



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 29

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of all Members of this House of Assembly I would like you to send condolences to the family of Thomas Anthony Horan, Blue Puttee 212, who died at his residence on Southside Road on Friday. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Horan was ninety-six years old at his death. He was a survivor of the battle of the Somme in the 1916 July drive where the Newfoundland regiment was decimated, Mr. Speaker, at Beaumont Hamel in France. Mr. Horan and his wife raised sixteen children and I am sure Members of the House of Assembly here would be familiar with some of Mr. Horan's children, all very fine upstanding people living in this Province and throughout Canada right now, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Horan was a very good friend of my grandparents, a very respected person in this Province, and in the District of Kilbride, and in his church the parish of Corpus Christi. The irony, I guess, of Mr. Horan's death is that on Friday the Royal Newfoundland Regiment celebrated its 195th birthday, and that was the day Mr. Horan died.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, we would like to add our words of condolence as well to the Horan family. I personally knew the family very well. Being a southsider myself, of course, the Gullage family and the Horan

family both lived on the Southside and I got to know the family very well over the years. As a matter of fact Mr. Horan made me always welcome every time I went to his house. He was a fine, fine gentleman, as was mentioned by the Member, and raised a family of sixteen, a rather large family. He was a world war veteran and a very respected and well liked person particularly on the southside among southsiders and throughout the District. We would like to add our words of condolences to those of the Member.

Thank you.

~~Mr. Speaker~~: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask Your Honour to send messages on behalf of all Members of this House to the seven Status of Women Councils in our Province that operate women's centres. I suggest that the messages congratulate them on their largely successful campaign to have the Federal Government extend operating funding so that all centres will be able to continue their valuable service throughout this year. I say, largely successful, because the Federal Government has not assured continuing core funding for women's centres, so I suggest that in addition to congratulating the women's centres on their campaign for continued Federal funding that we pledge our ongoing support for their continuing efforts to secure Federal funding beyond this year.

Their campaign aimed at ongoing Federal funding proved that they enjoy widespread support of the citizens of our Province. The messages that I am suggesting are

consistent with the resolution passed in this House a month or so ago on a motion by the Member for Bellevue, which was supported unanimously.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, the hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, for the second time this year a Newfoundlander has distinguished himself in the hockey world. Dwayne Norris sometime ago caught the attention of Canada and Newfoundland when he scored the winning goal in Europe, and last night John Slaney of St. John's, a defenseman with the Cornwall Royals, won the Outstanding Defenseman Award for all of Canada in the Canadian Junior Hockey League.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Winsor: I would like for this House to acknowledge John's great contributions and have the Speaker send the appropriate commendation.

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, on behalf of all hon. Members, I wish to extend a most cordial welcome to sixteen Grade 6 and Grade 7 students from Rigolet in the District of Torngat Mountains. These students and their teacher, Melva Bradley, are visiting under the Newfoundland and Labrador Intraprovincial Travel Program administered by the Youth Services Division of the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. So we would like to extend to them a sincere welcome both to the Capital City and to the House of Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Walter Carter: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the hon. Bernard Valcourt, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans for Canada, announced the Atlantic Fisheries Adjustment Program. The Premier held a press conference immediately after this announcement to give the reaction of the Government of Newfoundland to the Program. It is my intention over the next few days to offer additional comments on this Adjustment Program and also to make this hon. House more aware of the proposal which had been advanced by the Province to the Federal Government to be included as part of the Federal/Provincial Response Program.

The Province has a number of major concerns with the Adjustment Program. One of our major concerns is the fact that it is focussed almost entirely on the offshore sector, without recognizing the devastating impact that resource reductions are having upon inshore fishermen. I will be speaking later on the need for an income support program to meet the urgent requirements of fixed gear fishermen, particularly on the south and west coasts of our Province.

On August 23, 1989, the Premier and I met with Members of the Federal Cabinet Committee to discuss our assessment of this crisis in the industry. We indicated at that time that action must be taken to deal with a major economic crisis arising from a

reduction in ground fish quotas of more than 100,000 metric tons. We translated these quota reductions into an economic output loss of close to \$200 million and 3,200 person years of work in 1990.

The Province also proposed a Federal/Provincial economic development and diversification program which would recognize the need for alternative employment opportunities to be created outside of the fishery. Because of the failure of regional economic development policies, the Newfoundland fishery has had to carry a disproportionate responsibility for contributing to our economic well-being. Too many people have found it necessary to find a livelihood in the harvesting and processing of fish. This has had the effect of reducing earned income in the Newfoundland fishery to levels significantly below those in the other Atlantic provinces and significantly less than the industrial wage of other Newfoundland workers.

Mr. Speaker, if the Newfoundland fishery is to be prosperous and productive, then there must be opportunities outside of the fishery. This is why the Province has proposed an economic development and diversification program to create new employment opportunities. I will have more to say about our proposed program later and I will be telling this hon. House about the components of our proposal which included not only expenditure components but also policy changes which could be taken by the Government of Canada without adding to the Federal deficit. However, the strategy which the Federal and Provincial Governments had been embarked upon was directed towards creating new

opportunities outside of the fishery. The Newfoundland fishery will not be strong and prosperous unless it is part of a healthy Newfoundland economy. By the same token, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland economy will not be healthy and prosperous unless we have a strong and prosperous fishery. The two go hand in hand. Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised as to whether the Newfoundland Government has proposed or endorsed a downsizing of the Newfoundland fishing industry.

Newfoundland did indeed propose that thousands of new jobs be created outside of the fishery in order to provide job opportunities for people in the fishery who were earning an inadequate income. However, Newfoundland also proposed that there be further development of the fishing industry so that we could build a stronger fishing industry. We believe that a stronger Newfoundland economy and a stronger fishery can be created by further development within the fishery, as well as diversification outside. We agree with Mr. Valcourt in his statement yesterday that emphasis should be given to the development of under-utilized species, to aquaculture, to fisheries and fish-product development and marketing.

We believe that there is considerable potential to build a stronger and larger fishery through further processing, through improved quality, and generally through higher value added. However, we are disappointed, Mr. Speaker, with the magnitude of the fisheries development proposal contained in Mr. Valcourt's announcement.

The Federal Program seeks to downsize the fishery as a mechanism for adjustment. This downsizing of the fishery is to be undertaken through regulatory means. More restrictions will be imposed upon entry into the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, we do not believe that this approach will be successful. Such a restrictive approach to downsizing of the fishery is doomed to failure.

The economic diversification component of Mr. Valcourt's announcement yesterday was \$90 million. This amount will be spread over five provinces and five years. The amount that will be available to Newfoundland will be virtually insignificant. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this represents a repudiation of the structural approach which both the Federal and Provincial Governments had adopted in the fall of 1989. This structural approach was based upon a large-scale economic diversification program combined with fisheries development.

Whether this structural approach would have led to a downsizing in the fishing industry is open to question. Certainly with substantially reduced quotas, there will inevitably be a reduction in employment in primary processing. However, Mr. Speaker, with a successful program of fishery development and development of fisheries related manufacturing, we believe that the negative impacts can be substantially offset.

Unfortunately, the announcement yesterday rejected the structural approach which had been the foundation of the joint Federal/Provincial endeavor

arising from our meetings in August of 1989.

Mr. Speaker, I have called upon the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans for Canada to reconsider his rejection of the structural approach and to re-open discussions with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. We have asked the Federal Minister to give serious consideration to the detailed proposals which have been made to him and to his Government. These proposals recognize the limited fiscal flexibility of the Federal Government by proposing a number of budgetary and non-budgetary components. Mr. Speaker, we have not given up hope that reason will prevail and that a rational Federal/Provincial program can be put in place. The Province has indicated its willingness to share in the cost, notwithstanding the difficult financial situation in which this Province finds itself.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and hon. Members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first would like to thank the Minister of Fisheries for a copy of his statement, albeit I did not get it in as much advance as I usually do. I think his fax machine broke down today because he usually faxes statements over to me and I fax my questions to him. But I did have it before the House started and I would like to thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to react to the statement by saying that this side of the House is not completely satisfied with the package that was announced

yesterday by Mr. Valcourt and the other Federal Ministers either. There are some positive aspects to the package and there are some negative aspects to the package which, as well, the Minister has alluded to in his statement. But, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, listening to the mumblings and the utterings of the Premier, that I have never seen such an about-face in my life as I have witnessed from this Premier and the Government.

Some Hon Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: I have stood in this House since last fall particularly, Mr. Speaker, and I have listened to the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries talking about downsizing and rationalizing the Newfoundland fishery. The Minister of Fisheries even went so far as - about what is happening in this fishery, the Atlantic fishery, could be a blessing in disguise. And I can show him and quote him in Hansard to that effect. The Premier has spoken in this House and outside this House publicly saying that the Newfoundland fishery must be rationalized and downsized and there must be other alternative industries and employment found.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: What an about-face, Mr. Speaker, when I watched and read what he had to say yesterday. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I have sat in private with the Premier in meetings in his office with a delegation from the Town of Grand Bank, and they were told in no uncertain terms that there was no future for them in the fishery, that their fish plant would have to close, when asked a very direct question by

the Chairman of the Grand Bank Fisheries Committee.

An. Hon. Member: It is a shame!

Mr. Matthews: Now, Mr. Speaker, yes, we have some concerns with the Adjustment Program and the Minister has highlighted one which we have already today highlighted as well in a press conference early this morning, and that is the inshore sector. There is no question that there must be action taken to deal with the problems with the inshore fishery.

We all know that the stocks and the resources are in trouble. That is why this very drastic action of reduction of the TAC has taken place, which is seeing a lot of communities along our coast, particularly the offshore dependent communities, being shut down. But, as well because of the stock problem and the resource problem, landings and earnings of inshore fishermen have also been reduced. And I expect to see them further reduced after this season. I am hoping we will have a great fishery this year, and that we will all be wrong. But in reality, I think we have to expect that the earnings and landings of inshore fishermen will be reduced. And yesterday the Federal Government should have recognized, in principle, this problem; and by recognizing in principle, they could have awaited the outcome of this fishing season and consequently then compensated inshore fishermen for reduced earnings. That is the first thing they should have done.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker.

An. Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: I am talking about

the package yesterday.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that could have happened was the talk about the changing of gear types and increasing the size of the mesh. That there must be money given to inshore fishermen for that - to make that change. It is going to cost them money to increase mesh size. And as well by increasing mesh sizes, we are going to see smaller fish escape from nets, which is very, very important that smaller fish escape to grow and to spawn. But what that is going to mean as well is a reduction in the earnings of inshore fishermen in this Province and the Federal Government should have recognized that as well.

So with that particular part of the program we share the Minister's concern, and we call upon the Federal Government to immediately look at re-addressing, if you want to call it, that particular side of the problem.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: On the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, we, as well, would like to call upon the Provincial Government to do something.

In this statement, Mr. Speaker, the Province recognizes that really there is nothing else to do in those communities that are being negatively affected. And we have said that all along. And the Federal Government to a degree yesterday recognized in their statement and their package as well, at least they had the sense to be community specific, which is what we wanted all along. We wanted to be community specific, because for those communities that are going to have their fish

plants shut down there must be something else for them. And that I might add, Mr. Speaker, is a real change from what this Government wanted for those communities.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: We saw passing reference of what was recommended to the Federal Government for Grand Bank and Gaultois and Trepassey, Mr. Speaker, from surveillance to gear manufacturing; to skiing in the White Hills; to Marble Mountain; to Egyptian submarines in St. John's. That is the kind of specifics that this Government recommended to Ottawa, to take care of this very serious problem, Mr. Speaker.

This Government recommends to Ottawa to take care of this very serious problem, Mr. Speaker. What we saw sent to Ottawa from this Government, Mr. Speaker, was nothing short of a panic list. The eleventh hour had arrived and this Government had not put anything concrete in front of the Federal Government. It was a panic list that was first drawn up by Dr. House and then on April 3 the Premier sent up a letter to sort of back that up, where he made his passing references to Grand Bank and Gaultois, and I do not think it is good enough.

Now, the other question, Mr. Speaker, is that there was \$110 million supposed proposal by this Government to get involved in the package. Well, Mr. Speaker, this Government can still get involved in addressing this very, very serious issue by using its \$110 million to complement, or to devise its own programs to address this very serious crisis. We do

not agree and we do not know, to be very honest, Mr. Speaker, in some aspects of this package whether there is enough money there. In some cases it is hard to judge today whether there will be enough money there to look after this problem as the stocks decrease and the earnings decrease. That is a hard judgement call. We are not satisfied with all this package, Mr. Speaker. There are some positive aspects to it and there are some very negative aspects.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday we saw the spectacle of the Premier telling this House and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that one of the prime reasons for his opposing the fisheries aid package, which was announced by the Federal Government yesterday, was that it forced people out of the fishery, it forced downsizing and rationalization of the fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in a report dated October 30th, 1989, the Federal Task Force on northern cod, the Stein Task Force, reported the following to the Federal Government: The task force prepared a structural adjustment note for consideration by Newfoundland officials. With minimal revisions, this note was presented to the Newfoundland Cabinet who gave it approval in principle. That is the report by the Stein Group to the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, dated

October 30th, 1989. Now, I want to ask the Premier this: Will the Premier confirm that the Newfoundland Government did, in fact, in October 1989, give approval in principle to this so-called structural adjustment note, also known as Building a Viable Fishery?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, we did not give approval to what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says. Here is our position in the fall of 1989, and I will read it. It was in response to a question raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and it is reported in Hansard, November 22, 1989. The Leader of the Opposition was talking about the real problem. He says, 'I guess where the real problem comes in is the difference between providing an economic alternative now and people having the opportunity to get back to the fisheries when fish stocks rebuild, as they will if they are properly managed.' He was concerned about this concept of downsizing and we spelled out our position. It was not to downsize the fishery. There was no specific aim to downsize the fishery. What we spelled out in the fall of 1989 is what I said yesterday. There is total and complete consistency, contrary to the position of the Leader of the Opposition, which has done a 180 degree twist.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wells: We will see. It is all on the record to be seen. Now let me read, Mr. Speaker -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: They do not like truth. Let me read from Hansard of November 22, and here is the position of the Government. 'Mr. Speaker, the position we took' - and this is in relation to dealings with the Federal Government - 'the position we took is that if the Federal Government is prepared to put the resources in, we will put whatever Provincial resources along with it to help improve the overall economy of the Province, as well as providing for the fishermen who are displaced, so that in the meantime, four, five, six, seven or eight years from now, as the fish stocks regrow, there is an opportunity for people to go back into the fisheries or stay with the alternative employment if they want to.' The objective was to give people a choice, and we laid it out quite clearly.

I went on to the next page to spell it out clearly several times. It appears on page R9 of the same day. 'Mr. Speaker, we take this approach because we believe it would be wrong to say to the Federal Government what you have to do is spend \$400 million or \$500 million.'

Mr. Simms: Reading Hansard, is all you are doing.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, they want the truth of the position last year. Our position is the same yesterday as it was last fall and is today. There is clearly too great a pressure on our fishing industry. There are too few job opportunities in this Province so that our people have to put pressure on the fishery to earn an income or to get means of qualifying for unemployment insurance. So, Mr. Speaker, we must provide alternative

employment. It is not sufficient to buy them out of the fishery now, and then block the door to their entry next year, and leave people next year with no alternative means. That is why we have taken the approach, and that is why we say the approach now endorsed by the Opposition is totally wrong, because that is what the result will be.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Simms: Wiggle, wiggle, wiggle.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we know exactly what the Premier said on the public record in this House, read out again today, and so does everybody else. What we are concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is what the Premier and the Government say in the secrecy of the Cabinet room and then transmits to the national Government. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier confirm that building a viable fishery option, which was approved in principle by him and his Cabinet in October, 1989, clearly outlined the implications of creating a modern, commercially viable fishery in Newfoundland as the following: fewer fishermen, fewer plant workers, and fewer fish plants. Wasn't that what the Government approved, Mr. Speaker?

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker. Here is what the Government approved - this is precisely what

the Government approved, and we will put forward the proposal, the August 23rd proposal, we will put that forward. That is what the Government approved. That is the Government's position. Now what Mr. Stein says, or what Mr. Crosbie wants to contort it into, or what the Leader of the Opposition wants to contort or twist it into in order to cover up their own failures, is up to them. I am quite prepared to let the public of this Province judge us, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of what we have said in writing, not what Mr. Stein or the Leader of the Opposition says we said, or would like to think we said.

Mr. Baker: Right on!

Mr. Simms: Squirming, squirming. Backed into a corner now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The coverup here, Mr. Speaker, is the communication from this Government to the Government of Canada in October, 1989. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier this:

Mr. Simms: He doesn't even know what you are talking about.

Mr. Rideout: Will the Premier confirm again that the building a viable fisheries option which was approved in principle by him and his Cabinet in October, 1989, contained the Government approved principle that companies must be viable without Government subsidization? Did this Government approve that principle Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I approve of the principle, and the Government does, that companies must be viable without Government subsidization in order to succeed. Now, I do not know what document the Leader of the Opposition is talking about when he talks about building a viable fisheries option.

Mr. Simms: You already said you did twice, now you don't know what he is talking about.

Premier Wells: I would like to see it. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say whether or not the Government approved anything that is in it without seeing it. If he is prepared to table what he is talking about or what he is fronting for his friends in Ottawa, then I will answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier did not know about the document, and said no. Now he doesn't know what document we are talking about. Yet, in October or November of last year, when I asked him questions here in this House, which appeared in Hansard, he knew all about the document. There is something wrong with that.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier this. Will the Premier confirm that the building a viable fisheries option, which was approved in principle by him and his Government in October, 1989, that by approving that document in principle, by approving that option in principle, this Government, in fact, gave its approval to restricted entry to the fishery, and gave its approval

to reducing the total number of fishermen by placing a freeze on the transfer of licences, by a buy-back of licences, and by a phaseout of part-time fishermen? Didn't the Government agree to all of those things, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition have been led down the garden path by their friends in Ottawa. They somehow want me to say that we approved something the Federal Government wrote some where, some time. I can only say to you now I know this much: In October, 1989, we tabled the document we gave to the Federal Government on August 23, 1989. Now that is what we approved in October of 1989. I do not know what he is talking about when he talks about this building a viable fishery. If he will show me the document, I will tell him whether or not we approved it. As far as I know, it is a complete fabrication and a concoction, either by the hon. Member, or by his friends in Ottawa, or by somebody else. I know nothing about what they are talking about. I do not know whether it is real, whether it is fabricated or what, so I cannot say that we approved it or we did not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Premier that the Premier acknowledged this building a viable fisheries option in this House in November past. What is

wrong with the Premier's memory, Mr. Speaker?

Let me ask the Premier this: In this option, building a viable fisheries option, which the Government dealt with -

An Hon. Member: Table the document.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, the Premier acknowledged knowing about this option when I asked him about the option last fall.

Premier Wells: I don't know about it.

Mr. Rideout: Will the Premier tell us whether or not his Government gave approval -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Pardon?

Mr. Doyle: Would you like to repeat that?

Mr. Simms: 'Liar', he said.

Mr. Rideout: Would you like to repeat that.

Mr. Tobin: That came from the other side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair didn't hear the expression, but, again, the Chair has been notified by expression of hon. Members that an unparliamentary utterance was made. I am sure the hon. gentleman will do as the Chair requests, and if an unparliamentary utterance was made, I would ask the hon. Member to please withdraw it immediately.

Mr. Grimes: No unparliamentary

utterance was made, Mr. Speaker, and I do not withdraw. I did not make any unparliamentary utterance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair will check the tapes for what the hon. gentleman said. We will let it stop there for the moment.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: I was asking the Premier before that rude interruption from the corner, whoever it was, whether or not his Government, in approving this building a viable fishery option, had given its approval to manage an orderly downsizing of plant capacity, referred to by the Stein Task Force as the soft-landing approach. Did the Premier ever hear tell of that, Mr. Speaker? Did the Government every hear tell of that and give its approval, or otherwise, to the Government of Canada?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Here is what I can tell the House and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker: It is found on page 5 of the document to which I referred. This the only time I know the phrase 'building a viable fishery', and this is stated to be the challenge, building a viable fishery. Here is what we said with respect to that: 'Therefore' - if the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants the answer, I will give it to him - 'the objective of building a viable fishery must be accompanied by an objective of economic diversification. These objectives are inextricably linked. It is not possible to build a viable

fishery without diversifying the economic base. On the other hand, it is not possible to have a healthy economy in Newfoundland without a viable fishery sector.'

Now, I admit to all of that, I accept authorship and support for that, if that is what he is talking about. If there is something else he has in mind, for heaven's sake have the decency and the courage to show me what he is talking about and I will answer his questions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair has recognized the hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is making some comment about Telexes from Ottawa. Maybe it is about Meech, I do not know. I would like to ask the Premier a question. When the Premier made his press release last January 5 pertaining to funding for the extended notice period for workers, particularly at Grand Bank, Gaultois and Trepassey, he reiterated at that time that the extended notice period was the only action the Province could take by itself to minimize the short-term hardships associated with fish reductions and plant closures. And further on the Premier stated 'the action being taken by the Province is not intended to, and will not, avert these closures.'

Looking at what is expected to happen with the total allowable

catch next year - it is expected to be reduced - and the reference in the Premier's release, his reference to '91 for funding to enable those people to work for twenty weeks in 1990-91, could the Premier inform the House if any of this money has been paid to Fishery Products International to date, and how much he expects to be paid this year?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I forget the complete details as to how much will be paid this year and how much will be paid next year, but there is \$6 million in the Budget of the Department of Employment and Labour Relations for -

An Hon. Member: Nine million dollars.

Premier Wells: Nine million, I am sorry. There is \$9 million in the Budget this year for both Fishery Products and National Sea. My recollection is that close to \$3 million of that, or something approach \$3 million, will probably be required for National Sea, all of which would be required this year. So that leaves my Estimate of \$6 million for Fishery Products approximately correct for this year. I believe that is the way it would work out, but I could check the details and get it for the hon. Member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Premier a supplementary. Of course, we expect the TAC to be reduced, and I, personally, if the TAC is reduced any further, do not expect that Fishery Products International will operate Grand

Bank, Gaultois or Trepassey at all in 1991. I hope they do, but I am fearful they will not. If such is the case, then the \$13 million or \$14 million of Government's commitment will not be totally spent.

My supplementary to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is would the Premier make a commitment to provide any portion of the unused funding to the communities of Grand Bank, Gaultois and Trepassey? With the Premier having acknowledged that the \$300 million for NatSea will be used this year, would the Premier make that commitment, to provide that funding to those communities to assist them to adjust to this very serious crisis?

Some Hon. Members: A good question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not make a commitment as to how the funds will be spent before the circumstances that justify the expenditure or lack of expenditure arise. We will meet the circumstances as they arise and make the decision at the time. It would be irresponsible to do what the hon. Member asks.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me ask the Great Pretender another question. The Premier, the Great Pretender, on December 13 in this House, in debate, said he thought the time was right now for the Federal Government and the Provincial Government to get heavily involved

with aquaculture promotion and development in all species in the Province, 'and this is a good opportunity to put people to work effectively in that area.' Would the Premier explain for the House, please, after having said that, with the Department of Fisheries Budget reduced by \$2.1 million, and aquaculture being reduced from \$337,000 from last year to \$288,000 this year, a reduction of \$50,000, how he could have made such a statement?

Mr. Warren: He is not going to answer. He is The Great Pretender.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Let me just say very simply to the Premier, then, in light of the importance at that time, the priority put on aquaculture as a way to get around this very serious fisheries crisis, to develop and expand the fishing industry and to create employment, how could his Government, and particularly his Department of Fisheries, and he is the Leader of the Government, justify a reduction in Subhead 3.1.04, under the Fishing Industries Support Services of the Budget, by \$50,000?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I will examine that particular Subhead and provide the House with the answer in due course.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to get back to the extended notice we talked about. The Government, when the

companies announced closure of the plants, asked them if they would give extended notice and consequently provided somewhere from \$11 to \$14 million. If the TAC is reduced this coming year and the companies refuse to open their plants because they do not have resource enough to make it a viable operation, will the Premier confirm then that they will not receive any of the money as committed?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: If the companies do not open the plants, the companies will not receive the money that would otherwise be paid next year. I am confident that that is so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: If we have a severe reduction in the TAC, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier, then, if the plants are closed, and if there is no diversification plan in place - because he stated the reason he asked the companies to give extended notice was because the Government was ill-prepared for what had happened and had to put a diversification plan in place - what are the people going to do? If plants close with no diversification plan in place, what are the people going to do for employment?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Let me correct the hon. Member, Mr. Speaker. I did not say this Government was ill-prepared. What I did say was the Government of Canada was not ready to deal with its responsibilities, and had not worked out an arrangement with the

Province to deal with this particular situation, and in fact procrastinated until yesterday, and yesterday only announced something that they could have announced six months ago, for all that was in yesterday. That is what I did say, Mr. Speaker. If that eventuality occurs, where there is a further reduction in the total allowable catch next year and the plants we did expect to remain open in this coming season do not remain open, we will have to deal with that circumstance if, as, and when it arises. I am not going to deal with such an issue in a speculative manner now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, the Premier certainly has selective memory, because in public meetings he quite clearly stated that the Government was not prepared to address the problem and consequently needed more time to put a diversification plan in place, and consequently offered extended notice, which really means nothing, because this year the companies were going to keep the plants open anyway, and next year, if the TAC is reduced severely, then the Government does not have to put in anything in. It was nothing but a smart political move.

I ask the Premier, then, in light of the fact that the companies might close plants if the TAC is reduced, and in light of the fact that the Government has no plan in place, is not the only viable option the one offered by Mr. Valcourt yesterday, when he stressed the funding provided will help in promoting diversification within the fisheries to provide a

broader base for a viable fishery over the long-term, with emphasis being placed on the development of underutilized species, aquaculture, fisheries and fish products, with the priority being placed on plants which are now in trouble so they can be kept open to provide employment for the people?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Let me correct the hon. gentleman again, Mr. Speaker. The position we took was that we brought this matter to the attention of the Federal Government on August 23 and they dillydallied for months and would do nothing. Finally, we made the issue public in October and forced them into doing something.

MS VERGE: Ah! Ah!

PREMIER WELLS:

The Member for Humber East can moan and groan if she wants, it cannot alter the fact. Moaning and groaning is not an intelligent response to the fact, not at all intelligent. I am prepared to debate on an intelligent basis, but I am not prepared to moan and groan with her on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, that is the fact of the matter. Now, the way to deal with the issue is not the way Mr. Valcourt has suggested, the way to deal with the issue is to find viable alternative employment for our people in a variety of areas of the Province, in particular in the communities affected, but also in other parts of the coast of our Province, where people must rely on the fishery. That is what we asked the Federal Government to do. We have put proposals to them.

Ms Verge: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Let the Federal Government do what is right and put a naval station in Trepassey. That is what we have asked them to do. Let them do that. If Mr. Crosbie is committed to the people of Trepassey, let him -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

Indeed it is not.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Premier Wells: I was not going to say this, but I have perhaps been goaded into saying it, because they are fronting for the Federal Government with their telexed instructions from Ottawa, as he reads out from Ottawa the questions the Federal Government wants asked in this House today. If that is the way they are operating, then I will tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that recently we have had a request from the Federal Government for usage of a portion of the Southside wharf, operated by the Marine Institute, for naval facilities.

An hon. Member: Sure we know that.

Premier Wells: Sure you know that. They know that. The Federal Government is dealing with the Opposition. Well, if the Federal Government wants to deal with the Opposition of this Province, that is up to them -

Mr. Simms: That is old news.

Premier Wells: - if that is their competence. Our response to them is stop trying to crowd out St. John's harbour. Put your naval facility in Trepassey, if you are interested in the people of this

Province and in rural Newfoundland. If you want to deal with the real problems, put your naval facility in Trepassey. That is the thing to do. If you want to deal with the real problems of this Province, put a foreign trade zone in Grand Bank and the southern part of the Burin Peninsula. If you have any concern for the people of this Province, that is the thing to do. That is right, that is the thing to do.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The Chair is now having great difficulty deciding whether the Premier is answering the original question or whether he is answering a barrage or myriad of questions coming from Members to my right. I would ask the Premier to finish up, please.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: In response to the question of the hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes as to whether or not what Mr. Valcourt proposed was the best solution, my judgement is no, it is not the best solution. You cannot buy people out of the fishery for six months or one year, as he is proposing to do, because what are they going to do next year, and the next year, and the next and the next? You have to provide viable economic alternatives and this is -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) disagreed with him.

Premier Wells: I would still like to answer the question. The viable economic alternatives we

would propose is a naval facility in Trepassey instead of crowding St. John's Harbour; a foreign trade zone in Grand Bank to provide for assembly operations.

An hon. Member: It is not proposed, he says.

Mr. Simms: Silly!

Premier Wells: It is here, Mr. Speaker. It is in this document.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please!

Premier Wells: I would still like to answer the question, and not three or four others. We think this is the way to deal with the problem, because what the Federal Government is providing, Mr. Speaker, only deals with the immediate short-term problem. And they have thrown a sop to the longer term solution, by providing for \$90 million for the four Atlantic Provinces, and perhaps some to Quebec as well, \$90 million over five years. That is an average, say, of \$18 million a year for the whole of the Atlantic Provinces. Sure the former Government wasted more than that on Sprung!

