressive Conservative Conventions - I wonder if there is

any way hon. members could get a permit for me to attend? Could I attend some of their conventions?

MR. WARREN:

Yes.

MR. DECKER:

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) says yes. Will the member for Torngat Mountains undertake to get an invitation for me? I want to attend one of those conventions, and the reason I want to attend one of those conventions is that I want to present a motion on the floor of the Convention and the motion will be this: Whereas the mind frame of the members of this party is set in the years between 1587 and 1887; and whereas they are in a mind set; therefore be it resolved that this party today delete from its name the word 'Progressive'. Now, if I could only find a seconder for that motion on the floor of the Progressive Conservative Convention.

MR. TULK:

Would they let me in with you?

MR. DECKER:

Would you allow my friend from Fogo to come to second that motion so we can have it debated?

MR. WARREN:

We will have to see what happens.

MR. DECKER:

Ah, ha! I knew the hon. member would back down. Because they are not ready, Mr. Speaker, for the fresh air of liberalism that we would introduce to their their party. They cannot deal with the fresh breeze coming in, they cannot deal with change. They are so locked in the past that the word 'Progressive' should be removed from the name of their

party and it should be called 'Conservative' with a capital 'C', which is, by interpretation, I believe, Tory.

So the Community Development programme, their flagship, the one they get up and brag about is something which belongs in the past, it is not something which belongs to today.

The hon. minister, when he was up speaking, suggested that the Liberal party, a Liberal government gave away Churchill Falls. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to advise members about the king of all giveaways, the ultimate, absolute, unbelievable giveaway. Newfoundland, in recent times, has had one chance and one chance only to become a have Province. Newfoundland was blessed in that we had that one last chance and that one last chance was Hibernia. The hon. the Premier did not put Hibernia there, the Tory Government in Ottawa did not put Hibernia there, the Liberals or the NDP or nobody else can take credit for putting Hibernia there, God put it there. It was off our shores and it lay there dormant for billions of years, as day follows night and night follows day, and eventually it was discovered, not because we had a Tory government or a Liberal government. For goodness sake, Mr. Speaker, that is irrelevant. The fact of the matter is, it was discovered. About the time it was discovered, OPEC was formed and we saw what happened to the price of oil, to the price of gasoline and to the price of fuel; it began to rise, to skyrocket, and oil barons around the world, oil companies around the world were convinced that the price was going to go right through the roof, there would be no end to the price that

oil would go to.

This was the belief, this was the mind set, but what OPEC nations did not realize, and what many people in the world did not realize, was that a nation that can put a man on the moon, a nation that can fly to the stars is not going to be held up to ransom by OPEC or anybody else. So the American people put their minds to work, Mr. Speaker, and they showed OPEC that the price of oil was not going to go through the roof, that they were going to bring it down. And as the 1980s came in, Mr. Speaker, the price of oil came down.

Between the time OPEC was formed and the eighties, when the price of oil started to go down, the hon. the Premier, nobody else, was shadowboxing with Ottawa and, in the words of a former Premier, Premier Frank Moores, 'We missed the window.' Once to every man and nation comes a moment to decide. The moment came, the moment went by, and Hibernia will stay in the ground, possibly forever and all eternity, because we missed the window. If the Premier had not been so anxious to shadowbox, if he had not been so bent on playing political games with the minds of the people of this Province, if he had worked out a deal in the 1970s, Mr. Speaker, it would have been too late -

MR. REID:

He could not work out a deal without giving it all away.

MR. DECKER:

What did he do if he did not give it away? Hibernia has been given away. The Accord, Mr. Speaker, is not worth the paper it is written on.

MR. REID:

You gave away all our industries, every single one of them.

MR. DECKER:

A company today is registered in Bermuda which will never pay taxes to Newfoundland, which will never say that Newfoundlanders must work on the oil tankers, which will never say that Newfoundland will get preference, a company we do not even know, we can only insinuate, we can only pick up the word on the street that maybe it is a bunch of Tory bagmen. We do not even know who owns it. A company in Bermuda has first call on Hibernia, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. member that. If that is not giving away, will someone please stand up in this House and tell me what it is?

The Atlantic Accord was so big a farce it will make Churchill Falls look like a match stick by comparison. It will make Churchill Falls look like nothing. It is the ultimate giveaway. Generations yet unborn, generations yet to live upon this planet, when they read about the giveaways, and I would suggest, yes, Churchill Falls will be among them, but Churchill Falls will be minute in comparison to the giveaway of Hibernia, Mr. Speaker, because we had so much hope.

DR. COLLINS:

Where will it go?

