



PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN

Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 11

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

13 March 1987

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, there was a point of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). I am going to study that over the weekend. There may be some further research that I may need to do following that, which I will only be able to get on Tuesday, so it may be Wednesday at the earliest before I can rule on that, or possibly Thursday.

There was a point of order raised yesterday by the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young). It was in connection with a comment made by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). I did not hear it at the time because I was addressing another hon. member, but it is quite clear in Hansard. The hon. member said, "In other words you are lying." So, I call on the hon. member to withdraw that.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would wish that both rulings had come at the same time but, of course, in view of the fact that Your Honour is going to reserve a ruling on the point of privilege, I withdraw any unparliamentary remark that I made in this Legislature.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will recall, the Speech from the Throne gave the broad outlines of major new job creation initiatives to be undertaken this year by the government. The speech pointed out that the comprehensive package to be introduced would include funded activities designed to add significant long-term value to the community in general and to provide workers with the kind of job experience that could lead to long-term employment prospects.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to announce today, a new job development programme in response to the commitment given in the Throne Speech. I am announcing that the Department of Forest Resources and Lands will be spending \$1.3 million this Spring to create some 200 jobs of varying duration, in Eastern, Central, Southern, Western and the Labrador areas of the Province. The various projects to be covered by this expenditure will begin as soon as possible, with weather, field and other conditions permitting, sometime in the Spring after, of course, the passage of Interim Supply.

Information on specific projects is being provided this morning by other hon. ministers in three different regions, and, in the case of Labrador, by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), who are in Clarendville, Grand Falls, Corner Brook and Goose Bay to give various details to the local media and the local residents. However, I would like to provide to hon. members here this morning a list of project

locations and the expenditures planned for the various districts: First of all, we have the Bay of Islands, Humber East and Humber West project, \$40,000; we have a project in Fox Marsh, in the district of Harbour Main - Bell Island, \$56,279; We have a project in Cobbles Ridge, in St. Barbe district, \$78,000. We have a project in Bay St. George's in St. George's district, \$78,265. We have a project in Shipbuilders Pond area in the Lewisporte district, \$157,837. One at Lewisporte Southside in the Lewisporte district, \$68,137. We have a project in Goose Bay in Naskaupi district, \$68,283. We have a project in Gambo Hill in Bonavista North district, \$100,000. We have a project in Coles Pond in the Strait of Belle Isle district, \$150,000. We have a project in Ocean Pond in the Terra Nova district, \$149,780. Another one in Terra Nova district, in the Bloomfield area, \$46,718.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the largest single slice of the \$1.3 million will be spent in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

This is clearly a good example, Mr. Speaker, of government's recognition of the need for job creation measures in that district. Three projects are planned: One in the Camp 8 area for \$60,101, one in the Long Path area for \$100,311, and one in the Burnt Jacket area for \$164,265.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the total for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is \$324,677, or, Mr. Speaker, well over one-quarter of the total

expenditure under this particular job creation effort.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of hon. members to another aspect of this job creation programme, which also was announced in the Speech from the Throne and that is that we want to see 40 per cent of the these jobs assigned to youth, those 24 years and under, obviously, in order to help them gain experience in their search for permanent employment.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement today is only the first of many linked to the various job creation phases outlined in the Throne Speech. My colleagues in Cabinet will be announcing many more projects in the coming weeks, in various other sectors, such as fishery enhancement, parks, tourism, and agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I also want to emphasize that in the case of the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, this \$1.3 million job creation expenditure that I have announced today is above and beyond the millions we will spend this coming year on other forestry projects. I hope to be in a position in late April or early May, Mr. Speaker, to be able to announce approval of at least \$6 million worth of silviculture projects under our Forest Resources Development Agreement with Ottawa. That particular expenditure will result in another 1,000 to 1,250 jobs in various aspects of forestry work this Summer.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize once again that it is clear we are losing no time in living up to the promise contained in the Throne Speech to create new jobs in this Province. Thank you,

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will have to do this from now on, because the minister appears to be intending to be very co-operative, but I want to thank him for providing me with a copy of his statement an hour before announcing it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few serious comments that should be made here. Nobody knows better than the present Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) that forestry is the second biggest contributor to the economy of Newfoundland, right behind fishing. There are more people in Newfoundland today making, expecting to make, and wanting to make a living from forestry or forestry related industries or projects than in any other sector of the economy, outside of the fishery. However, very few members will know this probably, and very few people who do not have reason to think of it will know, that today the backbone of the economy of rural Newfoundland, next to the fishery, is forestry.