Mr. Simms: The matter is sub judice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A final supplementary. It is quite clear the Premier does not understand the implications of yesterday's document. I ask him, in light of the hints he dropped yesterday about plans for Trepassey, and in light of his revelations today, and in light of the fact that the Federal Minister

in yesterday's proposal made it possible for the people to use their own discretion in what they would like to do, number one, the first thing would be to keep the plant open and, secondly, to find ways to diversify, to find extra employment above and beyond not instead of, as I pointed out one time before when the Premier himself was saying close her down, I ask the Premier then, in light of his comments, would he be quite satisfied to cooperate with the people of Trepassey, and myself, in using the funding provided by the Federal Government to develop some of the plans he and others might have? And I ask him, in order to help the area generally, will he support a year-round ferry to Argentia?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the people of Trepassey, great respect for the Mayor and the council in Trepassey. They are absolutely tremendous people to deal with, very reasonable, very understanding, very fair-minded and very considerate of others. That's the people of Trepassey. I would not do or say anything to mislead them or lead them to expect there are great solutions just around the bend, I would be fair and honest and straightforward with them at all times. We can do no more for Trepassey than we do for Gaultois, Grand Bank and the St. John's workers and fish plant, and Burgeo, Ramea and all the other places around this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take any more intelligence than is available on the Opposition side of the House to know and to understand -

Mr. Matthews: There you go again. There you go.

Premier Wells: I did not say anything about the level of it, I said it doesn't take any more intelligence -

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please!

Premier Wells: It doesn't take any more intelligence than is available to know, Mr. Speaker, that when you have reduced the total allowable catch from 266,000 tons to 197,000 tons, and with the prospect of reducing it still further next year looming over the horizon, that some plants will not operate. Now, some plants will not operate. Any reasonable level of intelligence could only come to that conclusion, so I will not say to the people of Trepassey falsely, to give them false hope, 'we assure you we will work with you to keep your plant open.' We cannot do that - we cannot do that. We say to the people of Trepassey, we assure you that we will turn ourselves inside out to try and find a viable economic basis for the community of Trepassey. And if that is going to be in fishery, God bless the fishery and God bless Trepassey! If it has to be in something else, so it will be. Then, still God bless Trepassey!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We just saw in the Premier's answer the Government's real position as it was forwarded to the Government of Canada last

October.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Fisheries. On November, 15th in this House, talking about the downsizing and rationalization of the fishery, the Minister said the following: 'I believe we are going to have to make some tough decisions in that respect and maybe reduce the number of fishermen, maybe remove or reduce some of the part-time fishermen in the industry.' How does the Minister square that position with the position being articulated by the Premier in this House and other places, yesterday and today? What is the Government's policy, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Simms: A turnaround position, quickly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. W. Carter: Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious. I think when I made that statement my meaning was quite obvious, that in order to do that we would first of all have to involve ourselves in some economic diversification to provide jobs for the fishermen who obviously would have to leave the fishery. We are not suggesting that fishermen be taken out of their boats and left onshore with no other source of employment, what we are saying is join with us, Mr. Federal Government, join with us and let us start diversifying the economy, where fishermen who will be displaced from the boats or from the fish plants will then have a job to which they can go and earn a living.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to present the report of The Public Tendering Act exception for the Month of March.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to table the Annual Report of the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Simms: It is about time.

Mr. Baker: This is the fourth such report we have presented in the last year.

Notices of Motion

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 To Amend The Human Rights Code, 1988"; I give further notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Commissioners For Oaths Act."

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Motion 8, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of

Health to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Health Act", carried. (Bill No. 45).

On motion, Bill No. 45 read a first time, ordered read a second time, on tomorrow.

Mr. Baker: Motion 9, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Members Of The House Of Assembly (Retiring Allowances) Act, The Public Service (Pensions) Act And The Uniformed Services Pensions Act". (Bill No. 44).

On motion, Bill No. 44 read a first time, ordered read a second time, on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Order 2. The motion is that I do leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to discuss the Estimates.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

Mr. Chairman (Snow): Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. There is one thing I recognized that I meant to clear up before we left last night and did not. The Opposition House Leader asked a couple of times about the re-organization of Treasury Board, and that kind of thing. There is

a combination being done. The reason I was reminded of it is because today they are moving things around down there.

It is a combination of the Staff Division and the Budget Division, instead of having two separate Divisions now we will now have one Division. The Staff Division does analysis of papers for Treasury Board and the Budget Division also performs part of that function as well as the Budget preparation and Budget control. So they were in fact sharing part of that function of preparing papers and so on for Treasury Board. We felt that we could perhaps make them a little bit more efficient by joining them together. I think there were about five employees in each Division. Now that will create a single Division. We envisage not needing any more than maybe eight individuals in the combined Division, and all of the same functions of both Divisions will be performed by these individuals. So it is an efficiency measure to make the system a little more efficient in Treasury Board. So that is the details on the number of employees and so on.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the President of Treasury Board for that answer.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be appropriate after three and three quarter hours yesterday of examining the Estimates of the Executive Council, which includes the Premier's Office, Intergovernmental Affairs, and other responsibilities of those particular individuals and Ministers.

At least, I would like to, from my perspective, summarize briefly some of the matters that we addressed yesterday. And after three and three-quarter hours of scrutiny, I guess, we managed to scrape a few answers. Now the President of Treasury Board quite frequently, as I pointed out last night, from time to time had to indicate or had to answer in very vague terms, as far I know, and I think we plan to and in these times of answers, so I asked him if he would perhaps get his officials in this morning and maybe have some more firm answers.

But I thought for a moment maybe it was just because the President of Treasury Board was not totally prepared, or did not quite have all the information at his fingertips until the revelation of the Minister of Finance, and I am glad the Premier is here today to hear this because he may not be aware of this, once again his infamous Minister of Finance put his foot in his mouth, because yesterday evening, and you will see a portion of it in Hansard, as a matter of fact, although unfortunately they did not quote it all, but it is pretty clear what he said, and everybody in the House knows what he said.

Mr. Parsons: Make sure the Premier is listening.

Mr. Simms: I could not get the answers from the President of Treasury Board, when all of a sudden the Minister of Finance shouted across the House, you will get the answers after the House closes. Now, Mr. Chairman, if that was not the most startling comment of the evening, I do know what might be classed as the most startling comment. That prompted, of course, the Leader of the

Opposition and myself and others to then suggest the reasons why the Government is having these night sittings to try to get through their estimates. And the reason for it is pretty obvious, they want to get out of here by the end of May, this great reform party that was going to keep the House open forever and a day.

But the reality of this situation was emphasized by his Minister of Finance, when he said, 'Never mind the answers.' I kept asking for the answers and, he said, 'You will get the answers after the House closes.' That is what the Minister of Finance said and, of course, that is precisely what the Minister of Finance did with respect to his infamous payroll tax. We all remember in this House, and I am sure the public remembers, for days on end, for weeks, we peppered the Minister of Finance with questions about his payroll tax. Who is going to have to pay the payroll tax? Who will be involved? Who will be responsible? And he kept standing up day after day after day for the first part saying, I do not know. And then eventually saying I will make a statement; I will advise the House; I will make a statement. What happened is we adjourned for Easter for one week or ten days or whatever it was, and the Minister of Finance puts his information out, not at a press conference where the press could scrutinize it, but over the NIS wire, I presume, he put out some kind of a press release. So he did it, when the House was closed. He answered the questions on the payroll tax that had been asked of him for three weeks or four weeks in a row. He would not do it when the House was opened. He waited until the House closed and answered it. Slipped it out

on the wire. He did not even have the courage to call a press conference.

But we thought that was fine and dandy, until last night when I was saying to the President of Treasury Board, can you please get me some of these answers. I would like to have some of the answers. And the Minister of Finance shouts across and says, you will get the answer after the House closes. In other words, threatening us, hurry up and close the House. Now that, Mr. Chairman, is not acceptable. But, of course, it is fitting and it is in keeping with the Minister of Finance's whole approach and attitude.

Last night when we left this House to leave to go down on the elevator, the Minister of Finance once again, the infamous Minister of Finance, he was getting on the elevator with a group of us, from both sides, and Mr. Seward from CBC came to him and said, 'Could we do an interview?' And The Minister of Finance walked into the elevator and he said, 'No, no way, not tonight. Maybe tomorrow.' So we got on the elevator and the comment was made, I guess it is not only us that have trouble getting answers from the Minister of Finance, even the press could not get it. But that is typical of the Minister of Finance, unfortunately. I do not think it does much for the image of the Premier's Government.

I would like the Premier or the President of Treasury Board, whoever is going to respond or speak in this debate, to tell me whether or not the Minister of Finance was enunciating Government policy - that is the question - when he said, 'You will only get answers after the House closes.'

Is that Government policy? If it is not Government policy, has the Premier slapped him on the wrist, rapped him on the knuckles? Is that why he is not in the House today, because he cannot stand the pressure and he was told to stay out? Because every time he is here, he opens his mouth, puts his foot into it and gets into all kinds of trouble. Mr. Chairman, I just want to mention that in passing, at the outset.

An Hon. Member: You are all out of breath.

Mr. Simms: No, I have a sore throat.

Last night, Mr. Chairman, after three and three-quarter hours of asking questions and not getting anywhere with answers, we managed to scrounge out of the Government House Leader the fact - and I think he just blurted it out. I asked him who was getting the funding under professional services rendered for the Hibernia Implementation project, and the Government House Leader blurted out, 'Oh, there are a bunch of companies involved in that, Peter Lougheed's law firm' - Peter Lougheed's law firm! Now, I do not know but the Liberal Party won the election on that issue. I mean, that was a big issue for the Liberal Party. They chastised us, they attacked us, they criticized us every which way but loose about employing Peter Lougheed's law firm, as well as Peter Lougheed, to assist in the work his firm is noted for internationally with respect to offshore oil. And we find out last night that this company, Lougheed's law firm, is still on the payroll of the Government, the Liberal Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, which criticized the Tories time

and time again, another example, I suppose, of hypocrisy.

We also discovered, in scrutinizing the Estimates last night, that nearly one quarter of a million dollars has been budgeted in the Estimates this year on Meech Lake, nearly a quarter of a million dollar at least, budgeted on Meech Lake, according to the President of Treasury Board, in answering my questions; the establishment of the constitutional division in IGA, not counting the Premier's travel and all the rest of it, at least nearly a quarter of a million dollars.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: On Meech Lake. He said it was related to Meech Lake. I can only tell the Premier what it was, and perhaps he can tell us the rest of it.

Thirdly, we got a forthcoming response from the President of Treasury Board who acknowledged finally that, yes, indeed, they expect a lot of trouble in collective bargaining this year. They expect a considerable amount of trouble; in fact, to use his words, 'We would be foolish not to expect much more conflict than usual.'

Now, those are his words, so if the Member for Placentia wants to participate in the debate and say I am wrong, please do so, but don't shout across the House and interrupt me when I am trying to make a point.

And the reason we discovered it is because there is a sizeable increase in funding in Treasury Board for conciliation and arbitration. In fact, it is over

a 100 per cent increase. And when we asked the question time after time - I asked the question maybe ten times before he finally said, 'Yes, we do expect more conflict than normal. There is expected to be a difficult situation this coming year, with all the groups that are going to be up for negotiation.' We discovered that after 3-3/4 hours. Now, so far, there is not very much, but that is how the process works. We get up and ask questions, and the Ministers get up and refuse to answer, they walk all around them.

And, finally, of course, which I was pleased to see covered extensively by at least the printed media today, was the question of the Newfoundland Information Services move. We discovered that Newfoundland Information Services, which this hon. crowd opposite, when it was in Opposition, attacked us for and said it should be disbanded, should be dismantled, it was nothing but political -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Oh, yes, they did. The Premier is here shaking his head, when last night the President of Treasury Board said, 'Yes, I admit it. In fact, I was one of the ones who wanted to dismantle it.' That is what the President of Treasury Board said. The Premier is over there shaking his head, no, no, no. You had better have a chat to the President of Treasury Board.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, that is a good idea.

Anyway, they attacked it. They said it should be dismantled, it

was a waste of money.

Mr. Efford: The way you operated it.

Mr. Simms: We did not operate it! Don't be silly! The Minister of Social Services is, as usual, being silly. There was \$160,000 budgeted for last year. Do you know how much is in the Budget this year for NIS? \$338,000, more than a 100 per cent increase, doubled the cost, additional employees, more money for publications and printing and all the rest of that kind of thing, and it has been moved from the Department of Public Works into the political arm of Government, Executive Council. Now, whose office is in the Executive Council Estimates, I wonder? Well, you have the President of Treasury Board, you have the President of the Executive Council, and, strangely enough, you have the Premier's Office. Now, isn't that rather interesting? I guess the Premier can now have a closer eye on NIS, its services and operations.

The President of Treasury Board basically confessed last night that really he had a change of heart after he got in Government, he assessed the situation and he realized he was wrong; it wasn't being used for political purposes. It was nothing nonsensical, as the Minister of Social Services says, anybody at all could use it under the rules that existed, whatever they were. I remember Members on this side -

Mr. Efford: Your rules.

Mr. Simms: They were written rules, brother. The Minister of Social Services, as usual, doesn't even know what he is talking

about. I asked the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation to table the rules. Let us have a look at them and let us see. I remember Members on this side coming in complaining because Mr. Callahan, down in NIS, would not put a release over the wire because it had a word in there attacking somebody, or saying something about another Member. It was not political. That is nonsense, foolishness. It is a good system, it is a good process. Now the only question that arises is why you would double the Estimates, from \$160,000 to \$330,000, that is an interesting question in itself, when you have also provided FAX machines to every Minister's office in the Government?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Members's time is up.

Mr. Simms: I will get back at it, if nobody else wishes to speak. Does the hon. the Premier wish to speak?

Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of things I need to do to correct some of the wrong suggestions that have emanated from the hon. House. Indeed, I am quite pleased to answer some of these questions. I am going back now and looking at last night's Hansard, when some of these questions were raised. They wanted to know the number of people in the Premier's Office. Well, there are seventeen in the Premier's Office here and two in the Premier's Office in Corner Brook, for a total cost, Mr. Chairman, of everybody, including the Premier's salary, everybody, of \$780,000 altogether in the

Premier's establishment.

Mr. Simms: The Premier's Office and Executive Support.

Premier Wells: Under the Premier's direction is a total of seventeen people in here and two in Corner Brook, for a total cost, both here and in Corner Brook, of \$780,000.

Mr. Simms: What about the Premier's Office and the Executive Support staff? That is the political side.

Premier Wells: That is included.

Mr. Simms: What is the breakdown of that?

Premier Wells: I can give you the breakdown.

Mr. Simms: I will give it to them afterwards.

Premier Wells: The Premier and the Secretary directly in the Premier's Office is \$107,600, the salary cost of fifteen permanent positions, which is the political support staff and the administrative staff in the Premier's Office, is \$608,900. That is what we are requesting in this Budget.

Mr. Simms: Is this including the Premier's salary you are talking about?

Premier Wells: No, the Premier's salary is included in the amount of \$107,600. I have added up the three components. There is \$107,600 for the Premier and his secretary, \$608,900 for the fifteen permanent positions, and then there is an Executive Support Staff of two permanent positions, totalling \$53,800. When you add

all three of those together, you come up with a total cost of \$780,000 for the nineteen people involved in the Premier's Office.

Mr. Simms: So, the salary Estimates are wrong? The Salary Details shows nineteen people.

Premier Wells: I apologize. The salary Estimates show for one position that is not filled. I say there are nineteen people there now. If all positions were filled, there would be twenty. That is for a total cost of \$780,000. That compares with the last full year cost for the former Premier, Mr. Peckford, of \$1,300,000. So there is a substantial difference; it is a \$600,000 reduction in the cost of salary operations in the Premier's Office.

An Hon Member: What about the cost of consultants?

Premier Wells: There are none. We haven't had any consultants. I will tell you what the former Premier spent on consultants as well, if you want to know that. I can get that information, but I can tell you that up until now, we haven't spent any money on consultants.

Mr. Windsor: Almost every Department has (inaudible) its money allocations for consultant services (inaudible) cutting back on (inaudible) services.

Premier Wells: That may be so. There may indeed. I will take a look at it, and if there is an increase in consultants - I don't know, but I will certainly take a look at it and I will explain why. Mr. Chairman, that and travel is largely the difference between the much lower cost of the

Premier's office now from what it used to be before. The other question asked was under Executive Council, The Office of the Premier. The revised expenditure figure under Transportation and Communications for the fiscal year showed an expenditure of \$55,000 but the Estimates show a budgeted figure of \$78,000. That is correct, Mr. Chairman, but there is a reason for the difference. Hon. Members will know that the new Government was only formed on the 5th of May, so the Premier was quite busy reorganizing the new Government and there was very little travel in the first two or three months, and we knew it would be less. This year we are running from April 1 to the March 30 next year. Last year we were effectively two or three travel months short, so that explains the additional amount, Mr. Chairman.

The next question was Transportation and Communications, increased from \$116,000 to \$155,000. That appears, Mr. Chairman, under Transportation and Communications, and is pretty well the same explanation. We had Budgeted \$136,000 for last year but we did not spend it, we only spent \$116,000. We expect this year, because of the additional travel we anticipate for a variety of reasons, partly due to constitutional issues, as well, we may need as much as \$155,000, Mr. Chairman. But we may be as prudent this year as we were last year, and we may be able to indeed save some of the money. I sincerely hope we will be.

There were a couple of other questions which were raised, Mr. Chairman, one about Mr. Loughheed's Law Firm. When we got involved in the middle of the Hibernia discussions and negotiations with

that particular law firm, and we should use the law firm's name, which is Bennett Jones, in Calgary, they were so deeply involved in the negotiations that it would have been most imprudent for the Government to have changed horses in midstream, so we did not.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: I have no doubt about their capability. I think they are a capable firm, but I am also confident they are not the only capable firm, and I don't say they are the most capable firm, but I have no quarrel with their capability. But, Mr. Chairman, it would have been imprudent for us to change.

The other question raised by the hon. the Member for Grand Falls related to the expenditure allowed for the Constitutional Division, and this was due to Meech Lake, in the Department of Justice. That is not accurate.

Mr. Simms: Did you read Hansard.

Premier Wells: No, I did not read Hansard. I don't have to read Hansard to know what the truth is.

Mr. Simms: If you had read Hansard, you would know what I said.

Premier Wells: I am just referring to the comment the hon. Member made, and the reality is, Mr. Chairman, the Government wants to put in place a Constitutional Division in the Department of Justice to deal with major matters, including fisheries jurisdiction and offshore matters

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) the Department of Justice, is it?

Premier Wells: Pardon?

Mr. Simms: You said you intend to put a division in the Department of Justice.

Premier Wells: Well, we were looking at it, either in IGA or the Department of Justice.

Mr. Simms: It is in IGA, according to this.

Premier Wells: The vote at the moment is in IGA, I understand that, but we may rethink that and put the Constitutional Division in the Department of Justice, set it up as a section of the Department of Justice. IGA has most to do with it. For example, negotiating native land claims, and so on, that is a major matter that is normally attended to by IGA. The constitutional advisor would be heavily involved with that. Negotiations with the Federal Government with respect to Hibernia and offshore, with respect to fisheries jurisdiction, with respect to a host of other matters that have a constitutional overtone, usually involves IGA. So there is a difference of opinion as to whether the legal division can work best in IGA or in the Department of Justice. We had provided for the vote in IGA; we may, indeed, change that and let it operate in the Department of Justice instead, but firm decisions have not necessarily been made on that matter yet.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other thing they asked about was NIS, double the vote, the vote is up to \$338,000. Well, Mr. Chairman, that includes some of the public relations officials we have hired recently in place of the myriad of press aides every Minister, or virtually every Minister in the

former Government had, and cost the people of this Province about \$600,000. We abandoned that, and we are putting in place a proper information service through NIS, and that is part of the reason why NIS is increased in the manner in which it is. Some of those people are involved in that.

An hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: No, no, that is just for the press aides to Ministers.

Mr. Parsons: (Inaudible) what you just did.

Premier Wells: I will get the detailed cost of operating NIS before.

Mr. Parsons: (Inaudible) — go ahead.

Premier Wells: Let the Member sit tight for a minute. I will get the total cost of operating NIS and all the press and media aides the former Government had following them around, and put that all together and provide a lump sum cost of the information services that were provided. We have done it differently. We have taken it out of the political realm, and we are going to operate largely through NIS and a single public relations service, and we will give you the comparable costs of the two systems of operating.

Mr. Windsor: A single public relations firm? An external public relations firm?

Premier Wells: No, no, internal to Government. And some of the people will be assigned because of the work load to a particular department, or maybe two departments, and some may have

responsibility for two or three departments. We think this is a more efficient, more effective way to operate, and we have lined up some very competent people, Mr. Chairman, to do that job.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, we have been able to reduce the total operating cost of the Premier's Office by \$608,000 this coming year over what it was in the last full year under the former administration. And, Mr. Chairman, if you added the normal inflation which would have taken place, it is probably closer to \$900,000 that we have saved. So I think that that is pretty good performance in living up to our undertaking to streamline Government and make it more efficient and more cost-effective. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that has answered some of the questions raised by my hon. friend. If it has not, I would be happy to speak some more along the same lines.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we are at variance here, and I am afraid I will have to ask the Premier to try to clarify a bit more for me. Because unless these documents are faulty and incorrect, the numbers just do not jibe, and I do not quite understand it. For example, the departmental salary Estimates for 1988-89, the last year of the Peckford Administration to which he refers, in total for the Premier's office, Office of the Premier, Executive Support, and Administration, it is 26 employees, \$875,000. Now, that is the number. He can check it after. I will just give him what I have now, directly from the

Departmental Salary Details. This year for the Premier's Office, including Office of the Premier, Executive Support and Administration, total for the sub-program, the Premier's Office, is \$685,000, which is \$200,000 less for a total of nineteen employees. Now, maybe I am missing something, but, I mean, these are the salary estimates we are talking about for the Premier's Office - the salary estimates - and they show clearly a difference of about \$200,000 from 1988-89 to 1990-1991, as provided for in the Estimates; \$685,000 this year for your office with nineteen employees; \$875,000 for twenty-six employees. That is what is there, in the salary estimates.

Now, further to that, since the Premier provided us with the information he had, I am not sure whether it is incorrect or something else is thrown in there we are not aware of, or what, but perhaps we need a full breakdown; maybe he can table what he has in terms of response so we can see where the confusion is. But from the perspective of the political part of it, in particular, the Office of the Premier, which is the Premier himself and his secretary, and then the Executive Support, and it is the Executive Support, under the Executive Support Branch of the Premier Office, of course, where you have all your political people, basically, your Chief of Staff, your Public Relations Director, your Executive Assistants, or Special Assistants, whatever they are called, and then your secretaries, your parliamentary Assistant to the Premier, and so on, and so on. So, under the Premier's Office this year, from the Departmental Salary Details,

this document tabled by the Government, the total number of people involved there are fifteen; the Premier's Office, Executive Support, fifteen. The total amount of money budgeted there is \$547,942 - it is on page 8. That is for fifteen people in the Premier's Office and Executive Support. And if you look to the previous page and add the overtime - I am sorry, it is not overtime, it is called Temporary and Other Employees - you will see there is another \$70,700 provided in the Estimates for Temporary Employees, an additional number of employees. It does not say how many, but it is \$70,700. That is what is budgeted for Temporary Employees. And if you add the two, \$547,000 plus the \$70,000 overtime, it comes to \$617,000. That is for the Office of the Premier - Executive Support, okay? It is \$547,000 total for fifteen employees. That is what the Departmental Salary Details show. Then the previous page shows what is there for Temporary and Other Employees. Then the Premier's Office - oh, I am sorry. Maybe I have misread it. No, Executive Support \$70,700, Temporary Employees, page 6 of the Departmental Salary Details Booklet. Are you familiar with it? So you add the \$70,000 to the \$547,000, and it gives you \$617,000. My point is if you take the Estimates from 1988-89, Mr. Peckford's year, which is what the Premier has tried to do and would like to do, and you add the salary vote for the Office of the Premier and Executive Support, you will see the total number of employees is sixteen and the total expenditure is \$617,000, precisely about the same amount as a matter of fact, under those two heads, Executive Support and the Premier's Office.

Where the real difference is is in Administration, where Mr. Peckford had eight people employed. That is where he had his chef and those other ones, in that division, and the Premier only has two employed. That is where the big difference is. But in terms of the Executive Support and the Premier's Office, there does not appear, to me, to be any major difference.

Anyway, I suppose, you can argue about it day in and day out, but I make the point for the obvious political reason, and I make the point because that is the way I read it. I want to make sure that if we are going to have this argument for the next three or four years, that somehow both sides of the story come out.

Now, can I also ask of the President of the Council, if he perhaps could listen and take note of it, in the 1989-90 Budget, last year's Budget, under the Premier's Office, there was a position identified in the Salary Details Booklet, on page 11, a position of Policy Advisor, okay? The estimated salary was \$65,190 for a position of Policy Advisor. It was in your Budget last year. My question is simple: Was that position filled? Who occupied that position? Where is it now? It does not show in this year's Budget. I want to know, for example, had it been Ms Coyne? Would that be the person, or what? Who filled the position of Policy Advisor?

An hon. Member: Nobody.

Mr. Simms: Nobody. It was not filled. Well, okay, that is fine. That is why I asked the question.

Where was Ms Coyne's salary located last year, then, in the last year's Estimates, prior to this April? I understand her salary now is in this Constitutional Affairs Division, or whatever it is called, in IGA. And that is why I asked the question last night about whether this was mostly related to Meech? I got the distinct impression it was, because I understood that Ms Coyne was hired to give the Premier advice on Meech Lake, in particular. I do not know if she was hired to give you advice on fisheries and all those kind of constitutional matters as well, but I believe she was hired for advice on Meech Lake. If that is the case, she is the only employee in the Constitutional Affairs Division, a Division which has a Budget of \$214,000, which I have said was related to Meech Lake.

Mr. Wells: No.

Mr. Simms: The Premier says, no, no, no, it is not all Meech Lake. Yet, the only employee, the only significant employee with major responsibilities, is Deborah Coyne. So, perhaps he could explain that. Maybe I am just stupid, maybe I am confused, and the Premier will no doubt lecture me if I am and tell me how wrong I am, but perhaps he could explain that. Maybe, Mr Chairman, I will just leave it at that for those two. There are lots of other things we want to get on to, but I don't want to bog it down with a whole bunch of things, and we can see what the Premier has to say on it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, I think so. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Premier.

Premier Wells: I have a recollection of a few things he asked. The figure I gave him of \$1,300,000 for the operation of the Premier's office in the last full year is taken from the Public Accounts. Those are the actual expenditures in the Public Accounts.

Mr. Simms: Not just salaries?

Premier Wells: No, no, salaries alone. Salaries alone. The actual expenditure in the Public Accounts for the whole of the office was \$1,778,571. That was the total expenditure, \$1,778,571, taken from the Public Accounts of the Province for the year ended March 31, 1989. This is the information the Public Service provided me with and I pass this on to the House. It is not taken from the Estimates, it is taken from the Public Accounts.

Mr. Simms: Yes, I heard that.

Premier Wells: Okay.

Mr. Simms: The Estimates will give you the revised expenditure from the last year, and I want to see if it coincides.

Premier Wells: I asked the people, Mr. Vincent in particular, in the office, who manages the accounts, to provide me with detailed information, and this is the information I now happily pass on to the House. The actual expenditure on salaries was \$1,300,000, and it shows the three divisions: \$110,113 for the Premier's Office directly, the Executive Office, the political side, \$1,014,686 and then, I guess on the administrative and secretarial, \$175,594. Those

three added together round out to \$1,300,000.

Mr. Simms: I will wait, if you wish, because I think there has been an error somewhere.

Premier Wells: Well, if there is an error, I would most certainly like to correct it. Ms Coyne was engaged at the time to be a constitutional advisor but, quite frankly, the need at the time was because of the urgent matters arising out of the Meech Lake discussions and issues. That is what prompted the immediate hiring. Largely, not exclusively, the great bulk of the work Ms Coyne has been doing is in relation to the Meech Lake Constitutional issue. There is no question about that. Her salary would be included in that IGA estimate for Constitutional Division to which the hon. Member referred. I believe those were all the questions he asked. I guess he has some more now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I -

Premier Wells: Mr. Chairman, just before he proceeds, when I sat in this House last it was the frequent practice, in order to ensure that the maximum amount of accurate of information was given at the time, it was asked to have one of the officials, who was very knowledgeable about the detail, be available immediately in the House to give the information to the Committee.

Now I do not know if that practice has changed significantly since, but I would certainly have no objection, if the Committee has no objection, to inviting the man who

is standing outside the door, and I can run out and get the information from him and come back and tell the Committee, which seems to be a terribly inefficient way to do it. If the Committee does not object, I do not mind having Mr. Vincent available, because everybody knows I do not know these figures. I am passing on to the House detailed information given to me by somebody else. I do not occupy my time with counting these dollars, other people in the public service do. It would be more efficient to do it that way, if the Committee has no objection.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of whether the Committee has any objection. It is not proper procedure. It is not parliamentary. When the Estimates under this Head are done they are done in the House of Assembly, in Committee of the Whole. You cannot have strangers in the House in Committee of the Whole. It is totally different if other Departments are done outside the House in Committee stage, by Estimates Committee. But in Committee of the Whole it is not proper practice or procedure to have strangers enter the House upon invitation, I think that really is not (inaudible)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Chairman, somebody is going to immediately say yes, but that was in the dark ages. When I sat in this House before, it was the routine practice. As a matter of fact it may even have been that the present Clerk of the House sat with the then Premier, perhaps not. But others did, with every Department. When any Minister was

being examined and asked questions the officials of the Department were available to give the information. It could be done very efficiently and very effectively, instead of going back and forth in this way.