MR. DECKER:

It will stay in the ground. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Collins) is so bad at doing his job I even forget his title. I will tell him where it is going to go.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is your job, old dagger?

MR. DECKER:

Old dagger Decker will tell him where it is going to go, it is going to stay in the ground. The consumption of oil is going down in this world.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, it is not, it is going up.

MR. DECKER:

The consumption of oil, Mr. Speaker, will only go up when the price goes down.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, the price is going up.

MR. DECKER:

Just yesterday, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) announced a small mini hydro project in Labrador. There is one in Roddickton which is run by Hydro, by the way, and which was put there in the seventies, a little mini hydro project. We can harness the wind, we can harness the waves, we can harness enough energy that we will never again be dependent upon OPEC or unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, upon Hibernia.

But if the Premier and his hon. friends had not been so bent on playing politics with Hibernia it could have been so far advanced today that nobody could back off.

As Mr. Frank Moores said, Mr. Peckford missed the window. He gave Hibernia away. So do not tell me about giving away resources, do not tell me about giving away Churchill Falls. I am proud of what the Liberals did in Churchill Falls, even though I was not here. But it is minute when compared to the biggest of all giveaways, the one that we had hope in. The absolute, ultimate giveaway was when we gave away

Hibernia, our last chance to be a have Province.

Mr. Speaker, the hon member, when he spoke, also spoke about the one-stop shopping. I would like to make a suggestion to the hon Minister of Finance about this one-stop shopping. Working for welfare is not a new concept nor is one-stop shopping a new concept. One-stop shopping was started by the former Premier, Mr. Moores, who hired Bob Cole. We all know Bob Cole. His job was to cut through the bureaucracy - it cost a fortune - and when the present Premier decided it was time to fire Mr. Cole, his contract has to be bought back. It cost this Province hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy back that contract from Bob Cole. Now, Mr. Speaker, this budget brings forward the same idea again. One-stop shopping, Mr. Speaker, is Bob Cole all over again. What I am suggesting to the hon. minister is this, whereas you are reinstating the concept of one-stop shopping, would it be possible for the hon. Minister of Finance to go and meet with Bob Cole and bring him back again? Because we have paid him thousands of dollars to buy out his contract, surely if he is a man of good will he will come back and work out his contract. Because he has already been paid for it, we can have one-stop shopping for years and it will not cost us any money. Mr. Speaker, I believe this would be a very progressive step.

MR. TOBIN:

What does Clyde Wells think about the offshore?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

He keeps slapping up Clyde Wells to me, so I suppose I will have to say something about Clyde Wells.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You have said something about everybody else.

MR. DECKER:

Clyde Wells, Mr. Speaker, has put on our party a big money problem. We have a money problem. If you recall, a few months ago we had a money problem, we could not get enough money. The Liberal Party owed \$173,000. We could not even get a meal in a restaurant without paying in advance, Mr. Speaker. We were having money problems. But even when we had that kind of problem I believe we were better off than we are now, because now we have money coming out of our ears. Everywhere we turn, widows, housewives, men, lumberjacks, farmers, Harry Steele, you name them, we have the rich and we have the poor, trying to give us money because they can feel the breeze blowing. There is such a trend toward Liberalism in this Province today that everybody is trying to get on the bandwagon, Mr. Speaker. That is what is happening. They are throwing money at us. We have a big money problem. Last night, Mr. Speaker, I tried to buy a red tie. I am going to a graduation up in Labrador and I tried to buy a red tie. You cannot buy a red tie in this Province anymore because there is such a demand for red ties. Everybody is buying them up. I had to come in today with a blue tie on, Mr. Speaker. This is what is happening in this Province.

My time is getting short, and in closing I want to speak to the Minister of Finance about this \$8000 which every man, woman and

child in this Province owes. I think it is time for the hon. minister to explain to Newfoundlanders just what is involved in this \$8000. A very dear friend of mine, up in my district, a man who is close to sixty years old with a family of boys, heard on the radio, Mr. Speaker, that every man, woman and child owes \$8000. But he knew darn well that he did not owe \$8000.

DR. COLLINS:

You did not mislead a poor old gentleman now, did you?

MR. DECKER:

No, Mr. Speaker, I did not. I am having difficulty explaining.

DR. COLLINS:

That is scandalous! You worried an old gentleman.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, would you ask the Minister of Finance to be quite for a minute?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

This fine, old gentleman heard about every Newfoundlander owing \$8000. He has two or three sons, so he sat down and he phoned around to the various shops, the various businesses in the place and he asked, does John owe you money? The poor fellow is confused. He believes that his sons owe money to the businesses around Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for the Minister of Finance to get up and spell out just where that money is owed.