MR. MORGAN:

The fishery is first.

MR. FLIGHT:

The fishery is first, then forestry.

MR. DINN:

No, no, mining, then forestry.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

No, I am saying the second biggest employer, jobs, jobs, jobs. And lots of fishermen, as the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) knows, look to the forestry in times when the fishery is not good to supplement his income.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have reached a point in this Province where a bona fide logger, or anybody making a living in forestry today producing the raw material, logs, is lucky to get ten to fifteen weeks work. The great forest industry of Newfoundland has become a permanent temporary job situation. The bona fide loggers, members of the loggers union, employees of Abitibi-Price, employees of Kruger and now laterally, because the independent operators have agreed, Mr. Speaker, to operate only while the logging operations of the paper company are going on, the forestry is down and people working in the forest industry, and a good many are in the member's district, from Corner Brook -

MR. BAIRD:

You put me in mind of the hemlock looper, you are always tearing things down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- are getting less than fifteen weeks work per year, and I am sure the minister must be concerned about this, Mr. Speaker. Or maybe the minister treats it as lightly

as the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), but it is not treated lightly in Badger, it is not treated lightly in Deer Lake, it is not treated lightly in Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls or all the Northeast Coast of Stephenville, when the whole economy of a community is based on logging and the people in that community realize that the work force only works from ten to fifteen weeks. What has happened?

So, Mr. Speaker, that was worth saying. And the minister will also know that those communities which depend on the logging industry in Central Newfoundland are looking to diversify their economy, and they must look to forestry because there is nothing else in there but forestry-related industries.

MR. BAIRD:

Sit down boy, you are making a fool of yourself.

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, this \$1.3 million for new jobs, I would like to ask the minister where that particular \$1.3 million comes from. Maybe it is part of the agreement that he pulled the \$3 million out of for those make work projects. Is it new money? It says new jobs, is it really new money? Is the duration of the jobs really ten weeks on the basis of make work projects? Will these projects be administered by the Department of Forest Resources and Lands or the Department of Social Services, which is now administrating some of the jobs his department is funding?

MR. SIMMS:

It is all down there.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, it is not there.

Mr. Speaker, the minister should know there is no such district in Newfoundland as Harbour Main - Bell Island. He has \$56,000 for Harbour Main - Bell Island, and there is no such district.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:

Just one more minute, Mr. Speaker.

We are pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Stephenville has finally gotten through and he is recommending that the jobs come from -

MR. BAIRD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Speaker, I distinctly heard you say that the member's time was up yet he continues to speak. I think he should be told to take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a member in this House of Assembly who would deny me another minute to answer and speak on behalf of the \$1.3

million project announced by the Minister of Forestry. He took ten full minutes, Mr. Speaker. It is, right now, about fourteen and a half minutes. I do not think there is a member in this House who would deny me another minute to congratulate the minister for what he has done here.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
He is speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! To that point of order, there is no point of order. Actually I have erred, because the hon. minister spoke for five minutes and the hon. member now has spoken for five minutes. Actually, I gave him far beyond his allotted time. So unless he has leave, he cannot speak any further.

MR. FLIGHT:
Do I have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SIMMS:
We could give him leave for a minute, maybe, if he could give me leave for another minute to answer the questions he has raised.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to get the input that we have been trying to get, and that the minister has finally taken the advice of the

Opposition in dealing with forestry projects.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
The hon. member does not want answers to the questions he raised.

MR. SPEAKER:
Are there any further Ministerial Statements?