But I do not insist on it. I am not going to belabour the Committee with it. But it was the normal practice when I last sat in the House - when it got stopped or changed I do not know.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Just to respond to that I want to -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. W. Carter: I just wanted to comment on what the Premier has been saying.

Mr. Chairman: Well, the hon. the Opposition House Leader was recognized first.

Mr. Simms: No, go ahead.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. W. Carter: I agree with the Premier. I can recall back between the years 1975 and 1979 when I sat in the House. It was a common practice then for Ministers to have their deputies or their assistant deputies sitting next to them. I recall Mr. Ank Murphy, who was one time Minister of Provincial Affairs: Ank would not come in the House and discuss his estimates without his deputy with him. Of course, it goes back further than that because in my previous tenure in the House, the same thing happened. I do not know if there has been a change in

the House rules or not since then, but certainly upon until the later part of the 1970s that was the practice. I might add, pretty well all Ministers took advantage of it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: My understanding is that the experiences of the Premier in 1966, twenty-four years ago, and the experience of the Minister in 1975, fifteen years ago, were in fact thus as described by those two gentlemen. However, in 1979 the rules were changed by the House, by both parties in the House, by agreement. And in those rules it was agreed, and it is in those rules now, that the Departmental Estimates are referred outside the House to be studied by Legislative Review Committees.

In Committee of the Whole this one Department, Executive Council basically in the Premier's Office, is done in the House of Assembly in Committee of the Whole.

Premier Wells: And that is the only one.

Mr. Simms: Yes, that is the only one in Committee of Supply.

Premier Wells: Then why don't we employ the former practice of having the officials here for that?

Mr. Simms: Because the rules do not provide for that and do not allow for that.

Premier Wells: We can by consent.

Mr. Simms: We are in Committee of Supply right now. The Legislative Review Committees meet outside.

Premier Wells: That is right. And they examine everyone except Executive Council.

Mr. Simms: That is correct.

Premier Wells: So why would we not do Executive Council the same way?

Mr. Simms: As a matter of fact, Finance used to be done here but you have changed it and referred Finance out, for example, to be done by an Estimates Review Committee.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the point is the Premier says he does not know all the answers. We understand that, but if he wishes to take notice of it, and get information we are quite happy. We have twenty-odd hours, I think, or so remaining on this particular Department. So we have plenty of time and he can get some information, but, as all Ministers you are responsible for your Departments. And any Minister could say the same thing. I do not have the information here but I will get it. But you are expected to be briefed when your Estimates are appearing. You are expected to be briefed by your officials, bring them in five o'clock or five-thirty in the morning and ask them to run through it and tell you what this means and what that means and then when you come to the House you will have the answers, and you will not have to get up in the House and say, 'I am sorry I do not have the answers.' I mean that is what the President of Treasury Board was trying to get away with last night.

Anyway, I am not used to that kind of legal parliamentary discussion, I am not interested in that kind

of stuff. We leave that to the lawyers. I want to get back to the \$1.3 million in salaries that he is talking about, that he says he took from the public accounts for the year 1988-89. Is that what he said? The estimates, for example, for last year 1989-90, provides for \$1.3 million expenditure for the office of the Premier - everything. I am just wondering if the numbers somehow got mixed up or got confused because I cannot see -

Premier Wells: What was the question again?

Mr. Simms: Okay, the \$1.3 million, the answer you gave me was for salaries only in the Premier's office, 1988-89, was \$1.3 million approximately. That is the answer you gave me a few moments ago for 1988-89.

Mr. Premier: Yes.

Mr. Simms: And I was asking where did you get that number because in the departmental salary estimates of 1988-89 it does not show that. It shows a different number. It shows a considerably different number as a matter of fact. But then you said the answer came from the public accounts of the Province. So I sought then to get the estimates for 1989 to see what the revised figure would have been on salaries alone.

Premier Wells: For 1988-89.

Mr. Simms: For 1988-89.

Premier Wells: Right.

Mr. Simms: And you say that the number you have is \$1.3 million approximately.

Premier Wells: But in fact the

revised show much more than \$1.3 million.

Mr. Simms: Well, that was my next question. So, I do not know where the information - there is a bit of confusion there. And the other point I was making, of course, is that from the estimates of that year - I do not know why the significant increase in salaries under executives for that particular year in the Premier's office, two years ago. I have no idea what happened in 1988-89, but there is a significant increase for that particular year.

Premier Wells: Up to \$274,600.

Mr. Simms: Now that would not have anything to do with - I wonder would it? Was it in that year that the severance pay was paid out and things like that? No, it was not. That would have been the next year.

An hon. Member: The year after.

Premier Wells: I will find out the precise details. But let me tell the House that I have two documents here dealing with the same subject. One is the public accounts. Now I take that to be the Auditor General's report of the public accounts to be an accurate accounting of the actual expenditures. Actual dollars expended. So, the figures I gave you earlier totalling \$1.3 million come from that, and the exact amounts are \$110,113, \$1,014,686, and \$172,594. That roughly is \$1,300,000. Now that is where I got the \$1.3 million, the revised estimates tabled with last years estimates, which were tabled in May - early June.

An hon. Member: Early June I think it was.

Premier Wells: Tabled in early June. Two of those figures are identical.

An hon. Member: Yes.

Premier Wells: The \$1,014,700 and the \$172,600. The figure that is different is right directly in the office of the Premier where it shows \$274,600. Now I am guessing - He cannot listen to both of us. I know he has two ears, but he can only listen to one of us.

Mr. Simms: Absolutely. I can hear you. You were guessing you said, what you suspect.

Premier Wells: The \$274,600, I am taking a guess, but I will find out and let him know, that that probably included an amount for severance. That is a guess on my part, which the Auditor General said you cannot do because the severance took place after March 31st, it took place in April or May. So you will note that in the revised for this year, if you look at the revised budget for this year, is up to \$123,500. So I think the Auditor General probably said the severance has to go in the year in which it was paid. That is a guess on my part. But I will find out why that is there. But nevertheless the expenditure for the former Premier's Office, in his last year of operation, was at the very least \$1.3 million for salaries; and it may have been more. I took the least of them, \$1.3 million. According to the actual Public Accounts.

Mr. Chairman: I would like for hon. Members to wait for the Chair to recognize them for the purpose of Hansard. And before I identify the Opposition House Leader, I would like to welcome to the House on behalf of hon. Members, Mr.

Jerome Walsh, the Mayor of Marystown, and Mr. Gerry Appleby, Mayor of Burin. I think the other gentleman is Rex Matthews, the Mayor of Grand Bank.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is rather confusing. There is no real reason for me to keep harping on it, but I want to make sure that it is clearly understood, because the impression is, of course, and far be it for me to defend the salaries paid to the Premier's Office two years ago, even though I was President of Treasury Board at the time, but I think the point I am trying to make here is that under the Executive Support Revised Figure, the \$1.014 million the Premier referred to - of the \$1.3 million. What I am asking is: wasn't a sizable portion of that amount of money for severance to the staff in the Premier's Office. You recall when there was a changeover, an Administrative changeover and that happened before the end of March of that year, and I am suspecting that a sizeable amount of that would have been for severance, because it is a significant jump from \$600,000 -

Mr. Baker: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, over here I am talking about now, remember the change in the two Administrations? Yes, but the Budget amount was \$600,000 and the final amount was \$1 million. I mean that is a significant amount of over-expenditure and I am a bit uncomfortable unless I knew - were there there additional staff people? Was it for severance of

staff? Yes, you will have to get the answer. But I will ask a couple of other questions.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Why do you not go ahead and ask, and I will just ask a couple of other questions or something, if you like. Do you want to comment?

Premier Wells: Yes, it is easier to do it that way. Because you see all the other Departments are done in Committees where that is done. This is done right here in the Committee of Supply.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: My apologies to the Chair. Let me also tell the House where the \$274,600 comes from in the revised for 1988-89. Mr. Vincent has just explained to me that that incorporates part of IGA too because there was a separate Ministry of IGA before and there is not now. It is one of the Ministries we eliminated and your hard-working Premier, and Members of the hon. House, your hard-working Premier is discharging both the responsibilities of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Office of the Premier, thus saving hundreds of thousands of dollars for the taxpayers of this Province. So that is where that \$274,600 differential comes from; and when the Auditor General has to do with it he can find it obviously to the Premier's Office and show the account somewhat differently. So that explains that.

Now while he is asking another question, I will run out and talk to Mr. Vincent, if you insist on

continuing this very inefficient method. I will run out and talk to Mr. Vincent and try to get an explanation for the \$1.014 million jump from \$617,000. I will be right back.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Yes, anytime I get an opportunity to get the Premier running out and running in, I am happy to oblige. You know, it is not only his estimates that we are scrutinizing here, we are scrutinizing the estimates of the President of Treasury Board, President of the Executive Council and so on. So there are lots of other people we can ask questions of, as I did last night, when I asked three and three-quarters hours worth of questions and got very few answers. But hopefully I will get more answers today since the Premier is here. I am sure he will crack the whip and will get the President of Treasury Board to be a bit more forthcoming with respect to his answers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the President of Treasury Board to give us, at the earliest opportunity, after the Premier perhaps has a few more words or whatever, but at the earliest opportunity I would like the President of Treasury Board to tell us what is transpiring with respect to Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services at the present time, he is the Minister responsible for NLCS. What kind of Administrative changes have taken place at that Crown Corporation in terms of the Executive, in terms of the Administration? More specifically, he mentioned last

night in a lot of his answers how a lot of expenditures for professional services are actually contracts with NLCS to do internal reviews of Departments and programs and things of that nature. I asked them last night to provide me with some information as to what programs are being reviewed, what Departments are being reviewed and under scrutiny, and he indicated he would try to get the information for me. Specifically, I would like -

An hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: No, the Opposition Office is not under scrutiny, I hope. The Opposition office is not be reviewed again, is it?

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Simms: Oh, no! I can't believe it! But could he tell us a little bit about NLCS, where it is going and how it is doing? What Executive changes have taken place in the Executive and Administration of NLCS since the Minister, the President of Treasury Board is responsible for NLCS and, secondly, I would like him to give me a specific answer to the question concerning pay equity, the equal pay for work of equal value policy that was brought in by the previous Administration, I might modestly say spearheaded by the former President of Treasury Board at that time, as a matter of fact -

An Hon. Member: Do you remember (inaudible)?

Mr. Simms: Do I remember? I certainly do. It was five o'clock in the morning, almost at the top of Signal Hill, sitting across the table from CUPE and a few other

NAPE people, and Mr. Dave Curtis, with whom our friend the President of Treasury Board would be very familiar, one of the chief negotiators of NAPE; if he doesn't know him well now, I can assure him he is going to know him well before the year is out. Anyway, it was five o'clock in the morning when we completed the agreement on pay equity.

The whole process started in 1985, with the Task Force on Affirmative Action, and it was one of their recommendations. That task force, I believe, was spearheaded and introduced by my predecessor, the Member for Mount Pearl. He was the one who had the foresight to set up this task force to look at affirmative action programs for the Public Service, and one of the recommendations was the pay equity issue - equal pay for work of equal value. In fact, it was announced in 1988, two years ago, in April. The process at that time was to be a joint committee process, as I recollect, to do a general review of the positions in the Public Service that would be the appropriate ones to review, and once there was agreement, then the process would be put in place where the funding would be provided over a period of time to bring these positions to true equality, and to be retroactive, I believe, to April of 1988, the date of the announcement of the policy. I want to know, and would like to know, and I believe -

Ms Verge: And the principle was to be enshrined in the legislation.

Mr. Simms: Yes, but what I want to know, first of all, is on the aspect of the financial part of the Pay Equity Program. I believe there was money allocated this year in the Budget for the first

phase of it, and I want to know how much. I am not sure how much was in there this year, but I presume it started - \$6 million, I believe, was the amount. How much is estimated now it will cost, because they would have done the review. The Committee, I guess, would have a fair bit of the work done in terms of the review, if they have now decided to start paying the amount of money that is required. So how much longer will this go then, how many years? I think it was three or five years for a certain amount of money to be put in to bring it in. How many positions were involved? How many did they - you know, a little bit of an update on what is happening with the pay equity issue.

The other part of the pay equity issue, of course, had to do with the question of enshrining pay equity, equal pay for work of equal value, into legislation. At the time, I remember, the Province of Ontario had legislation for private sector and public sector. There was some hesitation and some concerns about the Ontario legislation, as I recollect. The best legislation, as I recollect, was the province of Manitoba. I believe the province of Manitoba had the most forward and progressive legislation in terms of pay equity. Nevertheless, we were the first Province that negotiated pay equity through a collective bargaining process, which was never done anywhere else in Canada at the time. But there was an intention to enshrine into legislation, and the issue of private sector pay equity legislation was also going to be looked at. Certainly, the public service legislation was part of the whole program, as we understood it. Maybe the

President of Treasury Board could tell us about that.

I understand the Liberal Party in its campaign, according to its brochure, intended to bring in legislation to deal with pay equity, quoted from 'Real Change, Party for Change', a big picture of the Premier on the front. The picture is a bit old. I cannot believe he is that young looking.

Mr. Verge: The promise is there in two places.

Mr. Simms: Oh, yes, so it is. As a matter of fact, as my colleague points out, under the labour aspect of the promises of the Liberal Party it says on one side, 'We will develop progressive and fair legislation to deal with double-breasting, industrial standards, minimum wage, and pay equity', and on the other side of the page, under women, this was under the labour heading, it says, 'A Liberal Government will introduce and enforce pay equity legislation.' I realize, I suppose, that you can say at some time during our term. I suppose that would be the answer, sometime during our term.

Ms. Verge: But if they promised it twice, you would think they would have rushed to do it early.

Mr. Simms: Do it halfway during their term. Well, they are in their second year now. I am a bit more progressive than the Member for Humber East. I am prepared to give them a chance, a little, tiny chance.

Ms. Verge: They have had a tiny chance.

Mr. Simms: What will be interesting, if their commitment

was to do it sometime within their mandate -

Ms. Verge: No, it was to do it right away.

Mr. Simms: If it was. Let us say that is what they will argue, then let us see if they will fulfill their commitment and bring in legislation for pay equity before their mandate expires. Let us get them on the record for that. At least, we will have them on the record for something.

Ms. Verge: It has to be in in the next year.

Mr. Simms: Well, on this issue the Member for Humber East will no doubt attack my position on the matter, but will speak to it herself later on in the day, or later on tonight. We will be here for the next twenty-four days, or twenty-four hours, I guess, debating these kind of matters. So, that is NLCS and pay equity. The Premier has an answer for me by now, I guess, on that other item, so maybe I will just take my seat and see what kind of responses we get.

Mr. Chairman: Before I recognize the Premier, I would like to welcome to the House on behalf of hon. Members the Mayor of Fortune, Charlie King.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Premier.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if you overlooked the gentleman, my eyes are bad, but I believe -

Mr. Chairman: The other gentleman is Gene King, the Town Manager of

Grand Bank.

Mr. Simms: No, Mr. Chairman, I am referring to -

Mr. Baker: We already did that.

Mr. Simms: I was not listening. Sorry.

Premier Wells: I understand. When the hon. Member was out, they were all recognized. So it is okay.

The amount of \$1,014,700 in the final accounts for 1988-89 do, indeed, include severance for the first lot of severance pay in the change of Administration, from Mr. Peckford to the present Leader of the Opposition. Then the amount in last year's expenditures of \$123,500, that also includes severance for the change from the now Leader of the Opposition to the present occupant of the office.

Mr. Simms: The hard working Premier.

Premier Wells: That is right, fulfilling two jobs, or three or four.

Mr. Simms: Is the President of Treasury Board going to respond to my questions -

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The Government House Leader, I am sorry.

Mr. Simms: Thank you very much for the promotion. I am sure you meant Opposition. I just had to listen to the machine to make sure of it.

Is the President of Treasury Board going to respond to my questions on NLCS and pay equity before we proceed? I think the Premier has

already set the example, coming in here this afternoon for the last hour, set an excellent example, I think, for his Ministers, by agreeing with me that the best process was to ask one or two questions so you don't get bogged down and everything like that, and get some answers. Maybe the President of Treasury Board did not hear the Premier when he said that, and I am sure he might want to reconsider his position at the next opportunity. I do not want to get up -

Premier Wells: I do not have the memory capacity he does, obviously.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Well, there is a lot the Premier doesn't have, and that may very well be one of the things.

Mr. Hogan: Don't get nasty.

Mr. Simms: That was not nasty. The hon. Member for Placentia, every time you open your mouth or say anything, 'Oh, don't get nasty! Don't get nasty!' Boy, if you can't take it, go out and have a cup of coffee in the common room, or something.

Mr. Winsor: He is thin-skinned.

Mr. Simms: Very thin-skinned, yes.

I want to get back to Newfoundland Information Services, if I may, once again. Before I get to that, may I just throw one more question to the President of Treasury Board, if he is going to take some time to reflect on the questions I have asked?

Premier Wells: Can I -

Mr. Simms: Be excused?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: In effect, yes. I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, I have to meet with representatives of the Canadian Legion and representatives of the Joint Councils on the Burin Peninsula. I have meetings scheduled with the two groups, and, assuming I have answered now all the questions the Committee has of me, I would like to go and fulfill those obligations. But I don't want to just walk out on the Committee. If they have more, I will be back tomorrow and the next day and the next day, or tonight or tomorrow night and so on, whatever is appropriate to answer questions. I do, however, have a commitment for tonight, so I would sooner make it tomorrow. Oh, tomorrow is Wednesday - Thursday then. Okay, we will make it Thursday. I just want to do the Committee the courtesy of letting them know why I have to leave now, and I thank the Committee for their consideration.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Of course, we obviously have no problem with that. We understand the Premier is a very busy man. The people who are waiting to see him are very busy people, too, and they cannot be kept waiting. We understand that, and we have no difficulty.

However, with respect to the Estimates process, I do not want him to misunderstand or be misled into thinking if the Committee has any more questions of him, because I can assure him there are many,

many more questions going to be asked of him. Now, if he is not here, then I am sure his right-hand man, the Deputy Premier who does not like to be referred to as the Deputy Premier, but everybody in the Province knows he is the Deputy Premier, will take note of the questions and hopefully provide the Premier with the questions and get his assistant to run downstairs and get the answers for him as quickly as he can, and respond sometime.

Mr. Tobin: Are you talking about Dr. House?

Mr. Simms: No, I am talking about the Member for Exploits, his Parliamentary Assistant. He will get the information.

Maybe I can get back to my old friend, the President of Treasury Board. Now that the Premier has gone and the pressure is off him he can relax a bit, and maybe get up. I think what happened was he was afraid to get up and answer my questions on NLCS and pay equity, because the Premier would then see for himself how inadequately prepared he is for these Estimates.

As everybody saw last night in the Estimates, the Government House Leader could not give me any answers and, today when I asked him a couple of questions on Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services, for which he is the Minister responsible, a very progressive Crown agency, and questions on pay equity, which is another very important issue in this Province, the Government House Leader said, 'I would rather wait for a little while and I will answer later on.' I think the real reason was the Premier was there. I don't think he wanted to get up and botch it, as he did

last night, letting it slip out that the Government still had Loughheed's law firm on their payroll, and things like that. He let that slip out, and I would say the Minister of Social Services took the President of Treasury Board to task afterwards, saying, 'What did you tell them that kind of stuff for? Why did you give them that information?'

But the President of Treasury Board is not ready yet to answer my questions on NCLS and pay equity, so I will just throw in one or two others. These are questions which are going to require lengthy answers, so that is the reason I wanted him to take some time and give the answers.

In addition to NCLS and pay equity, can he tell me a bit about the Hay Pay Plan? Since the Hay Pay Plan was implemented in the Public Service a few years back, there was, at that time, a lot of concern among public servants as to whether or not it was going to be acceptable, and I mean this seriously. I think the initial stages for the Hay Pay Plan was that it would be applicable to senior public servants; I think it was going to start with management, and then it was going to be applied, presumably, through the rest of the public service, depending on how it worked, how it was accepted, once the whole barrage of appeals were out of the way, and so on. That has been several years ago, so I would like him now to tell me at what stage it is now. Is it intended to implement the Hay Pay Plan throughout the rest of the public service? Has it been settled at the management level? Are things pretty well settled down by now? Are there still a whole barrage of appeals? How is it being

generally accepted, and what is the next stage of it?

Mr. Chairman, I think I want to leave those three things.

I would like to hear his comments on Pay Equity, NLCS and the Hay Pay Plan - those three very important items are obviously going to take a bit of time to respond to - before I get into some other interesting topics I intend to raise. For example, the political freedom of public servants is my next topic, in my next segment, so stay tuned for that. But I want the President of Treasury Board to please respond to those three items.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the President of the Council.

Mr. Baker: I will get up for a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, to give the Opposition House Leader a little rest. He needs to sit back and relax for a few minutes; he is carrying the ball alone over there and I sympathize with him. I will deal with one of the issues he raised.

As he indicated, some of the issues he raised are issues which require long explanations and long comments. We are getting more into policy now than detail. I think the first comment I will make will have to do with the pay equity situation. I will spend a few minutes on that.

As hon. Members know, the Pay Equity Committee has been working very hard since 1988. I believe it was in the summer of 1988 that the agreement was reached. It was a joint initiative of unions and employers, and it was a very good initiative on the part of the Government at the time. I suppose

if you try enough things, you will hit a few good ones.

Mr. Simms: As you are seeing.

Mr. Baker: Yes, that is right. The Steering Committee was set up and there was equal representation from the work force and the employers, and they have hammered out some terms and conditions. This Steering Committee has been working ever since, and it has had to go through a lot of stages. I have so much on the topic here, Mr. Chairman, that it may take me a few minutes to find some of the things I am looking for.

One of the biggest jobs, I suppose, in implementing any Pay Equity Program is to do an analysis of the jobs, and it is very, very difficult. We are talking about equal pay for work of equal value, and you really have to evaluate what work is being done, and you have to be able to compare various job classifications. It is extremely important to do that and to do it properly. Now, this also, I guess, relates to the Hay Plan and the Hay evaluation that was done in some areas. However, the Pay Equity Group decided to go back to step one and to hire their own consultants to do an evaluation; they decided to start with two branches of Government, I suppose, the Hydro employees and the health care sector. These are the two areas where an evaluation was done. When the evaluation is done, then you have to sort of do a pilot project and a test on the system. I am trying to shorten the process down for the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Oh, no, go on.

Mr. Baker: You want me to spend

more time? I am trying to condense it a little bit for him.

Mr. Simms: No, I want more information.

Mr. Baker: The pilot project was undertaken and I should, I suppose, quote from some of the pay equity newsletters and updates, which I am sure the hon. Member has been getting by one means or another.

The Pay Equity Steering Committee, and this is the stage they are at now, planned and directed a pilot project, which included forty-four employees in twenty-two classes selected from the health care sector and Hydro, which are the two areas which have had the evaluation done. The object of the pilot project was to test the proposed job evaluation system which had previously been developed with the help of consultants, I believe it was Touche Ross, or whatever they are called now - I think they recently had a name change. Anyway, with the help of this consulting firm, the program was devised and the pilot project was carried out. The pay equity newsletter says the pilot project was successfully completed. There were education sessions that were held and questionnaires that were completed. These employees were interviewed, rather extensive interviews in terms of their functions and exactly what they did in jobs and so on, and the positions were evaluated by the Steering Committee. The next step, I assume, once the evaluation of the pilot project has been done, the detailed planning of the implementation of pay equity then begins.

I suppose we can say at this point

that the preliminary work is over with. The evaluation of these two sectors of the jobs, then the pilot project with these forty-four employees to test the system that was devised by the Committee and Touche Ross and so on, that has been completed. These are the details, and they are satisfied with the proposals they now have developed. So now, I suppose, the detailed planning for the implementation of the pay equity plan in these sectors has now started in earnest; they are now down to the final stages; they have the preliminary work done.

The step they are now in the process of doing, they have a Health Care Job Evaluation Committee which is starting work now, and the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Job Evaluation Committee are supposed to start their work, and most of their work will be done in the fall. So we are now looking at the fall before the detailed work in terms of implementing the pay equity takes place.

The speed with which pay equity will be actually implemented depends largely on the work of the Committee. And in answers to questions previously in the House, I have indicated that I do not feel it is Government's place, once the Committee has been put to work, and do not forget now, the workers -

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Baker: By leave to finish up?

Mr. Simms: By leave, yes.

Mr. Chairman: By leave.

Mr. Baker: The workers as well as

management are involved, and things are going along nicely. It would be kind of out of place for me to start stepping in and imposing limits on them. I think that would be kind of improper. I believe this was the suggestion coming from the Member for Humber East at one point, that perhaps I should be speeding up the process and getting directly involved with what is happening there now. I think it would be grossly improper, and an insult to the people working on it.

They are not only supervising the job evaluation of these two areas and doing their pilot projects and getting the details together about pay equity, they are also engaged in developing publicity, developing brochures, a video - they have actually done a video to explain pay equity, because they envisioned there has to be a certain amount of education done, as well, in connection with this project. So they are developing their brochures and they have developed a video, and hopefully, by the time they are finished their work in these two sectors and we have to bring in the pay equity, everybody will be fully aware of what it is, number one, and number two, why it is done.

Now there is another side to this, as well, obviously. The agreement was that pay equity in terms of money is now implemented. As of the summer of 1988, pay equity is implemented in terms of money, and when the deal is worked out, then the money will be paid.

An Hon. Member: The rate of pay (inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Well, the Member knows the agreement was that pay equity would exist as from when the

Committee started to work, in terms of money.

Mr. Simms: Retroactive to April 1, '88.

Mr. Baker: Yes. And this would allow them to do the job properly. Each year, Government has been adding in an estimate of the amount of money that will be necessary to pay for the pay equity at the moment at which they have come up with the complete system and implemented it. So, for the three years, that has now amounted to about \$6 million. By the end of this fiscal year, pay equity, it seems, will not be at that point implemented, so there will have to be a further amount of money added so that there will be a larger amount of money and the workers will not lose. Because once the thing is done and done properly, it will be retroactive right back to April 1, 1988 regardless.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: I guess you would have to, wouldn't you? You would have to. To be fair, it is April 1, and that money is put in there, so, therefore, it would have to be paid.

So that allows us, allows the Committee not me, not us here, because I am not directly involved, but it allows them to develop properly, not under any pressure of time. They know they are going to get paid, and we are not delaying, in the sense of the longer we delay the more money we will save. I would like to assure the Opposition House Leader that the pay equity process is continuing. We are past the initial stage and now into the actual implementation stage, and

as quickly as possible pay equity will be implemented in those two sectors and then we have to move to the rest of the public service. So it takes time to do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the explanation given by the Government House Leader. I am sure he appreciates the fact I asked him the question to give him a chance to update himself on the matter. He obviously had to do a fair bit of reading, because it is an extensive question, it is a major, major question. It is a big issue among the public service of this Province, particularly the women, of course, because 98 per cent of the people it will affect will be female employees. The Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs is very familiar with it, and would know all about the Pay Equity Program.

Let me ask him some other questions. I want to ask the President of Treasury Board some other questions before I get to the issue of political activity of public servants. I want to deal with that in a separate segment. But I still have three or four other questions I want to get off the table here and over to that side.

In the Departmental Salary Details this year, tabled with the Minister of Finance's Budget, 1991, on page 14, he will see under Executive Council, under the Constitutional Affairs Division, on the top of the page - under the Constitutional Affairs Division at the top of the page he will see -

Mr. Baker: Page 14?

Mr. Simms: At the top of the page. See Constitutional Affairs?

Mr. Baker: Yes.

Mr. Simms: The Director position, one position, salary for that position, \$44,790. The Minister sees that? Well, I presume the Director of the Constitutional Affairs Division, as he indicated to me last night, is Ms Deborah Coyne.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, he said last night when I asked him questions about it, that what the \$211,000 was meant for, he will recall -

Mr. Baker: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: There is \$211,000 budgeted for the Constitutional Affairs Division. He told me last night that was Deborah Coyne, and there were two other positions which were not yet filled.

Mr. Baker: (Inaudible) one of them.

Mr. Simms: What was one of them?

Mr. Baker: I believe (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, then, how would that add up to the salary? It would not add up to the salary, because the \$211,000 is not salary only. The amount in the Estimates for salary is \$167,000. What position would Deborah Coyne occupy then? If the Director of the Division is \$44,790, and that presumably, as he just said now, is not Deborah Coyne, it is somebody else, what is she going to be, Assistant Director or just a staff person, or could he

explain to us how the Constitutional Affairs Division will work? He has indicated to me there is only one position there, \$58,000 for Deborah Coyne from Toronto, a lawyer from Toronto, when we have oodles of lawyers down here in Newfoundland, I submit, with tremendous qualifications, just as much constitutional knowledge as a lawyer from Toronto. There are all kinds of them sitting here around the table, as a matter of fact, but Deborah Coyne will make \$58,000. I cannot seem to put it together, you see.

Mr. Gilbert: You could not hire one when you were over here.

Mr. Simms: I see the old spark plug over there is shouting out again, the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. Right straight from haystack, that stuff is coming. You can hear it right straight from haystack - \$167,000. He never opened his mouth when the Premier was here. For an hour he never opened his gob, but he will now that the Premier has gone. Anyway, \$44,000 is what you have in your departmental Estimates for one position, Director of Constitutional Affairs. That is what is in your Estimates, your detailed Estimates. In your Budget Estimates you budgeted for \$167,000 in salaries. Now, there is obviously, Mr. Chairman, would you not think - I would not expect Your Honour to answer me, I ask this question rhetorically.

