



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 24

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Monday

[Preliminary Transcript]

30 October 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):  
Order, please!

I was instructed to ask hon. Members, and it slipped my mind, whether or not it would be permissible for a couple of photographers from the news media, specifically The Canadian National and The Evening Telegram, to take still pictures. I do not know why that was necessary but they have asked me, and I am only asking your permission for this Session. I expect they probably wanted some particular pictures for the media, of some type. I have been approached by two photographers from the media, the Canadian National and the The Evening Telegram, asking if they could have permission of Members to take some still pictures throughout the Session today. They will not be coming in, but will take some still pictures from the doorways. I said I would ask, and it is up to hon. Members, of course.

MR. FUREY:

We do not seem to have any problem on this side, for today only, if there were people who did not have the advantage, at some point when the media were allowed in the Assembly, we see no reason not to do that on a limited basis today.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the request is for today is it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes, for today only.

MR. SIMMS:

I see. Because the problem is, of course, that we have a Committee that has been dealing with the whole issue of coverage, and I

think the position, up until now, is to try and find a way to extend privileges to all members of the press and not simply one. However, that aside, since the acting Government House Leader (Mr. Furey) has no difficulty with it, I suppose we have no real problem with it, but it should be for today only, until we deal with the entire matter.

000

MR. SPEAKER:

The Honourable the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, before we get to Statements by Ministers it is my sad duty today to inform you, Your Honour, and the Members of the House, that the father of the Government House Leader died last night, after a fairly lengthy illness, and the Government House Leader is not here today. I have just learned, immediately before coming into the House this afternoon, that the funeral is now scheduled for 1:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon, in Gander.

Now I know that there are a significant number of Members on this side of the House who would like to attend the funeral and I expect there are a fair number on the Opposite side who would also like to attend the funeral, so I propose, during the course of the afternoon, to have some discussions with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rideout) and the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Simms) to determine how we can best provide for that opportunity.

In the meantime Mr. Speaker I would ask the House to record its

condolences to the Government House Leader, and to all members of the Baker family, in particular Mrs. Baker, on this sad occasion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. House Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, we and this side, of course, would like to be associated with the remarks of the Premier, and also extend our condolences to the family. I personally happened to have had occasion in the past to meet Mr. Baker. Many years ago, he was involved with the town of Gander, and he always had a great reputation as a fair minded individual and one who did his job thoroughly, and was very well respected, I think, by people all over the Province. And so, we want to be associated with those remarks of condolence, and I say to the Premier, as an aside, with respect to the other point, that we on this side would have no difficulty in working out whatever kind of arrangement you would like to have, including that of perhaps not sitting tomorrow, if that is the case. Out of respect, we would be quite prepared to do that.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 27 - last Friday - I was made aware that Mr. Arthur Petten of Eastern Shipbuilders Limited had written a letter to me, with copies to the Fisheries Loan Board and to the Minister of Fisheries, (now I still have not received the

original letter, but I have seen a copy of it) in which Mr. Petten made certain allegations against the Minister of Social Services. These allegations claim that the Minister was involved in the matter of a court action taken by his brother against Eastern Shipbuilders Limited, and a claim that, as a result, the Fisheries Loan Board are unfairly treating Eastern Shipbuilders Limited.

The Minister was out of the Province at the time, attending a meeting of the Canadian Association for Community Living, in Prince Edward Island, and did not return until Sunday evening. Immediately upon the Minister's return on Sunday evening he met with me and I advised him of the contents of the letter. We agreed to meet again this morning to review the entire matter.

This morning the Minister assured me that any actions he has taken in the matter have been totally innocent and were not intended to, and in fact did not, result in his brother receiving any preferential treatment, by reason of being the Minister's brother. Nevertheless the Minister was concerned that this entire matter be reviewed and cleared without his influence being felt in any way. Accordingly he has asked that I relieve him of responsibility as a Minister and as Minister for Social Services until the allegations have been thoroughly examined and a determination made as to whether or not there was any impropriety by the Minister.

I acknowledge the Minister's great sense of honour and concern that there be no basis whatsoever for any allegation of impropriety. He felt that the determination could best be made if he were not part

of the Government while the matter was being reviewed. Accordingly I have acceded to the Minister's wishes. I thank him for his great sense of honour and integrity. It is a source of great regret to me personally and to all of the Members of the Cabinet, to lose the services, even for a short period of time, of the individual we all describe as the most dedicated and hardworking Member of the Cabinet. The Government will immediately ask a judge of the Supreme Court to do an independent assessment of all facts relating to the matter and advise the Government as to whether or not there was any impropriety on the part of the Minister. That action will be taken immediately and it is expected that the whole matter will be resolved quickly. In the interim period, the Minister of Health will discharge the duties of the Minister of Social Services. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker first of all let me say, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, that none of us in this House - whatever side we are on - take any joy in the Premier having to make the decision he made today, I am sure least of all the Member for Port de Grave. But there have been serious allegations made, and I think the Premier has chosen the wise and prudent course in having those allegations thoroughly investigated. We welcome the Premier's decision and I hope the inquiry does its work speedily, and that the Government will deal with the matter in a quick and

prudent way, and that whatever the result is, the result is. But the Premier has made, in my view, a wise decision. I think he has taken a wise course of action, and I can say to the Premier that we applaud him for it.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is not an easy time for me Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Social Services, to have to say this today. It has been a difficult couple of weeks for me and now this is another thing I have to deal with. I would like, at this time, as Minister of Social Services, to thank the Premier for what he is doing for me to correct the situation, and also thank the Opposition for their support. I would like to say to this House that since being elected in 1985 I have had one major concern, to deal with my job as MHA for the district of Port de Grave and my responsibility to the House of Assembly, and to the people who I serve. Since being appointed to Cabinet I have exceeded just the responsibility for Port de Grave, because I now have the responsibility of keeping the credibility of Government, as a whole, the credibility of the Province, and all the people whom I serve as Minister of Social Services. I want to say to everybody in the House of Assembly, and to the Province as a whole, that I have a complete clear conscience. I have done nothing wrong in my position as MHA, and in my position as Minister of Social Services representing the Government. All I hope is that in two weeks time my feelings, my honesty, my integrity, and the credibility of

Government as a whole, and mine, will be cleared, and I can continue on to represent the Province as Minister of Social Services.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to give the House a brief outline as to what is happening in the fishing industry, and what progress is being made in our negotiations with Ottawa to find some solutions to those problems.

As we all know the fishing industry is facing a very serious crisis. The crisis is caused primarily by an enormous reduction in the amount of fish available to the Newfoundland fishing industry. We have estimated that the cumulative loss of resource in the groundfish sector alone over the 1988-1990 period, is in the order of 120,000 metric tons. This reduction is comprised of Northern cod as well as other groundfish species, including flounder on the Grand Banks. In addition fish landings along the St. Pierre Bank, on the South Coast, have declined significantly and groundfish stocks in the Gulf of St. Lawrence are also in serious difficulty.

The Province has created a Cabinet Committee chaired by the Premier and including the Ministers of Education, Employment and Labour Relations, Development and Fisheries. Reporting to the Cabinet Committee, we have also established a provincial task

force which has been working with the Federal Government's Stein Task Force to find means whereby the impact of these reductions can be alleviated.

The Task Force conducted an early analysis of the problems facing the Province as a result of anticipated reductions in fish quotas. That analysis was reviewed by the Cabinet Committee on fish quota reductions in early August. As a result of that analysis a document was prepared for presentation to the Federal cabinet. That document entitled Resource Crisis in the Newfoundland Fishery, a Preliminary Assessment, was presented by the Premier and myself to the Rt. hon. Joe Clark, Chairman of the Federal cabinet committee, on August 23, 1989. The presentation was the start of a co-ordinated and responsible approach to this problem by the Federal Government and the Province. The Federal and Provincial Task Force are working closely together. This was indicated in the Premier's Release on October 5, 1989.

The Federal Government is responding quite favourably to the proposals put forward by the Province in the August 23 document. I am taking this opportunity to reassess these for the Members of the House.

Newfoundland is seeking, therefore, a long term comprehensive Federal Response Program which would have the following elements:

1. Short-term compensation/income support: Even in the short term this element should be used to foster the longer term economic diversification objective. This

could include more imaginative and creative use of the large sums paid out in UI payments.

2. The fisheries operational considerations and management measures to rationalize and increase the efficiency of the fishing industry.

3. Alternate developments in the fishing industry; non-traditional and underutilized species: aquaculture; additional value-added processing; marketing; fishing gear manufacturing.

4. An economic and industrial diversification program to create opportunities outside the fishing industry for persons presently engaged in the fishery solely because no other alternative is available. This will broaden and strengthen the Province's economic base.

5. Education and training in support of: greater efficiency in the fishery; preparing people for career change.

These elements, Mr. Speaker, will be refined and elaborated, and others added, as the work proceeds over the fall months. The Province will co-operate to every extent with the Federal Government in efforts to define the problem and design the response program. The Province will also co-operate in every way in the implementation of the resource program. However, the financial responsibility for the program rests with the Federal Government, by virtue of its exclusive jurisdiction in respect of, and obligation for, fisheries resource management and international relations.

Ministers and officials have met frequently with National Sea,

Fishery Products International and the Fishermen's Union, along with other stakeholders in the industry. I have been travelling throughout the Province meeting with the Chairman of Fishermen's Committees.

The companies have not yet informed us of the sacrifices of plant closures. However, they have indicated that it will be necessary to reduce their plant capacity in order to survive and continue into the future. In our representations to the Federal Government we have emphasized the fact that too much northern cod is being taken to Nova Scotia. In light of Newfoundland's historical dependency and based upon arguments of location, economic efficiency and adjacency we have argued that Newfoundland has a prior claim on this resource. On August 22, the Premier and I presented a document to the Federal Cabinet Committee which argued that northern cod landed in Nova Scotia should be transferred to Newfoundland. The Provincial Task Force has been meeting frequently with the Federal Task Force to identify remedial measures. In these deliberations there has been agreement on the fundamental principles that must be adopted to make our Fishing Industry more viable. If the Fishery is to be strong and viable, then we must take a different approach to the industry. We have to stop forcing the fishing industry to pay the price for the failure in our Regional Development Policies. What this means of course, is that we have to take measures to diversify the Newfoundland economy so that the burden of solving our unemployment problem is not placed directly on the backs of the Fishing Industry and on the backs

of our fishermen. Mr. Speaker, our Cabinet Committee is preoccupied with this issue on a daily basis. We are in daily contact with our Federal counterparts both at the ministerial and officials level. The Federal and Provincial Governments have been dealing with this crisis in an orderly and rational manner. I can assure you, Sir, that everything that can be done, will be done. I can assure my colleagues in the House of Assembly that these quota reductions have been given the highest priority by this Government. As you know Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Vardy, is chairman of the Provincial Task Force, which has been working with the Fishing Industry and with the Federal Task Force chaired by Mr. Ken Stein. In light of the importance of these discussions, the Premier and I have agreed that Mr. Vardy be relieved of his day to day responsibilities as Deputy Minister of Fisheries so that he can dedicate his full time to the work of the Task Force on Fish Quota Reductions. This group of officials includes Dr. Doug House, Chairman of the Economic Recovery Commission, Mr. Clyde Granter, Deputy Minister of Developments, Mr. David Oake, Assistant Secretary to Cabinet, Mr. Fred Way, Assistant Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Les Dean, Assistant Deputy Minister in the Department of Fisheries. This Task Force is backed up by a working group of senior officials, seconded from the Marine Institute, the Department of Development, the Cabinet Secretariat and the Department of Fisheries. Over the next six weeks, the day to day responsibilities of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries will be

carried out by Mr. Harold Murphy, Assistant Deputy Minister, (Facilities). Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to ensure that my colleagues in the House of Assembly are fully briefed on this major issue. I shall be providing a periodic briefing to the House on the progress of our discussions with the Federal Governments and with the Fishing Industry. I have no intention of minimizing or downplaying the enormous impact of this resource crisis and the quota reductions resulting therefrom. This will be a difficult and trying period for all of us. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that our attention will be focused, not only on finding measures to cope with the present crisis, we will also be addressing fundamental changes in public policy and resource management which will ensure that such crises do not reappear. I shall have more to say at a later date Mr. Speaker, about this search for longer term solutions and for greater stability in the Newfoundland Fishery.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to thank the Minister for providing me with a copy of the statement prior to the House opening. And I would like to say to him and all hon. Members in this House of Assembly, that he is right on the money when he says that there is a very serious crisis in the Fishery, both inshore and deep sea, in this Province. In literally hundreds of communities around this Province people are wondering what is going to happen to them over the next number of months, and next number of years. With the

statements that have been made by the Minister and the Premier over the last couple of weeks particularly, they are even more concerned about the future of the total fishing industry of this Province. With the statements on loan guarantees and professional fishermen, and other things, a lot of people out and about our communities are certainly living in a period of uncertainty. I would like to say as well Mr. Speaker, in reacting to the statement, that when we talk about the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government, one has to question - I guess it begs the question - the sort of centralist attitude and mentality that has been put forward by the Premier over the last couple of weeks. But we are talking about jurisdiction, greater power for Ottawa, lesser power in control and jurisdiction for the Province, particularly with respect to our Fishing Industry.

I am pleased Mr. Speaker, with the Cabinet Committee which is Chaired by the Premier, and all the other task forces and what not, which have been trying to deal with this problem on what seems to be an hourly and ongoing basis. But I would again have to ask the question: what else is this Government prepared to do to get involved and to help solve this pending crisis, besides holding meetings with Ministers in Ottawa and so on. There is more to be done. We see in the statement, as well, about the Federal Government having to foot the bill. When we went through the Fishery's restructuring crisis in the early 1980's, this Government, of which I was a Member, put in some \$36 000 000 to help solve that problem. I would like to know where the Minister and the Premier

and the Cabinet is coming from on the financial compensation issue as well.