MR. SIMMONS:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the reason, I submit, that the gentleman for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) had difficulty in finishing his remarks in five minutes is that while the clock said five minutes, the effective time he had at his disposal was about two minutes, if you subtract the amount of shouting. I gave notice yesterday that I was going to raise this issue after Question Period, because yesterday Question Period was particularly noisy. Now, noise itself does not bother me if it is a bit productive, but I submit to you, Sir, that it is getting to the point in this House where a person is having real difficulty making his point. I hope there is such a thing as basic common courtesy. I disagree with a lot of the things people on the other side of the House say,

but that does not mean that I have to call them names every minute they are on their feet. I would hope, Sir, that we could get some protection during Question Period today. I am not suggesting that we did not have it yesterday, I am not saying that, but I am saying, Sir -

MR. J. CARTER:
Withdraw and apologize to the House.

MR. SIMMONS:
- and it is being illustrated right now, I am saying that over time we have gotten into the habit in this House of being much too vocal for our own purposes.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order. But I am going to say to the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage, he will have to withdraw the implication that he is not getting the protection of the Chair. He implied that in his comments and I ask him to make it perfectly clear that he does not mean that. I would ask him to withdraw that comment now?

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I withdraw unequivocally.

MR. SPEAKER:
Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
Another point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, Sir, another point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
The House will note that I withdrew twice, I withdrew a moment ago and I withdrew before Mr. Speaker rose. Now, Sir, my point of order is that I need the protection of the Chair as a member of this House, and to get that protection I am prepared to swallow and glutch and do what has to be done. But, Mr. Speaker, without casting any reflection on the Chair whatsoever, I am asking, and I did it in as low-keyed fashion as I knew how before the latest request from the Chair that I withdraw something that I had already withdrawn; clearly the record will show that I had already withdrawn. I am not looking for an argument, Mr. Speaker. I want to, on behalf of the people of Fortune - Hermitage and the people of the fifteen districts represented by the Official Opposition, have opportunities, Sir, to put our concerns in this House. And I submit to you, Sir, that yesterday in Question Period and in the instance of the gentleman for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) just now, and in many other instances, we are not getting the opportunity to do so because of the constant heckling. We do not mind heckling, but one of the functions of the Chair is to ensure that a member's right to be heard in silence is guarded.

And I submit to you, Sir, without suggesting that it has anything to do with a lack of protection from the Chair - I did not say that and I carefully said that it was not that, I said what it was, Sir, was a general habit that has evolved over this session, particularly, a habit that we shout and scream all the time when another fellow is speaking, and I guess I was making a general appeal to all concerned

that two can play that game, but if we are going to be allowed to do the job we are sent here to do, perhaps we can have the courtesy, when a fellow is speaking, to be relatively quiet. That is all I said.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, certainly the specific point made by the hon. gentleman nobody can take any objection with. It is a question, I think, that all of us are involved in and, I think, the hon. gentleman would be the first to admit that his colleagues, as well, at times infringe upon that, as do people on this side. There is always going to be a certain amount of noise or interjection of this or that, but it is a question of collective self-discipline.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order I think the point is well taken that when an hon. member is speaking he should be heard in silence but it is quite impossible to enforce that absolutely. I think we are always going to have some minor interruption, some comment made. You might rule strictly that it is out of order, but it is completely impractical to do that. Now, if I see that it is getting out of hand I am certainly going to step in right away, but I do not expect that hon. members in this House are going to be absolutely silent when some other member is speaking. That goes for both sides of the House.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the visitor's gallery fifteen Grade X and Grade XII students with their teacher, Kelly Burke. They are from Layola High School in Montreal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Any further Statements By Ministers?