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. member is unintentionally misleading the House. I, at no stage, said a poor, simple old gentleman in the hon. member's district owes \$8000. Now, I think members on the other side have said that, but I, on no occasion said that. It is a very shameful thing to confuse old people like that, worry them and cause them distress.

MR. DECKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

If the minister is going to say that those of our population who are over sixty-five do not owe the \$8,000, then will he concede that for every old person he knocks out he is going to have to replace with a young person, which means, then, the average will become \$16,000 instead of \$8,000?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

I would like to remind the hon. member his time has elapsed.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise, naturally, to advise you in advance that I will not be voting in favour of this motion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult having to follow the hon. gentleman from the Strait of Belle Isle who spoke for twenty minutes and only mentioned Clyde Wells once. Mr. Speaker, I find that amazing, an individual who has been bought by the Liberal Party, who has been paid to run in a leadership. Mr. Speaker, did the hon. gentleman say that all red ties have been bought up? No wonder! All red ties in the Province have been bought up because Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are ashamed of what the fifteen members over there did to their former leader. Now, all of the sudden, they are going after the Harry Steeles and others, and they talk about somebody with bank accounts in Bermuda. I wonder if Mr. Woodford has a bank account in Bermuda? I wonder if Mr. Steele has a bank account in Bermuda? I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if this is correct.

Mr. Speaker, talk about payoffs! And not only that, members of the Liberal executive were interviewed by CBC, they were asked what they thought of their potential leader being paid extra money, and half of the executive disagreed. Mr. Speaker, no wonder the Liberal Party has gone through eight leaders in the last eight years. I am sure Len Stirling was not paid extra.

MR. SIMMS:

Steve Neary certainly was not.

MR. WARREN:

Steve Neary was not paid extra. Mr. Speaker, I can sympathize with

the hon. gentlemen.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I am patiently sitting here in my seat trying to listen to the hon. gentleman and the noise coming, particularly from the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth up there, is just distracting. I cannot hear the speech that the hon. gentleman is making, and I want to hear it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order, but I would remind all hon. members that the hon. member is certainly entitled to silence.

MR. MATTHEWS:

And that applies to both sides.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that a bunch I would call the coattail bunch, fourteen individuals elected by the people in their various districts, would attend a convention in October, in Gander, and live footage shows the members shaking Mr. Barry's hand and clapping and everything else.

MR. TULK:

He had his hand shaken in Goose Bay, too - right?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I should say that I had the courtesy to not stick a knife in the man's back.

I am not sticking a knife in the man's back.

MR. TULK:

We know that.

MR. SIMMS:

You have the courage of your convictions.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I should say to the hon. gentleman that furthermore I got say that take up the bible and read the story of our Lord and his twelve disciples and, you know what, there was only one disciple that betrayed our Lord, only one. Here was the hon. member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), and how many betrayed their leader? How many?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fourteen.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just now got up and had very pious speech for twenty minutes with a very religious tone to his speech, would have the gall to make sure that the knife is not only put in the back of his leader but twisted while it is put in there.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. member the debate is on finances of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Relevance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, because that is exactly what I am getting to.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

You are absolutely right but if the hon. gentleman wants to go on in that tone, we have got no problem. Your Honour is absolutely right, but if he wants to go on with that tone, by all means.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to submit that part of this thing is on the deficit and there is a deficit in leadership on the other side. There has been a tremendous deficit, so there is a relationship there.

MR. SIMMS:

He raised it himself.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for bringing it to my attention but I want to bring it to your attention, Mr. Speaker, one

whereas there. "WHEREAS the Provincial General Election was called to give the present administration a mandate to create jobs." Now, one of the jobs I am talking about is the job for Clyde Wells. That is one of the jobs, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be created in this Province. So I am within lines of what the resolution is saying, Sir.

Now, Sir, to create jobs I guess I should get on to some of the -

MR. TULK:

No, no. Stay on what you were on.

MR. WARREN:

The hon. gentlemen would like for me to continue, my Lord. Mr. Speaker, let me ask you, Sir, the Messiah that is coming down from somewhere, was that the same Messiah that in the court on Hibernia, when there was a court action taken, was the lawyer for the federal government at that time. Who was the lawyer?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Clyde Wells.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Against Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN:

Now, who is Clyde Wells?

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is a lawyer.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Clyde Wells is a lawyer. You know, I am not very bright here so I want to make sure I get this right. So Clyde Wells is the Messiah - right? - and he is the lawyer that was hired by the federal Liberal government?