The Minister talks about short term compensation income support. There have been a number of people in the Province that have called for that over the last number of weeks, including the union, and this party as well. And yes, this is something that has to be done, because fishermen and plant workers in this Province are going to be earning less money over the next number of years. And I think it is why we have to be realistic, in that we are not talking three or four years for this Province to correct itself, or to correct itself with all our help. We are realistically looking at eight to ten years before we see any significant increase in the stocks off our coast, and that is then, only if we have the total cooperation of foreign countries, and of course our own Canadian trawler fleets, and so on. So it is not going to happen in three or four years, and I think we should level with the people and tell them that, we are probably looking at ten years before we see anything significant happen.

Fishery's operational considerations and management measures to rationalize and increase the efficiency of the fishing industry. Again I guess that is what the Minister, in essence, was talking about over the last week or so, when he talked about too many fishermen chasing too few fish and professional fishermen. Are they going to have a certificate now in the bows of the boat saying they are professional, and those part timers and so on will have to get out? I guess that is the question that over the next week or so, the



Minister will have to answer.

The big concern of course, where we have deep sea plants all around our Province - some eight or ten of them - the big question is what, in essence, are we going to see happen to a number of our deep sea plants around the coast? I guess again, the Minister and the Premier are going to have to come clean on that - on what information they have from the companies - and tell people out and about the Province exactly what is in store for them. Will the tax stay as is, will it be reduced by a certain amount, or, if it is reduced more drastically, what the economic and employment prospects will be, for those people in these communities, over the next number of years? And of course, we look at alternate developments in the fishing industry. It looks very good on paper, but it begs the question again; how long will it take to put this kind of program in place, and how much money will it take, and who will fund it. You see, what is going to happen in the deep sea fishery particularly, is going to happen all of a sudden, and people are not going to have two or three or four years in order for some Government, of some sort, to come up with some alternate measures for them to be employed at. The other thing is, when you talk about an economic and industrial diversification program to create employment opportunities, Mr. Speaker. If you eliminate the fishery from the hundreds of communities along our coast lines, there will be no economic base. Because we all know those communities were founded on the fishery, and that is why the people settled where they did.

So you are not going to have any opportunities outside of the fishery. If they cannot put their boat in the water and go out and fish, what else are they going to make a living at? Are they going to paint beach rocks and sell them? That is the big question. I guess it ties in as well to the economic recovery team, and what grandiose scheme they are going to have to come up with, for the people of Gaultois and Trepassey and all the other communities around the Province.

So Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the Minister once again for the statement, but there is a lot of vagueness in the statement. While I appreciate the meetings and other things, this Government has not yet said what it is going to do to address the inshore and deep sea fishery crisis that is on our door steps. And again, I think we are making a very fatal mistake as a Province, if we do not push for further jurisdiction over our fishery. It has been a priority of this party for years, that there was a Newfoundland first policy, and I am quite relieved to see, I must say, in this particular statement, that finally this Government has come to its senses and said 'Yes, fish taken off our doorsteps and taken to Nova Scotia and other Provinces, should be put in this Province first to create employment.' We have always believed that on this side, and I am delighted to see that the other side has finally come around that way, and are now starting to espouse it in statements in the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the Cabinet Committee, according to the statement, is preoccupied with the issue on a

daily basis, and I say again, 'So you should be.' We have thousands of Newfoundlanders, in hundreds of communities, that are dependent on this to a very great degree. The situation is that if you take away what little bit of the fishery that may be left, you will end up leaving them with nothing, and that is what I would like for the Premier, the Minister, and the Cabinet to consider as we go about dealing with this particular issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to give a brief update on the status of negotiations with Ontario and Quebec regarding potential development of future hydro-electric resources on the Churchill River in Labrador.

On Thursday of last week, October 26, negotiating teams from the three Provinces met for the first time in Toronto. We reviewed preliminary technical information prepared by officials of the three Provinces comparing the cost of new Churchill River Hydro Power with other alternatives available to Ontario, it was clear by the end of this first meeting that both Ontario and Quebec are interested in the possibility of obtaining access to this power potential and that further discussions are warranted to fully assess options available to us.

Newfoundland's first priority, Mr. Speaker, is that an interconnection be constructed to tie any new development into the Provincial grid so that we can

displace our present terminal oil fired generating plants and meet our future energy demands. Any power surplus to our needs at that time could be sold to Ontario and/or Quebec provided that an acceptable agreement can be reached.

Our present electrical energy sources on the Island, Mr. Speaker, are projected to be adequate to meet the Province's needs until 1994-1995. To meet our needs beyond that time we must decide within the next year or so which new sources will be developed. If we can reach an agreement within the next year on developing the Churchill River plus an intertie to the Island power from Labrador would be available in 1998.

Such an agreement would also clearly affect our decision concerning the type of power source to be developed to meet our expanding needs beyond 1994-1995. Discussions are very much at the preliminary stage as they proceed on this important issue, Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to report progress periodically to this House of Assembly and to the people of the Province.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

I would also like to thank the Minister for an advance copy of his statement.

I am pleased discussions are underway with regard to Labrador hydro power, insofar as

economically and environmentally safe power on the Island part of this Province is just about all used up.

All of this Mr. Speaker, sort of reminds me of a comment former Prime Minister Trudeau made in respect of our relationship with the United States of America. He said it was somewhat similar to a mouse sleeping with an elephant, we are affected by every twitch and grunt. In negotiating with Ontario and Quebec we are certainly talking to, if not sleeping with, the two elephants of the Canadian Confederation. Insofar as the Newfoundland mouse no longer roars, but talks like a lawyer, I shall be following up on these items in the weeks to come.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to inform this Honourable House that the Province has completed a loan in Japan for the purpose of refinancing an earlier Japanese yen borrowing.

This new loan in the amount of \$7 billion yen is for a term of five years and carries an interest rate of 5.4 per cent. The proceeds of this new borrowing were used to retire a loan of a similar amount arranged in 1984 and which carried an interest rate of 8.1 per cent for a term of ten years. Thanks to the option that had been built in by a previous Minister of Finance, the Province had the option of prepaying the 1984 loan

after five years. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this refinancing is that, the Province will continue to have a loan of seven billion Japanese Yen outstanding until 1994, however, the interest rate for the next five years will be 5.4 rather than 8.1 per cent. This lower interest rate will save the Province approximately 1.6 million dollars annually in its current account. The new loan was provided by the long-term credit Bank of Japan Limited, The Mutual Life Insurance Company and the Bank of Tokyo Limited. The loan agreements were signed on October 24, 1989. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would also thank the Minister for providing me with a copy of his statement and I want to congratulate the Management Division of the Department of Finance, who are responsible, no doubt for this negotiation, and also for getting the Minister on his feet. We are delighted to see the Minister standing up, and we are delighted that the cameras are here today to take pictures of the Minister on his feet, indeed, it is an historic occasion. On the serious side Mr. Speaker, we welcome this announcement, this is a good deal for the Province, obviously interest rates are reduced. We had that opportunity as the Minister said, to repay this amount, clearly this Government is not in a position to repay this amount at this point in time and so they have refinanced, they got a favourable rate - I would caution the Minister though, to be careful of how much he is borrowing in markets such as the Japanese markets. The Japanese

Market is good now, it has been for the past number of years, loans that we have swung in Japanese Yen over the past seven or eight years have turned out very favourably for the Province, and we did a loan just about eighteen months ago, maybe a little less than that in Japan which so far as I understand is going very, very well and that we have done well by it, but I caution the Minister not to get too high per cent of borrowings in Japanese Yen. The Japanese market is good at the moment but it is a little insecure, and a little unstable, we want to be very, very careful and when I get an opportunity I will ask the Minister what his policy is in that regard, are we now abandoning the Canadian/U.S. Markets and taking the risk of borrowing in foreign currencies.

MR. SPEAKER:

Any further Ministerial Statements? Before question period I would like to, on behalf of honourable Members, welcome to the public galleries, the newly elected Member for Trinity North, Mr. Hynes. He is presently awaiting some, I was going to say judicious activity, not judicious but rather judiciary activity. I am sure all honorary Members would like to welcome Mr. Hynes. Also in the Speaker's Gallery this afternoon are the following council Members: The Mayor of Spaniard's Bay, MR. Lewis Gosse and the Town Manager of Spaniard's Bay, Mr. Wayne Smith and also the Mayor of Tilting, Mayor Josiah Smiths I am sure all of them (Inaudible).

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. First of all I would like to refer the Premier to Hansard of March 18, 1988. On Page 258 of Hansard of that particular day, the Premier in his capacity as then Leader of the Opposition made the following statement: "It is the position of this party" - obviously talking about the Liberal Party - "that no other province should have access to Canadian waters around Newfoundland for catching fish as long as the plant facilities and the fishermen in Newfoundland do not have an adequate supply of fish." Of course we all applauded that statement and the Premier then went on to say, "if, however, there was a surplus, obviously, we would have to share." And we all agreed with that. Finally, the Premier said this: "If there is no surplus fish next year, then it ends. It is fairly simple. There is no trouble to control that. If the hon. gentlemen opposite" - talking about us at the time, the Government - "are not capable of putting in place a plan to effect that, we will. There is no problem to do that."

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. the Premier is this: following and consistent with the words he uttered in this House on March 18, 1988, I want to ask the Premier what specific plans have the Premier and the Government put before the Government of Canada to date, since there is no surplus of

northern cod to the needs of Newfoundland and Labrador, to ensure that immediately every last northern cod is landed in Newfoundland plants for processing in Newfoundland and Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I am happy to oblige, Mr. Speaker. Let me address the question of jurisdiction first, because jurisdiction affects it. The hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), when he addressed the statement made by the Minister of Fisheries, talked about jurisdiction. I can only say that we are very fortunate we never had the jurisdiction that he sought, because we would have the financial responsibility for the mess there is today.

The proposal we have put specifically to the Federal Government to deal with this matter is, in part, based on what the Minister outlined. It is not just a question of being anti-Nova Scotia. We are not anti-Nova Scotia. The position we took with them is take into account every possible and conceivable argument there is in favour of Nova Scotia and Nova Scotia fish plants and then judge the thing fairly. We think that if that is done by anybody objectively looking at what has happened historically, they will clearly come to the conclusion that the fish that is available must be there to respond to the historical fishing of the Newfoundland fishing industry, the historical reliance of the Newfoundland fishing industry on that northern cod stock.

Now, the specific proposal we have put very clearly to them is simply this: look at what has happened with that northern cod stock and bear in mind that over the centuries, up until the mid 1970s, Newfoundland relied on that northern cod stock almost exclusively. About 75, I believe, or 80 per cent of its total codfish was derived from that cod stock, and no other province was fishing that cod stock. The Government, in the mid 1970s, on the basis of the scientific information that it had, contended that there would be about a 400,000 ton total allowable catch by 1991. I think the Leader of the Opposition will acknowledge that figure. So, they looked at allowing other users to come into what they thought was a growing stock, but they were mistaken. They did allow other users.

The present Leader of the Opposition made a terrible error and compounded the problem by developing this middle-distance fleet, which everybody knows was another assault on the northern cod that should never, never have been made. I suspect the hon. the Leader of the Opposition recognizes now that that was error.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

That was another wrong approach. So, we have said to the Federal Government, look, you have to be fair to the Newfoundland fishermen and the fish plant workers, and here is how you do it: You apply the principle of last in first out, and wherever it takes you it takes you. What you do is eliminate the users of that northern cod stock that were last allowed access to it. That would

eliminate the middle-distance fishery that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition set up when he was Minister, it would eliminate, I believe, the vast majority if not all - it may leave some portion of it - of the amount that is presently caught and taken to Nova Scotia; it would reduce it very, very significantly and allow for a greater increase of the fish that would be available for processing in Newfoundland and Labrador plants. That is the plan we have put forward. We said be fair. Do not cut off Nova Scotia because it is Nova Scotia, do it on the basis of principle. That is the plan in detail that we have put forward: Use the last in first out method, and we are confident, Mr. Speaker, that that will resolve the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, if that is the extent of the plan that the Premier and the Government have put forth to the Government of Canada, God help the fishery in this Province!

Let me remind the Premier again that he firmly committed himself in this House to ensuring that out-of-Province users of non-surplus fish would be stopped when he formed the Government. Now he is the Government, let me tell the Premier that last in first out will not do it, because Nova Scotia has been in there since 1977. It will eliminate the middle-distance fishery, eliminate the Resource Short Plant Program, and that is about it.

Let me ask the Premier what he has put in front of the Federal Government to ensure that all of the total allowable catch coming from 2J+3KL in 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1993 and so on, stays in Newfoundland and Labrador, consistent with his promise?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I will say again, Mr. Speaker, that what we put before the Federal Government was what the hon. Minister of Fisheries just outlined. We said, look at the historical facts. That is a fishery on which Newfoundland and Labrador relied for 300 years to provide 75 per cent of its cod fishery so that it must have priority access on the basis of historic fishing. Look at the dependency. Look at the adjacency principle. These are the principles they should normally apply. Look at and apply all these principles. Look at the reliance on the stock and look at the fact that a reduction of a 1,000 tons of that fish in terms of Newfoundland, is the equivalent of a 3,000 ton reduction in Nova Scotia; it will have three times the economic impact on Newfoundland as it will on Nova Scotia. Take those factors into account and, Federal Government, if you have any sense of fairness at all, you will make sure that Newfoundland has priority access.