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier, I would like to ask the Government House Leader has the Province taken a position and submitted this to the Government of Canada prior to the conference on the aboriginal land claims question? Is the Province supporting the new federal policy which was enunciated a couple of months ago with respect to aboriginal land claims?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the aboriginal land claims the government has agreed to negotiations. One group, of course, has been identified, the LIA, on what is called the fast track or some such thing; also the NMIA, the Naskaupi Montagnais people of Labrador are recognized for purposes of negotiation of comprehensive land claim settlement as well. The government has taken the position

that the details of the land claims issue will be negotiated out by the three parties concerned, so that essentially is our position. We have not said, nor do I think it would be appropriate to say this is what will result from the negotiations, because obviously then you are really not negotiating. It will have to be worked out in the negotiating process.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if negotiations are proceeding according to an enunciated Government of Canada policy, those will be the guidelines that will apply; I am asking the minister if he has accepted the basis of this policy. I refer to items such as the readiness of the Government of Canada to negotiate on the basis of possible self-determination for Native groups. I refer to the item of willingness to negotiate without extinguishing completely Native rights for compensation. Does the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the government of this Province, accept those points in the new Government of Canada policy?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to self-determination, I personally find the term Native self-government a more accurate and less ambiguous term because, obviously, although self-determination is frequently used, strictly speaking it can have quite another meaning and can

mean sovereignty outside of the federation. So although it is frequently used I think it is ambiguous. But we certainly support self-government within the Canadian federation. We go on to say that there can be no one pattern for this, that relevant conditions like demography, the numbers of people involved, geography, all kinds of factors, differ radically from one part of the country to the other. Probably the most dramatic example would be if you take regions of the Northwest Territories where Native people in certain areas would be the vast majority, and you can take other parts of Canada where Native people could be a fairly small minority. While, obviously, rights are not related to arithmetic, people have rights or they do not have rights, certainly the modality or kind of self-government is going to be influenced by these very important factors. So we agree with the principle of Native self-government within the Canadian federal system. We say that it should be recognized that this is going to differ from area to area, circumstances to circumstances, that one cannot take a model and say this is self-government for the Native people throughout Canada, full stop, and that what constitutes self-government will have to be, again, worked out through tripartite negotiations. We are certainly willing and eager to negotiate but not within let us say, a straitjacket which others impose or which we attempt to impose.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I thank the minister for that lengthy answer. Would the minister inform us whether the Province has yet taken a position with respect to what should be entrenched in the Constitution with respect to aboriginal land claims? Will the minister indicate whether in government's opinion the delay in reaching a Native land claim settlement is one of the causes of the current caribou dispute that we have in Labrador with the Native people where there is allegedly illegal hunting proceeding?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

With respect to land claims and their Constitutional entrenchment, we have certainly taken the position that when an agreement is negotiated, when all parties are in agreement, that that would have a Constitutional reference and could not be changed unilaterally by any of the parties. So it would have a Constitutional reference.

Maybe the hon. gentleman means in terms of Native self-government a Constitutional reference. We have gone on record and support that a Constitutional reference to the right of Native self-government within the federation be given. As far as we are concerned we are supportive of a Constitutional reference to the right of self-government within the Canadian federation, but we do not agree with those who wish to define that right of self-government in the Constitution. We would regard

that as a straitjacket. It must be negotiated in each particular instance.

With respect to recent events in Labrador with respect to caribou hunting, whether this has resulted because the land claim issue in that area has not been settled yet, I could not say. But I certainly would go on record as saying it is in everybody's interests, including people who have hunted those animals for an extremely long time, that there be a conservation programme. I understand that herd was built up from about 250 to around 1200 or 1300 now. Unless that herd is in a healthy state it is not going to be of benefit to anybody, including the aboriginal people. While they may not like the idea of what is called the white man's authority imposing these regulations, the legitimate government of the Province, I think, has an obligation to so do, to protect that herd for the benefit of everybody including, and very much including, the Native people.