MR. SIMMS:

To fight against Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN:

To what?

MR. SIMMS:

To fight against Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN:

To fight against Newfoundland. Hold on now, I got to get this right. I got to get this right, Mr. Speaker, because this is serious business. Now, a lawyer that was hired by the federal Liberal government to oppose Newfoundland on jurisdiction for offshore, well, is this the same man now that fourteen members opposite are wanting to lead the party?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. WARREN:

No. It cannot be. No, no, no. You are wrong. It is not right. It cannot be right. They are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, how can it be right? I mean they cannot do that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

They will do anything.

MR. WARREN:

They were elected by people in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

DR. COLLINS:

Perhaps when they get him in they will knife him, perhaps that is what they will do.

MR. WARREN:

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, that might be what they are doing. Hold on. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is pretty smart. That is what they are after. They are trying to get him elected and, "Now, Mr. Wells, you did a bad thing for Newfoundland."

MR. SIMMS:

Watch your back.

MR. WARREN:

"Watch your back." Oh yes, I would think this is what they are after.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How much did he get paid?

MR. WARREN:

How much did the federal government pay Mr. Wells?

MR. SIMMS:

\$500.

MR. WARREN:

\$500?

MR. TULK:

He is worth a lot more than that.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, \$500, I would say there is a bigger anti than that, more than that.

MR. SIMMS:

\$5,000.

MR. WARREN:

No, more than that. No, Sir, more than that.

In fact, my figure may not be correct so I would just let one of the hon. members opposite, they know everything else, they might be able to tell me exactly how much the hon. member received.

MR. TOBIN:

Do they know if any other lawyers were asked to take it but said, "No way, I am not going against the Province?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Now, to my hon. colleague here from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), I mean, this is not true either. I am sure no one else was asked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

I do not know, Mr. Speaker. You know I will tell you this much - Now, Mr. Speaker, what are we getting into?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:

He decertified a union too. The Minister of Labour decertified a union.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I must say I must have opened a can of worms.

MR. TOBIN:

He was not very patriotic to Newfoundland because he sold out, in effect, to take the offshore resources from Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN:

That is number one.

MR. TOBIN:

He was not a patriotic Liberal because he had to be paid to run.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can see the headlines in the next provincial election two months down the road - just look at the big headlines, "Not one traitor, not Mr. Wells being a traitor to Newfoundland by going for the federal government and the offshore, but fourteen supporting traitors." Each one of these signed to get rid of Mr. Barry.

MR. TULK:

You got that wrong, fourteen are not supporting him, there is one running.

MR. WARREN:

Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, there is one running. Okay. Let me also say to the hon. gentlemen opposite -

MR. MATTHEWS:

He will not be supporting him much longer because he is not going to run.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, in fairness to our colleague who is running, I think the hon. member means thirteen traitors, not fourteen, although I am not sure "traitor" is parliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the protection. I should also say -

MR. TULK:

Traitor is unparliamentary, but we do not mind if Your Honour does not mind.

MR. WARREN:

I withdraw the word "traitor", Mr. Speaker, if need be.

I will say thirteen Judas Iscariots, that is the same thing. Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman that maybe they do not know and I should tell the hon. gentleman, the word is out in the street that due to the poor shape of the Liberal Party -

MR. MATTHEWS:

Which Mr. Wells did not know about.

MR. WARREN:

- Mr. Wells is having second thoughts.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is right. He did not know that it was in such bad shape. That is the rumour.

MR. WARREN:

This is not a rumour at all, Mr. Speaker, furthermore, after the leadership convention and if Mr. Well continues to stay in there, and if Mr. Wells wins, which probably he will, there is no doubt about that, if he stays in, here is what is interesting, the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island (Mr. Barry) is going to resign his seat and is going to let Mr. Wells contest the seat. Furthermore, Mr. Wells is not going to do it. He is afraid, afraid. He wants Stephenville.

MR. SIMMS:

He has to run for it.

MR. WARREN:

The seat is going to be vacant. He wants to run in one of those three seats.

MR. TULK:

Name them.

MR. WARREN:

Stephenville, Strait of Belle Isle, or Fogo.

MR. SIMMS:

The member for Stephenville is not fussy either.

MR. TOBIN:

When is he going to get the first cheque?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

No, he cannot win Bellevue.

Do you know what I would do if the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) resigns for Mr. Wells, I will take him on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

If someone wants to take on Mr. Wells and beat him, I will beat him in Bellevue any time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I know my colleague for Bellevue would not listen. I suppose I should say this, in all due respect to my colleague for Bellevue, if Mr. Wells is looking for Opposition member to resign his seat for a leader, at least the member for Bellevue does have experience in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

When does Clyde get his first cheque?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say on the night of the Coronation he will get his first cheque.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:

He is valued asset.