This was the position we put to them clearly in the document on August 23, and it is all spelled out. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to read it, he will see it all spelled out. We

have told them that. We said, if that causes you problems in terms of protecting Newfoundland's interest as you ought to be in that way, then look at it on the basis of the principle of LIFO, last in-first out, and you would still give Newfoundland far and away the greater portion of that fish. There would still be some fish left to be landed in Nova Scotia, it is true, but it would cut the amount very, very significantly, by at least more than 50 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the principles of adjacency, historic dependency, and usage are not new principles. They have been part of the GroundFish Management Plan since 1977, and they have not solved the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is this: The Premier promised when he was on this side of the House to have a plan not a set of principles, a plan that would bring that non-surplus fish to Newfoundland plants. I ask the Premier today, consistent with those statements and consistent with the fact that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador ought to be able to believe their Premier, what is his plan?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I will look at the reference in Hansard to which he referred. I do not have it in front of me, but I will get it and I will deal with this question. If he wants more elaboration, I can say I have

spelled it out. We have done it properly. It is a source of embarrassment, I can understand, to the Leader of the Opposition, who was the Minister of Fisheries and responsible, in part, for the increased burden. This increase took place while he was Minister of Fisheries. He, himself, contributed to it with the Resource-Short Plant Program. We are going to try and resolve the mess that he made of the fisheries while he was there. We are going to do our best to make sure that the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador get the benefit of it. I know it bothers him and gives him a great deal of discomfort, but we are still, nevertheless, going to persevere, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Fisheries. Before I pose my question, I would just like to say to the Premier that he is the Premier. We know he could not believe on the 21st. of April that he woke up Premier, but he is and he has to go on and deal with this. He was the most surprised person in Newfoundland and Labrador. Again, I would say to him, if he had more jurisdiction over the fishery and could land more fish in Newfoundland and Labrador and employ more Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, then we could afford to pay the cost that you slough off so easily and say, we do not have the economic base to pay for. Put Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to work and you will have the

economic base; your Treasury will be richer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries to confirm for the House that he is in possession of proposals and options from the two major fish companies, FPI and National Sea, with a number of options based upon the TAC that may be set - they may stay the same or may be reduced. Will the Minister confirm for the House of Assembly that he is in possession of documents from both major companies outlining what the economic impact will be in this Province, and what plants will be closed under the different options?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, we have had numerous meetings over the past six months, I suppose - or four months anyway - with both companies. There have been a number of discussions explaining different scenarios with respect to quota reductions, but to date, to my knowledge, neither company has made a final decision as to what they are going to do, what plants they may be closing or if, in fact, they are going to close any plants at all. My impression is that they are waiting for the allowable catch, the TAC, to be established, following which, then, they will make a decision as to exactly what they are going to do.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister. I would like to tell the Minister that one of the major fish companies in

particular, Fishery Products International, cannot decide to close a plant in this Province without the concurrence of his Government, under the Fisheries Restructuring Agreement of 1983. So, if any plants are going to close, it will be with the concurrence of this particular Government.

I would like the Minister to come clean with this House of Assembly and with the Members here, and particularly with the people living in the eight or ten communities I referred to earlier, when I spoke in this House in reaction to his statement. Will he come clean and tell us that if the TAC stays as it is this year, for next year if it is reduced to 195,000, or if it goes down a bit more, what plants in Newfoundland and Labrador can we expect the company to ask the Government for permission to close so that the people in these communities can get about their business and their future and plan? Because out and about the Province today there is a lot of uncertainty, and people do not know what is coming down the pipe tomorrow. So would the Minister come clean in the House, inform all here who deserve to know, and inform the people out and about the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is not a matter of coming clean. I told the hon. Member that we have not been so advised by either company. We know they are anticipating serious problems, as you would expect. As well, both companies are required to give the Province a three month notice before they take any such action. To date, we have not been



told what plants are going to be closed, and I would not expect them to until they at least find out exactly the extent of the reduction in the total allowable catch.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not like it when the Minister says 'they have not told us what plants they are going to close.' I remind him again, they cannot do that. You have to concur with plant closures in this Province.

I ask you as a final supplementary, what is the Government's position regarding plant closures in this Province? Are you going to support the options put forward by the company to close one, two, four, five or six plants in this Province, or are you going to adamantly oppose it and take the necessary action to prevent that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the position of our Government was spelled out in the press release issued by the Premier some weeks ago, in that we said then, and we say it now, that if it comes to pass that a plant or a number of plants are required to close because of the shortage of raw material, this Government will do everything possible to ensure that the plant will remain open in terms of diversification, maybe harvesting and processing underutilized species. We are certainly not going to just allow Mr. Young of FPI, or the gentleman who manages, or is the CEO of National Sea, to close the

plants. They will have to satisfy us that there is no way the plants can be kept open.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the hon. the Minister. I would like him to be a bit more forthcoming in his answer. Will the Minister confirm or deny that both large offshore operators have been to see the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and to see the Government of Canada, and have put before both Governments a scenario, that if the total allowable catch is 235,000 tons, here is our operating plan; if it is 190,000 tons, here is our operating plan; if it is 125,000 tons, here is our operating plan? Will the Minister confirm or deny that both FPI and NatSea have briefed the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador on those various scenarios depending on various total allowable catches?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I said a moment ago. Of course both companies have come to Government, and I presume they have gone to the Federal Government, and they have explained what might very well happen if the TAC is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

You know now.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, we do not know. That is the point.

MR. RIDEOUT:

If it is 190 you know, if it is 135 you know.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, Mr. Speaker, we have not come to that. We have not come to that Mr. Speaker. Up to this point in time, we as a Government do not know what plants if any will be closed. I do not know if Ottawa can answer that question, but we do not know. They have a requirement to inform us 90 days prior to any such action, but certainly we are not aware at this point in time what, or if, in fact, any, plants will be closed. It is their decision, and they will tell us, I presume, when they make it and then we will react to it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

If the TAC is 190, you know what plants are on the block, if it is 135, you know what plants are on the block.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Premier about the Hughes Enquiry. In April, the Rideout Government established the enquiry and included in the terms of reference the power to make recommendations about compensation for victims. In June, the present Government

endorsed the Hughes Commission but stripped it of the power to make recommendations about compensation for victims.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, in view of the unfolding of the enquiry over the last several weeks, particularly in view of the evidence presented of criminal activity at Mount Cashel and of prolonged pain and suffering on the part of victims, will he and his Government restore to the Commission the power to deal with and make recommendations about compensation for victims?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, before answering specifically the question, I would like to correct one of the assumptions that were made, or one of the stated positions, that is not accurate.

Rather than decreasing the power of the Commission we increased it. We gave the Hughes Commission power to enquire into the extent to which the Department of Justice and Government generally has failed to meet its obligations in the matter. We increased it beyond being simply an enquiry into the Mount Cashel allegations in the mid-1970s. We broadened it to deal with all aspects, so that everybody affected by such allegations, which were not pursued at the time by either the police or Justice officials, would have these matters brought out and it would be made known.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we changed the proposal that we thought was inappropriate in the circumstances, that we ask the Commissioner to make

recommendations as to what should be the compensation if any to alleged victims of child sexual abuse, because, Mr. Speaker, we have a Crimes Compensation Tribunal in this Province whose function it is specifically to do just that. We did not see that there was any purpose or any merit whatsoever in taking it away from the Crimes Compensation Tribunal, who normally discharge that responsibility, and giving it to this Commission in this one specific instance. We did not see any merit in that position at all, except perhaps to sort of divert attention away from the failures of the Department of Justice over the years. We gave the Commission the responsibility to make the enquiries, to put out the facts, and we left with the Crimes Compensation Tribunal, where we believe it belongs, the responsibility to make recommendations with respect to compensation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I have to correct the Premier. The original mandate of the Hughes Commission was to enquire into allegations that the Police failed, that the Crown Attorneys failed, that the Child Welfare Authorities failed to deal correctly with the original complaints of child abuse at Mount Cashel in the mid-1970s. In excusing the stripping of the Commission of the power to deal with compensation for victims in June, the Premier said that

victims can always apply to the courts; he has changed his excuse now.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, is he aware that the Crimes Compensation Board is backlogged, it is having difficulty dealing with applications before it? I would like to ask the Premier, is he aware of the fact that very few of the victims who testified at the Hughes Commission have applied for crimes compensation? I would like to ask the Premier, does he not see that it would be more humane for these victims and more efficient for the justice system to have the one and the same process, the one and the same commission deal with both compensation for victims and also the system? Surely the Premier, more than most people, realizes the trauma involved for victims in telling their stories over and over again before more than one tribunal. If they go to the Crimes Compensation Board it is yet another tribunal, and it requires repeating their stories; it prolongs the agony; it delays the process of healing.

If they go to the courts in a private legal action, they have to incur the expense of hiring lawyers, and that is even a longer and more drawn-out process?

MR. SIMMS:

A good question. An excellent question!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier..

PREMIER WELLS:

I believe there was a question

back at the earlier part of the commentary and, if I got it correctly, it is would I not agree that it would be better to allow the Hughes Commission to do this than the Crimes Compensation Tribunal, and that the Crimes Compensation Tribunal was backlogged?

There may be some backlog - I do not know at this moment if there is, but I will check to see if that is so - and part of the reason is because they are already dealing with this very question and have already awarded compensation to alleged victims of child sexual abuse. There were a number I saw reported in the paper just in the last two weeks, or heard on the news media somewhere, that awards had been made to victims of these crimes. They are being dealt with, contrary to what the Member believes. I can understand she has a difference of opinion, but I believe she is wrong. I believe the right course is with the body that normally discharges that function. I think it is totally inappropriate to have all of this played out daily before the television media as some kind of soap opera. I think it is far better where it is set up at the moment, where the Crimes Compensation Tribunal can deal with the question in the normal privacy with which it deals with these questions, and award compensation to the victims when the time comes. They, of course, as the Member mentioned, have the option of going to the courts directly if they wish. Either of those options is open. Some of them have obviously gone to the Crimes Compensation Tribunal and have already been compensated.

MS DUFF:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to address this question to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker). Mr. Speaker, there are seven patients in this Province who are suffering from severe kidney failure, and they have been treated for the past six months with a new drug known as erythro poietin, and it is part of a National Compassionate Program - that means that the drugs are supplied free up to that point by pharmaceutical companies. This drug is considered to be a major breakthrough in terms of treatment of kidney problems.

Now that program is going to end in ten days time, so that the drugs are no longer free, and, pending approval by the Health Protection Branch, private sector insurance or the plans that we have under the Government for health cards for seniors or social assistant recipients do not trigger in.

What I would like the Premier to answer is, is the Government making any plans to provide funding assistance so that these patients can continue this treatment, which is so vital to their quality of life and their productivity, in view of fact that within ten days the funding will discontinue from the National Program?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I have to frankly admit, Mr.

Speaker, that not being the Minister of Health, I do not have the detailed knowledge of the matter of which the hon. Member speaks. I will take the question under advisement and ensure that she is provided with an answer tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

While the Premier is undertaking to look into that particular matter, would he also undertake to look into what the Department of Health is doing with regard to establishing what hospitals call protocols, to ensure that the other sixty-five patients in this Province who need this treatment would be eligible to receive it, and if the Government is considering funding assistance so that all patients in Newfoundland who are suffering from kidney failure will not be deprived of this very important treatment by reason of the fact that they do not have the \$600 a month to pay for their drugs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I will similarly take that question under advisement, and either I or the Minister of Health will provide the hon. Member with the answer tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

MS DUFF:

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

I have a question for the Minister responsible for Energy. He has

mentioned to the media and in the House that preliminary negotiations, at least, are currently underway with Ontario and Quebec with regard to Labrador Hydro. I remember, from personal experience at a First Ministers' Conference, that Premier Peterson approached us on this some time ago and the PC Government of the day indicated that Ontario's involvement was a bit too preliminary. However, Ontario is now in the mix and my question for the Minister is, in general terms, what are the relationships here between the three provinces? Who is the seller? Who is the buyer? Who is the Financier?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, clearly, we are the seller and they are the buyers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GIBBONS:

At this time, we have not discussed financing. That will be something that we as a Province will be addressing later, after we are sure there is going to be a development and an agreement.

MR. HEWLETT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

The minister indicated in a local newspaper story, "Newfoundland will demand a profit on power sold outside Labrador." Insofar as Quebec is already an exporter of Hydro power, if we sell to Quebec it will either resell to Ontario

or to the United States of America. Is Quebec again to become a broker for our power? Are we reduced to receiving commissions on Quebec sales of our power?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. GIBBONS:

Far from it, Mr. Speaker, very far from it. In 1998, which is the earliest time that this power could be available, both Quebec and Ontario are going to be in dire need themselves, and probably either one of them would like to have all of the power. I do not think either one of them is even dreaming at this stage of trying to export it otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

The hon. the Premier is trying to put up a big fight, at least in public perception terms, with regard to the Meech Lake Constitutional Accord. I ask this question to the Premier as a supplementary, is he willing to put up a similar fight on our constitutional right to wheel our hydro electric power across the Province of Quebec?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

The member can be absolutely assured that we will, Mr. Speaker. We will not abandon that right as the former Government did when it went off on an ill-advised attack on Hydro Quebec instead of pursuing the proper course. And that is the responsibility of the

Government of Canada, to ensure that every province has the means to get its goods and produce to market, whether that is in another province or in another country, or across one or more other provinces. This government will, Mr. Speaker, make sure that the Government of Canada responds properly to its constitutional obligations and accords to Newfoundland the means to get its goods and produce to market, and that the rest of this country acknowledges that.

Now, it may be that the present Government in Ottawa is not very disposed to that. But there will come a time when that Government is going to change, and when that change does take place, I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada will recognize the extent to which the people of Newfoundland have been grossly unfairly treated by the Province of Quebec in maintaining the position that they have, and they will see to it that the Government of Canada discharges its proper responsibility to this Province to ensure that we have the means of getting our goods and services to the market, or if we do not have the means, if they are of the opinion that it is in the national interest, that we do not bear the cost of that, that the nation as a whole bears the cost of protecting the national interest not the Province of Newfoundland.