MR. BARRY:

A final brief supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

The minister, I think, has sidetracked the question. There is a conference coming up between the various governments and the Native peoples, and there has to be a decision as to whether or not there will be certain matters enshrined in the Constitution. Now this will be done prior to negotiations being concluded. If we listen to the minister, it

would be that he is only prepared to entrench constitutionally that which has been negotiated, as opposed to recognizing that there are certain inherent, or explicit depending on the policy of government, aboriginal rights. Would the minister tell us whether the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador accepts the principle of enshrining in the Constitution either inherent or explicit constitutional rights prior to the conclusion of negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, we are certainly in agreement to explicitly stating in the Constitution that there is a right to Native self-government. We are not in agreement of defining or enumerating those rights. An explicit reference to the right to self-government, yes, but not defining those rights in the Constitution. I think those rights, in their definition and in their operation, are the matters for negotiation. But a specific or explicit reference to the rights to Native self-government within the Canadian federal system, we are agreed to a constitutional reference or entrenchment or inclusion.

MR. BARRY:

There are more rights than self-government.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is the one this is chiefly about.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune -

Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I see eleven ministers over there, /Mr. Speaker, and there are twenty-two in the Ministry. I understand the Premier is in the building. Can the Government House Leader indicate if he is boycotting the House for some particular reason? I have some questions I want to put to him about the First Ministers' Conference on free trade. Is there some particular reason why the Premier and the Minister of Development, whom we had questions for, and a number of other ministers, cannot be in the House this morning?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier returned late last night from Ottawa. He is, I think, returning some urgent phone calls or whatever it is, right now. It is my understanding it is his intention to be here.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

It would help if he came during Question Period. He must know when that takes place. In his absence, I ask has the Government House Leader talked to the Premier on the subject of the First Ministers' Conference and, in particular, has the Premier got any assurances at the First Ministers' Conference which would allay his earlier fears, stated publicly on January 10,

immediately following the First Ministers' Conference in Toronto, on the subject of the Canada - French deal, that the same thing could well happen to the provinces on free trade as happened to Newfoundland on the Canada - France deal? That is to say, they would be ignored in the final analysis. Did the Premier receive, at the latest First Ministers' Conference, any assurance from the Prime Minister, or the Government of Canada, that his fears expressed publicly on February 10 are not well founded?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I have only spoken briefly with the Premier since his return. Obviously, for any detailed answer on that, he would have to be the one to give it. I was not there, nor have I had the benefit of any lengthy conversation with him. But it is my understanding that he was satisfied with what transpired there, with the assurance of a continuing consultation between the federal government and the provincial governments, and through that continuing process of involvement, the Province's imperatives will be served.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Can the minister indicate then what, in substance - I understand he said he has just had a brief conversation with the Premier, but the minister has given the House

the undertaking that he understands the Premier was satisfied with the tenor, and I hope the substance of the meeting - was undertaken by the Prime Minister of Canada to assure the Premier of this Province that the cavalier action that we saw on the Canada - France deal will not be repeated insofar as the free trade with the United States issue is concerned?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It is my understanding that there has been a commitment to complete involvement, consultation, knowledge, and input from the Province, vis-a-vis the federal government, and that the government is satisfied that this continuing involvement, continuing input, continuing consultation, and knowledge and appreciation of the position of the Province on various issues is satisfactory. Obviously, things are judged in their effect. The commitments given with respect to continuing and indepth involvement and consultation are satisfactory.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The minister is a lawyer by profession, a man of great experience in politics. Perhaps he would be prepared to answer the following: Given the undertaking of the Government of Canada, soon after its election in September, 1984, to engage in complete consultation and contrast that

with the cavalier action on the Canada-France deal, how seriously does the minister take the latest commitment that there will be consultation? Does he believe, can he indicate to the House, whether the latest undertaking by the Government of Canada to be consultative is worth the paper it is written on, worth the words that it was said with, given the track record of this government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I totally disagree with the substance and the manner with which the federal government acted with respect to the Canada-France negotiations. It would be my opinion that having done that, probably not having realized the serious political consequence - apart from other consequences, just within the political concept - the serious political consequences not only in Newfoundland, which they apparently were not aware of because they cannot be sadists, but also throughout Canada - because it became apparent that when people in other parts of Canada, including Prairie Provinces, realized what had transpired and the way in which Newfoundland's interests had not been protected, I think there was very significant political fall-out from that - I cannot see that the present government or any government will again act in such an insensitive manner. I personally think this is really not a question of a PC Government or Liberal Government, or whatever government, I think what it boils down to is, if one wishes the mentality of centralism and of seeing everything from Ottawa's perspective, and the further you

get away to the extremities, whether it is the Eastern extremity or the Western extremity, the less knowledgeable and sensitive they are. But I think that the central Government has certainly learned that from recent experience and I cannot envision them in the near future acting in that way again. I think that is a kind of a political insurance.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, may I, John?