Mr. Flight: How do you spell it?

Mr. Simms: Who cares how you spell it. The Chairman knows what I am talking about. There is a discrepancy here, as you can well see, so I would like the

Government House Leader to explain the discrepancy. How come in their detailed salary estimates they put in one position, Director of Constitutional Affairs, \$44,790? And last night I asked the President of the Council about the Estimates for the Constitutional Affairs Division salaries, \$167,000, and he said that is for Deborah Coyne, and two other positions not yet filled. Now he tells me one of the two positions not filled is this Director's position, \$44,000. If that is the case, what is the position of Deborah Coyne? What is she going to be? Is she going to be the Director of the Division?

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Simms: No. She will get \$58,000, he told me, yet the Director will only get \$44,000. Do you see where I am coming from with respect to the question? Maybe he can answer the question. I want to know why the difference, and how come there is a discrepancy? It sounds kind of strange. He can answer that for me. I would like him to tell me now, or tell us when he stands, or if he has to get the information he can do it, of the fifteen Departments of Government we now have, including the Premier's Office, how many of those Departments have press secretaries? Now, I know they are being very coy with the public in saying they are not press secretaries, they are press information directors. I do not know what they are calling them, but he knows what I am talking about. The press information officers. I do not know where they are listed in the Estimates. Did anybody come across the name of them? Does the President of Treasury Board know the positions

I am referring to? The press information positions, or the public information positions.

Mr. Baker: My mind has wandered a little. I am not used to hearing (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: What do you call them? The Directors of public information, fifty-odd thousand. He knows the ones I am talking about. Could he provide for us a list of those Departments which now have those positions? Who occupies those positions? And what is the salary for each of the occupants of those positions? That is the request I am making here this afternoon. It is a fairly simple request. I imagine the Premier's Assistant would be able to get that with very little difficulty. And I do not want to have to raise it again tomorrow, when the Premier comes back.

An Hon. Member: Thursday.

Mr. Simms: Well, whenever he is coming back. You will have it for me Thursday? Okay, have the information for me Thursday. That is a good response, a superb question.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask him if he would also, perhaps, give us on Thursday or tonight - I am sure he will have a chance to talk to his officials tonight if he is not thoroughly up to date on it, but since 1985 the Treasury Board, the Government, instituted an Affirmative Action Program which I now think is called employment equity, and a major portion of that Affirmative Action Program, Employment Equity Program, was to assist or ensure that more women in the public service rose to senior positions in the public service. He is very familiar with

that program, I am sure. It is administered by his department, the Treasury Board. I recall, in fact, the Women's Policy Office used to provide me with a statistical sheet every three months, or every six months or something, as to what kind of progress we were making: the percentage of management positions, for example, in the public service that were being occupied by women, and what kind of progress and improvement we were making as a result of the Affirmative Action Program, or Employment Action Program, which was initiated by the previous Administration and the previous President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The Women's Policy Office, the ADM of the Women's Policy Office, I asked her if she would give me an update. Now Noreen Holden, down in your own Department, can give you the same information.

Mr. Baker: No, I am talking about the one you are talking about, from Luanne.

Mr. Simms: Employment Equity Program, which was to try to help improve the position of women in the public service, help them get senior positions, management positions. That was not the only thing the Employment Equity Program was for, but that was one of the major thrusts of it. And you Assistant Deputy Minister in the Women's Policy Office would provide me with an update on a regular basis on how we were progressing from year to year.

Mr. Baker: Yes.

Mr. Simms: What increase there

was. He might even find that it is positive. He might want to put out a press release on his Fax machine, or through NIS, because it is - I hope it is positive. It was making progress in the years we were there. I remember it was always increasing ever so slightly, but it was increasing. Maybe even the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations would be very familiar with that matter, being a person who is strongly supportive of equal rights for women. Particularly now that she is a Minister, she would be supportive of improvements in the status of women in the public service, in a senior positions. So she might even be able to tell the President of Treasury Board. I would not be surprised if she knew it off the top of her head, being the knowledgeable individual she is with respect to these issues. If not, however, hopefully the President of the Council can tell us a little later on.

Also in February 1989, just before Government changed -

Mr. Baker: The real change.

Mr. Simms: Just before the real change.

Mr. Winsor: A short change.

Mr. Simms: Just before the short change. That is even better. He does not like that one, a short change.

Mr. Baker: No, I thought he might be (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: In February of 1989, under the previous Administration, a review was ordered to assess the feasibility of consolidating existing civil engineering

functions within the Government, with the obvious objective being to obtain cost savings and so on. What I would like to know is, since that was an initiative of the previous Administration, but nevertheless was a good initiative and a good idea, did this Government follow up on it? Is it shelved? Is it active? Ongoing? Is it underway, or were they politically partisan and hauled it out and said: oh, that is one of theirs and tear it up? I do not know if he will be familiar with that particular matter or not, but we spent a considerable amount of time looking at consolidating all the civil engineering functions within the Government, because they are spread out all over various Government Departments and so on, and indeed the Senior Expenditure Review Committee, SERC committee as it was called under Mr. Randell, made recommendations in that respect from time to time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will leave those few questions with the President of the Council and perhaps he could respond to some of them, and then I want to, on the next segment, get onto a totally different topic, as I mentioned the political activity of public servants is one in which I have an interest in. So maybe you could have a few comments which would give me time to (inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Before I recognize the hon. Member, I want to welcome to the House, on behalf of all the hon. Members, twelve Grades VI, VII, VII and IX students from Petit Forte accompanied by their teachers Clint Smith and Wayne Smith.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to comment on a couple of points raised by the Opposition House Leader. First of all, I want to assure him that we have not automatically thrown out anything simply on the basis that it was introduced by a previous Government. I can assure him that our approach, and assure the people of the Province, that our approach has been to pick and improve on the best of what was done in the past and to make some changes as well. Granted there have been a lot of changes, but they have always been changes for the better, always. I have to admit that there were some good things done in the past. It is obvious. There were some good things done in the past, right back to 1949, I suppose, tremendous things done in that time. Tremendous things done that still exist today, so I am willing to admit that Members opposite, when they were in Government, did some things that were reasonable and good.

Perhaps some debate as to where the balance is, perhaps some debate there, but they did some things that were good. To specifically get to a couple of questions which were mentioned: The Member for Grand Falls has asked a number of times about Deborah Coyne, the constitutional problem and so on. He seems to be taken up with that subject, and I do not know why. Maybe he feels that at some point in time it will be picked up by the press or whatever. He uses one of his tricks of course, for which he is famous for, or at least in the precincts of this House he is famous for, where he takes up one

document and says there is an amount here; the President of Treasury Board has admitted that this amount is in error and he said that \$58,000 - so he takes one document and waves it around, then he takes up another document and says, but in this document it says something different. The reason for that is that the two documents he used were not similar documents. They were, in essence not related, and that obviously an amount that appears in one doesn't necessarily have to appear in another. The Opposition House Leader, having come fairly recently from the position that I now occupy, fairly recently, should realize that this Departmental salary detail applies only to permanent staff complement, permanent staff complement, and in constitutional affairs there is one permanent staff position, that's all. As has been pointed out many times, it was pointed out right at the beginning when Miss Coyne came to work in the Premier's Office, that this was a contractual appointment, the salary level was set, and this was not, in effect, a permanent position but would be accounted for in a separate, not in this document, it would not be accounted for in this document, these are only the permanent employees. It would be accounted for under the heading of Temporary or Contractual Employees. The answer to his question is very simple. The reason it is not in here is because it does not belong in here. It is not where it is suppose to be - it's somewhere else - it's in the other documentation that has been provided to the Members of the House.

Another thing I would like to comment on had to do with a review

that the Member claims was initiated in February 1989. It had to do with a review to assess the feasibility of existing civil engineering functions within Government. And he wants to know what the status is of that particular review initiated by, I guess, the Members opposite. Well SERC suggested consolidation of a number of areas. There were a number of areas in Government where it would be possible to consolidate services and this kind of thing.

I am not going to comment on the exact state of the civil engineering thing. I am simply going to say that what the SERC Committee said about these things is absolutely right, I believe, that there are areas in Government that are perhaps better consolidated. There are functions that Departments have, individually, that probably might be better run from a central location. We are trying to identify the areas where this is possible. As the Members opposite know there are many of these areas in Government, and we are continually searching for areas to make Government more efficient, because on this side of the House we believe that - and we are not trying to make them more efficient for the sake of efficiency, because we believe that the only function, the only reason for existence of Government - the same thing with the Opposition, mind you - the only reason for existence of Government is to provide the best possible service to all the people in the Province. And that is the reason we are looking at a lot of these areas, where we can consolidate functions from one Department to another, to make them run more efficiently, to provide better

service at less cost. That is important as well.

So I will say to the Opposition House Leader that that kind of study is ongoing. Not only with civil engineering, but a number of other areas. I mean economic analysis is another one; and we do have an Economic Analysis Branch. But perhaps we need to look at that and see how that is being used throughout Government and perhaps that could be - so there are a number of other areas like that but they are also being looked at.

Now there are still a few topics outstanding which I will get to. Some of them require quite a bit of explanation. I will be tabling tomorrow the annual report of NLCS and the Opposition House Leader will have a chance then to have a look at it and see exactly what has been happening - some of the things that have been happening in the last year. He knows there has been a change at the top, and we will talk about that. There have been changes, in the sense that there is tremendous demand for computer experts. There are jobs that are there if they could find the people to fill them; some jobs, not a whole pile, but some jobs. The company has been doing - each year its profit picture has been improving and it's providing more and more service to Government - various branches of Government. But there have been changes in NLCS, nothing extraordinary though, except the change at the top. Nothing was extraordinary. There were normal changes. But if he wants me to outline specifically what the changes are, then I will get the information for him and pass it along.

The other topic that is outstanding is the HAY plan. The Opposition House Leader can correct me if I am wrong, do you want a complete explanation of the HAY plan? You want to know if there is any problem with it, any trouble created by that artificial plan? Do you want an explanation of the pay line, the 104 per cent level, the various levels, and that kind of stuff? You are just interested in the difficulties that perhaps have been created, the good and the bad of the Hay Plan. You do not want a complete explanation of the plan, do you? You do not want to confuse everybody?

An Hon. Member: No, I do not.

Mr. Baker: Okay. That is outstanding. The names, salaries, Departments and so on of the information people, directors of information, that will be provided. Some details on employment equity and the progress made in employment equity in the positions within the civil service, I will get the stats on that and pass it along to the hon. Member. These are the main items that are outstanding right now. I will get the further information on them.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, just three or four quick things, because I do want to address the political activity question of public servants. I was appalled to hear the President of the Treasury Board, in responding to my question about the salary for Deborah Coyne, where it was, and how come in the Estimates of the Department, the Estimates tabled with the Budget, it said one

thing, and in the salary details, Departmental Salary Details, it says the other thing.

He made the appalling statement that one document is not related to the other. Now he made that statement, and it will be in Hansard, Mr. Chairman. So I have to take him to task on that to say that the one document has nothing to do with the other document. I mean, these documents were all tabled with the Budget. We have to assume that they are related. Unless there is some kind of game being played by the Minister of Finance. And I will point out to him that indeed budgets for temporary employees are included in the Departmental salary detail booklet. So to suggest that the two documents are not related is really an appalling statement.

Now having made that point, and I am sure that he will come back at me and try to argue otherwise, and if he does I want to know why they bothered to table the documents if they are not related to the budget.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I also want to ask him specifically, even though I have asked for him to table a list of the Departments that have these Director of Public Relations, or whatever they are, the Josephine Cheeseman's, I think who is with the Department of Fisheries, those positions, the Minister of Municipal Affairs has one and there are several others. Mr. Callahan, I believe, well there are some others.

An Hon. Member: However many there are.

Mr. Simms: Whatever there are. If I could have the House Leader's attention. He understands what I have asked for, but in addition to

asking that I want to ask him a specific question now at this stage.

Can he tell me, show me where in the Departmental salary details, where I presume the position would be identified somewhere, it is a \$40,000 or \$50,000 position, I forget what it was. But for example, under the Department of Fisheries - I think they also said in making the announcement of these positions that they were going to be responsible and answerable to the deputy minister of the Department in the Executive Support Branch, we cannot find such a position listed in the Executive Support Branch of the Department. I am not sure if it is listed in the Municipal Affairs Department. I have not had a chance to look through them all. I am sorry, the President of the Council says that if you look for them you will find them.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, we looked but we cannot find it. That is the point. So, since the Treasury Board President is responsible for a fair bit of preparing the Budget, perhaps he knows exactly where it is located, and when he stands to respond he can point out, in the Department of Fisheries for example, where is the salary for the Director of Public Information listed? Where is it shown? I cannot seem to find it there. It is possible that I might be mistaken and so on and so forth. But I cannot seem to find it. I am sure that if he takes a look he may have the same difficulty. I do not know. Perhaps, it is elsewhere. Maybe it is in the Departmental Estimates, is it? Did anybody look through that?

It should be in the Departmental salary estimates. But where are they? You do not hide that. You have to show that somewhere.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, that is what I want to find out, where it is and where it is located. Where is it hidden? Where is the salary hidden. That is the question. I will leave it at that for now.

And I want to move on to the other question that I wanted to raise before the afternoon is over, and that is the question of political activity of public servants. Now Mr. Chairman, that was a policy, I think, a great reform of the previous Administration back in 1988, where our Government at the time gave public servants in the Province political freedom, to put it succinctly. Consistent with the Charter of Rights and Freedom we allowed them the basic freedom, and we gave it to bargaining unit employees, not the management employees in the public service, where outside of working hours public servants can work actively for a political party. They could get leave of absence to run for office without pay, and all employees except the executive could run for a municipal office, for example, with the Deputy Minister's consent. So there were a number of reforms in this whole political freedom. Freedom for public servants to enjoy political freedom in the public, even though they were members of the public service.

In addition to that the President of Treasury Board will recall, because his critic at the time when they were in opposition, praised the policy and praised the reform. These people cannot be

compelled to participate in politics nor can they be compelled to make payments to any political party. All those kinds of restrictions were there. They could not be threatened or discriminated against in their work for refusing to participate in political activity, or for not refusing for that matter. But essentially management employees were left alone at the time because there was a great debate whether we should extend it to management employees and then executive employees, because of the question of whether or not the public service should be seen to be independent, and if they had political freedom, then perhaps that independence would be taken away and you might lose the confidence of the public. So it was a great debate. However the critic of the Opposition at the time, the former Member for Fogo, Mr. Tulk, now the Assistant Deputy Minister in the Department of Social Services, in responding to the statement - because I made the statement on behalf of the Government - said, this was a great reform to give to public servants, but it should be extended to management employees in the public service. They, too, should have the basic right and freedom to participate in political activity without fear of discrimination or threat.

So, essentially, my question is this - well, I have two questions: a) What is the situation now, as a result of that great reform that came into being in 1988, over two years ago? Since, in the intervening period, we have had a general election, for example, and no doubt, lots of public servants participated, but there were concerns at the time we brought the policy in that maybe

we were going a bit too far, if you understand what I am saying. And a lot of the concerns were expressed -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to out-shout.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: A lot of the concerns were expressed by bureaucrats at the executive level, in particular, because they were deady opposed to it, by the way, I do not mind saying. So the concerns were whether or not there would be, in the eyes of the general public, some feeling, some lack of confidence, some loss of confidence, because public servants were out actively participating for a political party in a general election. But we thought it was fair and right and a basic freedom that they deserved. If they wanted to participate, they should be able to do it without fear of discrimination or threat, and many of them did.

I want to know if there has ever been any feedback, from this Administration's point of view, since they came into office, about that reform. Secondly, I want to know if it is the policy of the present Administration, as enunciated by their former Treasury Board critic, Mr. Tulk, the Member for Fogo, when he asked that the basic reform be extended to the management employees of the public service. I want to know what the present Government's position is on that particular issue.

So those are just two or three points I want to finish off with

this afternoon. Maybe the President of Treasury Board can take us to 5:00, with a bit of pleading from me, and respond to those things and make a few comments.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, in terms of political activity -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: - it is an intriguing question! We are all in favour of political activity, no doubt about it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: At the time when the announcement was made by the previous Government, we, in Opposition at the time, indicated it was a good move, that people had a right to political activity for the political party of their choice.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: They could go out and work in election campaigns, if they wanted to. They had a right to voice their opinions like everybody else and so on. As you go through the public service of the Province you run into a problem at a certain level, and I think the only question is, at what point do you run into that problem. A Government in power has to have a certain amount of trust, and a certain amount of confidence and so on, in the fact that things are being planned and things are being looked at, and so on, and Members opposite know,

after so recently having come from Government, that you consider all kinds of options when you are governing a province, you look at all kinds of alternatives and so on and hopefully, as you go through the process and you look at alternatives to a problem and reject some and refine others and so on, that hopefully in the end you will end up with the solution that is best. But the Government has to have confidence, absolute confidence that in examining all alternatives to a problem, that the examination is purely internal at that stage.

Now I am not suggesting that an individual of a particular political stripe would treat that information in a totally proper way and an individual of another political stripe would not. I am not suggesting that. What I am saying is that at a certain level we have to have confidence that the people that are dealing with all this information are totally impartial. And we really have to feel that that is the case. When you get beyond a certain level, individuals who are in possession of information that could be - not because it could be politically damaging to a Government, but because it could interfere with the process of reaching a proper decision.

An Hon. Member: That is right, Sir.

Mr. Baker: That is the main consideration here. Not whether it is political damage to a party or not.

So how far do you say that the right to political activity extends? Does it extend to the Deputy Minister level? Should your Deputy Ministers be actively

involved in party politics? We can get universal agreement there - I believe, I suspect.

When we get to the ADM level, should people at the ADM level be allowed to take part in political activities? Should they be allowed to actively participate in party politics? What about the Director level? At a certain point you have to say yes, you have a freedom to act politically, but as to what that level is I cannot say. We have not had a discussion on it and reached any firm decisions on it. We have said that the rights given by the previous Government are reasonable. Whether they should be extended beyond, I mean, we have to draw the line somewhere and where will we draw it? We have not had that discussion quite honestly.

However, I suppose the argument could be made that more people should have the freedom to get involved in politics than is now the accepted rule. Maybe, one of those days we will deal with the problem. There have been so many other problems we have had to deal with in our eleven and a half months that have been, in the sense of this problem, have been kind of overwhelming, and would mean that we do not really have the time to deal with that type of problem now. So, political activity, yes, all levels of the civil service, no. Where do you cut it off? I do not know. Right now there is a logical cut-off and we have no intentions in the immediate future of changing it.

There is one request that I was just looking back over that I intended to get some extra information on, on four or five points that I summarized last

time. I wondered about the percentage in management positions, the percentage of women in management positions in Government. I certainly have to ask. You may be a little bit confused. There is a report that comes out every three months concerning the percentage of women in discretionary appointments, as opposed to the permanent civil service. You are not confused. There are two things that happen, but you specifically wanted the one that involved the women in management positions in the civil service. That is specifically the one you wanted? You did not want the other one? I can tell you about the second one now. In terms of discretionary appointments the levels have been improving ever since that became a policy, and they are still improving, but again not enough. I will get it, but again I say, not enough. It is going to take a number of years before we get equal representation because appointments last for a certain amount of time and when you replace you do not want to go overboard one way or the other. So it will take a number of years before we reach that, you know, system, the equal representation.

Mr. Simms: We had a policy on discretionary appointments to Boards and Committees.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: On appointments to Boards and Committees - I believe we had a policy of aiming for fifty per cent.

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Simms: Yes I believe we did.

An hon. Member: You did.

Mr. Simms: So that policy is still in place I presume, and your are attempting to -

Mr. Baker:

Yes. You had a policy of fifty percent, and I think what happened was, as appointments came due, you were doing it on an alternate basis, and you were appointing on pretty close to a fifty per cent basis, so that the percentage kept going up, and I believe that it ended up thirty-eight per cent or something, and I think it is about there now, although we should be now showing some changes because some Boards have come due, and so on, so we should now be showing changes. We hope to get it above forty within a few years.

Mr. Simms: Well you can show us the information. It would be interesting to see it.

Mr. Baker: Yes, we will deal with that later.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Okay, Mr. Chairman there are only a couple of minutes left before 5:00 and I understand the Government intends to either not move the motion to adjourn or else to keep the motion to adjourn should I move it, which I will do, I can assure. So that means we will be back here tonight, and I want to tell the President of Treasury Board that several of my colleagues have been coming at the bit for the last day and a half, and have been giving me a hard time behind closed doors because I have been asking all the questions and participating in the debate and hogging the time maybe. Nevertheless, since they have

chastised me and given me such a tough time, I intend tonight to let some of my colleagues, not to let them, but to relieve myself of some of my responsibility. And I want to ensure the President of the Council that some of the questions that will be coming from here on will be a bit tougher than the ones I have been asking. I have been just trying to get some of the detailed information, but my colleagues will be asking questions on policy matters, particularly policy matters or matters that might affect politics in Newfoundland and Labrador, and I suggest that you can ask anything at all or talk about anything, obviously as we have agreed, because the Premier, the Premier's office is everything. The Executive Council is the Government, so you can talk about fisheries, forestry, whatever you want to talk about, and they will be doing that. But I want to remind the President of Council in the last minute I have, he still owes me answers on a whole slew of questions.

The update on the Government House renovation program, the information on the professional services for economic research division, transportation costs for classification appeals board, \$41,000 in purchase services for offshore fund, professional services in O and M, what programs are being reviewed and Departments are being reviewed, professional services and human resource management.

We wanted more information on that which he has agreed to get. Cost of being a participant in the Atlantic Provinces Premier's Council. He is going to get me all that. Information on regional development programs, because

there are huge increases in every item under that particular vote; who gets the contracts and all the rest of it, details on professional services and the Hibernia projects. These are questions that are still sitting, of which I have made note off, that he said he would get me more information, and I presume he will before the time expires.

Mr. Chairman, since it is five o'clock I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 2:00 p.m..

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion.

All in favour, 'aye'?

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Chairman: Against, 'nay'.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairman: Motion defeated.
The House will resume at 7:00 p.m.



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 29(A)

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

8 May 1990

The House resumed at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The Hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: Leaving already are you? You should talk to the House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to an issue I raised earlier today and last night, as well, with respect to the Constitutional Affairs Division of Intergovernmental Affairs. I was asking the question about the Constitutional Advisor, so called. Deborah Coyne, I think is her name, as I have been told. There was a considerable amount of confusion, particularly from the answers given to me by the President of the Council with respect to her position, where it was located during the last fiscal year in terms of the Estimates, we cannot seem to find it, and why, indeed, the Departmental Salary Estimates, the detailed Departmental Salary Estimates, indicate one position in that Division at a salary of \$44,000, approximately, when last night, the Government House Leader advised me that the salary of Ms Coyne was to be about \$58,000.

An Hon. Member: Too low.

Mr. Simms: And well, this is why I am asking the question. The Minister of Social Services, who I hope -

An Hon. Member: Too low.

An Hon. Member: What is he paying Social Services (inaudible).

Ms Verge: What is he paying Social Workers?

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Social Services, who I hope was not affected since he had the close relationship with the refugee problem in the Province, I hope he was not affected by the injection of drugs that are going on these days or the accusations of the injection of drugs to refugees, I hope he was not, himself, injected with some dope.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: I hope he, himself, was not injected with a bit of dope, that is what I was about to say, Mr. Chairman. Anyway, as I was saying, the salary quoted by the President of the Executive Council was \$58,000. Now, what I want to know specifically, aside from the confusion that he has added by answering the questions vaguely and not being able to tell us exactly where the position was located, in what head it was located, where it was during the last Estimates, and where it is now, aside from all of that, I want to ask him what the qualifications of this individual might be that would place her in such a position of being the Constitutional Advisor to the Premier.

I do not know if she would have any particular expertise with respect to Constitutional matters dealing with the fisheries.

Ms Verge: She agrees with Clyde, that is her thing.

Mr. Simms: Well, I am about to get to that. I presume she is hired specifically to advise on Meech Lake, so that is a \$58,000 expenditure to provide advice to

the Premier on Meech Lake. But, I would like to know what her qualifications are. What her credentials are in terms of being a Constitutional, or so-called, Constitutional expert.

And was it because of those credentials and qualifications that she was hired as the Meech Lake Advisor to the Premier, or was it simply because, publicly prior to her hiring, it was a very well-known fact that her position on Meech Lake was very, very similar to that of the Premier and he was just endeared to that position and then hired the person? Is that the reason? That is the question I am asking the President of the Council. The other thing I want to ask the President of the Council at the beginning, is the whole question of the Ombudsman, and the Bill to -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, that is okay, the President of the Council will have tomorrow and the next day and the next day and the day after and the day after if we want to.

An Hon. Member: Can he answer two or three things we want done?

Mr. Simms: The Opposition is entitled to ask questions about any matter that it wants to, as he knows. I did not mean to raise such a sensitive issue. I did not realize that he would be so sensitive. But I do want to ask about this whole question of the Government's decision to eliminate the Ombudsman's office and, yes, we will have a debate on it tomorrow, and I hope that the Government might see fit to reconsider that very retrogressive step because everybody who has commented publicly on this

decision has made the same comment, that it is a retrogressive step and I am not talking, I want to separate the issue of the individual who occupies the office, because that is not our concern. If the Government wishes to relieve the present incumbent of his duties in the Ombudsman's office, that is fine, we are not talking about that at all. We are talking about the elimination of the Ombudsman's office.

And I just cannot, for the life of me, understand why the Government would take such a decision. Now, I know that some brilliant people over on that side have made the reference to the fact that, I think it was the Minister of Finance in an interview with NTV, on that Sunday afternoon show said, "Well, you know, we do not need that position because we have fifty-two MHAs and Ministers and the people have a problem and cannot get a problem solved, they go to the Ministers". Well, it should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that one of the main purposes for the Ombudsman in the first place is to deal with people who feel they have been unfairly wronged by the system, by Government, by Government Departments, and, in many cases, by Ministers, because they have not been able to get their problem resolved.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Now is that when you were in?

Mr. Simms: No, no, that is nonsense. Now, the Minister of Social Services should stop getting on with his nonsense.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Stop getting on with his nonsense.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The point is, Mr. Chairman, that the answer by the Minister of Finance, that he gave as a reason for eliminating the Ombudsman's office, was really silly. And he obviously did not do much research on it, and I suspect that it was a last minute decision, anyway, let's wipe out this and we will save a couple of hundred grand. I suspect that is the way it went. But, I mean, I really think it is a really, really retrogressive step.

I mean, we are the only jurisdiction that will have eliminated the Ombudsman's office, over forty countries in the world have an Ombudsman, most jurisdictions in Canada have an Ombudsman and if the people feel wronged by the system and cannot get their problem resolved by Ministers or MHAs, they can, at least, turn to the Ombudsman who has many more powers than an MHA or a Minister because he can access information that Members of the House of Assembly cannot access, he can call witnesses, he has all kinds of powers that are not available to the individual MHA and Minister. So, the whole question of the elimination of the Ombudsman's office, which is done under the name of the President of the Executive Council, the Bill is tabled in his name, will, I think, be a very sad day for Newfoundland and Labrador and for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly those who have had some experience with the Ombudsman's office. And we have heard many people speak out on open line programs and on television phone-in programs,

people who have had occasion to go to the present Ombudsman in this case and have problems resolved. He has been able to get situations

Mr. Chairman: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, the reason I am not smiling is because I am quite serious about the matter and I am sincere about it. And that is what the Minister of Social Services cannot get through his head, that anybody would ever be sincere about a matter such as this, and I am sincere about it.

Mr. Efford: No you are not.

Mr. Simms: I am absolutely sincere about it, I am telling him they have made a serious mistake. This is a drastic move and a stupid move as far as I am concerned in terms of decision making, and again, I say to him, I am not talking about the individual who occupies the position, that is not my interest at all. The Government can easily remove the incumbent, it has nothing to do with that, but the decision, itself, is a very retrogressive step and I hope that the Government will reconsider it.

You know, every province, I think it is, in Canada, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, has an Ombudsman. Every province in Canada. The Federal jurisdiction, I believe, has a Federal Ombudsman as well. And, I think, this is going to be another black eye to the people in the eyes of the people of the country, and I think it will be in the eyes of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And I think the Government will come to regret it. The only hope I have, and I believe I have gotten an

indication from the Government House Leader, maybe he can confirm it, but I believe it is his intention to allow the Legislative Review Committee to deal with this particular item, and perhaps the Legislative Review Committee in their wisdom will see fit to have some hearings on it and take it to a couple of places around the Province and see what the people think. And if the people come back and say they would like to see it remain in place, and maybe the Government is flexible enough to be able to reconsider such a decision. So, Mr. Chairman, I will just make those few opening remarks, seeing my time is up for now, and see what the present Treasury Board has to say.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the President of the Council.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, very quickly, to deal with the Deborah Coyne question again. I do not know if the Opposition House Leader understands what I am saying, but in terms of the Departmental Salary Estimates, that deals only with permanent employees, Ms. Coyne's salary, she is on a contractual basis and she is getting paid, I believe I said around \$58,000 a year which is very, very cheap. Her expertise is that she is an expert on Constitutional affairs and was hired on that basis.

Ms Verge: (Inaudible), why.

Mr. Baker: Now, Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see -

An Hon. Member: What part of Newfoundland is she from? Where did she come from? (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: - that in his comments the Opposition House Leader mentioned advice on the fishery, and I would just like to spend a few minutes elaborating on that side of it.

An Hon. Member: Good.

Mr. Baker: One wonders where the Opposition is getting its advice on the fishery.

Ms Verge: Exactly.