The hon. member for Green Bay can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that this Government will protect the interests of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

DR. KITCHEN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. KITCHEN:  
Mr. Speaker, I have to table in the House four Special Warrants: One from the Department of Finance; one from the Department of Forestry and Agriculture; one from the Department of Justice; and one from the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

The Special Warrant from Finance is for an additional \$150,000, which is for the Commission of Enquiry on Pensions. This amount was required to supplement the \$50,000 allocation in the Budget. The Commission announced in the Budget Speech has been directed to review the Province's Employee Pension Plans and report to the Government thereon.

The Warrant for Forestry and Agriculture is for \$1,274,800, and it is required to cover the extraordinary costs of forest fire suppression during 1989. The Department advises that less than average amounts of both winter and spring precipitation resulted in a substantial increase in the number of forest fires and areas burned during 1989.

The Warrant for Justice comprises, first of all, the funding of \$100,000 required to cover the cost of a by-election not anticipated in 1989-90 Budget; \$533,500 required for the Royal Commission of Enquiry into the police investigation of child abuse at Mount Cashel Orphanage in

1975 and other related matters. The total funding requirements of the Commission now approximates \$1,033,500, or \$533,500 in excess of the \$500,000 allocation in the Budget.

The fourth Warrant, for \$896,000 for Municipal and Provincial Affairs, covers two points, one for the comprehensive Labrador Agreement, \$641,000. The thing here is that on July 21, 1989 the Federal and Provincial Governments signed a comprehensive Labrador Agreement. The total value of the component for water and sewer and waste disposal infrastructure is \$18 million to be cost shared 70/30 with the Federal Government. The Department indicates that in order to expend the appropriate \$7 million cash flow during 1990-91, it is necessary to complete the planning and design work this fall. So that \$641,000 is for the design work for that.

There is another \$255,000 in that same Warrant, for the same Department: During the 1989-1990 budgetary process we proposed that \$2,665,000 be allocated for Newfoundland and Labrador Inuit Agreement. However, in the interim, before the actual signing, an allocation of \$255,000 was included for the design work for Nain and Postville water and sewer projects.

These are the four Warrants, Mr. Speaker.

In addition, I would also like to table before the House, and I am required to do so under Section 26.14 of The Financial Administration Act, copies of Minutes of Council. There are three Minutes of Council applicable to Section 26.14 of The

Financial Administration Act covering precommitments, and one Minute of Council applicable to Section 28.3 (b) of The Financial Administration Act covering the creation of a new subhead within the Department of Development.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### Notices of Motion

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Economic Council Act".

As well, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department of Development".

MR. GIBBONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: A bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976", and a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department of Mines and Energy".

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Forestry And Agriculture."

DR. KITCHEN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. KITCHEN:  
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act, No. 2"

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973."

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Finance."

I give notice that I will on tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty.

Thank you.

MR. KELLAND:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.



I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department of Environment And Lands". (Bill No. 23).

MR. DICKS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DICKS:  
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department of Justice."

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The St. John's Municipal Election's Act."

#### Orders of the Day

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Development and Acting House Leader.

MR. FUREY:  
Order 1.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for St. John's East (Ms Duff) left off when we last sat, and has roughly twenty minutes or more left.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The member for St. John's East has concluded. I thank the hon. member for pointing that out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
It is my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to speak in the interest of (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker, one had to take some time to reflect back on the Throne Speech before one could get up in the House of Assembly and present any kind of remarks, because the Throne Speech, of course, was presented back last May, some six months ago now or close to that. May 25th, I believe, was the actual date for the Throne Speech.

So, I went back to the first red cover book introduced by this administration and I read through some of the things they had there, and some of them were rather startling actually. The first page: 'My Government will place before this hon. House new directions and alternatives for serving the needs of our people.' I guess we heard a lot of that today in amending The Department of Mines and Energy Act, amending The Department of Justice Act and amending The Department of Forestry and Agriculture Act. Those are really major, major initiatives, there is no question about it. '...new directions and alternatives for serving the needs

of our people. These will encompass the broadest possible initiatives to revitalize our society, our economy and the way in which Government itself operates.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that was just about six months ago. We have not seen much evidence of it on this side of the House, and I think it is fair to say that the public, the people of the Province have not seen a lot of evidence, but I shall get to that momentarily.

First I want to address the Throne Speech in the traditional way that it has been addressed, where Members of the House take the opportunity to say a few congratulatory words and make a few complimentary comments. I see the Super Snitch over there nodding his head. Super Snitch is the new term, by the way, for the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Walsh). Every time somebody in the Liberal backbenches has a problem with something the Government is doing, who runs to the Premier? Old Super Snitch. He stands so close to him, you can hear two heartbeats from the Premier. He is that close to him. Anyway, I see him nodding in approval and hopefully he will have some more information to give to the Premier as time goes on. The Premier shakes his head and that is fine. He is allowed to do that. At least, he is moving. That is one important thing we see here today.

Mr. Speaker, traditionally in the Address in Reply a Member in speaking in the House of Assembly would congratulate yourself on being appointed Speaker, elected by the Members of the House, your peers, but it happened so long ago I think we have all had occasion to congratulate you. Members

would congratulate the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, and they would even congratulate the Assistant Deputy Speaker, Deputy Chairman of Committees. That would be normal practice in addressing the Speech from the Throne.

The problem with this here today, of course, is that the Government found itself short. The House has reopened today after several months of adjournment, and what do we find on the Order Paper? What did the Government leave on the Order Paper to debate? The Address in Reply. The other two items of business on the Order Paper are not even tabled in the Legislature. So, after a four or five month delay, after the Government has had several months to prepare, there is nothing on the Order Paper for us to debate other than the address in reply. It is unfortunate in a way, but in many other ways it is very fortunate, because it will give us an opportunity to talk generally about some of the actions of this Government and what they have been doing over the last six or seven months, to talk in a general way to pass on to Government and to the Administration some of the responses we have heard from the public, from the people around the Province, because the Address in Reply allows you to speak in general terms, you do not have to be confined to a specific topic.

So I do all of that: congratulate the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Assistant Deputy Speaker, congratulate all of the Members who were elected and re-elected, congratulate the Premier for finally getting a seat in the House of Assembly, congratulate the Government on the Election, and remind them, of course, that

it was this side of the House that received the majority of votes, so they probably should not get too excited about the fact that they won the Government, because it may not last too long. This side of the House, this Party, received the majority of votes as Members opposite know. We have a fairly strong base of support.

I am delighted to see our new colleague in the gallery today, who will soon be taking his seat in the House I have no doubt, the Member for Trinity North (Mr. Hynes). Seated right behind him, of course, is the Leader of the other Party, who did not run anybody in Trinity North because they are making big plans for three years down the road, as we are. But the Member for Trinity North is here in the gallery and we are delighted to have him with us. We know he will make a valuable contribution to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and to the workings of this Province. I had occasion to work with him for a few days during the by-election, and I think the people of Trinity North certainly have given a message to the Administration, to the Government opposite. Whether they listen or not is going to be very difficult to say.

MR. TOBIN:

They got 93 votes less in the by-election than they got in the general election.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, and the Premier tried to give the impression that they made terrific gains. The reality is, of course, they received less votes than they did in the April General Election, but they did not mention that in passing. And the old snitch from Mount Scio - Bell Island was out, I understand, in

the Clarenville area doing some campaigning for a few days. The Minister of Fisheries was down in Catalina. They advertised for four days: 'A big rally in Catalina. Come and hear the Minister of Fisheries. He is coming down to make a great big speech.' My God, they would be coming from all over the place, you would figure. Not only that, he was accompanied by the Member for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque). This was on the posters four days in advance. He was accompanied by the Member for Bonavista South (Mr. Gover), the heavyweight from Bonavista South, and he was accompanied by the candidate who was running for the Liberal Party. The Minister of Fisheries knows all about this. He was down there for the whole day just about, at the fish plant shaking hands and everything like that -

MR. TOBIN:

How many showed up?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not the whole day.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, half the day - a fair portion of the day.

I do not want the Minister of Fisheries to tell me how many were there at the rally.

AN HON. MEMBER:

500.

MR. SIMMS:

About 40 or 50 people. Now, the Minister of Fisheries knows better than that. Ten people is just about right. Ten people, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

So they advertised all this for four days, big posters all over

town, the Minister of Fisheries with a great speech, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Big ads on the radio.

MR. SIMMS:

- ads on radio and everything, and they had a band, a live band, and they had, I think, forty-seven people, twenty cars. I was there, Sir, I counted the cars personally.

MR. TOBIN:

Does anyone know why only forty-seven showed up?

MR. SIMMS:

No.

MR. TOBIN:

Because at that time they were not sure whether the Minister of Fisheries was speaking on behalf of the P.C. candidate or the Liberal candidate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

That is a little side joke we have with the Minister of Fisheries. But, in any event, the Member got elected and he is in the gallery today. Very shortly, he will be taking his seat here on this side. So I welcome him, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not thank the voters of Grand Falls for the fine vote of confidence they afforded me seven months ago.

MR. DOYLE:

A sensible bunch of people!

MR. SIMMS:

I probably will send this out to The Grand Falls Advertiser, as my colleague, the Member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight)

will know. So I want to make sure I get my words straight and correct here. I want to thank them for the fine vote of confidence, the tremendous majority they gave me, as the Member for Windsor - Buchans knows, the largest majority ever given to anybody who ever ran in that district, by the way. Some of you will recollect what happened in 1985, when for four years I was called 'Landslide Simms' after a very narrow victory in 1985. Now they can truly call me 'Landslide Simms' because I received a very big majority and a big vote. I am happy about that, and I want to thank the people of Grand Falls.

Let me get back to The Throne Speech.

I will have to repeat some of this, because it is so long ago, probably Members opposite forget.

The Throne Speech, itself, was a very, very vague document. I think everybody will agree with that, even Members opposite. Most of it contained promises of no commitment at all, in fact. Everywhere there were words like 'in due course', 'as soon as funding is available', 'when funding permits', 'as soon as possible', 'we will give appropriate attention to'. Those were the terminologies used in The Throne Speech - very vague. And, in fact, The Evening Telegram of the day said, 'There is little in this Throne Speech different from any other.' That was one thing they said. It also said 'The Throne Speech was long on rhetoric and sparse in detail', which was quite true. And it said, 'Liberal plans were outlined in the election and therefore, the Speech had little new to offer. Among

promises regurgitated were a commitment to stem the tide of out-migration' - and we have seen the effect that that policy has had - 'and more job opportunities for young people' - and we have certainly seen the effect that that promise in The Throne Speech has had. The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations should hang her head in shame, I guess, because of what is happening with the unemployment rate in Newfoundland, and the cancellation of The Private Sector Employment program, all of those kinds of things that have been really very shocking, and nothing to be happy about.

Now, my friend from Windsor - Buchans, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, always tries to goad me into saying something. Well, since we are on the topic of The Throne Speech and since he has opened his mouth - obviously, the Premier is not in his seat, otherwise he would not dare say a word - but now the Premier is gone so he says something. He is talking about The Throne Speech, no doubt, and The Grand Falls Advertiser and all these kinds of things.

Here is what the Member for Windsor - Buchans said about The Throne Speech in 1987. I just happened to have it here, because I had a feeling he might have something to say. The Member for Windsor - Buchans says - if I can find it - and I do not know why the Government did not take the advice of the Member for Windsor - Buchans, by the way. He said publicly in 1987, when I was speaking in The Throne Speech, that there was nothing in our Throne Speech about the water treatment plant for Grand Falls. Does the Member remember that?

The Member must remember that. And I said, 'You would not announce those kinds of things in a Throne Speech.' And do you know what the Member said? For those who want to follow it up, see Hansard, the bottom of page 435, March 10, 1987: I said, "I tell the hon. Member that you would not announce a water treatment plant, you would not announce the problem with the regional incinerator in the Throne Speech." Mr. Flight: 'I would.' That is what he said, 'I would if I were in the Government.' Well, Mr. Speaker, he is now in the Government. And I have looked everywhere in this Throne Speech document, I have looked on every single page that is there, every page, all sixteen pages, and there is not one mention, not a mention -

AN HON. MEMBER:

It has to be in there.

MR. SIMMS:

No, it is not there. Not a mention.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It has to be in there.

MR. SIMMS:

Perhaps the Member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), the Minister of Forestry, will get an opportunity to speak in the debate, perhaps he will follow me. Who knows! And perhaps he can then tell us how come when he was on the Opposition side he said it would be in the Throne Speech, if he was there in Government, now he is in the Government and it is not there. So maybe he can mention that just in passing, and that is really something in passing.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few minutes to talk about the

District of Grand Falls which I represent, and the Town of Grand Falls. I am only going to be brief, but I want to try and make a point. The point is, this particular community is a very progressive community. It has a very strong business community in the town.

MR. DOYLE:

A strong Member.

MR. SIMMS:

A strong business community who will fight like the dickens to get things done in the Town. It is, in fact, the industrial base of Central Newfoundland without question.

MR. DOYLE:

A good Member.

MR. SIMMS:

It has a major employer there, Abitibi Price, which is something I hope the Minister will also respond to one of these days. And it employs as many people probably from outside of Grand Falls, as from Grand Falls. As many people from Windsor, Bishop's Falls, Botwood, all of these places, work in the town and community of Grand Falls, as work there from the Town of Grand Falls.

Mr. Speaker, it is a progressive community, as I said, a modern town. It has a major hospital facility which was just completely renovated by the previous Administration, at a cost in excess of \$20 million. A beautiful facility. It has a strong Town Council, with a strong staff, that has done a lot of work to improve the lot of the people in the Town of Grand Falls and the surrounding area. They have done a lot of work. And it is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, since it is

one of the fastest growing communities in the Province, it is for that reason that I sincerely expressed the hope, several months back, when this new Government took place, that that community would not be attacked, would not be kept down from making progress, simply because of its politics, simply because it elected a Progressive Conservative Member to the House of Assembly.