MR. EFFORD:

After my colleague.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I had indicated earlier it was the final question, but in view of the very telling comment the minister so generously gave in his last answer - in which I concur, by the way; it is possible for the Ottawa government to have the kind of myopia that he alluded to - would he concede that if that is the case, therefore, that by transference it is quite possible for this government, centred in St. John's, to have the same difficulty in fathoming the concerns of the geographic extremities of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose in theory one would have to agree -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- but in practice I do not think that is the case at all. We are a province of 500,000 people, we are here from every part of the Province, and there is great mobility of the people whose work is here, including members of the House who represent other areas. We are one people, fairly small in number and, while fairly large in geography, we have nothing at all like the Canadian situation. I think there is much more of a sense of identity within the Province and between the various parts of the Province, even though you get rivalries - Island, Labrador, East Coast, West Coast; even my friend, the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), sometimes might even get involved in the slight rivalries there. But I think there is overall a sense of identity and that the government has this sense of involvement and responsibility to all of the Province, whether one agrees with its policies or not, and that that is much more accented here than it is in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), but he is not here, so I will have to go to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what is the policy of the Minister of Social

Services or the Department of Justice as far as a family member, or someone such as myself representing a constituent, visiting an inmate or a resident of the Boys' Home?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Port de Grave realizes that the Boys' Home is within the jurisdiction of the Minister and the Department of Social Services. I can take the question as notice and refer it to my colleague, the Minister of Social Services. I am sure he will be glad to supply the answer next week.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

That is the answer I expected from the Minister of Justice. That is what she comes back with at all times. Mr. Speaker, I am very serious about this question, because last evening I visited the young lad, with the permission of the Department of Social Services, at the Health Sciences Complex. Much to my dismay I saw the state in which his hand is. I am afraid he is possibly going to lose his hand. But I wanted to talk to the young lad in private, and he also indicated that he wanted to talk to me. I asked permission of the two attendants at the Health Sciences Complex and they would not give me permission. I then phoned the Department of Social

Services and they would not give me permission. I checked with the penitentiary, and they said it is the policy of the penitentiary, anytime a family member or an M.H.A. visits, to allow you to visit in private. I again ask the Minister of Justice - surely she should know the answer to the question - why is it that I was not allowed to visit a young resident of the Boys' Home in private for five minutes, and he is a constituent of mine? It has been proven in the past that both of my colleagues visited a resident at the Boys' Home for one hour in private.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
After that speech by the member for Port de Grave, I can simply repeat that the Boys' Home and the whole field of youth corrections is within the jurisdiction of the Social Services Department, not the Justice Department.

What I would suggest the hon. member do is immediately bring his concerns to the Deputy Minister of Social Services in the absence of the minister. As I said before, I will take up the matter with the minister. But it is just the field that adult corrections that is within the responsibility of my department.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you very much. My question is to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt). The minister indicated yesterday that as a result of the study of the two toxic waste dumps in Come By Chance, people in the area have been notified that there is no problem, that there is no risk to their water supply. If that is indeed so, then why the secrecy and why is the minister refusing to release the results of that study?

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, this preliminary study was done for Cabinet. It is an internal document, therefore it is not going to be released.