Mr. Baker: One wonders when one hears the comments, especially from the Opposition Leader, where his advice is coming from. Mr. Chairman, to listen to him today -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: - you would swear that he was expressing an attitude that he had held for a long time and was really sincere about what he was saying, Mr. Chairman, you would swear that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Let me quote to you from an interview that was right after the fisheries program was announced. Let me quote the Opposition House Leader from that interview.

Some Hon. Members: Yes, what did he say.

Mr. Baker: He was sitting down with his buddy, Mr. Crosbie, he has been fronting for him for the last, ever since he has been here, trying to cover up for him, and trying to run interference for him. The interviewers asked you a question about the program, "Mr. Rideout, what do you think of it?" What do you think the Leader of the Opposition said? "Mr.

Rideout, what do you think of this program?"

An Hon. Member: Wonderful, wonderful.

Mr. Baker: "Well, let me say, I like the focus of the program". He loved it. He lapped it up. He said, "I think the focus is in the right direction, and that is what I like about it". He lapped it up. He was then asked, "Any criticism at all with the program?" "Any at all". What was his answer? "No, no, no criticism at all?" That was it. He was sitting there with his buddy then, do not forget, he was sitting with his buddy.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Well, you knew your buddy was listening.

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Baker: All right, all right.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Now, that may have been a slip, he said, "No, I have no criticism, I think what is necessary now is for the Province to start putting money in." No criticism with the Federal program at all. And he reiterated several times later on. John Crosbie talked, there in the same conversation about discussions he had had and no concrete proposals, talking about this kind of thing, and then, to get back to Mr. Rideout, this is exactly what you would have suggested, the program. And Mr. Rideout, Tom Rideout, it says here, "The focus is exactly what I would have suggested.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Exactly what I would have suggested.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: So, the interviewer says, "So, a pat on the back to your Federal counterparts".

An Hon. Member: A pat on the back.

Mr. Baker: And the Opposition Leader says, "Absolutely! Absolutely!".

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker: Now, Mr. Chairmam, to listen to that interview and to listen to the Leader of the Opposition on television today and in this House today, one would think they were two different people. One wonders about advice on the fisheries. One wonders who needs the advice on the fisheries. It is amazing! That interview was done immediately after the program was announced. Then all of a sudden, during the next day, the public reaction comes -

Ms Verge: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: - and from source after source after source people say, 'That is not the program we want, we do not like the program, that is not the program we want-

An Hon. Member:
Where did you get it?

Mr. Baker:
So what happens today? What is his attitude today? Now, he does not like the program. He has changed overnight. Where did he get his advice from overnight, Mr. Chairman?

So, Mr. Chairman, the kind of

advice that we have been getting and the positions we have been taking are consistent. I wonder about the consistency of the members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) debate are you?

Ms Verge: (Inaudible) the answer about Deborah Coyne.

Mr. Simms: Yes he did, very quickly.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: He cannot take the heat. He is gone.

Mr. Simms: Come back in here, ya chicken, tail between your legs! Get in here, your tail between your legs. Can't take the heat, look.

Mr. Chairman: I recognized the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader is standing in the door. I thought by this time he would be on the phone to George to get another bit of information, or talking to the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Langdon) to get another copy of a transcript from him that was supposed to have been used in the House in Question Period.

Mr. Langdon: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: A point of order, the Hon. the Member for Fortune - Hermitage.

Mr. Langdon: I did not give this particular information sheet to the Government members. Yesterday

when I was coming in from my district and I heard the comment being made, I could not believe it, with all the inshore people in my district with no compensation. I asked for a transcript from the CBC to make sure, and that is where I got it from.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I did not even realize the Member for Fortune - Hermitage had a copy of the transcript. We get transcripts of these things through the services in the Premier's Office, and that is where this came from. We follow the news, and we did not need somebody to give us a transcript. We follow the news, we know what is going on, and we sometimes listen to the Leader of the Opposition and his press statements and so on. We sometimes listen and we follow and keep track and we see where his inconsistencies are, Mr. Chairman.

It simply points out that the assumption of the source of the transcript, that is public information and so on, is totally wrong, and that corresponds with just about everything else the hon. member has been saying.

Some Hon. Members:
Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman:
The Hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms:
To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

What a foolish charade we have just seen. The Member for Fortune - Hermitage is so sensitive that he jumps up immediately on a point of order. He was anxious all day to get up and ask questions and did not get up to ask questions. Then the Government House Leader says that the Leader of the Opposition's sources are not very valid and all this kind of foolishness, and says he is wrong by accusing the Member for Fortune - Hermitage.

Mr. Chairman, I just say this: If the members will take the time to read Hansard, particularly the Member for Fortune - Hermitage, if he will take time to read Hansard tomorrow, he will see that the Leader of the Opposition did not say that the Member for Fortune - Hermitage provided that transcript to the Government House Leader. He did not say that at all. What he said was, "Perhaps the Government House Leader would like to phone his brother, George, to get another bit of information or he may want to talk to the Member for Fortune - Hermitage to get another bit of information," but never did he say that that member down there in the corner provided that transcript.

So I suggest to the Member for Fortune - Hermitage that he not be so sensitive, that he not be so quick to jump, until he checks his facts.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I said on the radio interview yesterday I will say again today. I will say again tomorrow, and I will say again forever and a day. The focus of the federal aid package in focusing on the problem in the fishery and in communities where fish plants are going to close down, like Gaultois, is the right focus -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, in direct contrast to that Government over there, which tried to focus an economic diversification package for Gaultois supported, I assume, Mr. Chairman, by Oliver Twist himself, the focus of the government was on Egyptian submarines.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Egyptian submarines, Mr. Chairman, that was the focus of this Government and I would much prefer, any day, Mr. Chairman, to support a red fish program for Gaultois with a development fund for Gaultois so the people of Gaultois can stay in Gaultois and not have to go to Harbour Breton.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: And I would much prefer, Mr. Chairman, any day to support a diversification program within the fishery with a development fund for Grand Bank than depend on a free trade zone that we had in Stephenville for years and attracted nothing, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Rideout: That is what I call it.

An Hon. Member: That's a boy, Tom.

Mr. Rideout: And I will stand in any fisheries community in this Province, Mr. Chairman-

Mr. Efford: You had better not then.

Mr. Simms: Who cares what you would advise?

Mr. Rideout: - and support a fisheries related-diversification program for Trepassey, Mr. Chairman, that is based on the fishery and diversifying the economy of the community rather than talking about a surveillance port, Mr. Chairman, in Gaultois which might provide twenty-five or thirty or forty jobs out of six hundred being lost in the fish plant. That is what I am standing for.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: That is the difference between us and you.

Mr. Rideout: That was the focus, Mr. Chairman, and I tell you something else I would stand for, Mr. Chairman, I would stand for Government, Mr. Chairman, Government having the intestinal fortitude to come before this House and the people of this Province and tell the secrets of the Cabinet room, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: This Government, Mr. Chairman, supported a development option known as Structural Adjustments: Building a Viable Fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador as put forward, Mr. Chairman, to this Government by the Stein Task Force, taken to Cabinet and approved -

An Hon. Member: That's right.

Mr. Rideout: which said, Mr. Chairman, there must be fewer fishermen, -

Mr. Simms:
Yes. You will see.

Mr. Rideout: - to our friend from Fortune - Hermitage, this Government supported fewer fishermen, fewer fish plants and fewer fish plant employees. That is what this Government supported.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: And they authorized, Mr. Chairman, their bureaucrats, their minions to pass that along to the Government of Canada and said we support it in principle.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Rideout: And they are too deceitful, Mr. Chairman, they are too much the master of deception, they are too much cover-up artists, Mr. Chairman, to have the nerve. Now, the Premier squirms, Mr. Chairman, and skates, and says that I am the great defender of rural Newfoundland and Labrador.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, Jimmy Bakker, himself, pales into (inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Jimmy-Tammy Fay, himself, Mr. Chairman, was never the fundamentalist who would clothe himself into rural support of Newfoundland and Labrador -

Mr. Simms:
Right on.

Mr. Rideout: So self-righteous, Mr. Chairman, as to take on to himself the cause of sustaining rural Newfoundland and Labrador when this man, this Leader, is the architect of centralization and resettlement, Mr. Chairman, the likes we have not seen since the 1960's.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout:
Does anybody over there, Mr. Chairman, have the gall or the gumption to talk about what this Government told the Federal Government they were prepared to do? They sold the shop, Mr. Chairman, they gave it away. Once the Government of Canada, for the first time since 1949 found that they had a puppet government in Newfoundland that was willing to accept downsizing and centralization and taking people out of the fishery, once they had that, Mr. Chairman, they went ahead like a house on fire. They grabbed the opportunity with the concurrence of this Government to destroy rural Newfoundland, and the master of deception trying to get people to believe the difference. And the Minister of Social Services trying to get people to believe the difference.

An Hon. Member: Jimmy Bakker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rideout: Then of course Mr. Chairman this is the same people who have the nerve to talk about economic diversification..I was just reading a statement a few minutes ago put out by Dr. Doug House, the Chairman of the Economic Recovery Commission, in

which he says, "I am taking no particular responsibility, as Chairman of the Commission, in addressing the crisis in the fishery", but then goes on to add, Mr. Chairman, that he is a member of the task force developing and coming up with those new economic diversification suggestions.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we saw them. We saw what the Government finally sent to Ottawa on March 22nd, a wish list, Mr. Chairman, that had as much to do with the fishery as I have to do with the man in the moon, Mr. Chairman. No co-ordination, no focus on the fishery, no focus on Gaultois, no focus on Trepassey, no focus on Twillingate, no focus on rural Newfoundland, just a focus on dragging people from the rural centers to the urban centers, if they are lucky, or if they are not, to mainland, Canada, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Rideout: That is exactly what we saw, Mr. Chairman. The hypocrisy! The nerve!

Mr. Chairman.
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

There is a lot of time left before the night is over.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

Let me assure the hon. -

An Hon. Member: Wait until you are recognized.

Mr. Efford: He is recognized.

Mr. Chairman: I have recognized the Hon. Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me assure the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition there is a lot of time left and there is going to be a lot of time left around rural Newfoundland when they look at this: "Any criticism at all for the program, Mr. Rideout?" "No criticism for the program at all." You go out to Gaultois, you go out to Grand Bank, you go out to Twillingate and you tell them there is no criticism for this program when next year this time there is no food on the table You tell them that.

You talk about hypocrisy! The former Minister of Fisheries, the former Premier for twenty-nine days, who was a part of the administration that caused the problems that are happening around the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador now, trying to stand up here in this House and say that he is totally in agreement with Ottawa.

Mr. Simms: He did not say that.

Mr. Efford: He just said, 'I think the focus is in the right direction.'

Mr. Simms: Don't be misleading.

Mr. Efford: That is not misleading, that is a fact.

Why are there problems, Mr. Chairman -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Order, please!

Mr. Efford: Why are there problems today in Newfoundland and Labrador in the fishery? Is it because this administration caused the problems? Is it because the former administration contributed to the problems, the former Minister of Fisheries himself?

What happened in Ottawa when the regulations were being brought in about who could catch the groundfish, who could catch the underutilized species, who could go out on the Grand Banks and catch fish, or who could catch fish inshore? Why is it that now they have to take at least 800 people out of the caplin fishery? Under whose guidance was that done? The former Minister of Fisheries.

An Hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) they were all in the caplin fishery!

Mr. Efford: They were all in the caplin fishery. And everybody starving! Not enough money! Three days fishing at a productive fishery because there were no decent or sensible regulations that went into that fishery at all.

Then, after causing all the problems and being part of the problems, and after standing in this House of Assembly and standing publicly making the statements they have made over the last couple of weeks about the federal input into the Newfoundland fishery, and then when it is delivered, a measly \$584 million over five years. Do

you know why? Because Ottawa's attitude has never changed towards Newfoundland. Second-class citizens! Give them a few crumbs under the table and they are satisfied, and that is what that Leader of the Opposition agrees with: 'The focus is great! No criticism at all!' Eighteen million dollars a year for the next five years to help the fishermen perishing in this Province. That is the sort of thing, no diversification. Stay with the plants in Gaultois. Stay with the plants in Grand Bank. No diversification. No thought in any industry to create a few jobs.

That is the reason why the people in Newfoundland are like they are today, because that mentality has been carried through for the last seventeen years, don't try to switch into something else. It is time to change the mentality and know that Newfoundland have the capability to do something else besides the fishery. There are alternatives to the fishery. There is an alternative industry that coincides with the fishery. But the mentality of Ottawa, the small population of Newfoundland and Labrador - any man over there who has any decency, any respect for his culture or his heritage, would look at Ottawa and say you take that and bury it. Do not bring it down here in Newfoundland. We have absolutely no time to be laughed at once again. You have been laughing at us since 1949, and they are still shoving it up our nose and here it is, and any Leader, any man with any pride or any political caring for Newfoundland at all, would take that and rip it up like that and throw it down in the garbage, but no, what do you do? "No problems, we agree with everything that is on to it".

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) in Ottawa says they agree.

Mr. Efford: But next year this time, you are going to have to go out and tell the people that. There is no one thing in that program for any inshore fishermen. Not one mention of the inshore fishermen, and that Leader of the Opposition agrees with it.

Mr. Simms: Oh, don't be so foolish.

Mr. Efford: You do not agree with the fact that the inshore fishermen are not mentioned, do you.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Oh. Well, what did he say?

Mr. Simms: He said, read the statement.

Mr. Efford: He said, he agrees with the focus of the paper, there is no criticism whatsoever. He said it, he cannot deny it, and once you make the statement, you cannot take it back.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Never mind, you have made a fool of yourself for the last ten years as Minister of Fisheries and you are doing it now as the Leader of Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: You have done it and everybody in this Province knows that, and any man that has any pride in his stomach at all to stand up and make a statement saying there is no criticism just because he want to play cozy with his Tory buddies in Ottawa,

absolute nonsense-

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) do you want to listen or do you deliberately want to mislead? That's what you want to do.

Mr. Efford: But, the whole point behind it is that you cannot fool the people anymore.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: The people recognize the difference. You tried it, you cannot fool the people any more. And the day is going to come, Mr. Chairman, that when this Opposition Party is going to have to go out there and answer to the people of Gaultois and answer to the people in the communities of rural Newfoundland and Labrador where they are experiencing these problems, and I would challenge the Leader of the Opposition to go down on the wharf in Port de Grave tomorrow, and I will accompany him, I will go with him and tell them that he agrees with everything that is in that package, and he agrees that there is no room for criticism, and he agrees that there is nothing in there for the inshore fisherman. I will accompany him down to the community of Port de Grave and see who will be standing on the wharf after he says it. I will tell you he better wear his swimsuit, because I can assure him that he would be in the ocean before he would have a chance to get off that wharf. And that is the kind of attitude, Mr. Chairman, that has been ruining Newfoundland and Labrador for the last seventeen years, and that mentality, it will never change until they get some respect for the people of this Province, and Ottawa carries no respect, and that Opposition Party carries no respect, and that is

the reason why we are perishing today in this fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Warren: Now, let's hear something sensible for a change.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just like to remind the Moose Member that he should be quiet because as I said in this House a number of times before that there are going to be things to come back and haunt this Government a lot more than Sprung haunted us when we were in Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: And one of them is going to be your Economic Recovery Commission. Your Economic Recovery Commission is number one.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: Your Economic Recovery Commission is going to be it. Now the problem, Mr. Chairman, with this particular Government is that you have a Premier of this Province for the first time -

An Hon. Member: Who cares about this Province.

Mr. Warren: Oh, yes, he sure does.

Ms Verge: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Matthews: Bring out the strait jacket, he is not in his

office listening to you, you can relax. You can relax, he is not in his office listening to you. He is out of the building.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Matthews: Your colleagues would not tell him what you are saying in his defence tonight. So, relax. That is why you are no longer Caucus Chairman. They booted you out of it because you are such a sook.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: Spent most of your time lap dogging to the Premier about your buddies, so be quiet. Now the problem, Mr. Chairman, is that we have a Premier for the first time of which fish is not a sophisticated enough word for him, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: The fishing industry is not sophisticated enough for Clyde Wells, he would rather talk about Meech and Constitutions. He thinks fish smells, Mr. Chairman, that is the damn problem in this here today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: That is the problem. Now let me just react to the Minister. And the other problem is that we have a Minister of Fisheries who's biding time. He is not in touch with the issues. He has not known a thing that has happened in the fishery in the last six months, we had to tell him everything. And we are telling him that there is a deal in the works for Burgeo, and he does not know anything about it or the Member know anything about it, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: We are seventeen years doing nothing except lap dogging Ottawa and that is why we are in the shape we are in today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

I recognize the Hon. Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Member should not be sore because his own Caucus gave him the boot. Don't blame it on us.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) keep your mouth shut.

Mr. Matthews: Now, let me just tell the Member for Social Services that we did -

An Hon. Member: I am not worried about it this time at all.

Mr. Matthews: - disagree with things in the Federal package. Yes, we, being the Leader and the things we disagreed with, as I pointed out today, is that there was no recognition in principle by the Federal Government of the problems in the inshore, and we disagreed with that.

There should have been a recognition of that. There should have been compensation provided accordingly for reduced landings in the inshore. Another weakness in the package, there should have been sufficient funds to allow fishermen to change their gear types and to convert to larger mesh sizes. We said that and we disagreed with that particular aspect.

The other thing we disagreed with is because of the increase in mesh sizes, inshore fishermen will have decreased landings and decreased earnings in this Province and it is incumbent on the Federal Government to recognize that and to put a fund in place accordingly. Now, we disagreed with that omission and that weakness in the Federal proposal and the Federal package. We disagree with that.

The other thing we disagree with, Mr. Chairman, unlike the Member for Fortune-Hermitage and the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries is that there is no future in Gaultois. That Member for Fortune-Hermitage told me time and time again that there would have to be fish plants closed and I asked him directly, I said what would happen to the people of Gaultois, what would they do. He said they would have to relocate. I said where. He said Harbour Breton. I said would they be relocating then somewhere else where they would be unemployed. Now, that is the difference in us and the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries and this Member. We believe the people of Gaultois should stay in Gaultois.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: That is true. And the other thing about it, being with the people of Grand Bank last night, the only thing that has been offered to the people of Grand Bank, Mr. Chairman, is a \$6 million development fund by the Federal Government. Not five cents from this Government, not five.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: I sat in the

Premier's office with the Grand Bank delegation, all five of us, and they asked the Premier directly, what are you going to do for Grand Bank, and he said to them categorically, nothing. Your fish plant must close, there are too many plants open in this Province. That is what the Premier told them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: Do not tell me what you wanted to do for Grand Bank, and the only thing you suggested, that is geographically located to Grand Bank, is a Heritage Village proposed by the Greater Lamaline Area Development Association, Mr. Chairman. Now, that is going to take care of three hundred and fifty people in Grand Bank, and the closest thing to Gaultois is a mineral development in Bay D'Espoir, and the next closest thing is skiing at the White Hills. That is the next thing. And a \$50 million proposed for Marble Mountain, Mr. Chairman. And Egyptian submarines for St. John's, that is going to do a lot for Trepassey, Grand Bank and Gaultois, isn't it. That is going to do a lot for them. Now, that is what you proposed to the Government of Ottawa. And I have it right here and I will show you.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: And that is facts. That is your facts, it is not the Government of Ottawa's, the document is yours. If you were not so stunned, you would understand it. To the Hon. Bernard Valcourt from Premier Clyde Wells. Premier Clyde Wells wrote this to Bernard Valcourt.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The Hon. Member for Grand Bank has the floor. I have recognized the Hon. Member for Grand Bank. If other Members want to speak, I will identify them when the hon. Member for Grand Bank's time has elapsed. I think I have tolerated this too much. I will not tolerate it anymore. The Hon. Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what the Premier suggested to Mr. Valcourt - a plastic industry for Conche, and an integrated leather tannery. That is the kind of stuff you sent to Ottawa for Grand Bank, Gaultois and other communities in this Province. You should get a copy of your own Government's documentation, and read it and then you will be better informed. And the one thing we said we liked about the Federal package, Mr. Chairman, was that at least it was community specific for those communities who are having their fish plants closed.

We believe that Gaultois should keep processing red fish, and they should have a ten thousand metric ton allocation, and we supported Gaultois in writing on that. We believe that. If they can get ten thousand metric tons of red fish and they have their development fund to complement that, then Gaultois will be better than ever Mr. Chairman, and what is wrong with that? The only thing Grand Bank has been offered is a \$6 million development fund. That is what they have been offered. You have not offered them a cent.

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Matthews: What has Trepassey

been offered? Nothing, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Matthews: From this particular Government - nothing. The Premier and the Minister of Fisheries went up there and told them their plant would have to close. What hope did you offer Trepassey? And then we hear today the Premier mention about a naval facility or something up there.

Ms Verge: And when did he mention that to the Federal Government?

Mr. Matthews: Today.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member for Humber East is not in her seat and it is-

An Hon. Member: Not in her seat.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, the Premier alluded yesterday to trade free zones and he mentioned specifically Grand Bank, and I said yesterday, and I waved the document, that there was no reference to trade free zones that would be of any benefit to Grand Bank. I read it again after yesterday, and I say categorically that there is nothing here from this Government that will be of any benefit to Grand Bank through that avenue, nothing whatsoever.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, the Feds do not solve all the problems, they far from solve all the problems, but let me just say to the Government House Leader, they solve some of the problems, which is more than this Government does.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: They solve some of the problems. The workers income support system package which is in place is totally Federal Government, and you are not putting a cent into it.

An Hon. Member: Not a penny.

Mr. Matthews: Not a penny. You have got \$110 million that you say you proposed-

Mr. Simms: Blame it on the Feds.

An Hon. Member: Now, we are telling the truth.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, if this Government was concerned about the fishery, if it was sophisticated enough for the Premier to get involved in, if his hands would not smell after he dealt in fish, you would put \$110 million in now with your own programs, like you said you were going to do with the Federal Government. But, you know what? This Government never had any intention of getting involved with the Federal Government in a package. It was nothing but a sham.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: And you know what makes the Premier as bitter as he is today? Because the only salvation for his Economic Recovery Commission was a billion dollars from the Federal Government. And you know what he wanted? He wanted the Feds to agree to a billion dollars, and after the money was approved, then they would get specific projects. That is what this Government expected of the Federal Government.

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Matthews: Give me a billion dollars.

Mr. Chairman: Time is up.

Mr. Matthews: After we got that we would get specific projects. Do you know why? So he could justify his Economic Recovery Commission, which is now a failure.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for LaPoile.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Shot down the Minister again.

Mr. Warren: I think it was good too.

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Chairman, you would swear, according to the Members opposite and their comments, that the Provincial Government has always been right there with support when any industry dies. You would certainly think the closure of the Newfoundland Railway, as an example, was fully financially supported by the Provincial Government in areas most drastically affected, namely Bishop's Falls and Port aux Basques, and not a penny-

An Hon. Member: Not a penny.

Mr. Ramsay: - from the Provincial Government went into a town that has lost in excess of fifteen hundred jobs over the last ten to fifteen years, not a penny. And what did they get? They received

a \$7 million Economic Diversification Fund which they have to cry and screech and bawl to get any money out of, because they only get money from it when its politically expedient for the Federal Government.

An Hon. Member: That is right!

Mr. Ramsay: When it is politically correct for John Crosbie to make an announcement.

An Hon. Member: That is right!

An Hon. Member: You should be out in Port aux Basques to the meeting for (inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: Yes, I will be Sire.

An Hon. Member: When?

Mr. Ramsay: Now, let's talk about a few other things.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Ramsay: Let's talk about one item that Port aux Basques had to perform some really, really hard work at getting - the NDT Centre for Port aux Basques. I understand that the hon. Minister had a lot to do with that at the time. They really had to work hard to get it.

An Hon. Member: Like what.

Mr. Ramsay: Well, apparently it was slated for down in your area but, at the last minute the recommendation of the NDT Association of Canada -

An Hon. Member: What can you do with it?

Mr. Ramsay: Pardon?

An Hon. Member: What can you do with it? (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: Oh. I see, okay.

An Hon. Member: At that time, you needed it more than we did.

Mr. Ramsay: Oh, yes. Hindsight is 20/20 they say. But anyway, that is one thing-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: This item here, Mr. Chairman, the item where we have the transcript of exactly what the hon. Leader of the Opposition had to say. I have listened to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for a year now, and the words that he uses are very - we know the types of words he uses - certain people have certain words that are used very frequently in speech. The word focus is very rarely used by the Leader of the Opposition. The words, but at first blush, he says, and particularly a blush on the focus, I think the focus is the proper one. Does this not sound like the preparation of a media briefing session prior to going on the air? Federal people who take you into a room, possibly, and say here is the response we want you to give the hon. Minister of International Trade when he makes his comment on it and you are asked about it, we want you to say this, use this word, as a first blush. I have never heard the man utter the word "a first blush".

An Hon. Member: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Ramsay: Oh, there is nothing wrong with it, it is just a little out of character for that kind of wording to be used. It would lead one to believe that some Tory

lobbying firm, - maybe Public Affairs or the Frank Moores crowd or whatever, go and they say, well, we will give part of our Economic Diversification money over to Mr. Moores and the boys and pay them to tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition of the Provincial PC Party what to say, so he can look like he is fully in support of the Federal PC Party.

An Hon. Member: Which he is.

Mr. Ramsay: Which he is, sincerely, he says here, absolutely, there will be areas of the package over the next several days as we get into analyzing it, and we have further observations to make. Now, he did say that. So, based on saying that, I guess he is giving himself the out that he needs to be able to pick up on little things, and, the Opt-Out Syndrome, you know.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: Yes, but it is a little out of focus, you know.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: It is probably the blush we will see after the next election. But there is not, Mr. Chairman, in this package, a single thing to address the southwest coast and the south coast winter fishery. I have got, in the District of LaPoile, approximately two thousand people who are in dire consequences, the people are about to lose their homes, they are about to lose their cars, and the hon. Minister has written, I have written the hon. Minister of Fisheries, Federally, and we get little or no response at all. It is almost like they figure, well, it is not a Northern Cod issue, it is not

something that the national media has picked up on, so, let's forget about that, they are not going to kick up too much of a stink, because the capital city is not there, it is not Mr. Crosbie's District, we do not have to address that so much, we will just shove that under the GST rug, and we will worry about that later. And that is the kind of treatment that the average Newfoundlander and Labradorian will have to put up with from the Federal Government that has this kind of mind set. It is just despicable. It is unreal.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Ramsay: Yes.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) Tory fund for the first term.

Mr. Ramsay: Yes.

Mr. Hearn: Steve Neary used to say that anyone could get elected there.

Mr. Ramsay: Well, I can tell you some of the things that have been proposed are currently being negotiated on behalf of the local Diversification Fund crowd in Port aux Basques, the Committee. If you talk about Economic Diversification, if we allow the Federal Government to have their full hands on Economic Diversification in this Province, without our Economic Recovery Commission or Departments of Government getting involved in it, it will never happen. Because it is not politically correct. It all has to go the the bigger areas in the Province.

A lot of these different proposals that have been mentioned, variants of them and various other

proposals have been put before ACOA, have been turned down and they have been held up because they say, well, you need another business plan. So, they go back to ACOA with another business plan, and in that business plan they say, well you left out this, this, this and this. So they get together again and they put forth another business plan. By the time they get to where they are going the darn thing is gone. The opportunity that the business was going to be created for is gone because of the Federal bureaucracy in ACOA.

So I take no amount of comfort in the fact that the Federal Government program, as it is, what it is, is going to be delivered by ACOA. Because the truth of the matter is, if the Diversification plans for the various communities in the Province is in the hands of ACOA, then God help those communities if they have to experience what the Port aux Basques area has experienced over the past year or so since the close-down of the Railway. Because it is just. But not unless there is someone there to spearhead it who have their mind in rural Newfoundland, who have ideas of how people in rural Newfoundland think. What better place to find it, than here in the House of Assembly? The majority of Members of this House would have the main ideas of what will work, what people will accept, and what people will think is useful.

But if they allow a person, a Director General, or whoever in a Federal Government Department - normally some of them are Newfoundlanders - but the decisions made at the higher levels are not being made by Newfoundlanders, they are made by

people who have been at desk jobs all their lives, and have little or no experience. Then God help us, because without our input, and I do not mean this from a partisan political nature, but without the Provincial Government input, and I mean effective input not just two on a Board of eight, but input and control over these funds, we will get nowhere.

We have one, Mr. Chairman, if I might mention prior to you telling me that my time is up, the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles craze. If anyone remembers, I mentioned that in this House back in November, how this was a craze, and ACOA has consistently prevented the company that we have set up in Port aux Basques from getting that part of their business plan ahead. There is a \$70 million order of Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtle products that has been held up and basically gone out the window because of this wrangling over politically incorrect interference with this Federal Government Agency.

\$70 million worth of work that would keep, in excess of three shifts, like two different plants, three shifts in each plant, working producing these Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtle ornamental, helmet-type things for, I do not know, probably a full year.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Ramsay: All right, I will continue later, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: Way to go Bill!.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Before I recognize the hon. Member, I ask the hon. Member of

Social Services if he could remove that display from his desk.