And, Mr. Speaker, we hear the Premier opposite, on occasion after occasion, saying no community will be treated unfairly because it elected a Progressive Conservative. We have heard that time and time again. The Members on the other side who attended the rally in Shoal Harbour during the by-election in Trinity North, heard the Premier -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not a big crowd.

MR. SIMMS:

No, not a big crowd again. Originally they planned to have the rally in the stadium, then they were going to look for a bigger hall in Clarendville, and finally they had to move it down to Shoal Harbour.

AN HON. MEMBER:

One hundred and forty-seven.

MR. SIMMS:

They had one hundred and forty-seven people there. But Members opposite know what I am talking about. The Premier said again, much to the chagrin of the Liberal candidate, that nobody will be treated unfairly, no District will be treated unfairly because it votes PC, no District.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I make that point, and I say that, because I

want to ask the following: whether or not the Members in the House, would consider the following to be unfair treatment of a constituency that has voted an Opposition Member into the House of Assembly. For example, in my own District, this Administration, this Government has halted a number of projects. They have halted the water treatment plant. They have halted the expansion to the Central Newfoundland Community College. They put a stop to that, which is probably one of the biggest needs out there, and I am surprised the Minister of Education (Dr. Kitchen) would even let that happen, but it has happened. They halted the expansion to the Central Newfoundland Community College. They halted the funding contribution that we put forward as a Government, and we committed and announced for the Regional Recreation Complex. All of these facilities, by the way, the water treatment plant, the community college, and the recreation complex was to serve the entire region, not Grand Falls, but Grand Falls, Windsor, and Bishop's Falls, represented by two Members of the Government on the other side.

They halted the paving of a downtown arterial road that was committed and approved. They halted and cancelled the \$25,000 recreation grant for the curling club, which was announced and committed. The Minister of Forestry has all kinds of problems out there now with the Wooddale operation - which we will get to the bottom of one of these days, very, very soon, I might add - there are going to be cut-backs there in employment, and it used to employ upwards of 200 people; it used to be a great operation

for employment. So I say to the Members opposite: I have listed all of those things, can Members opposite honestly sit there and shake their heads and tell me they do not think that Grand Falls is being unfairly treated? All of these things that were committed and announced, have all been halted, cancelled, stopped. Mr. Speaker, I say to Members opposite that they are not really listening, and they are not being fair to themselves. The Premier says 'no district will be treated unfairly.' Now Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about in the District of Grand Falls is being talked about all throughout the Province. This is the point I want to make. This is not only coming from the people of Grand Falls, it is coming from people all over the Province, and all Members on this side have had opportunities throughout the summer, to travel around the Province, and we have heard an awful lot of people telling us of their dissatisfaction with the Government. Mr. Speaker there is one particular term that you hear quite frequently, that this Administration will be a one term Administration, that is what we hear consistently throughout, throughout, throughout, and it is not just being told to us by Conservative supporters, there are quite a few Liberal supporters who are very unhappy with the performance. The Minister of Finance laughs, he can laugh all he wants, he can laugh all he wants, we will see what happens in a few years. The problem is this Mr. Speaker, and the point is this, Mr. Speaker, there are many negative feelings, and this is very unusual for a Government having just been elected - now in its seventh month by the way - a quarter of its term just about

over, and nothing has happened. They have not done a thing, and what is more unusual, Mr. Speaker, is that people are talking so negatively about this Government. I have not heard the like of it in my life, and because of all of that negativism, because of all that negativity, Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility on this side of the House to represent those people who we have communicated with and who have communicated with us, we have a responsibility to represent them in this Legislature, and to reflect their views and their opinions as best we can. Bearing that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move the following nonconfidence motion in the Government, in the form of an Amendment to the Address in Reply. I have a copy of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, which I will send to you after I read the motion, and you can tell me if it is in order or not, I submit that it will be. I move Mr. Speaker, and as seconded by my colleague the Member for Grand Bank, that all the words after "that" be deleted in the motion before the House, and the following words substituted therefor: "This House deplores the Government's failure to deal adequately with the real problems facing our people and its failure to provide competent management to our Province". Mr. Speaker wants a few seconds to consider it, fine, there are all kinds of copies here. We will see now, after seven months in office? If Your Honour wishes it, I can just mention to him that this is the traditional motion and copy of the resolution, or motion, that is generally put at this time.

MR. SPEAKER (Snow):

I am just waiting for the Speaker to return.

MR. SIMMS:  
Pardon me?

MR. SPEAKER:

I just want to consult with the Speaker for one minute.

MR. SIMMS:

Does The Chair want to recess?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes for one minute?

MR. SIMMS:

Sure.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

This is in order. I ask the hon. House Leader for the Opposition Party to resume his remarks.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this motion, this amendment, this non-confidence motion is not made in jest, I can assure hon. Members of this House. It is made sincerely because of the representations that we have received, time and time again, from people all over this Province, over the last several months. It is because it is such an unusual set of circumstances, a very unusual set of circumstances for a new Government, a new Administration, in office now only seven months going on seven months, to have such animosity and such negativity being expressed by the people around the Province. Let me tell you why, let me refresh Members feelings or Members memories, let me give you some of the reasons why. People remember, for example, that in two short months after the last general election,



the Minister of Finance stood in this House and he introduced a new taxation policy - an increase in taxation that represents probably about \$100 million. Now that is one issue to remember. Fuel tax was increased, drivers licence went up, alcohol went up, corporate income tax went up, personal income tax went up. So that is point number one.

Point number two. Do you remember all of the Members opposite, who used to sit over on this side, talking about closing hospital beds? Members opposite used to criticize us, when we were in Government, for closing hospital beds. Well not only, Mr. Speaker, have they kept hospital beds closed all over the Province, they have in fact actually, literally, closed hospitals. They announced plans to close facilities in St. Lawrence and Grand Bank. There was a ten per cent tuition fee increase at all post secondary institutions around the Province. The private sector employment program was cancelled. We were told they were going to re-introduce or introduce their own little program, their Liberal program. And what has happened since; the unemployment rate has increased and we have lost probably over a thousand or more jobs from the private sector employment program.

Amalgamation: people are sick and tired, and communities are sick and tired of having amalgamation forced down their throats, by a Government which had no mandate - which had no mandate to pursue this amalgamation issue. It came from right out of the blue. And what happened is, the new Minister got himself in hot water. He went out and was going to take the strong arm approach - tough fisted

approach - and said, 'You will amalgamate or else', until the Premier came along and pulled the rug out from underneath him. People remember that Mr. Speaker. People remember that.

I just want to whip through this. I have thirty-five or so little points here I want to make, so if my colleague would give me the courtesy. The censorship issue: the Minister of Education got himself in a lot of hot water over that one and he knows it. He is smiling now but he was not smiling two or three months ago, I can tell you Mr. Speaker.

The second Bell Island Ferry, which had been committed, was cancelled. The second Bell Island Ferry, which had been committed, was cancelled.

Remember the Bay d'Espoir Hydro Center? The Center was going to be moved back to Bay d'Espoir from St. John's. Paid ads on the radio by the Member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir all through the election. 'If I am elected, I will move them back to Bay d'Espoir'. People remember that Mr. Speaker. People remember these kind of back-offs.

The Economic Recovery Team (its Minister is Doug House) is going to usurp all of the powers of the Minister of Development. There is no such thing as development any more. We do not hear of it. We never hear of rural development, that is for sure. We hear nothing about development at all. The fishery - we addressed it today in question period on a few occasions - I ask Members to reflect on these things, the fishery is in a shambles. The Government does not appear to be doing anything, nothing. The people and the

fishermen are out there crying out, wondering what this Government is going to do. Nothing.

Conflict of interest: remember the conflict of interest in the one month session we had? No conflict. The Premier got up every day, 'No conflicts, no conflicts.' And what happened? Three of them got rid of their conflicts, and told the press they had gotten rid of their conflicts, even though the Premier had said there were no conflicts. People remember this. Remember the regional recreation facilities, where there had been commitments and cheques already approved for three projects in this Province? And what has this Government done? What have you done with the cheques? You have taken them away from the people of the Connaigre Peninsula, Fogo.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
And Terra Nova.

MR. SIMMS:  
No, it was not Terra Nova. Bonavista North, the Speaker's own district, Mr. Speaker. People remember these things. No patronage in this Government. Never any patronage in this Government. I will not mention any names. Some of the Members opposite remember some of the patronage, even though the Premier said there will be no patronage. There will be no political favouritism, and we get a list of recreation grants, that are approved by the Cabinet, which represent about \$800,000, \$760,000 of which goes to Liberal districts and \$50,000 of which goes to PC districts, 10 per cent. Members opposite have the gall to sit there, and the Premier has the gall to stand and say there will

be no political favouritism shown. What about fairness and balance?

MR. TOBIN:  
That is fairness and balance?

MR. SIMMS:  
People remember this stuff. They have told us about it. The first year of university - Labrador West - remember that commitment? The Premier said, 'I will deliver it in September.' Well, maybe not September, maybe 1991, maybe 1990, eventually they agreed to deliver it in January, but the people in Labrador West remember it, Mr. Speaker. Then he talks about the importance of having a co-operative approach with other Governments in Canada, a co-operative approach with the Federal Government. Remember when he used to criticize our Government, if we had any confrontation at all with Ottawa? What about the new Government's confrontational attitude with other jurisdictions, which we will hear more about as time goes on? The school tax: all the election promises during the election, the paid ads - we will abolish school taxes. Oh, yes, the Minister can shake his head all he wants, but that was the ad, and nothing has happened with that. The Minister of Labour has not said a word, not a peep, about all the difficulties there are with respect to the construction industry, and now with respect to some of the public service unions. There is all kinds of trouble building up with labour. She also is the Minister that cancelled, or put on hold, the occupational integration program for women. She put that on hold.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No, she did not.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, she did. And what about the firings, Mr. Speaker? This is item number twenty-odd. What about the firings of the career public servants in our Province, who have made a deep commitment to serve the public and the people of this Province? The purge - what about that? Do you know what is happening, Mr. Speaker? Members opposite laugh, they sit there and shake their heads and nod in approval, everything is fine and hunky-dory. But, do you know what has happened to the public servants of this Province? Do you know what has happened to them? The people in this Province who work for the public service are absolutely demoralized. They spend all day long walking around looking behind their shoulders and, Mr. Speaker, that should not be. The people who have worked in this Province in the public service have worked hard and deserve a little more than this Government is showing them. I can tell every one of you, and you are laughing and nodding about it, let me assure you that what I have just said is a fact. It is an absolute fact and we are obviously hearing about it all the time. People come to the Opposition and tell us these things. That is where we are hearing about all of these matters. What kind of optimism has the Premier been showing with respect to Hibernia development? Tell me about that if you want to laugh and nod about something. What kind of optimism has he been showing? He has not been showing one iota of optimism and the industry people are absolutely fed up with him. The Minister knows, because I know people who told the Minister, will you get 'Clyde' to be a bit more optimistic, and not be so negative and pessimistic. They are

absolutely poisoned with him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Then we hear all kinds of other things, like Cabinet interference in the fish processing licence system. We hear stories about that. We hear stories about political Cabinet interference in other public tendering processes, some of which will be raised in the House of Assembly very soon, I suspect.

MR. TOBIN:

Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMS:

Other than that one. There are others. Those are the kinds of things that people remind us of, Mr. Speaker.

They also remember the ads during the election campaign about people leaving Newfoundland and going to Toronto and 'Clyde' says, 'We want to bring them back. We must bring them back.' And every second week on television we see somebody loading up a truck and heading off back to Toronto from Placentia District and all over the place, Mr. Speaker. So they do not believe it. They just do not believe this Government.

Economic growth: the base upon which this Premier tries to build his reputation - economic growth. Have you looked at the economic outlook for Newfoundland and Labrador put out by the Investment Dealers Association of Canada? Do you see it? The economic growth for this year, 1988 was 3.8 per cent. This is in real terms. In 1989 the economic growth will be 1.7 per cent, nearly half. Now that is a nice positive outlook

and a nice positive attitude to have floating around the Province. Maybe you can ask the Premier why?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Why?

MR. SIMMS:  
Well he is not here. I would ask him if he was here, but I would not expect to get a straight answer.

Mr. Speaker, there is a whole bunch of other things. They just hired a new constitutional expert, a lawyer from Toronto.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, no!

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes, from Toronto. He brought another one back home from Toronto, but it was not a Newfoundlander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:  
But more interestingly, and the Leader of the NDP Party is not here, more interestingly this person is a self-professed Social Democratic.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What?

MR. SIMMS:  
Now what do you think that means?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:  
She also is a self-professed supporter of the Trudeau constitutional vision of Canada. She is a self-professed supporter of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
So now we can see where we are going with respect to this debate.

But I ask this question: \$60,000 in salary, I think, or \$57,000, the Premier was quoted?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Less than Peter Lougheed's figure.

MR. SIMMS:  
Oh, it might very well be. But the point is it is \$57,000 or \$60,000 in salary. It is also several thousands -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You paid for his services.

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes, which you attacked us on. Now you turn around and do the same thing.

MR. FUREY:  
\$100,000.

MR. SIMMS:  
What kind of hypocrisy is this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:  
Plus travel expenses. Thousands and thousands of dollars.

But I want to know this: What is wrong with the lawyers in the Department of Justice? There are constitutional experts in our own Department of Justice who are Newfoundlanders, Newfoundland lawyers.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Ron Penney.

MR. SIMMS:

Answer that.