On my announcement about the safety of the water supply for Come By Chance, I have been told by experts in my department, hydrologists, that in fact the water supply for Come By Chance and other communities in the area is in another watershed. Now unless there is something there that can crawl up over hills and swoop down in another valley, then, you know, there really is not any problem and I have so informed the municipalities out there. So, Mr. Speaker, I have not been withholding any information from the people of Come By Chance that they are duly supposed to have.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of the Environment tell the House this: Did the terms of reference that authorized the spending of that \$5,000 to do the toxic waste study. Indicate that that study was to be a Cabinet document and, therefore, subject to secrecy, or did that secrecy come about as a result of that study? Is the minister prepared to table in this House the terms of reference authorizing that \$5,000 expenditure?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to the hon. member and others on numerous occasions this proposal was called for and awarded to a company to go out do it for the consideration of Cabinet, for Cabinet making a decision. It was during the time that the oil refinery at Come By Chance was being considered for sale to Newfoundland Energy. Newfoundland Energy did not want to go in and assume any responsibility for environmental matters that may or may not have been caused by the previous operator. So the report was called for by Cabinet in the normal way, it was used for Cabinet's consideration, and therefore it is not a public document. Too bad for the hon. member! He will never be in a position to deal with Cabinet documents. I told him yesterday.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

It is not too bad for the member, Mr. Speaker, it is too bad for the general public who look to that man to protect the environment.

Will the minister table the Minute of Council that authorized the expenditure of that \$5,000? When the minister tables the Minute of Council, will he indicate who received the contract and did the study on the toxic waste dumps in Come By Chance?

MR. MATTHEWS:

It is the same question three days in a row.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, when the Department of the Environment goes out for proposals, Mr. Speaker, it is done in accordance with the rules and regulations of this Province and that information is available to the hon. member. I got a lot of work to do. If he wants that information all he has to do is call the Department of the Environment. I have other things to do without digging up information for the hon. member. He can go to the Department of the Environment and get all that information. The company that did it, that is all public knowledge and has been in the paper anyway.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), Mr. Speaker, on a topic which I am sure is very close to her heart and maybe that is where it stays. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that many studies conducted throughout Canada have shown a consistent wage gap between female and male workers, and in view of recent statistics stating that on a national basis women receive two-thirds of the salary of men, can the minister indicate how these figures compare with the situation in Newfoundland? In other words, how does this salary differential between women and men compare with the provincial scene?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Justice I have responsibility for the Human Rights Commission and the Human Rights Code, so perhaps with that responsibility I can respond to the question although it might more appropriately be put to my colleague, the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mr. Power).

My understanding is that the wage gap between women and men in all of Canada is as bad as the member indicates. But worse, over the last year the gap has widened instead of narrowed. Further, it is my understanding, based on information published by the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, appointed by the government, that if anything the situation is worse in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I thank the minister for her answer. That is what I sort of expected. That is the kind of figures that I expected. I figured it was a wide differential.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, since I know who the appropriate minister is I will direct my question to him.

In view of the inequity and injustice involved as demonstrated by the minister in the tremendous gap of salaries between female and male, what time does this government plan to initiate legislation requiring equal pay for work of equal value? What time? Do they expect it in this present sitting of the House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, we do not have a plan to bring in, in this sitting of the House, legislation to proclaim in Newfoundland equal pay for work of equal value. We have done an awful lot in Newfoundland to try and close the gap between what women earn as workers and what men earn. We have done that in many different ways. The Affirmative Action policy of government, where we deal with our employees, is one significant way to do that. This problem, which is a long-term problem that has been in place for a very long period of time, cannot be rectified simply by passing a piece of legislation or by doing something that simplistic. It has to be done over a fairly long period of time and on many

different fronts. One of the most significant ways to change the role of women in society so that they can earn more money for what they do is through the training and education system, the system that we have put in place in Newfoundland recently, Mr. Speaker, which will give equal access to all women in this Province to get better trained. It is through better training and better education that an awful lot of this discrepancy between the rate of pay paid to women and men will be narrowed, and with our Affirmative Action programmes and the other things that government is doing to increase the opportunities for women to enter the work force at a fairly high level, and the day-care system that we have. A new day-care system is being opened in this building very shortly to take care of the children of employees of government to allow women to become, I guess, more advanced in the public service. We just opened a \$500,000 building at the Cabot Institute to really teach day-care workers in this Province to be professional, so they can bring that service to many women in this Province who are primarily responsible for child care. These are all things that will help women attain their rightful place in Newfoundland society. It is not fair to say that simply passing a piece of legislation will do all of that.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the minister that in jurisdictions

where they have legislation requiring equal pay for work of equal value, it has been very, very successful in narrowing the gap in the salary differential. It has been very, very successful. One, of course, is it will show firmly that the government is dedicated and committed to this principle.