The Hon. Member for Torngat Mountains.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to get into this debate a little bit too. Listening to my colleagues opposite, the Leader of the Official Opposition and my colleague here from Grand Bank, I could see, Mr. Chairman, that it looks like the Members opposite are forgetting one thing. Now, the Minister of Social Services earlier said, and my colleague from LaPoile was saying, that the Leader of the Opposition was sort of with Mr. Crosbie, talking about this whole package and when it was taking place. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind my hon. colleagues opposite that all they had to do was turn on NTV, at the same time the briefing was taking place, the Leader of the Opposition was on Newfoundland AM on NTV answering questions from the public. Now, Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a very, very important and very versatile person. But, Mr. Chairman, how could he be in two or three places at one time? Now, he was down at the NTV station answering questions from the public and at the same time, the hon. Member, the Minister of Social Services, said the Opposition Leader was down talking to Mr. Crosbie - there was no such thing. So, I just want to say, Mr. Chairman-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Oh, I am sorry, yes,

the Member for LaPoile, I am going to apologize to the Minister of Social Services who went up to Ottawa to meet with the Minister of Employment and Immigration and was told, get back home and put your own house in order. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister announced on radio and Television, that he was going to do that.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Warren: I am going to Ottawa and settle this problem with refugees.

Mr. Chairman: Okay, the hon. Member may continue.

The hon. Member for Torngat Mountains may continue.

Mr. Warren: Oh.

Mr. Chairman: I just wanted to get the attention of the hon. Members to my right here who were causing some interruption.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You know, this attacking, Mr. Chairman, slowed me down and now I have to start again. However, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that the hon. Minister of Social Services announced on radio and television that he was going to Ottawa, he was going to meet with the Minister of Employment and Immigration, and he was going to settle the refugee problem in the Province.

An Hon. Member: Did it get solved?

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, let me just tell the hon. gentleman-

An Hon. Member: You tell us.

Mr. Warren: But Mr. Chairman, it

had nothing to do with the Minister's trip, that is the funny thing about it, Mr. Chairman, not one thing to do with the Minister's trip. Mr. Chairman, the Minister told him, look we have got it solved, go back home, you are wasting your time up here. But the hon. gentleman wanted to get PR.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Warren: He wanted to get PR, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get back to one other very important segment of this whole Budget debate, and I go back to a question I asked of the Premier a few days ago. And I thought it would all tie together into the Budget because we were talking about native policy, which is in this Budget, and within the native policy, naturally, are concerns with the native people. And Mr. Chairman, I asked the Premier would he go to Hopedale to meet with concerned people. Okay, Mr. Chairman?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: My colleague should just relax. Here is what the Premier said, Mr. Chairman, 'The citizens of the community of Hopedale, if, as, and when the Council in Hopedale or a group of concerned citizens of Hopedale ask me to meet with them, I will most certainly meet with them.'

An Hon. Member: That is what he said.

Mr. Warren: In answer, Mr. Chairman, on Thursday and Friday past, a fax arrived in the Premier's office.

An Hon. Member: Both days?

Mr. Warren: Both days, two days in a row.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Two days in a row.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: He said he would meet with the people, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I will just say now that the hon. Member for Humber East was not in her seat, and she wanted to speak. You said she should go back to her seat. Why don't you tell the hon. gentleman to do the same thing.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Premier said those words.

An Hon. Member: What day?

Mr. Warren: What day? May 3rd, Mr. Chairman. On Friday, the Premier received correspondence from the Hopedale Council.

An Hon. Member: Indeed he did.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, it was sent on Friday, but the Premier did not look at it until four days later.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

I remind the hon. Member for Exploits that he is not in his proper place in the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: And Mr. Chairman, the Premier received a request from the Community Council of Hopedale asking him to come into Hopedale to meet with them. Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Premier called Hopedale.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, I am telling you what the Premier does because I want to give the Premier credit, okay? So, why did you not listen?

An Hon. Member: Okay, okay.

Mr. Warren: Now, yesterday, the Premier called the Mayor of Hopedale.

An Hon. Member: Who is that?

Mr. Warren: Fred Benson. Okay? Now, Mr. Chairman, the Premier called the Mayor in Hopedale, and he said I received your telex, I got your fax, you want me to come into Hopedale. And the Mayor said yes, sir, we have concerns about low level flying in our area. So, all of a sudden, the Premier started explaining. Now remember this fellows because this is very important. All of a sudden the Premier started explaining to the Mayor in Hopedale about the geographical area of Hopedale. Now, the Premier made only one trip there. Okay?

The Premier made one trip to Hopedale and all of a sudden he starts telling the Mayor, who spent thirty-three years in Hopedale, where Hopedale was located. Okay, that is the first thing he did. Now the second thing the Premier did, which I thought was right, because this Premier is an honest, downright, upright, downright, inside right,

outside right, everything right, okay?

An Hon. Member: Sanctimonious (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Sanctimonious?

Whatever you say, the Premier is that. So now, and knowing what the Premier said here, he said I will meet with anybody, anytime when they ask me. The Premier said, Mr. Benson -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: You just listen. Why don't you take off your diapers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Your only a baby, boy!

Mr. Warren: And, Mr. Chairman, what the Premier said.

An Hon. Member: Tell us.

Mr. Warren: The Premier said to the Mayor of Hopedale, Mr. Benson, I am going to call the Base Commander and ask him to go to Hopedale.

An Hon. Member: Base Commander?

Mr. Warren: Oh yes.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: I don't know. He was going to ask the Base Commander to go in instead of going in himself. After all the land belongs to the Province.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what the Premier said, I will meet with them, if they ask me. They asked him, and he said I

am going to send a colonel.

An Hon. Member: Base Commander.

Mr. Warren: I am going to send a Base Commander from Goose Bay to meet with the Council.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: And, Mr. Chairman, I must say that when I spoke to the Mayor today, not only the Mayor, but many, many other people in Labrador, finally Mr. Chairman, they are seeing their true Jimmy Bakker, they are seeing a true guy, they are seeing the wolf in sheep's clothing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: Now what is going to happen? The Premier is going to call the Base Commander to go into Hopedale. There is going to be a public meeting.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: There is nothing wrong with it. But I see 52 of us here altogether and there is not one seat here for the Base Commander. Not one.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Warren: You know, if you can tell me where he sits in this House, I will be satisfied.

Mr. Warren: But he works with the Federal Government.

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Warren: And this land of Newfoundland and Labrador belongs to the Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: So, why do you want the Base Commander to go into Hopedale? Why doesn't the Premier go into Hopedale, where he belongs, and talk to the people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: Well, you know Mr. Chairman, I have to say this, either the Premier is telling Mr. Benson a lie, or he told me a lie. He did one or the other.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Warren: He did one of two things, Mr. Chairman, and I will find out for sure which is right. And he told a lie to either this House when he said this or he told the Mayor of Hopedale a lie. He did one of two things.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, it is calculated right here what he said here.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Warren: By leave, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: By leave.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of comments about the hon. Member for Grand Bank because, I think, of all the Members on that side of the House, he is the one who says what he

feels, and he is really determined to be interested and to solve the problems, not only of the constituents of his own area, but people all over Newfoundland and Labrador. I totally support and understand exactly what he is saying.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: And, in fact, of all the Members over there, he is the only person who has the ability to perform as an Opposition Member, and I think he is doing a masterful job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: However, I can say one thing in all honesty, he is an honest individual, and he did not agree with his Leader on the statements he made in the news media yesterday. And I saw his expression when it was first brought up in the House this evening when he looked at the Leader. Now I can understand why last night, when I sat here in this hon. House of Assembly, that the Leader of the Opposition had better be aware of what is going on behind him.

I do not care what is going on behind me. I can understand why he does not care, because you know you have no future when you have people like that who really believe and support the people of Newfoundland and don't know what is right. I am not saying who is going to be the Leader, but he is sincere and he is honest about it, and he knows full well how falsifying you are towards the people, and there is no question about it, we saw the Minister operate, the former Minister operate in the House of Assembly. We saw what he was like as

Leader. We saw him today support the Federal's attitude towards Newfoundland and Labrador - second-class citizens. Give them a few handouts, make things difficult. And it is not the first time that he supported his Tory buddies in Ottawa when they tried to downgrade and make things difficult for Newfoundland.

Let me read just one sentence from a statement of April 5, 1989. "Today Premier Tom Rideout is responding to earlier reaction by the Federal Opposition. The Premier states that he feels these comments are alarmist. The Premier said he is encouraged by the Federal Government's intent on improving the program's effectiveness on fairness in the UI regulations in Newfoundland and Labrador". He totally supported the UI benefits.

Mr. Simms: Thousands waiting for their unemployment (inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Yes. Sure it is. Bring in the fourteen weeks, bring in all the changes, but no jobs. That is exactly what that gentleman over there, that hon. Member of the House of Assembly -

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Efford: - the Leader of the Opposition supports anything that is detrimental to Newfoundland and Labrador. Bring in the fourteen weeks; bring in the support of UI regulations; bring in no jobs; bring in no training programs; and starve the Newfoundlanders. Second-class citizens again today.

The only thing the Member for Grand Bank (Mr. Simms) - I am disappointed in him - said was

that he was against the Premier when he asked for the \$1 billion for Newfoundland. Surely -

Mr. Simms: No. I did not.

Mr. Efford: Okay. I misunderstood what you were saying. Surely nobody in their right mind -

Mr. Simms: You did not misunderstand him, you misled -

Mr. Efford: Surely nobody in their right mind would be against Newfoundland and Labrador getting \$1 billion for the fishery. Ottawa has robbed more than that from Newfoundland and Labrador in the last ten years. They have raped the fishery stocks. They have allowed the Grand Banks to be raped. They have allowed the inshore fishery to be raped. There are no more fish left. You were part and parcel to that going on for the last seventeen years. Your government was part and parcel -

Mr. Simms: We had a Liberal Government in Ottawa. Blame Trudeau. He didn't do anything about it.

Mr. Efford: Now, when all the fish are gone, when all the jobs are gone, when the people of Gaultois are out of work and the people of Grand Bank are out of work, they cry 'foul' on the Liberal Government and this present government. Just imagine! Seventeen years -

Mr. Simms: Right now you are not doing anything.

Mr. Efford: Not doing anything?

Mr. Simms: No, you are not.

Mr. Efford: So we are supposed to snap our fingers now and bring the fish stocks back that have been totally wiped out. Keep the plants open. Can you imagine! Keep the plants open and no fish coming in, absolutely no fish. Set all the cod traps you like around the Coast, no fish; set all the trawls you like, no fish; set the gill nets, no fish; but keep the plants open. That makes about as much sense as you made during the last four years when you made the pickle factory. It all comes to the same reality -

An Hon. Member: But that was 200 jobs.

Mr. Efford: Yes. That was 200 jobs. Well, well! Let me tell this hon. House who paid for the jobs - and I only found it out today - who paid for the labour in the cucumber factory. The Department of Social Services, through the Community Development Program, paid for the jobs out there in the Sprung Greenhouse.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Order, please!

Mr. Efford: The Department of Social Services paid for the jobs out there.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Social Services has been recognized by the Chairman. I would like the other Members to refrain from shouting across the House.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Now, I do not mind anybody standing up - and the hon. Member

for Grand Bank has the right to do so - to fight for the fishermen and the people in his community and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. But when you see the Leader of the Opposition get to his feet and make the accusation that he makes in this House of Assembly, telling us that this Government is doing absolutely nothing -

Mr. Simms: What are you doing? Tell us.

Mr. Efford: Well, I will tell you what I am going to do tomorrow morning. I am going to go out on the wharf in Port de Grave and I am going to flick the fingers, and in comes the fish and in comes the caplin.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Oh, my! Oh, my! Oh, my! Talk about sense! No wonder the people only allowed him to be there as Premier for twenty-nine days. No wonder he only lasted twenty-nine days. God help Newfoundland if he had lasted thirty-one days.

It is all attitude, Mr. Chairman. It is all a game. But the biggest disappointment - the Leader of the Opposition knows full well what I am saying - is to express any concern that you totally supported what is in that Federal package.

Mr. Simms: He did not say that. Don't be lying.

Mr. Efford: Sure you said, "Is there any criticism?"

An Hon. Member: No criticism at all, no.

Mr. Efford: It is stated very clearly. Mr. Andrews -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Twist Words Almighty. The truth shall come out.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, these are not my words. You would not believe what I am going to say, so I am going to read all.

Art Andrews, CBC: "Any criticism at all with the program?" "No." "Any criticism at all with the program as you know it?" "No." It is here. I will table it.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Page to come and photocopy this and pass it over to the Leader. I will table it in the House of Assembly so you can read it. It is not something that I am dreaming up or fabricating, it is there in plain English. Unless they are saying that somebody printed the wrong words. Is the Leader of the Opposition denying it? Do you have any criticism? Let me ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: And I would say yes.

Mr. Simms: There was a statement made this morning.

Mr. Efford: Let me hear your reaction. Do you have any criticism?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

The Hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: Just a few comments. I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services where he wants the reservation made for tomorrow evening for dinner after all those fine remarks.

Mr. Rideout: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, no! I am only kidding, of course.

I would just like to say that the official position in reaction to the Fisheries Adjustment Package yesterday - we would like to give the response of the Opposition caucus to the Fisheries Adjustment Package. While our response is not wholly positive, neither is it wholly negative. That is what I said before.

An Hon. Member: Oh, no.

Mr. Matthews: Oh, yes.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Hold on! That is not what I said. Those are the words of the Leader of the Opposition. Now, you should listen.

The title is: "Press statement by Opposition Leader, Tom Rideout, in response to the Federal Government Fisheries Adjustment Package." Now, let me just refer further to this, if the hon. Members would just listen. "The Adjustment Package is seriously flawed. However, in his total lack of a response to the crisis in the inshore fishery, fishermen and plant workers dependent on the inshore fishery have once again been left out, and this is unacceptable.

"We would have expected the Adjustment Package to provide

compensation -

An Hon. Member: I bet he will not say it tomorrow before Crosbie.

Mr. Matthews: I do not care if it is before Crosbie or during Crosbie or after Crosbie, I just want the Member to listen.

"We would have expected the Adjustment Package to provide compensation to fishermen and plant workers engaged in the inshore fishery if landings this year fall significantly below the inshore allowance of 115,000 tons," which everyone is expecting by the way. We hope it does not happen but everyone is expecting it.

"We would also have expected financial assistance to help fishermen change gear type and mesh size, and fishermen must receive financial compensation if those changes, the gear size changes, as they will, result in lower landings."

Now, that is our position and our reaction to that package. Let me just say to the Government House Leader, Mr. Chairman, that the biggest about-face in this Province happened in the last twenty-four hours by the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: The biggest about-face ever seen since Confederation on an issue was by this Premier. We will deal with that another day. We have copies of Hansard where the Premier took part in Question Period and debate. We have copies of Hansard where the Minister of Fisheries responded to questions in Question Period and in debate. We have public transcripts and documents

of both the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries saying that fish plants have to be closed.

As a matter of fact, as I said earlier today, the Minister of Fisheries went so far in debate in this House as to say that what is happening with the Atlantic fishery in this Province is probably a blessing in disguise. Now, what is anything of a blessing in what is happening in the Atlantic fishery? I have not been able to find out yet.

I just want to react to the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Ramsay) for a moment. He had some very good points, yes we have all had our difficulties with ACOA. I have had them for people that I have tried to get things done for, it is slow and cumbersome, hard to get money approved, I agree with all of that. It is true, and I have reservations about how easy it will be to access this money through ACOA, for the simple reason that we do not have a lot of time, particularly when I look at my own situation in Grand Bank, because it is my sincere belief that if the Total Allowable Catch is decreased again next year, that Fishery Products International will not open the doors of that plant after this year.

So when the boys walk out of the plant in June, it may be the last time they come to the gate under Fishery Products International. So we do not have a lot of time to dilly-dally with bureaucratic obstructions, I agree on that.

But I just want to say to him that realizing full well you have very serious problems with the fishery on the southwest coast, but if you scrutinize what has been put forward by your Government to

Ottawa to address this crisis, the closest thing that I can find, geographically related to your problem, is the aggregate mining operation at St. George's, where they are talking about the expansion of that.

You see, that is the closest thing, geographically, that I could find in your document put forward by your Premier, okay, with the help of Dr. House, to address -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: What is that?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Okay, sure. I would appreciate it if you would. But on scrutinizing it now for quite a while, that is the closest thing I can see mentioned that would in any way help economic diversification or job creation anywhere closely related to that gentleman's District. That is the closest thing I could find.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: The what?

An Hon. Member: The year-round (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Well, yes, of course, that is going to be a -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, what really has bothered me about once the Provincial position became public, is that all along I believed and the people of the Province believed and the people in my area of the Province believed that the Provincial Government was actively seeking

alternative industries for Grand Bank because the fish plant was slated for closure. I believed that, and the people believed it.

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Matthews: But when you look at what was sent to Ottawa to address the problems, particularly by those communities who are already slated for closure, the closest thing I can find to Grand Bank is the Heritage Village proposed by the Greater Lamaline Area Development Association, which is important.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, it is here, sponsored by the Greater Lamaline Area Development Association, not Placentia West as I thought first.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: So what is that going to do for the 350 workers in the Grand Bank fish plant?

Ms Verge: When was it submitted?

Mr. Matthews: April 3rd. The 3rd of April.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: This year. And the next closest thing I can find to Grand Bank, I would like to tell the hon. gentleman, the next closest thing I can find is, I think, it is somewhere like a \$20 million proposal for development of the White Hills Ski Resort.

Mr. Warren: In Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: No, that is in Clarendville.

Mr. Warren: Oh, I thought that

was in Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Now that is fine, too. I have nothing against White Hills. I hope it is developed, and I hope it takes off. But how many people from Grand Bank - they will not be able to afford to go down there and ski.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) of Argentia?

Mr. Matthews: And I look at Gaultois, and the closest thing proposed for Gaultois by the Provincial Government is some mineral quarry activity up in the head of Bay D'Espoir. And the next closest thing again to Gaultois is the White Hills Ski Resort, I say to the Member for Fortune-Hermitage.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Then, when I look at a \$50 million proposal for development of Marble Mountain -

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Matthews: - under the disguise of a fisheries response program by this Government.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, John, you can say what you like, under the disguise of addressing the fisheries crisis, that is what this Government proposed to Ottawa, \$50 million for Marble Mountain. Now I hope there is \$100 million spent on Marble Mountain, it is a wonderful facility, but do not do it on the back of the fishery.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: That stuff should

go on anyway, if you could get the money.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: Do not do it on the backs of the workers in Grand Bank and Gaultois, Trepassey and St. John's southside.

Economic development is the mandate of any government, whether Provincial or Federal. You should be doing that all the time. You do not have to have a crisis in our most important industry to go to the Federal Government or pony up a few dollars yourselves for that kind of development around this Province, but you do not do it on the back of the fishery and the thousands of people in those communities. That is what you did, and that is why the Leader of the Opposition-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: That is why he called the Premier the master of deception.

An Hon. Member: That is right!

Mr. Matthews: Because the people have been deceived.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Matthews: That is what has happened, and I do not say things that I do not believe.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: We all have a crisis, it is a resource crisis. We all recognize that. That is why my fish plant is slated to close, that is why inshore landings have decreased, that is why earnings have gone down, and that is why somebody has got to

put money in to address it. Now the other point is this-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, what is going to -

An Hon. Member: A million dollars is okay.

Mr. Matthews: But you -

An Hon. Member: The fish must come back.

Mr. Matthews: Exactly. But what do we do while we are waiting for the fish to come back is the question.

Mr. Simms: That is the answer.

An Hon. Member: Go work at Marble Mountain, I guess.

Mr. Matthews: What are the workers in Grand Bank going to do while they are waiting for the fish to come back, go to the Heritage Village, go to the White Hills skiing?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: No, they cannot do that, and that is why the only positive sign I saw in the package yesterday for Grand Bank -

An Hon. Member: It is the only one.

Mr. Matthews: Hold on now, just let me finish. The \$6 million development fund was positive. Because I think, when there is \$6 or 7 million floating around, there is usually someone who will nibble to try to get a bit of it. Now we are going to have to be very careful that we do not - I cannot use the word here - let it

go without really carefully analyzing what is proposed for the utilization of the money.

And the other thing is the other positive aspect was the power program; it was announced months ago, and the Province is going to cost share in that, 30 per cent, which was negotiated two years ago when I happened to be the Minister responsible. That is positive.

The other thing is that there now will be a package for severance and so on for fish plant workers - \$120 million, I believe, was announced yesterday. Now that was not there before. Now in Grand Bank, by the way, in Grand Bank, the power program will take care of, at fifty-five years of age, about thirty-nine people out of three hundred and fifty. Now, if there are some others who are willing to take severance and want to get out of the fishery or want to go and be retrained, well that is up to them.

I watched the newscast last night and I know the people they interviewed. There was one young gentleman who said, I do not mind being retrained. I would like to try something else. So there will be a few of them. But what is going to happen to the other three hundred? In Grand Bank, there will be nothing else without something fishery related.

Now, there has been a lot of fancy talk about underutilized species, and hopefully -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Of course, it is too bad we all did not recognize it years ago.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Matthews: It is too bad. By leave?

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Minister of Health.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: Oh, Mr. Chairman, I am apolitical. I have been sitting here, Mr. Chairman, for the past couple of days minding my own business, wondering where we can build another hospital, wondering where we can open a few more hospital beds, and while all this has been going on, I have been listening to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and to Members of the Opposition Party. I have been listening to them and, Mr. Chairman, I am totally confused. Yesterday, I listened to the Leader of the Opposition when he talked to his friend, his colleague, his Tory cousin down from Ottawa, John Crosbie.

Mr. Simms: Oh here we go, same old speech.

Mr. Decker: And Mr. Chairman, it reminded me of Spike and Ralph. Now, I wonder if all our Members remember Spike and Ralph.

An Hon. Member: I remember Spike and Ralph.

An Hon. Member: Who is Spike and Ralph?

Mr. Decker: Spike and Ralph are two cartoon characters. Two dogs, actually. I remember Ralph. Now, Ralph is a great big dog, I mean a big old Great Dane, big muscles in him, you know, all swollen up and, you see, old Ralph is dodging down

the road, you know, pretty sophisticated, not unlike John Crosbie, and running next to Ralph there is Spike: Ralph, Ralph, you are a great fellow, Ralph. Ralph, what a fellow! What, Ralph? Ralph, let's go bowling, Ralph. Yes, Ralph. Good Ralph. And Ralph just gives him a douse in the side of the head, you see. Poor old Spike.

Well, Mr. Chairman, yesterday, for those of us who listened, we could see Spike say, Yes John, yes John, yes John. What a program! What a program, John.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: Now the newsman was totally - who was it? Was it Miller? Who was it?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: Art Andrews was absolutely amazed. Art said, 'But Mr. Rideout, do you totally agree with everything in this package? Yes, yes, yes, Ralph, yes Ralph.' But he said, 'Mr. Rideout, surely goodness, there must be something in this program you disagree with.' 'No, no'.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: It was -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: Now, Mr. Chairman, that was yesterday. Between yesterday and today the Leader of the Opposition put his finger up in the air to see which way the wind was blowing, and he discovered that some people in this Province who know a few things about the fishery, namely Richard Cashin, namely the expert on fisheries, the Minister of

Fisheries, namely our Premier, and the fishermen on Fisherman's Broadcast-

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: He listened to all of them, and they pointed out that this was not as good a program as Spike thought it was when he was talking to Ralph yesterday. So Spike said maybe I have taken the wrong side on this story.

You see, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows what leadership means. His definition of leadership is this: Watch the crowd to see in which direction they are running and then get out in front of them and pretend you are leading. So when he discovered which way the crowd was going, he discovered that what he had said to Ralph yesterday was totally inappropriate and he struck off in his own direction and said, 'No, this is not a good program'. Talk about schizophrenia!

I saw him on the television tonight and I could not believe it was the same - I thought it was an impersonator. I thought someone was impersonating the Leader of the Opposition. I came here tonight fully expecting to see him up on a point of privilege, asking CBC to apologize for putting on this other person, dressed up in his clothes, imitating his voice, and saying that he disagreed with Ralph. I just could not believe what I was hearing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is what had happened. Yesterday, 'Yes, yes, yes', today, 'No, no, no'. Now I am waiting in anticipation for tomorrow - what will tomorrow bring for us?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: And I finally, Mr. Chairman, I have finally got the glimmer from the Minister, from the Member for Grand Bank when he was up speaking, I finally got the glimmer, yes, yes, yes, no, no, no, we believe, some of it we like, some of it we do not like.

An Hon. Member: Maybe, maybe, maybe.

Mr. Decker: Maybe, maybe, maybe. Well, Mr. Chairman -

Mr. Tobin: Tell us about the time you organized Peckford's Leadership.

Mr. Decker: This, Mr. Chairman, this is why the people of the Province lost confidence in the Members of the PC Party, after having them there for seventeen years.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: I have a lot of respect for Brian Peckford. Now, do not -

An Hon. Member: You organized (inaudible).

Mr. Decker: Brian Peckford and I were friends, we went to University together, we drove back and forth from Englee to St. John's together many times.

Mr. Tobin: And then he wanted to run for them and he would not have you. (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: And Brian Peckford was a great man. But, you know, what happened to the poor fellow? He surrounded himself with incompetent people.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: I mean, the former Minister of Justice, the woman in the Cabinet, today is a front for Ottawa when they close up the Women's Centres.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Decker: She thinks it is a wonderful thing. Yes, Ralph, yes, Ralph, you know. They have taken over. So the problem with Peckford -

An Hon. Member: He would not take you. He said I have Tom Rideout and I am sticking with him, when you wanted to run PC in the election, in 1985.

Mr. Decker: You are talking about the time when the Leader of the Opposition now went for a nomination, and I opposed him for a nomination for the Liberal Party.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: The both of us were in for a nomination and he got the most votes.

I remember his speech, Mr. Chairman, because it was a good speech. It was one of the best speeches I have heard the hon. Member make, before he was elected or since he was elected. And the basis of his speech was this: Ladies and Gentlemen, he said, I was born a Liberal, and Ladies and Gentlemen I will tell you this, all my life I have been a Liberal; my father before me was a Liberal and I will die a Liberal, Mr. Chairman. That is the speech which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition made. It was a good speech. And, furthermore, he said, I would hope that my children will be Liberal. That is

the speech the hon. Member -

Mr. Tobin: You are right.

Mr. Decker: Mr. Chairman, he is absolutely right. His father and his mother before him were Liberals. His brothers and his sisters were and are Liberals and, I would think, Mr. Chairman, after his children see the way this Government is performing and the way their father is performing, they, too, will be Liberals, Mr. Chairman. That is the reality.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: Were you a Liberal when you organized Brian Peckford's Leadership in 1979?

Mr. Decker: Mr. Chairman, I cannot take credit for that one.

An Hon. Member: You worked on his (inaudible).

Mr. Decker: I gave him a donation. That was the best I could do for him.

Mr. Tobin: You worked on his campaign.

Mr. Decker: Did I work on his campaign? They are getting me off track, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tobin: Then he finds that you want to run for him and he said no, I am not having you I have Tom Rideout.

An Hon. Member: Go back to Ralph and Spike.

Mr. Decker: No, Mr. Chairman, I am a Liberal and I have been a Liberal all my life. Now I do not know if I am going to die a Liberal, I cannot say that. I cannot say I am going to do that,

but when the Leader of the Opposition was trying to get the nomination for this Party -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. the Member for Burin-Placentia West I have tolerated. He is not in his seat.

Ms. Verge: That was me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: No, it was not the Member for Humber East. I know the hon. Member for Humber East, and I suggest that the hon. Member return to his chair if he wants to get involved in the debate.

Mr. Decker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, because it is extremely difficult for me to maintain my composure when the Member for Burin-Placentia West gets over there and tries to -

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West, now that he is in his chair, I will recognize him.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I was talking from the wrong chair, and I would like to apologize to your Hon. in the highest form. But let me say that there is a time to say the things that are right and the Member, Mr. Chairman, for the Strait of Belle Isle did want to run as a Conservative, as did your Hon. want to run as a Conservative in the last election.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order, and his Hon. will not be -

An Hon. Member: Think about it!

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: Oh, Mr. Chairman, I have done some crazy things in my life but one of them was not wanting to run as a Progressive Conservative. Not because of the philosophy necessarily, Mr. Chairman, but I would have to be absolutely, totally suicidal to run as a Progressive Conservative in the great District of the Strait of Belle Isle. So I have never ever wanted to do that.

Now Mr. Chairman -

Ms Verge: So, you are an opportunist.

Mr. Decker: Listen to opportunism, listen to the personification of opportunism, when she got behind the Leader of the Opposition for the Leadership, the Deputy Premier for the west coast. Talk about opportunism. The personification of opportunism.

Mr. Tobin: And what happened on election day in Humber East?

Mr. Decker: Talk about opportunism, on election day we saw a change of Government after seventeen years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: After seventeen years of Tory rule in this Province, Mr. Chairman, when the Province, as I tried to say the other day and I was cut off in mid-sentence, the Province was like a great ocean liner, or those big fuel ships -

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: - which are on their way across the ocean loaded down with oil. It takes them days,

inertia is so great, it takes them days to slow down. Now this is what happened to this Province. This Province was under Tory rule and it was heading into bankruptcy. The Tories were putting the Province under, they were bringing industry to its knees, they were bringing the fishery to its knees, they were destroying the Province, Mr. Chairman, and after seventeen years the people of the Province realized that it was time to bring this to a stop, so on the 20th of April, the election day my friend asked about -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Decker: Thank you. What about the point of order? I cannot get that story.

Mr. Chairman: Before I recognize the hon. Member for St. John's East Extern, there was no point of order made by the Member for Burin-Placentia West.

The Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have to compliment the hon. the House Leader when he came in tonight, you know, he looked not himself, he is usually a bit jovial with a smile on his face. When he came in tonight, he looked right straight across at the Leader of the Opposition and boy what a stare. Yes, he was vicious.