I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker, they cannot answer it. None of them, because none of them know anything about it. It was done by the Premier. Everybody knows she was hand picked. He met her at a conference or a meeting several months ago up in Toronto somewhere, and said, 'My God, how would you like to come to Newfoundland? How would you like to come down, since you tell me now that you support Mr. Trudeau's philosophy on the Meech Lake Accord and all the rest, or on the constitution, and therefore you support my philosophy', said the Premier. Come down and work for us, make it look like we are really going to do something about this?'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend -

AN HON. MEMBER:

I hope he does not keep going to Toronto.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, the Premier better cut down on his trips to Toronto. Every time he goes up he brings somebody back from Toronto.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will not bring up expense accounts. I will not bring it up. I saw the Minister's disclosure in The Sunday Express a couple of weeks ago, about how the Minister is not travelling first class, all his travelling expenses have been cut down. I suppose they are, Doug House is doing all of the travelling for the Government now. They do not need a Minister of Development.

I will not mention Ministers' ads in the weekend papers or in The Newfoundland Herald, all of that

nonsensical stuff. We would not mention that, except for the fact the Premier said there would be no more of it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There will not be either.

MR. SIMMS:

Is this after today again now? You are aware of the latest ones I guess, are you? Because if you are not -

AN HON. MEMBER:

We are having them checked-out now.

MR. SIMMS:

Good. I am pleased to hear that.

I do not want to waste the time of the House on such a minor little matter, but since the Premier made an issue of it, we thought that we had to keep reminding him, obviously.

So, Mr. Speaker, on and on, and on and on, this litany of failures, people come to us constantly with all of these negative feelings. Now this is a Government that has been in office for six, seven months. Now you have allowed them a honeymoon period, you let them make some mistakes, you let them make some errors, but Mr. Speaker, I just rambled off twenty-nine or thirty minor little things that happened, some major, and if you are going to keep going in that direction you will have this problem. This why we have a responsibility as an Opposition to bring this to your attention, so that you in the backbenches who want to get into the Cabinet, particularly the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, should pay it close attention. Those of you who want to, please ask the Premier, please ask the Ministers, confront them and say, what in the name of

heavens are you doing with all this stuff. We are never going to get elected again if you keep up this direction.

Let me just conclude with this, I know the Minister of Development wants to have a few words, I gather, and perhaps somebody else might want to speak. I just want to say this. The thing that really has galled most Newfoundlanders lately, the last several weeks - the Premier has heard it, but I am going to say it again on behalf of those people who have told me about it, and there are literally dozens and dozens - what have the Premier and the Government been doing through all of this, the fishery collapse and all the rest of those things that I mentioned? Oh, he has been doing something. He has been trying to enhance his personal image at the national political level.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He has gone to a lot of work trying.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, but he has been trying. He has been on every television station from here to Kamloops, British Columbia, I suppose. Talking about -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The National Leadership.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, no, not about the National Leadership. I do not know but he might. You never know with this Premier, he might change his mind tomorrow. He has changed his mind frequently during the last six months. He may just do that.

But he is spending his time trying to enhance his own personal image

and I suppose that is okay at a national level. That is fine. But when I read what he had to say, and I hope he corrects me if I am wrong, but when I read what he had to say at the Premier's Conference in August, I think it was in Quebec City or somewhere, when he said, or at least he is quoted as saying, that, "Senate Reform is the salvation to Newfoundland's problems."

Now when I heard that, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you I absolutely -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Threw up.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I do not want to use that term. But I can tell you this, there were an awful lot of people in Newfoundland who did, because I have lived in this Province all my life. I travelled around the Province and I have talked to people all over the Province, and if I were to ask people in Newfoundland and Labrador or anybody, what do you think is the most important problem facing Newfoundland today?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Senate reform.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, you can hear it. You just cannot believe it. I have nothing personal against the Premier on this particular issue but I tell him I cannot agree with him on what he is doing. He is taking a red herring and he is beating it to death all across the Country. That is what he is trying to do to enhance his own image and his own possibilities in the future.

So, telling us that Senate Reform -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about Meech Lake.

MR. SIMMS:

I will tell him about Meech Lake while we are waiting for the Premier to bring in his resolution. We will wait for the Premier to bring in his resolution. We will have lots to say. It will be brought in the Premier's says. We expect it. We fully expect it. Do everything you can boy to tear the Country apart. You are doing a great job so far.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as has been said on many occasions, and I am going to conclude with this, it is clear that this is a Government from the 1960s led by politicians from the 1960s. We have said it on dozens of occasions. I think it is a fair comment, because more and more you hear people telling us that. People tell us that, people all over the Province tell us that. It is not us. It is the public. And if you are over there shaking your heads and laughing, and everything like that, and closing your eyes, then you are just worse off than we think you are. Worse off than we think you are. You should open your eyes and listen to what the people have to say. It is a Government from the past and the people of the Province have let us know that in no uncertain terms. They expect us to express their views and opinions in the Legislature, and that is precisely what I have been trying to do for the last few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The people of Trinity North did not have confidence in this Government. I submit to you that the people of the Province do not have the confidence in this Government, Mr. Speaker. We

certainly do not have confidence in this Government on this side of the House, which I know that you would expect. But this resolution and this non-confidence motion is placed, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the Province.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Acting Government House Leader.

MR. FUREY:

I would like to inform the hon. Opposition House Leader (Mr. Simms) he has forty minutes left. He has an hour to speak whenever he presents an amendment. Maybe he wants to conclude by using the other forty minutes prior to our speaker taking the hour we want to use for this debate.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that opportunity. I do not know but I just might accept it. Is it because nobody on that side wishes to speak in support and defence of your own Throne Speech?

MR. FUREY:

No, we are ready. I just wanted to remind you about the forty minutes.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, I know about the time. I know all about the time. I did not

have to rush through the Beauchesne booklet today, as the hon. Member did, to try to figure out the speakers. If the Minister of Finance is going to speak, I will be happy to hear from him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Three times in one day. I think the cameras have gone.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, this is not going to be my routine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

I will give Members opposite a chance to get in once in a while. Because of the amendment to the resolution on the Throne Speech, I thought I would speak today not as the Minister of Finance but as the Member for St. John's Centre, and I wish to speak as the Member for St. John's Centre for several reasons. Mr. Speaker, this District has been represented previous to my being elected by a Speaker, and it is rare that a Speaker gets a chance to speak in the House on behalf of his district, so that in the past several years St. John's Centre has not really been in the forefront of the House of Assembly.

In the years before Dr. McNicholas, the hon. Ank Murphy represented St. John's Centre for the Conservatives. In fact, St. John's Centre has never been represented by a Liberal, not since 1949, and certainly not since 1932. I do not know how far

back it goes, because my memory does not go beyond that very much. But it has been a long time since somebody stood in the House of Assembly, on the Liberal side, and spoke for the people of St. John's Centre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

It is time that those people were represented.

This District of St. John's Centre is where we are now. The House of Assembly, the Government buildings are all in St. John's Centre. As you can see, it is a fine District. It is a great District! Memorial University is in St. John's Centre, at least that part of it which is south of Prince Philip Drive, and, as a result, most of the students who go to Memorial are constituents of mine.

DR. P. WARREN:

And mine.

DR. KITCHEN:

And most of the rest are my colleague's, who represents St. John's North.

The old Memorial, formerly the Fisheries College, is also in St. John's Centre, and so is that other Parliamentary Institution which has made the television news every week, City Hall. That is in St. John's Centre, as well.

I would like to say a few words about the City Council of St. John's, particularly in the time of Mayor Murphy, but going back before that, and to state that I, for one, feel very good about the manner in which St. John's Centre, and St. John's generally, has been



beautified by the present Council. They have done a tremendous job, and those of us who look back realize that the city now is much better than it was several years ago, and a lot of credit is due to the present Mayor and Councillors, and others before them.

I believe St. John's is one of the most beautiful cities in the world. It is by and large a very clean city. It is not a heavily congested city. Go to Toronto and see the congestion and the difficulty of getting from one place to another, and the dirt. Or go to a foreign capital and see the congestion in a place like Tokyo, where I was the other day, unbelievable congestion, million and millions of people. It takes two or three hours to get a few miles. The thing I want to say is we live in a beautiful city, a very tremendously beautiful city, and I believe we should be thankful that we have this city and certainly be thankful for the council we have here and for what has been happening.

In the city we have a number of problems. We have George Street. I will not classify George Street as a problem, but there is under certain circumstances a problem between the businesses on George Street and the residents in the area. We have to try to keep the businesses going that are employing people and giving fun and pleasure to the rest of the city and outside, in bounds with the desires and needs of the people in the area. I think we have to look very carefully at that.

My own association with the district of St. John's Centre goes back many years, to when I first

came here and lived at 16 Dicks Square, then later on on Calver Avenue, Merrymeeting Road and Monroe Street, and for the past twenty-two years I have lived on London Road, which is also in the district. So, you see, I am the most fortunate Member in the House of Assembly; I never have to leave my district to go to work, I am always here. I live here, I work here and wherever I want to be, it is here in the district. I do not why I was so lucky as to get this district. I suppose I owe it to the Premier. The Premier phoned me up a couple of months before the election and said, Will you give us a hand in organizing St. John's? I said, yes, gladly. I will do anything you want me to do. Anything you want me to do I will do in organizing St. John's. Yes, I will gladly do it, so here we go. But I could not get a candidate in St. John's Centre, so I said I suppose I am going to have to run. And, bless my soul! I am elected. How lucky can you get?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

I was very glad to support the Premier and I will tell you why. The main attraction, as far as I am concerned, is his fairness and balance. I know what it is like to live under a Tory regime for seventeen years as a Liberal, not a heavily practicing Liberal. And I know what else has been happening. I know how the civil service here had been gutted out and Tory after Tory slipped in all over the place. And, I know how the institutions surrounding the Government had been selecting their people; loyalty to the Tory Party, and competence goes down the drain. That is why I support

the fairness and balance principle, and when fairness and balance goes, I am gone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
You are gone. You are gone.

DR. KITCHEN:  
The last speaker said he noticed that there were a number of Liberals appointed to Government positions. Heavens to Betsy! all the Tories are already appointed. The only people who are not appointed are non-Tories. So, you see, it is only by chance, really, that most of the people will be Liberals. It is not that we are that way or anything, it is just the way it has to be. If you have ten in a pot, one blue and nine red and you are going to draw randomly, you would probably draw a red one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:  
The previous speaker mentioned that people in the civil service were looking over their shoulders. I do not think any civil servant is looking over his shoulder, except those who possibly have something to fear because they have not been up to anything while they were here. And I do not see very many of them in my day, very, very few.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh! Shameful!

DR. KITCHEN:  
There is no civil servant, no public servant who has anything to fear from this Administration -

MR. TOBIN:

That is not what you just said.

DR. KITCHEN:  
- as long as they do their work in a competent fashion. But God help the public servant who plays political patronage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:  
What were you doing the day Frank Moores was elected leader of the P.C. Party?

DR. KITCHEN:  
I want to speak about some problems in my District now, as Members have the obligation to do. The calls that come to my desk from the District largely involve housing. I have mentioned this to the Minister of Housing, not that it is his problem entirely, but a goodly number of people in this city are not properly housed. The kind of people who telephone are very often single parents with one or two or three children who find it very difficult to get appropriate housing. Now I believe one of the thrusts we are going to have to make shortly is a big thrust in the area of housing. Public housing perhaps, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation; we are going to have to look at the St. John's non-profit housing and perhaps help out. We are working together with some of the members of City Council on that. I believe, too, that private housing is going to have to be looked at fairly carefully, not that we want to go public or private, but there is a great need for good, substantial low-cost housing in the city.

There are also a number of houses in the city where people should

not be living. I have been in a number that are really not appropriate for people to be living in, yet they are being rented. So we are going to have to do something about that. It bothers me very much to see people crawling up stairs where the tread is about two inches wide and the riser is eight inches, and they go around a turn, and some old lady or old gentleman are frightened to death to go up and down. There is not a lot of houses like that in the city, but there are some, a fairly large number. Not only that, but every time a fire breaks out in St. John's we are all petrified with fear because we know what could happen. We are very fortunate in our Fire Department. Things could be much worse. I believe we have to pay attention to this whole question of housing in the city, and part of it is in St. John's Center.

Another thing I would like to raise to Members of the House is the question of income. I believe social assistance levels are too low and that we are going to have to raise them as much as we can, because a lot of people are finding it very difficult to live these days, people without work. People, sometimes, do not have enough food to eat, they find it difficult to have books for their youngsters to go to school, to put clothes on the backs of their children, and I feel that has to be addressed by us in Government.

We have to look, too, at the minimum wage. People who are working for the minimum wage are earning, perhaps, less than \$9,000 a year. It is hard to marry and raise a family on that. It is a very difficult thing to do. It is hard to live on your own salary. So that is another thing we are

going to have to consider.

There are a lot of people who have part-time jobs, and I want to say a few words about part-time jobs later on. There is nothing wrong with a part-time job, but very often some of the benefits other people have are not associated with part-time jobs, like health insurance or pensions and things of that nature. I believe we are going to have to look at the whole question of part-time jobs, as well.

So, there are quite a number of problems in my District. It is a good District, as I say, and I am very pleased to represent it. And people are coming and speaking quite a bit. Students in my district come to me and they are concerned about - and the Minister of Education (Mr. Warren) knows about this - the question of student aid. Some people find that student aid is hard to get when you need it, and some are finding it hard. So I think we may have to look at that. What we can do, I do not know. I am just raising concerns people bring to me, and passing them on to the House of Assembly so that we can come to grips with them as a group.

I want to leave this bit now and wax philosophical. It is not very often I get the opportunity to give some news, but what I want to say now has to do with some economic remarks. In this Province there are, as I see it, three distinct economies: One is the economy of large-scale industry, where people have full-time jobs and who work the year round and whose wages are generally fairly good. The largest industry providing full-time jobs is the Government Service, Federal, Provincial and

Municipal. That is the largest industry in the Province providing full-time jobs. And people who work for the Governments, generally speaking, have security, they have pensions, they have health insurance, they have a reasonable standard of living. And there are also a number of others besides Government. We have the people who work in universities, schools and hospitals. They, too, generally fall into that category of full-time jobs, security of employment, and the benefits that go with having full-time jobs.