MR. TOBIN:

If he had to stay there now he would be leader.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes left.

MR. TOBIN:

Who is going to sign Clyde's first cheque?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Janet McCarthy.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I know I only have a few more minutes left, and we were talking earlier about creating jobs in the Province. I just want to show what emphasis that this government is placing towards the various communities in Labrador. Just in the Department of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, could you kindly take care of those two guys on both sides so I can at least take the last five minutes to explain what government is doing for the people of Labrador, in my district and in the district of Eagle River.

MR. MATTHEWS:

See if there is any coercion.

MR. WARREN:

In Pinware, a Labrador district, a community in a Liberal district -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

They are losing me. I am going to give up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I only have four minutes left, Sir, according to the clock. Can you ask everybody to be quiet?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development is spending \$10,000 in the community of Pinware in a Liberal district; \$10,000 in the community of West St. Modeste, in a Liberal district; \$50,000 in Happy Valley, in a Liberal district; \$36,000 in Cape Charles, in a Liberal district; \$15,000 in Port Hope Simpson, in a Liberal district; \$10,000 in Charlottetown, a Liberal district; \$10,000 in Rigolet, a P.C. district; \$6,000 in Makkovik, my district; \$10,000 in Makkovik, again in my district; \$25,000 in Postville, in my district; \$10,000 in Hopedale, in my district; \$25,000 in Davis Inlet, in my district; \$6,000, \$5,000, and \$5,000 in Nain, in my district.

Mr. Speaker, you talk about the government not doing anything for Labrador. In the district of Naskaupi, some \$513,000, plus \$605,000, in total, \$1,018,000 in the district of Naskaupi for the Indian Band Council. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my district: \$48,999

in Nain; \$24,046 in Hopedale; \$19,538 in Postville; \$49,108 in Makkovik; \$24,780 in Rigolet; plus \$560,000 this year in the community of Davis Inlet for housing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

There is a great deal of concern on my part because it seems to me that he has emptied the pork barrel and there is nothing left for the rest of the pork barrelers over there. Will the hon. gentleman stop? The next thing he is going to have his own colleagues after him because he has every cent spent that the government has got up on the Coast of Labrador. It is shocking! You better watch him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. I would like to remind the hon member he has about one minute left.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in concluding my remarks that this government has set out on a path of creating employment throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I have just given you indications of the three of the four districts in Labrador where money has been spent on a number of projects.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I should say also, I think, if I have the chance, what about the Department of Fisheries? Let us speak about a community by the name of the Williams Harbour. That is in a Liberal district. Williams Harbour is in a Liberal district. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will just throw in another place here. Let us see! Mary's Harbour, a Liberal district. Where is Baine Harbour? I am sure Baine Harbour is not in a Liberal district, is it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. WARREN:

Never will be in a Liberal district no more, Baine Harbour.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. WARREN:

Never will be, right.

Where is Harry's Harbour? Where is Cartwright? Fifty thousand dollars in Cartwright. What district is Harry's Harbour in?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the co-operation from the members opposite. I assure the hon. members opposite that I will do what I can to make sure you get some funds to assist your

districts.

Mr. Speaker, what about Red Bay? Where is Red Bay? It is in a Liberal district. Mr. Speaker, altogether \$567,000 for 373 jobs by the Department of Fisheries throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, to create employment. The hon. member for Bonavista North comes in with a resolution such as this! I think the resolution is a bunch of crap. It is just useless to talk about, Mr. Speaker.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, and have not will be no more. I adjourn the debate until next day when we will get at it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn - I think it is agreed we call it six o'clock - just to remind hon. members that this evening the Estimates to be considered at seven-thirty are Career Development and Advanced Studies. Tomorrow morning at nine-thirty,

Fisheries, and at eleven, Energy.

MR. TULK:
What about tomorrow evening? Do we start Development? Have you got that?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Yes, of course I do. Tomorrow evening at seven-thirty, Transportation. So, this evening Career Development, tomorrow morning, Fisheries, the first part of the morning, the second part of the morning, Energy, and tomorrow evening, Transportation.

DR. COLLINS:
Will the hon. House Leader make sure that CBC knows that Energy is going to be on tomorrow at 11 p.m.?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Tomorrow we will be back on legislation. We will continue with the bill on the Department of Development. Then we will proceed to the bill which was distributed yesterday with respect to the restructuring of Fishery Products.

The House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.