Mr. Rideout: Intimidating.

Mr. Parsons: Trying to intimidate him, I would say, Mr. Chairman, I was almost prepared to go over and stand to his back. Glory be, but

all of a sudden now the climate has changed, after such an intellectual contribution by the Minister of Health. Glory be! I do not know how stupid we are. We should have all rose and gave him a standing ovation. I mean, for the like of that to come across the House. I never! I must say, I always looked up to that gentleman.

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Parsons: Yes, I did. That is when I was sitting, Mr. Chairman, but anyway, you know, when you get up and hear these things that are going on, this - what would you call it? - not foolishness, there is another word for it.

Ms Verge: Political buffoonery.

Mr. Parsons: You said it. I will not even try to repeat it. Shenanigans. I am surprised at the Minister of Health. The Minister responsible for the health of this Province. To get up on such a serious matter and make a joke of the whole thing. It is all a joke.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: You know, my glory be, when he starts in talking about two dogs, one chasing the other.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Well, I mean, Mr. Chairman, and then he said about the closure of the Women's Offices, and he said something about the hon. the Member for Humber East, right? Who did anymore than that hon. Member? Will any Member in the House, any hon. Member in the House stand in their place and say that anyone

did more, right across Canada, than she has done to re-instate these offices, and she was successful in doing it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parsons: Then the Minister of Health talks about the economic situation in the Province, the economic climate we have in the Province. Let me say this, Mr. Chairman, in the first three months of this year there have been one hundred and five bankruptcies in this Province. Is that a climate, an economic climate to be proud of?

An Hon. Member: Forty for the same period last year.

Mr. Parsons: Forty for the same period last year and a hundred and five this year.

Mr. Tobin: Kevin, tell him he is barking up the wrong tree (inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Chairman, I want to sort of talk about the topic of conversation tonight, and I am reading here from a piece and it states the points of contention. Now, everything that transpired yesterday when the Federal people came down, the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. Mr. Valcourt, came down here and he gave to Atlantic Canada \$584 million to address the problem we were having in the fisheries. And right away the Premier was on his feet. He lambasted Mr. Crosbie last week, he was doing nothing; the Federal Government, they are never doing anything. All he wanted was to spend the money the Feds were going to give this Province in areas where he saw fit.

An Hon. Member: Marble Mountain.

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Chairman, I was so amazed.

An Hon. Member: You were stunned.

Mr. Parsons: When I said they want to resettle the communities. My grandfather built a boat in Flatrock, the first one that was ever built in that area with two stems, imagine him going to Marble Mountain skiing.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parsons: Imagine those people from those communities. What an insult. Let me say to you, these are what the Federal Government requested, these were the programs they requested from the Federal Government, Marble Mountain. I think it was \$50 million. The White Hills Ski Resort. Now, I say to the hon. the Minister of Social Services, how about the people from Port de Grave? If they have problems over there, because your Deputy Minister of Fisheries has already said there are going to be one hundred and four plants closed, so -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: One second! In your District there might be something happen. Are they going to go to Marble Mountain to ski?

Mr. Efford: They are going to fish.

An Hon. Member: Fish what?

Mr. Parsons: What are they going to fish?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: For the Exploits valley, fish silage production for the Exploits valley. Known for

what? Fishing? Farming? Now they are going to put a fish silage production plant there.

Daniel's Harbor, the culturing of blue mussels. That is a dandy program.

Holyrood Pond Development. The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes must be delighted with that.

An Hon. Member: It is going to take care of all the jobs lost in Trepassey.

Mr. Parsons: That is all the jobs that are lost in Trepassey, they are going to put a Holyrood Pond Salmon Development. That was the request made by that Government to the Government in Ottawa. Now, they are up there the past two days, all of them over there saying what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said. Let me tell you a few things of what the Leader of the Opposition has said since last November. In one of his press releases, and I read from it: 'Our Caucus believes that this temporary period of decline in a renewable fishing resource. The pain must be shared as much as possible over the whole system so that every plant can remain viable'.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Parsons: This is what we brought before this House in a resolution. This is what it was, Mr. Chairman. Now they are telling us that everything is different. They are quoting the Leader of the Opposition for what he said about the focus. The focus of that plan was right. The focus by the Federal Government yesterday was right. It was right on the mark. Community oriented,

to keep the people of those communities where they live. Diversification: Where are you going to find diversification? What are you going to do with them. What are you going to do with the plant workers in Gaultois? What are you going to do with the fisherman?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Diversification. What are you going to diversify in? Then they come up, you know, all the things that have happened, the Federal Government, the PCs in Ottawa did it. The PCs in Ottawa caused the demise of the fishery.

Mr. Efford: That is right!

Mr. Parsons: Let me tell those hon. Members where this all started, agreement between Canada and France under mutual fishing relations, done at Ottawa.

An Hon. Member: When?

Mr. Parsons: When was it? On the 27th of March 1972. Who was in power? Trudeau was up there. That is who gave it away.

Listen, I will read an excerpt from that agreement. '...to recognize' - they are speaking of 2J+3KL now - 'the right of French Nationals to fish in these waters.' They gave away the shop. It is like you said, Sir, they gave away the shop. Now, it did not happen two years ago, it gave the French the right to fish. They raped 3PS, they devoured it, now they have the right to fish in 2J+3KL. And all we can hear is what the Federal Government is doing today. It just did not happen today, it happened many, many years ago, when the Liberals were in power in

Ottawa.

An Hon. Member: How long is the agreement for?

Mr. Parsons: The agreement is forever.

An Hon. Member: How long is that agreement for?

Mr. Simms: He just said it.

Mr. Parsons: They sold Newfoundland down the river.

Ms Verge: Just ignore him.

Mr. Parsons: Don't come up here today holier than thou. The Premier there across the way, today I looked at him, someone called out over here, what is his name? Bakker?

An Hon. Member: Jimmy Bakker.

Mr. Parsons: Tammy Bakker, you know. Oh, how holy am I. Here I am the Saviour of the whole community. Here I am, I am out there, and I want to do the best there is for Newfoundland.

What we believe in on this side is more jurisdiction. We believe that part of the problem in the fishery is because we do not have jurisdiction in our bays, in our eyes, whatever. We believe more jurisdiction is necessary to bring back the fishery to its vibrance that we once knew. But let me say this to you.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: By leave, by leave.

Mr. Chairman:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: The hon. Members on every side will have lots of opportunity to speak, but I want to make a couple of points because I think, Mr. Chairman, it is important to make them at this particular time. And I am not going to be political for a change and attack the Opposition, because I do not think they deserve it anymore. I can now understand why the hon. Brian Peckford walked away and left them.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: My God Almighty. When I just heard old anti-Confederate up there making those statements he just made, old anti-Confederate.

An Hon. Member: Who?

Mr. Efford: The hon. Member for St. John's East Extern.

An Hon. Member: I thought you were talking about the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Efford: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have got to make one comment on Page 3 of this news release and it refers to the Leader of the Opposition.

An Hon. Member: Is that the latest one, now?

Mr. Efford: Wait now.

An Hon. Member: It changes every hour.

Mr. Efford: Wait now.

An Hon. Member: That is yesterday's.

Mr. Efford: Oh, which one is right?

An Hon. Member: We do not know.

Mr. Efford: I am not easily confused, but you have got me confused now. Okay, let me tell you -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Gee whiz, probably CBC got no date. This is May 7th, time 1:45. I have got to read this. 'Mr. Rideout, this is exactly what you would have suggested? The focus is exactly what I would have suggested, exactly.' Art Andrews: So, a pat on the back to your Federal counterparts. Absolutely.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: Just imagine. What are we getting, the hon. Minister, \$18 million a year for the next five years?

An Hon. Member: Less than that.

Mr. Efford: Less than \$18 million a year for the next five years. That will do something for Gaultois, that will do something for Grand Bank, that will do something for Fortune.

An Hon. Member: A pat on the back for that.

Mr. Efford: A pat on the back, absolutely.

Mr. Simms: What is your suggestion.

Mr. Efford: My oh my! Now I want to talk about what the Member for St. John's East Extern was referring to and the Member for Grand Bank and all the Members, about how good Ottawa has been.

An Hon. Member: I did not think you would have the answers for all four Provinces.

Mr. Efford: All four Provinces, \$18 million a year for all four Provinces.

An Hon. Member: What are you giving?

Mr. Efford: Oh, well, that is a good thing. I should say let's. Come out tomorrow morning, I will take you out to Port de Grave and let you make that statement on the wharf. You should make that statement.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Yes, I will take him up to Eastern Ship Builders to make that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Efford: Yes, I will take him to Eastern Ship Builders, with no regrets, any day in the week.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Any day in the week. Now let me talk about what Ottawa is doing towards the fishery in Newfoundland. Let's talk about the local fishermen.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: The Salmon Program. Let's talk about what a fishermen today has to do that the then Minister of Fisheries agreed with.

An Hon. Member: Tell them about the licences.

Mr. Efford: Fishermen trying to survive on the inshore fishery of Newfoundland, which has been taken away, raped by all the foreign fleets, they have nothing coming inshore. That has been given away, licences given away by Ottawa, and fishermen in Port de Grave or fishermen anywhere around the coast of Newfoundland, hauls in the cod traps and catches a salmon. The salmon is dead in the mesh. What are they going to do with it? Throw away a dead salmon. No cod fish in the trap, catch a dead salmon out of the leader of the trap and throw it away. That is Ottawa's attitude towards Newfoundland.

Let me tell you what they did last year with the tuna fishery. And the Leader of the Opposition knows full well. There were licences being issued for the tuna fishery out on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, out at the Virgin Rocks. What did they do to save Newfoundland. They gave us twelve licences. They said if you want any more licences, you have to purchase them from the recreation sector. So they did. They went out and borrowed money, up to one hundred, one hundred and fifty thousand dollars and they bought a licence.

One month after they had forced the fishermen of Newfoundland to do that what did they do? They turned around and issued twenty-seven commercial licences to Japan. Now that happened. Last year Ottawa issued twenty-seven commercial tuna licences to Japan to fish on the Grand Banks.

What do they do this year? What

did they do just a month ago? The tuna licences, a small quota of tuna on the Virgin Rocks, the few Newfoundlanders who do have their licences cannot possibly make some sort of commercial viability out of it. They turned around now and gave the rights to Quebec fishermen to fish out on the Virgin Rocks, the same quota - in the last month.

Now this is the Tory, Federal attitude towards Newfoundland. What did they do with the caplin back in January, the caplin stocks out on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks? They gave five factory freezer trawlers -

An Hon. Member: How many?

Mr. Efford: Five.

An Hon. Member: Five?

Mr. Efford: Five factory freezer trawler licences to the foreign fleets. Now, what is that going to do? That is Ottawa's attitude towards Newfoundland. That is the reason why every Newfoundlander and Labradorian is in this position today. It is because of Ottawa's second-rate attitude towards the Newfoundland fishery.

Oh, give the Newfoundlanders a few make-work projects. Give them a few jobs to build a few slipways. Give them a few jobs. They do not care about the fishery. Give it to the foreigners.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Let me tell you what they did out in the 3NO division, when they introduced the halibut fishery out there. The fishermen went off and paid \$50,000 for the hook and line, a new type of fishery. They had a by-catch of

cod, because when you throw the big halibut hooks overboard you do not know what you are going to catch on them. So they haul up big steak codfish on the same trawls. When they came into port - and everybody on that side knows - the fisheries officers went immediately aboard the boat and confiscated the whole catch. They wiped out that fishery.

In the same area, the 3NO Division out on the Grand Banks, the fishermen from Nova Scotia, in the exact same size boat, fish out there and catch the cod. And the former Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Andrews, told me himself that they can catch away and the fisheries officers will not bother them.

An Hon. Member: Is that why they are giving Ottawa a pat on the back?

Mr. Efford: In fact, they docked up in Bay Bulls. When one boat, a sixty-four foot eleven-and-a-half inch, we may not say sixty-five, docked there with 90,000 pound of cod, it was confiscated by the Federal Fisheries. But when a boat from Nova Scotia docked right next to them, the Nova Scotia fisherman said to the fisheries officials, 'You step aboard that boat and I will chop the hands off you,' and he sold his fish and he got paid in full for them. That is the attitude of Ottawa and the federal people towards Newfoundlanders, and those are facts.

An Hon. Member: And they are patting them on the back for it.

Mr. Efford: Yes. That is those people over there patting them on the back. That is the former Minister of Fisheries supporting

the then Minister of Fisheries -

An Hon. Member: You do not believe in getting facts right, do you?

Mr. Efford: Believe it. Those are facts.

Now, why are we in the position we are in today with the fishery? It is not because the French came over and caught the fish. It is not because the Russians came over and caught the fish. You know, they came with rules and regulations. Ottawa just completely handed the fishery over to them. I do not care whether it was Trudeau, I do not care whether it was Diefenbaker, and I do not care whether it was Mulroney, the darn fact is that Ottawa treated Newfoundlanders as second-class citizens, and they are still doing it today. The fact is that you people over there have supported that over the last fifteen to seventeen years, and the Leader of the Opposition is still today supporting them. So, a pat on the back to your federal counterparts. Absolutely!

Now, did I write that? No.

Mr. Parsons: The Minister of Social Services knows better.

Mr. Efford: The Minister of Social Services knows what kind of a mess this Province was in when we took it over. He knows full well what kind of a state this Province was in, and not only in the fishery. When the Tories took over seventeen years ago we were less than \$1 billion in debt. Now, it is over \$5.5 billion in debt. You need one-third of the revenue of this Province just to pay the interest rate.

Mr. Simms: And thanks to the Liberals, \$1 billion.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Chairman, that is all fine, but the fact of the matter is that Ottawa has destroyed the Newfoundland fishery, and it is not going to be easily solved. It is not going to be solved overnight. You are not going to be able to go out there and snap your fingers and put the aquaculture in place so that the fish will replenish overnight. You are not going to solve the problems of Gaultois; you are not going to solve the problems of Twillingate; and you are not going to solve the problems on the Grand Banks overnight.

You can slur across the House of Assembly from daylight until dark, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, but I think the one clear message that we should be sending as a group, as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, is we should be attacking Ottawa for what they are not doing.

Never mind patting them on the back for what they have not done. It is time for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to stand together and unite and send a message to Ottawa, that we are not going to stand for this second-class citizen treatment anymore, that we are not people who are dependent on social services, that we need a future in this Province.

The Leader of the Opposition knows all too well, and I think today in caucus there was a clear message sent to him. I understand now why there has been a change, because I believe, as I said earlier about the Member for Grand Bank, there are some people over there who have some respect, some honesty, some integrity and some

credibility left in them for the people of this Province. He knew, when he read that yesterday, on May 7th, when he read our response to the program, that he was not satisfied.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Just to continue with my few remarks, because my time ran out before. I was specifically talking about Grand Bank and what is going to happen to the 300 or so workers who cannot be accommodated under the program for older worker adjustment.

And there is one other, I guess, as I indicated before, slightly positive side to yesterday's announcement, and that is the \$120 million package for early retirement which was not in existence before. Now that is not going to take care of many people either, but it will take care of some who will want to retire a bit earlier. So that is in addition to anything that has been discussed before over the last eight to ten months, and I do not think there was anything concrete in the discussions that the Province had with the Federal Government about that particular aspect up until the announcement of yesterday.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member, but there is conversation going on to my left and I am having difficulty hearing the hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

An Hon. Member: Throw him out.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, who has not participated in the debate tonight on his feet but has participated quite a bit from his seat, that some -

An Hon. Member: He is afraid (inaudible) embarrass us all.

An Hon. Member: The things you have to do in this Province, (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: You also embarrass your own colleagues.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

I recognize the Hon. Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was another good speech by the hon. Member, about the third one tonight. The only speech I know he gave better than that was when he was doing his moose calls on with Ron Pumphrey last week.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the hon. Member that there has been \$6 million spent in this Province to date by the Economic Recovery Commission and all they have done with that \$6 million is pay themselves. They paid themselves with \$6 million. When the hon. gentleman talks about the other topic he loves to talk about, and I told him about two months after he came into this Legislature that he should be careful, because

there would be other things that will roll off the tongues of the populace of Newfoundland and Labrador besides Sprung within a couple of years, and the Economic Recovery Commission is going to be one of them.

Now that is why we see the Premier being so uptight the last couple of days, because he thought he was going to get his hands on a billion dollars from the Federal Government to justify the creation of the Economic Recovery Commission which, in a year, has not created one job in Newfoundland and Labrador. And when they were asked to put together a package for the Premier to send to Ottawa, what did they do? They researched the submissions made by the development associations around this Province. They slapped that together in this package on the 22nd of March and sent it to Ottawa.

Now that is what Dr. House has done. That is what Dr. House is being paid for, work done by development associations and other businesspeople around this Province looking for funding through different Provincial Government Agencies. That is what was sent to Ottawa in a panic-stricken situation.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Of course he did. That is what is here. There is a big list and that is where they all came from, not one original idea, not one.

I want to correct another misunderstanding. I listened to the Minister of Social Services, I listened to Mr. Valcourt yesterday, I have listened to

people consistently talk about the Gaultois situation. There is no shortage of fish for Gaultois. Gaultois has not processed a pound of northern cod. The only cod they process is the little by-catch they get when they catch their redfish, and that is not enough to have a good meal of fish and brewis for the Members of this House. There is no shortage of fish for Gaultois. It is a red fish plant. All Gaultois is asking for is 10,000 metric tons of redfish and no one will have to worry about Gaultois anymore. They will process their redfish, and they will have markets, and they will find someone to harvest it as well, which, when you look at other species, it can be a problem; harvesting other species can be a problem, but not redfish for Gaultois. So we should -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Sorry?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: I am not aware of that. I was up to Gaultois a couple of months ago, and that was not brought to my attention. A very productive little plant.

An Hon. Member: That is some statement for a Member of the Government to make.

Mr. Matthews: A surplus of redfish in the water, and the former Minister of Fisheries, Federal Minister, set up the resource pool of, I think, some 100,000 metric tons of underutilized species, most of which is redfish. Now, if there is that much redfish there - and I say to the gentleman again - why doesn't the Federal Minister give the Town of Gaultois 10,000 metric

tons of the 100,000 tons that is left out in the water and let them go on with the rest of their lives in Gaultois?

An Hon. Member: I do not know why they would not approve it.

Mr. Matthews: I cannot understand why they will not do it.

We have written to the Federal Minister and said, 'Please give them 10,000 metric tons of redfish, and that will take care of their problem.' We cannot do any more than that. I could not get close enough to him yesterday to twist his ear and say, 'Give them 10,000 metric tons of fish and you will not have to worry about that problem anymore. That is one less you will have to worry about.' But I do not know why these things do not happen. I cannot understand it. I say, for the record of this House, 'I cannot understand it,' and the minister knows I cannot understand it.

Mr. Tobin: Wasn't that an awful statement he just made about Gaultois that time?

Mr. Matthews: Who? I do not know what he said.

Mr. Tobin: He said, 'There are parasites in the fish, that is why they cannot have them.'

Mr. Matthews: Well, there are parasites in a lot of fish. I mean, we were in the Grand Bank fish plant three or four months ago and, I will tell you, the extra cost of processing that fish, because they had to put it under the light and de-worm it, drove the cost of production up like nobody's business. So, yes, parasites are a problem. Whether

they are or not with that particular species, I do not know. I cannot say.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) Government guaranteed loans yet.

Mr. Matthews: We debate the resolution of redfish for Gaultois.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the Federal Government tomorrow in Private Member's Day.

Mr. Matthews: No problem with that. We support it. The Premier and the Government were asked to support that request, as well.

I asked the question a couple of weeks ago and I did not get an answer. I doubt very much if the Government officially corresponded with the Federal Minister on behalf of the people. I do not know. Because I thought if they did correspond on something that positive they would have given the answer in the House. Did the Government officially correspond with the Government of Ottawa to do that, to provide 10,000 metric tons of redfish for Gaultois?

Mr. Matthews: No. Did you officially write them?

Mr. Carter: We surely have.

Mr. Matthews: Well, we would like to see the letter tabled, if you would not mind.

Mr. Simms: We asked that before, actually.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, and we have not gotten it. That was two weeks ago.

Mr. Warren: He did not write the letter.

Mr. Matthews: Just to get back to the package, Mr. Chairman, whether or not certain aspects of this package are adequately funded is a big question. We do not know how severe the crisis is going to be next year. There may be more money needed. But when you look at the program for older worker adjustments, when you look at the \$120 million fund for early retirement packages, and then you look at \$50 million for diversification within the fishery, which I think is going to be inadequate - there is \$90 million for diversification outside the fishery.

Now, the hope I see for the communities affected is that there is a fund for diversification within the fishery, so hopefully they can find something fishery-related for those communities. Hopefully they can access the diversification fund for outside the fishery, to create a few more jobs. My guess would be it is going to end up being very small or medium-sized, hiring five, six or ten people, which would be great if it does. Every one of them is five or six jobs. Ten of them and you have fifty or sixty jobs, and that would be great. But I do not think there is enough funding there.

Now, the big question, Mr. Chairman, is this: The Premier, in his statement of yesterday, said that the Province was willing to cost-share 80/20 with the Federal Government. They were willing to put up \$110 million to address the crisis in the fishery. Now, the question is, Mr. Chairman, why doesn't the Premier and the Provincial Government put up the \$110 million to top up that \$50 million for diversification within the

fishery, and to top up the \$90 million for diversification outside the fishery to give those communities a better chance of making it both inside and outside the fishery?

If you are willing to put it in jointly with the Federal Government - the Feds have now announced their package - why doesn't the Province take that \$110 million and develop its own package to complement the federal package, to help the fish plant workers and the fishermen?

An Hon. Member: And help in the inshore.

Mr. Matthews: Help the inshore, and help everyone in the industry to do something. Now, that seems like a very logical, reasonable question. It would seem to be a very logical position for the Province to take if they were sincere about putting \$110 million in to address the crisis. Now, when I heard the Premier's, 'No! No! No!', yesterday, to the questions specifically on this, it made me wonder if the Province was really sincere.

Never mind talking about his Leader. That is as far as you can see in addressing this issue. We had the dog story, we have had the moose story, we have had the Leader story, but we are talking about things far more serious than this here. I am talking about the future of a community where I was born and raised, and my family and my friends live there, and I do not think it is very funny.

An Hon. Member: You are the only speaker on that side who has made any sense in the last (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Well, why don't you

listen to me then?

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Matthews: In concluding, Mr. Chairman, the biggest reason the Minister of Social Services is objecting to the package is that - he is not listening to me. I wish he would listen - is that he has a part-time fishing licence and he is going to lose it as of yesterday.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I listened with interest to the impassioned pleas from the Member for Grand Bank. I listened with great interest to the Member, and I know exactly where he is coming from when he says he does not intend to stand by and see his own community he grew up in die before his eyes. I know where he is coming from, Mr. Chairman, because for the last three consecutive years, in the Labrador Straits, we have had no fish come ashore in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I know, Mr. Chairman, what he is talking about when he wants to secure some good jobs and a secure economic livelihood for his people. I know where he is coming from.

But, Mr. Chairman, today, everybody in this Province knows where the Federal Government is coming from.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: Everybody in this Province, Mr. Chairman, is saying as they said in the People's Paper, 'Many cry foul to Valcourt's fish assistance. Fisheries Plant A Failure, Coalition says. The plan shortsighted, the union says. Fishing communities unimpressed.' This is what the people are saying, Mr. Chairman. And today, people are left with two things on their minds: What is happening to our Leader of the Opposition? And what is happening to Tory policy?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: Let me say a couple of things, Mr. Chairman. What is happening is that people are saying because on April 5th of last year the people watched television when John Crosbie came down from Ottawa and said, I am going to gut the Unemployment Insurance System, and the Leader of the Opposition, who was then Premier, said, Yes, Sir, Mr. Crosbie, give it to us'.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: Give it to us. That was our fighter. That was our fighter, Mr. Chairman. That was the guy. And then the other day, Mr. Chairman, just yesterday on the Cross Talk program, here he is again with Mr. Crosbie, that great perpetrator of economic prosperity for Newfoundland, here he is again, sitting down with him again and Mr. Crosbie is saying, Gut the inshore fishery. Gut L'Anse au Clair, gut Gaultois, gut all those places. And what does he say? Yes, Sir, Mr. Crosbie. Absolutely, Mr. Crosbie.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: That is what he is saying.

Mr. Dumaresque: And I say, Mr. Chairman, that people are also questioning what is happening to Tory policy. What is happening to that all prevailing and glorious all-plants-open policy? What is happening there? Is he not saying quite openly and passively that yes, indeed, we are accepting absolutely. The focus is right on. He said the focus is right on!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: Let's see those plants die, because that is exactly what is accepted by saying yes to this particular assistance program that John Crosbie delivered yesterday. That is what he is saying. The plants are going to die. The all-plants-open policy, Mr. Chairman, was a farce. It was a political charade that this Leader has put on this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: People have seen, Mr. Chairman, that what we have seen is a shameful neglect of Leadership on the part of the Leader of the Opposition and on the part of the official Opposition. We have seen them come full square behind a policy that is going to gut the inshore fishery, that has neglected the inshore fishery and catered to the Tory friends of the big companies, catered to the offshore, catered to those companies to secure them. That is what he has done, Mr. Chairman.

They have come full square behind the 15 per cent solution of Brian Mulroney, that is what they have done.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Dumaresque: The 15 per cent solution.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: That is where they are. And I can tell you people today, after watching the Here and Now program tonight, as Mr. Tilley said, Tom Rideout admits he has a few problems with Ottawa's aid package for the Atlantic Fishery. Rideout has already come out in favor of the program and he is sticking by that support.

Now, then, that is what he is saying. Now, January of 1990, people are saying, what is happening to our glorious Tom Rideout? What is happening to that man who was so much there for rural Newfoundland and for the inshore fishery? In January of this year he says to the papers, what are the options? I haven't heard any options yet? But I am all for it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: I want to see it happen. He is all for something he doesn't know anything about.

What is happening to that party, the party that was supposed to be there to protect the little guy, that great Liberal who said, in 1975, I am a Liberal and I am going to die a Liberal? That is what that great Liberal over there said.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province have been dealt a dastardly deed. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador, the inshore fishermen of this Province, have been dealt a

dastardly deed. They have been dealt a deed that they have never had before perpetrated on them by a Tory Government in Ottawa. They have never had, and what is more shameful, Mr. Chairman, and what will be remembered more than anything else, is that the great people of Newfoundland and Labrador who were elected to serve their interests, the people who were elected in those Districts, the PC Districts, they are the people who will be remembered as letting the people down, letting rural Newfoundland down, letting the inshore fishery down.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: That is what is going to be remembered.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: It is indeed, Mr. Chairman, a sad day. And I do not know where they think they are leading, Mr. Chairman. I do not know where they think they are leading, but maybe we will have to wait until tomorrow to see what another position of the Leader of the Opposition is going to be. Maybe we will see tomorrow, once he looks at the papers and headlines again to see where he is supposed to put his position.

They deserve better. The people of this Province will have an Opposition, an official Opposition who is supposed to do their job, not follow the waves of public opinion, not follow the big Tory machine in Ottawa for the sake of their own political livelihood. Mr. Chairman, they were elected to do a job, to stand up for the average Newfoundlander, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the 15 per cent solution will be far ahead of the popularity of that

party by the time the next election rolls around, with this performance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: The people of this Province, the people of the rural Newfoundland and Labrador communities, the people of small town Newfoundland, the average Newfoundlander, Mr. Chairman, are hurting tonight because they have seen a year of planning, a year of progress being made by this Government, a conscientious effort to solve the real problems of our economy, they have seen that being done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dumaresque: And they expected a responsible, conscientious and sincere Government to respond. They expected them to respond, because it was that great Tory who said, I am not afraid to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland and Labrador. Well, we saw what prosperity he put on rural Newfoundland and Labrador yesterday, we saw what prosperity he is putting into the pocketbooks of the plant workers and the inshore fishermen of this Province, Mr. Chairman. And it is too bad. We would like to see these hon. gentlemen around, but down they are going to go on backing this Tory Government in Ottawa, down they will go, Mr. Chairman. And I would say if that is the way they are going to continue, good riddance, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The Hon. Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will say to my colleagues opposite, they will hear the truth now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, I will ask my hon. colleague from Eagle River if he does not do it tonight, at least do it tomorrow morning, or go over and see the Minister of Fisheries and ask him for this copy right here of fifty-six items, Mr. Chairman, fifty-six items and not one for the Labrador coast, not one, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: Who's document is it?

Mr. Warren: From the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. Not one for the coast of Labrador, Mr. Chairman, and this gentleman just now supported the Government.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: I would say shame on you. Shame on you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see what is here for L'Anse-au-Clair. Steel mesh lobster pot production.

Mr. Parsons: What is it?

Mr. Warren: Steel mesh lobster pot production. There are no lobsters in L'Anse-au-Clair.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see what else is here. Holyrood Pond salmon development in St. Mary's Bay. That is good for the Labrador coast.

Let us get another one now. This

is a good one, peat operation, extraction of high concentrate fertilizer.

An Hon. Member: Where is that? Where is that?

Mr. Warren: That is for Forteau.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what else is here? A salt beef plant.

An Hon. Member: Where?

Mr. Warren: That is going to be in Fox Harbour, on the Labrador coast.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: No, Mr. Chairman, it is down in Bonavista Bay.

Let us see if there is anything else here. It should be interesting for the hon. gentleman. Mr. Chairman, let me tell the hon. gentleman, now that he is in his own seat. and I said it before and I will say it again. In fact, I am glad the hon. gentleman asked me. Because, Mr. Chairman, the Premier, the great pretender, the Jimmy Bakker of the world, is trying to get Newfoundland away from Canada, but Labrador will take off from Newfoundland as fast as you can go.