We have people who work in the paper mills who, generally speaking, are in the same category. There may be some insecurity there from time to time, but basically it is full-time, large-scale, with all the benefits. We have people who work in the mines, and, generally speaking, again they have all these benefits and an adequate standard of living. The professions also, the doctors, the lawyers, and so on, some of these make an adequate living, most of them live fairly well, but there is a security about it, there is a security about life.

There are the people who are in trade, in retail, wholesale, insurance and banking. These, too, have full-time jobs and are part of a large-scale economy and things are reasonably good for them. I believe these we should continue to encourage, large-scale industry and full-time jobs, as much as we can. That has to be one of our areas of economic thrust.

This type of job, though, has certain implications for other things we do. It means we have to

provide child care, for example, if two spouses work; usually we have to provide the child care, government provided or child care people can buy. It means specialization, generally speaking, a lifestyle characterized by specialization by single skills usually, single, highly specialized skills, and a lot of time doing one thing all day long. I believe, though, that this type of economic activity has to be respected, Mr. Speaker, because most people want it. But, at the moment in Newfoundland, there is a limited amount of full-time jobs.

What I want to say now, though, is that there are two other aspects of the economy that I believe we must also foster.

One is a seasonal economy. We have a fishing industry which is basically seasonal. There is not much you can do except recognize that it is seasonal. People have tried to make it non-seasonal, but it has been basically a very difficult job. We must recognize the fact that an important number of our people are going to be caught up in a seasonal economy, and I believe we have to respect that seasonal economy and not try to eliminate it, do away with it, and try to put it into a 'Cinderella slipper' type of development.

Agriculture is seasonal in this Province. Tourism is seasonal. It is going to be a difficult job to make tourism into a year-round activity. It may be possible in some places, but basically tourism is a seasonal activity, and I think we have to respect it and recognize it for what it is.

The construction industry in this Province is basically seasonal.

People have tried to extend the season to some extent, but it is very difficult to get construction work done in winter, very difficult, particularly if you are trying to tear down and re-build, as we were doing with Elizabeth Towers.

I believe this seasonal economy we have in most of the communities in Newfoundland is a very important part of our economy and one that we have to shore up and bolster and assist and do all that is necessary to make it an appropriate lifestyle for those who are engaged in it.

I will have some words to say about policy later on, I think, not my policy, but Federal Government policy.

The other economy I wish to speak about has to do with what I call the 'household economy', and that is the economy to which we basically do not pay enough attention. It is a tremendous economy in this Province. The 'household economy' is probably greater in this Province than in any other province in Canada. I will give you an example: Many Newfoundlanders build their own homes. That is a tremendous skill which most people living in cities, or in 'Economy No. 1', as I call it, cannot do. Very few people working in the Government service, or in universities or in schools can build their own houses. Most Newfoundlanders can do it. That is a tremendous thing to be able to do, to be able to have an \$80,000 or \$90,000 or \$100,000 house that you built yourself, and you do not have to save money to buy. It is a series of skills which I believe we have to encourage and develop. Instead of that, we may be inclined,

sometimes, to say that is not important, and leave it. We must encourage it. Where skills are lacking, I believe they have to be provided so that people who do not have a certain skill can learn it as quickly as they can, rather than have to pay somebody to build and not have the money to do it. It is very difficult, if you are a seasonal worker, to save enough money to buy a house, but it is not too much trouble if you can do it yourself.

That is only one aspect of the 'household economy'. Many people fish and eat some of what they catch. The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture tells me he is going to get a moose one of these days. There are a lot of people who catch moose and other things for food.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Consumerism.

DR. KITCHEN:

Consumerism, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Prosumerism.

DR. KITCHEN:

Prosumerism.

Years ago, we used to do a lot of gardening and keep animals. These are skills which many people no longer have. We have lost, to some extent, many of those skills. I believe anyone who wants to acquire these skills should be able to acquire them, and that community colleges and Government should encourage people to do so.

Some people cut their own firewood. These are examples of the 'household economy'. I believe that people who discuss

the 'household economy' overlook the single most important factor, and that is the person who often spends most of his or her time, usually it is a her, in the house doing all sorts of things, all economic things, which, if that household had to hire someone to do them, the cooking and the cleaning and all the other things, and the child raising, would cost a fortune. What we have to do is recognize that that activity that is carried out by so many people is a good solid economic activity. It is not something we have to be ashamed of, but something we should be encouraging so that people can take their choice as to what they want to do. What bothers me is that this particular form of the economy, this third part of the economy as I call it, is generally overlooked in statistics of Gross Domestic Product, it is not counted. If you look at Canada's GDP and Newfoundland's GDP, we are understated by a considerable amount. I would not want to state that in a Budget address going across Canada, because they would immediately cut back on our equalization thing, but it is all right to state it here I think, in private, somewhat private, anyway.

Some people would like to see a homemaker's pension. I believe it is something we have to consider. We have to recognize that there is more to work than having a job. Having a job is one way of being economically productive, being seasonally employed is another way of being economically productive, contributing to the household economy is another way of being economically productive. Work is not equal to jobs, and you know as well as I do that there are people who have jobs, high paying jobs - perhaps some of the Members here

who do not do much work, certainly on your side, perhaps not on our side - who do not contribute much to the economy. I think we would agree with that. And there are a great many people who do not have jobs, but who contribute an enormous amount to the economy. This is particularly true in Newfoundland, and I think we have to recognize that wherever it exists, right throughout the Province, in St. John's Centre, as well as other parts. I want to make that point, because it is a major point that we should be considering in this house as we develop our economic philosophies.

I asked some time ago, in another situation, for people to try to come up with an inventory of all the ways people contribute to the 'household economy'. Well, we started on it, and we got twenty or thirty pages of different things. I was amazed at the number of ways people can contribute to developing this household, non-cash, non-earned economy. But it is economically productive, because it produces things that people need. I want to make the point very strongly, because it has to be faced.

Also, I want to cast this now in a different light, and the light, I want to say, is that as we look into the future, there is some difficulty with establishing this large-scale economy. Most countries of the world are nervous about their large-scale economies, they are breaking up, and this idea of 'household economy', seasonal work, part-time work, sometimes full-time work, this mixture of economic productivity is what is coming on stream more and more than ever before. We have many more part-time workers in society now than we ever had

before. We have them in the city more than we ever had before, and it is respectable, and we have to look at it and encourage it and make sure that the people who are in that kind of activity are looked after with respect to security. There are things they need. We should not just pay attention to full-time job creation. It is important to do that, extremely important that we create full-time jobs in industries that produce full-time jobs, but it is equally important that we develop other parts of the economy.

Now, Federal Government Policy. I am not going to speak about Provincial Government Policy, because I do not want to become partisan on this point. I just want to mention that for many, many years we have turned our backs on economies two and three, and concentrated on economy one, not only we, but particularly the Federal Government.

You remember the whole question of resettlement, which was basically an attempt to get into that first economy I mentioned, and the ultimate of that resettlement program is that there are now so many of us in Toronto, hundreds of thousands of Newfoundlanders in Toronto. I spoke in Toronto to the MUN Alumni over the weekend, and every one of them wished to dickens they were back here. They do not want to live in Toronto, but they are no good back here because they cannot make a living, either because there are no jobs or they do not know how to make a living the other way, the Newfoundland way. So they have to live in Toronto.

We remember Percival Copes; Copes had the notion that every

Newfoundlander should move from small places to large places, ultimately Grand Falls and St. John's, and then, in the third generation, they may have a few skills so they can flick off to Toronto. But we have seen recently the ultimate in Copesism, with this steady stream of people to Toronto and the Canadian Mainland. That is what has happened because we have turned our backs and, to a large extent, neglected what we are to try to make ourselves into something we are not. I believe our development has to be threefold: we have to develop jobs, we have to develop industries, and we have to develop and prop up seasonal work. We also have to do the same with respect to the 'household economy'.

Now, one of the problems I have with economic reports on Newfoundland, particularly those emanating from the Federal Government, has to do with those who say Newfoundlanders are not productive. And what they do is this, they take the production, divide it by the labour and say you do not produce much per unit of labour.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN:  
That is true. In the Grand Falls paper mill we do, because it is heavily mechanized, in Labrador City we do, because it is heavily mechanized, and in other places where you have a lot of machinery. That is one way of doing it. But, on the other hand, if you define productivity in terms of unit of capital, then Corner Brook is not productive, Grand Falls is not productive and Labrador West is not productive.

If you define it in terms of productivity per hour of labour, these are productive. If you define it in terms of units of capital, they may not be as productive. What I am trying to say is, the way you define your productivity depends upon the way you do it. We cannot swallow what everybody tells us. We cannot swallow what the economists tell us. Good lord!

One of the problems we are confronted with right now is high tech scientists up in the Department of Fisheries in Ottawa who told us, with their scientific going around the country and taking samples here and there, that we have lots of fish and we should expand our fishery. By gum, we swallowed it hook, line and sinker, and said, Yes, we have to expand our fishery. The scientists tell us; science says we have to expand our fishery.

Now, is there anybody in the House whoever looks a scientist in the face without a question mark in his eye?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Or two.

DR. KITCHEN:  
Another thing happened recently. The Minister of Finance in the Federal Government (Mr. Wilson) conjured up a goods and service tax and he said, The goods and service tax is going to benefit every province. We are all going to be better off. Inflation will go up in a minor way, exports will go up, we will be able to compete against foreign imports and everything will be grand. We must have it. These economic scientists, these people up there who crank out the charts, the same related civil servants, I guess,

whoever they are, the public servants or the people who are hired, or whatever, they also cranked up the figures on the GST. We, the Province, also had studies done on the GST by our own people, which we look at very carefully. And the provinces jointly put together several studies and had them done, and there is very little comparison between what they said and what the other guy said. Now who is right? I believe ours are right, because I looked over their data. That was all I could really see, what our people did, because the other background papers were not fully available to me. But it looked like what our people were saying was accurate.

When federal scientists come to me, when these high tech boys come down to me and say, We are high tech. We know. I look them in the eye and say, What is it you are trying to say? Then they will go goobledygook sometimes, and you do not understand what they are saying. Well, if I am stunned the problem is me. But as soon as you admit that the other guy knows when you do not know that he knows, then I think we are being foolish. We have to put ourselves in the position where they either explain their position so we can understand it or we will not accept it. And that goes for federal scientists, fishery scientists, goods and service scientists or any other scientists. We have to look at them and have them make their position clear to us. We are the people who are here to represent the people of this Province. They trust us and we cannot back off and look at these people with eyes that are mystically fogged. Just as we examine religion more carefully than we did in the past,



so must we look at this new religion of high technology and science in a very careful light. I am not putting down science, I am merely saying look at it for what it is. And do not let them cod us, because they have been doing it for years. The responsibility for running this Province resides in this House of Assembly and you cannot get away from it and pass it over to anyone else except the people here.

I must comment on this, because I have noticed it. I have noticed since I have been in Government, for example, that a lot of the things we do relate to ourselves and to the people we hire. Sometimes it trickles out to the people out there. We worry about our own salaries first of all. We have to be well looked after, and that is fair. I am not knocking it, I am saying we spend a fair amount of time at that. Then we spend a lot of time negotiating with the people who work for Government and looking after their pensions; we established a Pension Review Committee to look at that. We spend an awful lot of time on promotions in the civil service and all this old stuff, making sure it is fair and square, and people are hired right, there is no political patronage and all that. That is a big deal. We spend an awful lot of our time in managing the organization, and we spend a tremendous amount of money. The bulk of the money spent by the Province is spent on the internal of Government. Sometimes money gets out beyond, and that bothers me very much. I would like to see lean Government, where most of the money that is taxed from the people gets back to the people and does not hang up in the mechanism of Government. What we do, basically, is contemplate our

collective navels. That is what we do, and we do not get beyond the pale. That worries me very much, that does.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Volunteer your time.

DR. KITCHEN:

Well, within reason. I am not bothered that people should be properly treated, but the purpose of Government is not to make life comfortable for the Public Service. The purpose of Government is to help the Province move ahead, and to help the people of the Province have good lives. The rest is a means to an end. We must not let the means become the end, and I believe, to some extent, particularly with the federal civil service becoming so large and so powerful that you cannot get anything done, that we, too, will have to watch it. How many does City Hall have down there now, hon. member for St. John's East, six hundred?

MS DUFF:

(Inaudible) number.

DR. KITCHEN:

It is in that area, is it not? They have 500 or 600 people down there. It is amazing! This is what is happening. The machinery of Government is becoming the purpose of Government, and that bothers me very much. What I am trying to say, I suppose, is that I am not opposed to any individual and what they get out of it and so on, but the totality is something that has to be looked at. If we are going to serve our constituents, if I am going to serve mine, if I am going to be able to get money to provide housing, to provide to social assistance to people who need it, and to provide all the other

things that are mentioned - the things that people are mentioning about health care - if we are going to try to do all that, then somewhere we are going to have to either trim our budgets or raise more money, so we have to be careful about it; we have to be careful about our expenditures, and we have to be careful that everything does not go on the interna of Government.

I think I am going to stop there, Mr. Speaker. This will be chapter one, and chapter two will come in my second talk on the Address in Reply. This is just to the amendment.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Acting Government House Leader did not remind his colleague that he had in excess of twenty minutes left. I believe the Hon. Minister ran out of notes. I believe that is what happened.