So let me just say to the hon. gentleman that the only reason my hon. colleague, my good friend from Eagle River, just said then about why he is supporting this Government, the only reason why he is supporting this Government is because the Government has said you have to support us or you get out. That is the only reason.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me go back to my hon. colleague. I will table this little brochure.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Listen and be quiet. This is very important. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, knows what this is all about. If my hon. colleague from Eagle River does not know, it says a proposal to purchase MVB Hamilton Banker.

Do you know what the Hamilton Banker is? It is a boat that is tied up down on the Southside. And here is a proposal which was submitted to the Minister of Fisheries, submitted to the Premier, February 26th, before this famous document, and here was the opportunity for this Government -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).
What?

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister of Social Services, I saw a picture in the paper of him kissing a pig. He sounded like a pig that time.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: So, Mr. Chairman, what I say to this document, and I say it to my hon. colleagues, now the Minister of Fisheries knows what I am talking about.

Here was a submission, submitted to this Government on the 26th of February, asking this Government to give the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation the opportunity to use the Hamilton Banker to catch fish and bring it in to fish plants on the Labrador coast.

My hon. colleague, just got up and he condemned the Federal

Government in Ottawa, and he condemned this Opposition over here. Now, my hon. colleague did that. Did my hon. colleague know about this proposal? Did you know about this proposal.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Okay, he did not know about the proposal. Now, Mr. Chairman, here is a proposal asking the Government to let the Labrador Inuit Association use this boat to catch fish to bring it to the plants on the Labrador coast. Now, Mr. Chairman, what did -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I will tell the hon. gentleman one other thing, that I would not go into a community along the Labrador coast, when I was paid by the taxpayers of this Province as a civil servant, to try to get into politics. Now, Mr. Chairman. So, let me continue on this one.

Mr. Chairman, now the Minister had this one and the Premier had this and, Mr. Chairman, all of a sudden, the way the hon. gentleman is saying it, is that he agrees with what the Government is doing on the Labrador coast. So, I was hoping and praying that the Minister of Fisheries or the hon. Member from Eagle River would have said, yes, this Government will support this proposal. But, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Premier and the hon. Minister of Fisheries said no to this proposal.

An Hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Warren: They said no. No, you cannot have that boat to catch fish to employ people in a fish plant on the Labrador coast.

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Warren: You cannot - yes, Mr. Chairman, I will table this. No problem at all. Because, Mr. Chairman, it is public knowledge. And, Mr. Chairman, the reason is because the same thing as the Premier has said to the people in Hopedale yesterday on the telephone, why do you want me to go up there?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: You know, I was a bit excited when the hon. Member got elected and, Mr. Chairman, I think for a while he had the genuine concern of his constituents at heart. But, all of a sudden - oh, Mr. Chairman, I have to tell you one more thing before I sit down. Today, my hon. colleague sent me over his press release.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: The Member from the District of Eagle River sent over his press release, in fact, a good press release.

An Hon. Member: Sent it over to you?

Mr. Warren: Oh, yes, a good press release, a real good press release, and he is calling upon the Federal Government -

An Hon. Member: He wanted you to approve it, did he?

Mr. Warren: No, no he wanted me to support it, which was no problem, but he is calling upon the Federal Government to make sure they extend the UI benefits to the people on the Labrador coast because there is ice up there.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman said he was born in Labrador. There has been ice up there for the last thirty years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, why is there only ice there this year? Where was he last year? Where was he for the last twenty years? All of a sudden, this year there is ice up there. There has always been ice up on the Labrador coast.

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, there has been ice up there for the last 27 years. But I will tell the hon. gentleman that I will not be making any press release to Barbara McDougall, I will go up and see her. I will go up and see Barbara McDougall myself.

An Hon. Member: Take a month.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I will tell the hon. gentleman that I will go and talk to the lady in person. Now, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: I will say to my hon. colleague from Carbonear, I will get a meeting with Barbara McDougall before May 25.

An Hon. Member: I hope so.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman. I have asked for a meeting with Barbara McDougall for months and months, okay?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I will tell you I am going to get a meeting with Barbara McDougall.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: And, Mr. Chairman, I know I am going to get a meeting with her.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Warren: By leave, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Stephenville.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. K. Aylward: I have a cold tonight, Mr. Chairman, but I am going to try.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. K. Aylward: I must say, Mr. Chairman, this debate is very lively. It is good to see a good lively debate in the House of Assembly, Mr. Chairman. I must commend the hon. Member for Eagle River on his fine speech, we will say, the very good speech he made.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. K. Aylward: A very good speech he made, talking about the concerns of the fishery, the concerns of the fishery in his area, and that is going to be a hard act to follow, I have to tell you. As a matter of fact, it will be a very difficult act for any of us to follow. He is a very good speaker, a good university buddy of mine, as a matter of fact; we went to university together, and

it is good to see him in the House, doing a good job. Now I will not say anything more about that.

An Hon. Member: Are you not older than him.

Mr. K. Aylward: No, no, he is older than me, but -

Mr. Simms: He should be in the Cabinet, too.

Mr. K. Aylward: But I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that this Government has made significant proposals and has been in a consultative approach with the Federal Government since last August, and the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries have tabled those documents and indicated again today that we have been involved since last August in a number of discussions, and have presented a number of proposals to the Federal Government, very concrete proposals with numbers, Mr. Chairman, to address the problem that exists.

There were substantive discussions that were held until February, only a couple of months ago, when the Federal Government decided to bow out, and then decided to go on their own, for whatever reason. And, obviously, that decision to go on their own has not met with very much success, and certainly has not got a positive response from the people of this Province.

I believe they have made a drastic mistake, because they have not looked at the problem seriously enough, have not addressed the problem, and are going to find that within the next couple of months, once the people of the Province and this Government respond in the fashion that they

should, they are going to find that they are going to have to pump a lot more money in, a lot more resources in, to deal with the problem. This Government is committed to doing that, but the Federal Government has a tremendous responsibility here which they are trying to evade. I think it is time that we made sure that they took the responsibility very seriously.

This amount of money that they are talking about sounds like the old railway deal that we got a couple of years ago. \$584 million is all dressed up, \$150 million here, \$150 million there, one-third of it was announced previously, too, when they announced it yesterday. The railway deal was the same way, they came in and there was \$150 million announced in the previous program, they dressed it up to \$800 million dollars that was the headline.

An Hon. Member: (inaudible) from CN pensions.

Mr. K. Aylward: \$800 million for the railway deal over, was it fifteen years or twenty years?

An Hon. Member: Fifteen years.

Mr. K. Aylward: Fifteen years. If you worked it out, it is the same amount of money we would normally get anyway through our highways agreement.

Included in the \$800 million for the railway deal was \$70 million in the pension fund for railway employees. We had asked all kinds of questions about that at the time, and a response we could not get. So, it seems like they know how to dress it up, have the communication down pat, on how to dress it up, but the substantive

portion of it is not there, it is just not there. This is for five Provinces now, four or five Provinces, including south Quebec I believe, and \$584 million, there is only \$146 million for economic development initiatives. That is crazy, we ask for more than that for just Newfoundland because we know we have a crisis.

But how are you supposed to get them to listen? When you have Prime Minister Mulroney up there in Ottawa saying; I don't think it is a crisis, folks. I don't think there is a crisis in Newfoundland, I really don't know.

He was over in New Brunswick last week, going through a fish plant, and when he got out of the fish plant he asked, do you think there is a problem? The people look pretty happy to me in the fish plant. That is what he said, they look pretty happy to me, they don't look like they have a problem. You only got 150 out demonstrating.

He goes over to Prince Edward Island and announces a big bundle, GST. We are going to put a GST Taxation Centre in Prince Edward Island. This is wonderful stuff. Now they found out two days ago most of that is going to be transferred employees from Ottawa, coming down to Prince Edward Island, going to move in to Charlottetown, over to Summerside, and going to set up the GST Centre. That is just wonderful stuff, and I am sure they are ecstatic over in Prince Edward Island now about what this wonderful economic initiative is going to be.

I can see it, they just know that the Federal Government really cares about them, obviously. That

is obvious, through that initiative. And now they can also tell through this wonderful initiative that Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Reid, yesterday, along with Mr. Valcourt, and Mr. ACOA, who was down. Mr. Elmer MacKay, Mr. ACOA, the great agency that helps all, the one that does not get in our way when we are trying to do anything, the one that accepts the legitimate proposals that all businesses want to put forward.

That wonderful group, yesterday, brought us a gift. They brought us this wonderful gift of \$584 million over five years, over five provinces. I am amazed, Mr. Chairman, I am amazed they had the gall to come to Newfoundland to announce it, to tell you the truth, because it is a shocking outline that they presented in the dollar amounts that they have put forward. It does not even come close to what the situation is all about.

What I cannot understand is, we tried very hard over the last six to eight months to get them to agree to a joint memorandum of understanding, to sit down. As a matter of fact, it was only a couple of months ago, in February, they withdrew from negotiations to sign a memorandum of understanding. You have to wonder why. You really have to wonder why. It is most unfortunate. Maybe they don't think we know anything about the fishery down here, even though we are surrounded by it, and we live with it and we have always lived with it. Maybe that is the problem. Maybe they think we do not know anything and maybe they just do not want to listen to us, I do not know. But I find it absolutely amazing that they withdrew and now they are coming in with their own

initiative which, obviously, does not have the support of hardly anybody in this Province but a few people, maybe. And there are some initiatives that, if they would stock them with the right amount of dollars, maybe they would be okay. But there are a number of things that have been left out, especially the inshore fishery side, and I know a number of our Caucus Members are very upset with that. I just cannot understand that they would go ahead and leave all of that out.

Now I have heard Mr. Crosbie yesterday talking about how he was going, Well, when the inshore has a problem, we will come down and deal with that - when it has a problem. I do not know about you, but I think we have problems in the inshore now. So why do we not deal with it now instead of waiting for God knows when, whenever that is?

An Hon. Member: It is a lot worse now.

Mr. K. Aylward: I suppose, since we have another new Minister of Fisheries who obviously understands all about Newfoundland and Labrador, there is no doubt about that, obviously we have got no problem there. But I have to say that this Government has presented a number of concrete proposals, and one of them which the Federal Government turned down and they should be just, well we should lambaste them from here until eternity.

A Canada-Newfoundland Fisheries Management Board, an excellent suggestion put forth by the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier in this Province put forward, and it was in the Harris Report I believe, it was put

forward to the Federal Minister, Federal Government. They turned it down flat, I do not know if they even responded to it, I am not even sure if they responded to it. That is a good initiative which could see some input by our Province and our people into the management of the fishery. Now, you know, that was turned down flat, and I think that this is shocking and I think that the Federal Government should again sit down and maybe sit around a table with their Cabinet Committee that they had, which is supposed to address this problem but did not address the problem, they left it. They just completely left it. I do not know what they were doing. They had some meetings, apparently, maybe they had one meeting and then the one at the end, but that is about it, because there is obviously little thought gone into this.

I mean, our suggestions are for long-term changes and long-term improvements. Their suggestions are completely, what the Premier said yesterday, 'Total band-aid', Mr. Chairman, they are absolutely a total band-aid, and the band-aid does not even cover the cut, as a matter of fact, it does not even reach. We need about fifteen of those band-aids just to cover the cut, Mr. Chairman, and then we have to deal with the problem. And we are certainly not going to deal with it through this initiative that we have got here now, because this initiative is just not going to do the job. It is just not worth its salt and it is certainly time that the Federal Government woke up and really dealt with this crisis because it is a serious, serious problem. I just do not think that they have any idea about what the problem is really all about. And it is time

that the Federal Government woke up on this major issue.

I want to also refer to the idea that the Leader of the Opposition said earlier talking about trade zones, saying that the trade zone did not work in Stephenville. I have to tell him that the only reason the trade zone did not work in Stephenville is because nobody promoted it, nobody pushed it and nobody went out and even checked to see whether or not it was any good of an idea, and I will tell him now that for the last six to eight months we have been doing that, and as a matter of fact we have developed some proposals that we are working on, and I think that possibly it could be used, a trade zone idea could be used in all parts of the Province, this Newfoundland and Labrador, it is a good idea for global market in this day and age. That is just one idea, now mind you. Right. They are doing it around the world in other places, it is not a bad idea, but we have to put some resources into it, but that is just one.

There are all kinds of them out there. Well we should go out and get them and we should not be saying, well let's do not look at that and let's do not look at this. Let's go and have a look at them and see whether or not they are worth anything. But, that is one initiative alone that could be done in a number of places in this Province and it might help attract some business and some industry. But at least they are suggestions and they should be checked out, Mr. Chairman. They should not be written off because they are worthwhile pursuing because you do not know until you try, and I think they should not write them off like the Leader of the

Opposition was doing earlier because it is not a bad initiative at all. But there are all kinds of other initiatives that have got to be taken.

And the understanding that has got to be put out also, I think, is that we have got to have diversification along with the fishery, along with helping the fishery grow and get better and repairing it and getting it back to the state that it should be into. You have got to have other things there besides just having the fishery. Let's get other things around it. I mean, let's surround it with everything else we can find. That is what we are saying as a Government.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. K. Aylward: That is what we are saying.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. K. Aylward: Now, I do not know what the Opposition is saying, because I am a little bit confused right now. I am not so sure. But now, I am hoping -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. K. Aylward: - that is what they are going to say, I am not sure, but I hope.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. K. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Opposition Leader.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, I have observed with interest what has been happening in the House for the last hour and-a-half or so tonight, and I took part during the first half hour or so myself, and then observed, sitting in the back observing what was happening here this evening, and, Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious to any thinking person, any observer, that the whole focus of the Government attack this evening is towards me and some statements I have made on the fisheries response package - right? - and I fully do not mind acknowledging every word I say, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: He does not deserve it, but he expects it.

Mr. Rideout: The focus, Mr. Chairman, is for a reason. Because the lap - well, I will not use unparliamentary language like they used to use when they were over here, I will get rid of that, I will go to a little higher plain. The hon. gentlemen opposite have been instructed, Mr. Chairman, have been instructed to try to re-direct the focus from the flip-flop made by the Premier yesterday.

Mr. Simms: It is pretty obvious.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what they have been directed to do.

Mr. Simms: That is what the press is saying.

Mr. Rideout: And like the good trained hon. people they are, they come in without his eminence being

present, of course, and having to sit through this gory attack without him being here, Mr. Chairman, then they proceed to do what they did tonight. And that is fine. I have no problem with that, Mr. Chairman, none whatsoever, no problem with that, I can take it, Mr. Chairman, and I can dish it out, and that is the way it should be in this House.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the facts of the matter are these: It is too important an issue, Mr. Chairman, to get down to the comic strip presentation by the Minister of Health. The facts of the matter are these, Mr. Chairman. For the first time in the history of Confederation, for the first time since 1949, we have a Provincial Government which has officially supported the downsize of the fishery, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: That is the first time it has happened. We have a Provincial Government that communicated to the Government of Canada, and the Minister of Fisheries, himself, said in this House, I quoted from Hansard today, November 15th. We have a Provincial Government that have officially communicated to the Government of Canada that they believe in fewer fishermen, fewer fish plants and fewer fish plant workers, Mr. Chairman, the first time in the history of Confederation that that has ever happened. The Government of Canada always felt that way, Mr. Chairman. The present Government of Canada feels that way, previous Governments of Canada felt that way, but never before in the forty-something years of Confederation did we have a Provincial Government who felt

that way. And that was the one big significant difference, Mr. Chairman. The single-most dastardly act ever perpetrated on the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador, next to burn your boats, Mr. Chairman, has been delivered over the last seven or eight months by another Liberal Government, Mr. Chairman, and that is why we are in the mess we are today.

An Hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rideout: Now you can skate and you can squirm and you can attack me or you can attack somebody else. You can do all of that, Mr. Chairman, all of that can be done, and if that suits your fancy, go ahead and do it. You can tell comic strip stories, you can wave pickle recipes, you can do all of that, but that will never take away from the fact of the matter that this Government began the process to sell out rural Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: And they found, Mr. Chairman, not to anybody's surprise, not to anybody's surprise, Mr. Chairman, they found a willing audience, Mr. Chairman, in the Government of Canada. They have been willing for decades to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the hon. gentleman from Eagle River.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: And you have no difficulty to figure out what our position will be tomorrow, our position will be the same as it was yesterday, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: Oh yes!

Mr. Rideout: The same as it was today, the same as it was in January, the same as it was last spring, Mr. Chairman. Blah! blah! blah! Well, that is what our position will be, Mr. Chairman, consistent all the time, and when we see something that is positive, Mr. Chairman, we will welcome it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Because the focus of the Federal Aid Package on the fishery and the communities where plants were due to close down, that is the right focus, Mr. Chairman, and I make no apologies for saying that. No apologies whatsoever.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: I will not respond in deceit by hiding behind the secrecy of the Cabinet room. I will not do that, Mr. Chairman, because this Government gave approval in principle.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman there are rules in Beauséjour. I can shout to a certain decibel level and I think I am as good at it as most people here, but there are rules in Beauséjour, when it gets too out of proportion, then Your Honour is bound to use them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this Government, by Cabinet secrecy, in October of 1989, despite the deception of the Leader of the Government, gave clear direction to the Provincial Task Force to inform the Federal Task Force, to inform the Federal Government that they accepted the option known as building a viable fishery.

An Hon. Member: Not true.

Mr. Rideout: That is true, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: No! (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: That was conveyed to the Government of Canada, and no amount of no and no amount of deceit, and no amount of deception can change that. Nothing can change it.

Mr. Simms: Tell him eat his words.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader and the Premier, who denied it in this House last November, who denied it in this House again today, will eat their words.

Mr. Simms: Right on.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: They will be shown to have misled the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, I will say in more definitive language outside the House what I cannot say in. They will have been shown to have misled the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and misled this House. This Government, Mr. Chairman, I could not believe it, when I heard it first last November.

I heard it first last November and, in fact, I came into this House myself and our Fishery critic, and questioned the Premier and the Minister on that very option. The Premier had recollection of the option then. Now, six or seven months have gone by, but Hansard clearly shows, because we went through it today, the Premier had recollection of the option then. He never had any recollection today. The Premier,

Mr. -Chairman, remembers selectively. When it is to his advantage to remember, he has a good memory. But when it is not to his advantage, then his memory seems to fail him. But the fact of the matter is, that for the first time -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: It was the Minister of Fisheries who said here that this crisis in the fishery, I believe I am quoting him correctly, might be a blessing in disguise. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is quite a statement coming from the Minister of Fisheries. This crisis in the fishery, he said, might be a blessing in disguise.

On November 15th past, the Minister told this House that we have to face reality, that there are too many fisherman, that there are too many fish plants, that there are too many fish plant workers. And what has this Government done since last August or September? They have finally, at the eleventh and a half hour, on April 3rd, before a package was announced, they scrambled, they scrambled all the resources they could find and came up with this list of proposed projects to the Government of Canada.

An Hon. Member: Something else that is not true.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, the Premier tabled a letter dated April 3rd. He did that publicly yesterday. The only thing that was done, a list of projects, the only thing that was done - and he hides behind the skirts, the nameless faces of the bureaucrats. This Government has become famous for that. Oh, our officials said this, our officials

said something else, our officials are negotiating this. Mr. Chairman, Ministers have to take responsibility in our system. Governments have to take responsibility.

An Hon. Member: Right on, right on! (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: I suppose one of the most unkind cuts of all was that the first presentation to come from this Province to the Government of Canada on a Diversification Program came from the unelected Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Chairman of the Economic Recovery Commission.

Some Hon. Members: Another one that is not true.

Mr. Simms:
It is true.

Mr. Rideout: It is true, absolutely true. The Premier admitted in this House that he and Mr. House, the Economic Recovery Commission Chairman, even discussed whether or not Mr. House should send it to the Prime Minister, right?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Did you buy a car?

Mr. Rideout: And he went on to suppose that our Tory friends sent it down to us.

Mr. Simms: Would you buy a used car from this Cabinet? Not a chance.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, over the last day or so it has become abundantly clear that this Government is the cause of what is happening in response to the

fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador today.

An Hon. Member: Cover up for John now.

Mr. Rideout: John is big enough, in more ways than one, Mr. Chairman, to take care of himself. He does not need any help from me. But where I think he is right and where I think the Government of Canada is right I will say so, and I say this, Mr. Chairman, I say this, that was in direct contrast to that Party when they were over here and their Liberal buddies were the Government in Ottawa, and it was kiss, kiss, kiss, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: I sat over here with Leaders, Mr. Chairman, who would not dare let you open your mouth about the Government of Canada.

Mr. Simms: Right on!

Mr. Rideout: But you do not see that happening in this Caucus or in this Party or in this Opposition, because when we think they do something right, when we think they will do something right we will say so, and we will point out where they are wrong when we think they are wrong, Mr. Chairman, and on this issue that is exactly what we have done.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) they were wrong, now they are right again.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, I have one regret tonight, that we do not have television in the House so that the people of Newfoundland can see their elected representatives on that side of the House and their Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Tobin: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: You never opened your mouth the whole night.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member for Burin-Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to give the hon. Minister of Fisheries all the time to clue up here tonight, as far as I am concerned, but when he gets up and pokes fun at this side of the House that was carrying on tonight, Mr. Chairman, it was his Cabinet colleague, the Minister of Health that acted like a dog in this House tonight, and not somebody on this side.

An Hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chairman: No point of order.

The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, I am not even finished what I was going to say, and what I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, was that I only regret that we do not have television, because I think the people of Newfoundland tonight deserve to see how their representatives are acting. They deserve to see people who are elected in good faith -

An Hon. Member: On both sides.

Mr. Carter: - elected in good faith here, supposedly to

represent the interests of the people of Newfoundland when it is quite obvious that they are prepared to sell out that interest and support their friends and support their political buddies, their political soul mates in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carter: I have been sitting in this House now for a while, and I have never in my life seen such twisting of the truth, completely ignoring of the truth and the facts, all trying to score some political points and obviously being done on orders from their political bosses in Ottawa.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carter: And from their political soul mates in Ottawa and here in St. John's. Everything they have uttered in the past three or four days, Mr. Chairman, I can say to you now, is not true. They talk about the Province, and I know what is happening, by the way, the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa knew that he would have trouble selling his package-

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Carter: He had trouble with Crosbie, for example, we all know that he and Mr. Crosbie could not agree.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Crosbie wanted to do certain things and make the announcement in certain areas-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, would you mind? I kept quiet while he

was speaking. May I have silence while I am speaking?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has asked for silence.

Mr. Carter: It is obvious, what we have seen, Mr. Chairman, now in two or three days is a desperate attempt on the part of the Members opposite, especially the Leader of the Opposition to cover-up, and to run interference for his friends in Ottawa, and to cover-up for their inadequacies up there, to cover-up for the fact that they are not able to produce a package that is going to be adequate to solve the problem caused by their government.

An Hon. Member: Where is your package? Where is your package?

Mr. Carter: Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get down to the level that I have seen over there tonight. I would like to be able to make a reasonable speech without too many interruptions, and maybe I can shed some light on what has been happening.

Mr. Chairman, the problems we are facing in Newfoundland today in the fishing industry were caused by poor management on the part of the Federal Government. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Simms: Which one?

Mr. Carter: I will include all Federal Governments. I am not just talking one. I am the first to admit, Mr. Chairman -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, would you mind keeping them quiet?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, Sunday night the Premier and I met with Mr. Valcourt in the Premier's house, where we got an hour and-a-half briefing on the so-called response package that he announced here yesterday morning. Mr. Valcourt was trying to defend his package. Of course, he found it extremely difficult to do that. The Premier reminded him that the package was inadequate, given the fact that if a similar crisis developed on the Prairies, for example, they would think nothing of providing \$1 billion to overcome the problem.

The Premier said, 'Look, the problem we are facing now in the fishery was not caused by Newfoundlanders. We did not cause the problem. The problem was caused by virtue of there being bad management on the part of the Federal Government. Therefore, we must look to the Federal Government to come to our rescue and do what needs to be done to alleviate the suffering that is caused by that problem.'

Mr. Valcourt, in an attempt to defend himself, said, 'Yes, but, Mr. Premier, I will agree that maybe we did increase the total allowable catch to too great an extent. Maybe we did give certain allocations to certain companies and countries that we should not have, but do not forget, Mr. Premier, the Province of Newfoundland is guilty too. You have done things, too, that have contributed to the problem. Think of all the fish plants you have built in the Province.'

'But, Mr. Valcourt,' I said, 'Mr. Valcourt, I am not aware of a fish plant ever yet going behind the Nose and Tail of Grand Banks and catching fish.' I said, 'Fish plants, Sir, do not catch fish. Fish plants are built to facilitate fish that is caught by the fishermen that the Federal Government licence.' And I reminded the Minister that the Newfoundland Government, since day one, has never yet licenced a fisherman in this Province. That is a responsibility of the Federal Government. They talk about too many fishermen chasing too few fish, but who licenced the fishermen, part-time and full-time? It is the Federal Government, not the Province.

I recall, back a few years ago when they started criticizing the Province for allowing, maybe, an escalation of construction of fish plants, the cause for that. Then we were listening to the federal scientists. After the declaration of the 200-mile limit they were telling us that the fish stocks were going to regenerate to such an extent that the allowable catch would be tripled in five years. They were then projecting a total allowable catch, in 1985 I believe, of well in excess of 300,000 metric tons. Therefore, the Province and the Government of the day felt that if we did not build fish plants to facilitate all of this fish, then we would have to lose it. If we had a surplus -

An Hon. Member: You were minister then?

Mr. Carter: Yes. I was minister then. I make no apology for what we did then, because I think, under the circumstances, we had no choice but to do that. We were

told that within a few years the fish stocks would more than triple.

At that time, we did not have the catching effort to catch that much fish. Other countries and other provinces were waiting to get their hands on it. Of course, the Law of the Sea says that which is surplus to the coastal states own needs and requirements must go to other countries.

So we knew then that if we did not gear up and provide processing capability, that we would lose the right to that fish. That was a decision based on advice given to the then Government, by the Federal Government, and, obviously now, looking back on it, it was wrong advice. And now we are paying the price for it. But when Mr. Valcourt and others talk about there being too many fishermen in the Province, again we only have to remind them that the licencing is their prerogative, they have exercised it, and obviously they have overdone it. They have allowed too many fishermen to be licenced.

Now, the hon. gentleman opposite - I do not have too much time and I want to clear this up before I take my seat - he keeps quoting me as saying that it might be a godsend or a blessing in disguise that we have this crisis.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, would you mind asking the gentleman to -

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Chairman, there should be a lesson in this. They should never send a boy to do a man's job. The Minister of Social Services should not be sent to do a man's job.

Mr. Simms: The Government House Leader should have handled it.

Mr. Rideout: Yes, the Government House Leader should have handled it. His performance on that mission, that rescue mission tonight, Mr. Chairman, was as good as the Minister of Development's performance was on the calling for the bells back two or three or - calling for Division.

They should never get him to try to negotiate the tactics again. He failed miserably. I must say he is man enough to admit it.

Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes I have left there are two or three things I want to say.

The Minister of Fisheries began his remarks by saying that he wished TV cameras were in this House tonight. Mr. Chairman, I wish they were, too, because I wish the people of Newfoundland and Labrador could see the political buffoonery coming from the Government side of this House tonight.

I wish the cameras were here to observe the fact that the Minister of Fisheries was in his seat a full hour and-a-half tonight and never once attempted to get to his feet, only to go to the table to try to negotiate to get the last ten minutes on the clock. I wish the people were here to see that kind of performance, when the Minister could have been up anytime tonight. Anytime tonight he could have been up -

Mr. Simms:

There are two minutes left. Can't take the heat.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Order. Your honour, and I will say this in all sincerity, your honour I will have to say that I did not do what I have been accused of doing.

Mr. Simms: I heard you.

Mr. Carter: I did not, I do not care who heard anything. His hon. will tell you -

Mr. Simms: He might, but I heard you.

Mr. Carter: He will tell you that is not so, and I think I deserve an apology. I did not try to manipulate the time where I would be last. What difference does it make?

Mr. Simms: Don't be so sensitive.

Mr. Carter: Let me say something. If I did not rise before in my seat, I would hardly lower myself, quite frankly, to take part in a debate of such low calibre (inaudible) from outside the House.

Mr. Rideout: So that is why you did not stand when all of your colleagues -

Mr. Carter: No, no. Mr. Chairman, will you please confirm that I did not negotiate with you or try to manipulate -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

There is no Point of Order. There were no negotiations with this

Chair.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

No apology, Mr. Chairman, because our ears are not very far from the center of this - nothing on the Chairman - I am talking to the hon. Minister, who sat in this House for an hour and-a-half tonight and never had the fortitude to get to his feet. He tried to get the last ten minutes, then they sent the Minister of Social Services to try to get the last ten minutes. The Minister of Social Services tried to arrange it to get Oliver Twist on for the last minute or so, Mr. Chairman, but we were up to your game. Admit it. We were up to your game, Mr. Chairman. It never happened, you could not pull it off, Mr. Chairman, and it is time to rise the Committee and report progress.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries on a point of order.

Mr. Carter: The hon. gentleman is not permitted to suggest that your hon. has lied, and that is what he has done. Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member can not be allowed to suggest that your honour has lied, and that is what he has done. He should be made to apologize.

Mr. Chairman: It is moved and seconded that the Committee rise and report progress.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Bellevue.

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, on tomorrow.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 2:00 p.m.