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say that it is too bad the Leader of the New Democratic Party has left the Legislature. I do not know if he has been making a habit of staying beyond Question Period, I had not really noticed, quite frankly, in the last Session, nor do I really care, but it would have been interesting for him to

be here today to observe the thoughts of the Minister of Finance on the civil service, on the labour movement and on employment in Newfoundland and Labrador. Because if ever there was a red Tory, Mr. Speaker - not a mainstream Tory - pronouncing on the effect of the expansion of the civil service and what you have to do to contain that expansion, then I suspect that the Leader of the NDP could have brought quite a message to Mr. March and NAPE, in particular, who represent a lot of the public service employees in this Province, to members of CUPE and to those people who, in the election a few months ago, because they did not have an alternative from within their own ranks of the NDP, and found themselves supporting the Liberal Party. Mr. Speaker, the red Tory, who has become the Minister of Finance, certainly put it very clearly today that the Leader of the NDP should be here. He should be here to observe and report to his bosses that the labour movement better keep looking over their shoulders.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They do not have to worry.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, they might not have to worry, but the Minister certainly made it clear today, Mr. Speaker, that he is anti-labour. The Minister of Finance is anti-labour, Mr. Speaker, he is anti-employment in the public service. The Minister of Finance is old slasher. As long as he can slash, slash, slash, cut back the budget, cut back spending, raise taxes, then we have the right Minister of Finance. If that is what you want, we have the right Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I also noticed today, and it is the first time that I can recall, and I have been here almost fifteen years, that a non-confidence motion was responded to by a person saying, instead of responding to the substance of the motion, I am going to spend the next half hour or forty-five minutes, or whatever it is, talking about matters in the district. That is the first time I have ever heard that. Usually, the format in a parliamentary forum is that the Opposition will put down a non-confidence motion and a person will reply for the Government, defending the Government, pointing out that all of the stuff the Opposition put down was foolishness, that the Government was productive, it was alive, it was vibrant, it had new policy, new plans, and that things were working out well. But we did not hear any defence from the lead off Speaker for the Government today.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there is a reason for that. It is pretty difficult to defend the indefensible, and the actions of this Government over the last six or seven months, Mr. Speaker, have been pretty indefensible.

The Minister, speaking in his capacity as the Member for St. John's Center, said, and I hope I quote him correctly, 'When fairness and balance is gone from this Government, then I am gone.' Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should get out of his seat and proceed down to the bar of the House and skedaddle as fast as he can into the elevator and out of the building.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is what the hon. Member should do if there is any honor and integrity in the words 'when fairness and balance is gone, I am gone'. If he meant that, then go. Because all you had to do, Mr. Speaker, for an hon. crowd that preached fairness and balance, is look at the Recreation Capital Grant Program. Look at the Recreation and Capital Grant Program, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of pork barreling, which this Government said they would never tolerate, when they were representing constituents from this side of the House. Let me tell you about fairness and balance, Mr. Speaker. You ought to be be ashamed, Sir, to mouth those words. You ought to be ashamed to mouth them in this House - \$782,000 in Liberal districts and \$59,000 in P.C. districts. Fairness and balance? You ought to be ashamed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And the hon. gentleman gets up Mr. Speaker and says in his pious and sanctimonious way, 'When fairness and balance is gone, I am gone.' Well, he is still over there. He has not gone yet. I have not heard him say a word about the Recreational Capital Grant Program, because he cannot defend it. The Minister cannot defend it. There are a number of Ministers over there, Mr. Speaker, who deserve and will, in fact, be hauled over the coals over the next few days for hiding behind the protective skirts of the Civil Service of this Province. You were elected to govern. You were

elected to take responsibility. You were elected to come before this House and defend the actions that you as a Government take, like men and women of honour. That is what you were elected for. Do not have the gall to go to the press and say, Oh, we only approved that program because civil servants sent it up. What foolishness, Mr. Speaker! What a total lack of responsibility! If you talk to the Minister of Municipal Affairs about his Recreational Capital Grant program he will say, We did not do anything with that, we just approved what the civil servants sent up. Take your responsibility! Stand up for your responsibility! Defend your actions! Do not be hiding behind the protective skirt of the bureaucracy, of the civil servants. They were not elected, you were elected. You have the responsibility to act for your decisions. It was not the civil servants who finalized the Recreational Capital Grant list, Mr. Speaker, it was the Cabinet. The Cabinet is elected politicians. Do not be afraid to stand up and say, yes. Do not be afraid to be questioned about it, instead of sloughing it off to some faceless, nameless bureaucracy down in the bowels of Confederation Building, especially when it is not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, this Government is not going to get away with any more of that I can guarantee you, with the people on this side of the House.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is anything in Beausheerne to silence the hon. gentlemen for Windsor - Buchans. No trouble to know his leader is not here.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He has to say something sometime.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, fairness and balance. The Recreational Capital Grant program, Mr. Speaker, there should not be another Member on the other side of the House who would ever have the gall again, for as long as they are in this House, to utter the words fairness and balance.

MR. SIMMS:

And did you hear the Member for Exploits on the radio the other day?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes. I will get to that.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman from Mount Scio - Bell Island if we were wrong, and we were not perfect, we have paid the price.

MR. WALSH:

Yes, you did.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You are now the Government, so you take -

MR. WALSH:

And you will pay the price for years.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It may very well be, Sir, but it may also very well be that you will have one shot and it will be your last shot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Do not be so presumptuous as to judge the intelligence of the electorate of this Province. They will make the judgement on you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman might need more than twenty-six votes next time to slip by in Mount Scio - Bell Island, Mr. Speaker. And there are other landslides on the other side of the House who might need more than one vote, or nineteen votes, or twenty-six votes or forty-five votes, Mr. Speaker. I would not presume to be so aloof as to take the electorate for granted. Let not the hon. gentlemen do that. We had paid our price; you are now the Government and you have a responsibility to act.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on. Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. gentleman talked about tourism being seasonal. Mr. Speaker, tourism does not have to be a seasonal industry in Newfoundland. The hon. the Minister of Finance should know the difference of that. I am sure the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey) probably knows that. If Tourism in this Province is properly developed, with a proper plan, there can be a number of parts of the components in the tourism industry that are all-season, which can contribute all season - Marble Mountain is one example. I am sure there are

others. So the Minister of Finance should not jump to the conclusion that the tourism industry has to be a seasonal industry in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, you wonder why we will put down a motion of no confidence in this Government. Well, I would like to take the few minutes left to me to elaborate somewhat on that. Certainly the Budget left no reason for the people of this Province to have confidence in the Government, no reason whatsoever. The Minister of Finance made the penetrating revelation to the people of this Province that we were the lowest taxed people in Canada. He said, 'There was a misconception that we were the highest taxed, but we have done an assessment and we have come up with the facts and figures to show that we are not the highest taxed people in Canada. We might not be the lowest, but we certainly are not the highest.' But just to ensure that you really are the highest taxed people in Canada, on goes a massive \$100 million tax grab, and you expect, Mr. Speaker, people to have confidence in that kind of Government?

Mr. Speaker, the people of Trinity North,-

MR. FLIGHT:

Get to the GST.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will get to the GST. Hon. gentleman, keep quiet! I will get to it.

The people of Trinity North sat back, Mr. Speaker, and looked at the Government report card, and they looked at it very, very seriously. Because many districts

in this Province, four or five months after an election, would deliberately say to themselves, I do not care. The Government is there for the next three and a half or four years. I do not care what my past political persuasion was, I am going to jump on the side of the Government. They have not been too bad over the last four or five months. They have performed reasonably well and we could probably be better off if we elected a member to be part of that Government. I would not have been one bit surprised and, in fact, most Newfoundlanders would not have been surprised had that been the result, Mr. Speaker, but it was not. The people very, very carefully assessed the situation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Go way, boy, you dropped 900 votes.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Ah! Let me get to the point the Premier tried to slough off from Toronto or wherever the Newfoundland media caught up to him that night. He certainly was not in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, ready to talk to them. That was exactly the point. "We cut their margin, their vote, from 900 down to 16." If that were the case, Mr. Spoeaker, the Government should have won the by-election by 450 votes. If that were the case.

MR. HEARN:

If they kept their vote.

MR. RIDEOUT:

If they kept their vote. But what happened, Mr. Speaker, is the Liberal candidate polled less votes on October 3 than he polled on April 20 - 93 less, as a matter of fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The PC candidate polled several hundred votes less than the PC candidate polled in the April 20th election, and not the same candidate, by the way, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Party candidate was the same candidate, the same person, but despite the hon. gentleman from St. John's South, we won, the Government lost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

There were not six people in Newfoundland and Labrador, I bet you, Mr. Speaker, who gave us a fighting chance of even coming close to winning that by-election, but we went out there with a dedicated team of people, including the Member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) and the Member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), with an excellent candidate, we plugged away at it, we worked away at it, and, Mr. Speaker, we were the first to cross the finish line. That is all that counts in this game. We were the first to cross the finish line.

MR. MATTHEWS:

What a cake walk it was going to be.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, we were getting all that. Some cake walk! The Members opposite were coming up and meeting us at Holiday Inn out there and you almost had to give them a smack in the chops to whip the grin of their faces. They were going around licking their chops, Mr. Speaker. They had it in the bag. The old snitch was down there himself, and came back and reported to the boss I assume. He told him that it was in the bag. There were a number

of Ministers and backbenchers I ran into, and they gloried in meeting you, Mr. Speaker, with a grin on their face and rubbing your nose into it - you are going to get some kick in the pants on the night of October 3. The Minister of Energy was down there, the Minister of Health was there, the Minister of Fisheries was there. There was a host of Ministers and backbenchers all over the place, and all coming back with the same report to the boss, that it was in the bag. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was not in the bag, far from it.

The Minister of Finance brought Special Warrants before this House today.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
No pork barreling.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
No pork barreling? Go to your Recreational Capital Grant Program if you want to see pork barrels.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance brought Special Warrants before this House today from a Minister and a Government who said they would not deal in Special Warrants, they would not make it a habit; unless in a dire emergency, there would be no such thing as a special warrant.

We saw today, Mr. Speaker, Special Warrants coming before the House already, with the Government only six or seven months into its mandate, and with a Budget that only came down in June. The Budget came down in June with a surplus of \$5 million and that surplus, Mr. Speaker, I suspect, has totally disappeared by now. I would expect, with the Special Warrants the Minister brought in today and with other things that

have happened, the Minister is, at this point in time, running a deficit.

I remember Ed Roberts year after year, when the good friend and hon. gentleman was over here -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You were (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:  
No, I was not then. I was over with the Minister of Fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I remember the Opposition accusing the then Minister of Finance, Dr. Collins, of cooking the books just to make it look good for Budget Day. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suspect we have a classic case of cooking the books this year. A classic case of cooking the books!

The Minister of Finance hinted at it in his Budget Speech. He has changed now from quarterly reports to, I believe he says, half yearly.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He is cooking in the kitchen.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Cooking in the kitchen.

Mr. Speaker, we will see where that \$5 million surplus is at the end of the day. I suspect it will not be there at all. And if the Special Warrants have any significance whatsoever, then it is probably even wiped out by now.

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The Hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek leave of the House to suspend tomorrow's sitting so that Members on both sides of the House can take the opportunity to attend Mr. Baker's funeral, in Gander. Out of respect for the President of Treasury Board and the MP for Grand Falls - Gander - I think that is the new District title - maybe the hon. Opposition House Leader would concur?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, we indicated earlier that we are quite prepared, out of respect for the situation, to certainly agree not to sit tomorrow.

MR. FUREY:

The Speaker, has an announcement, I think, with respect to travel arrangements for Members who would like to attend.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek leave of the hon. Opposition House Leader to suspend sitting this Friday so that this side of the House can attend an historic convention in Gander, the first convention since we have taken over the reins of power after eighteen long years. We would appreciate it if you suspend sitting on this Friday so that we could take the opportunity to attend this historic convention, as well.

Mr. Speaker, that request is certainly in keeping with the traditions of this House. If one of the parties has a convention on

a particular weekend and it runs on a Friday, then there is usually co-operation in that regard.

However, I would want to add this general kind of comment, that we are always co-operative anyway, as the hon. Member knows. But, more particularly, I think he is right that this probably will be a very historic convention for the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, because there will probably be a request for a leadership review, from everything that we are hearing over here. We agree with Friday, as long as the Minister does not try to come back with what I just said then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the only thing the Minister has to say is that we approve of the hon. Opposition House Leader's usual display of magnanimity.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, we want to announce that the Private Member's Motion for Wednesday will be Motion 6 as it appears on the May 31 Order Paper, and that is the motion from the hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island dealing with the lack of a tourism subsidiary agreement for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Do you want to speak to that?

MR. SIMMS:

No, that is fine. You talked me into it.

MR. SIMMS:

Before you move the motion to adjourn, can the hon. Member give us some indication of what business will be dealt with on Thursday, since Thursday is the



only other day we will be sitting?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, it is our fondest hope to return to the Address in Reply, in particular with the amendment to the motion of non-confidence, where our speakers will point out the truth of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House on its rising do adjourn until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, and that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before putting the question I just want to make two announcements: First of all, the Speaker's Office has been approached re making arrangements for the funeral tomorrow, and the Office will take care of that. I think somebody has tried to find out who will be travelling, and the Speaker's Office will co-ordinate that event. Anybody wanting to get further information can call in the morning.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, do you have the flight times?

MR. SPEAKER:

Not at this moment.

MR. FUREY:

May I ask that the Member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) report on that, because he was co-ordinating from this side, I think, to see how many people wanted to attend the funeral. Can we stop the clock and allow the Member to do that?

MR. SIMMS:

Stop the clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes, okay.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think the flight will be leaving around 10:00 a.m. and returning at about 4:00 p.m.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What flight?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Air Atlantic in the morning.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are tickets taken care of?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, that will be taken care of in the morning, Members opposite and Members of the Government. The ones who are going will be contacted in the morning by the Speaker's Office, and tickets will be arranged and so on. So all of that is being done now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The other point is I have been asked to announce: Please be advised that the Social Legislation Review Committee will meet on Tuesday, October 31, at 2:00 p.m. in the House of Assembly to deal with an Act Respecting The Department of Social Services, and The Day Care and Homemaker Services Act. That is a public meeting tomorrow at 2:00 p.m. here in the House.

On motion, the House at its rising stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at two of the clock.