Now I am going to ask the minister what is his government doing, and when will they bring in this legislation to demonstrate that the government is firmly committed to this principle of equal pay for work of equal value, and stop skirting the issue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, as I just mentioned, there are many, many ways to rectify the situation as it relates to women's salaries in Newfoundland or any other part of Canada. It has not been proved in all provinces that equal pay for work of equal value legislation is going to solve all the problems immediately. What will solve the problem is what I outlined in my answer to the previous question. That will be done. We will not be bringing in legislation this session to bring in equal pay for work of equal value.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Notices of Motion

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Standard Time Act."

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
On behalf of the Minister of Finance, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, as Minister responsible for the Office of the Legislative Council, under Section 18 of the Statutes and Subordinate Legislation Act, I am required to lay before the House of Assembly a copy of subordinate legislation filed under that act. I hereby table the issues of The Newfoundland Gazette published between May 16, 1986 and March 6, 1987.

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 1. The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, in introducing my few remarks on this subject, I said, in essence, that to understand the reason we find ourselves in the present situation, where we are debating a resolution put down by a Conservative Government here to condemn a Conservative Government in Ottawa, the reason we find ourselves in that unlikely marriage in this House, where the Liberals and Tories are all together wanting to condemn the action of some other Tories elsewhere, the reason for all that can best be understood if you understand first, or scrutinize first, the mind of Brian Mulroney. To do that you have got to go back and look at some of his actions. Actions speak louder than words, as we say. Let us look at the actions.

Very quickly, I recall for you this morning what I said yesterday. I now have the book to which I was, in struggling fashion, making reference. The title was, as I thought, Contenders: The Tory Quest For Power. The authors do include Alan Greg, whom I mentioned yesterday. Another person I did not mention, a native Newfoundlander, George Perlin, was

a co-author. The third, of course, is one Patrick Martin.

From that book I described this for you yesterday. I did not have the page then, but I do now. It is page 78. On that page, in the same paragraph, it is described how Mr. Mulroney in one act gives an instruction to set in motion a public event in Montreal which would have him, side by side with Mr. Clark, declare his undying support for the incumbent leader and, in that same paragraph, indeed about two sentences away, he then proceeds to compile his list of people opposed to 'Joe' to ensure they have enough to bring him down at Winnipeg. The complicity of the mind of Brian Mulroney, as capsuled in that particular paragraph, is very telling if you want to understand the Canada/France deal.

The second point I began to make yesterday I would like to reinforce right now. By the way, before I leave this book, for the benefit of my friends in all parts of the House who may not have read this book, even if you have not got time to read it, I suggest you look at the pictures and read the captions underneath. There are two delightful pictures in this book, Mr. Speaker, both of which bear as directly under the Canada/France deal as you can imagine. Facing page 78 is a picture of Mr. Clark and Mr. Mulroney with a caption underneath, "Brian Mulroney declares his support for the leader - Montreal, December 6, 1982."

But, Mr. Speaker, this is an even more intriguing picture, I thought. If you would just flip over to the second lot of pictures in the book following page 174 you

will find a sequence of pictures and in the middle of that sequence you will find a delightful picture in which two great Newfoundlanders are seen with arms raised in victory together, side by side, soldiers on the same side of the cause, fighting for what they believe in, John Crosbie and Brian Peckford. The caption underneath says, "John and Jane Crosbie and Newfoundland Premier Brian Peckford welcome the results of the second ballot." There we have it, Mr. Speaker, the two men fighting, in that case, side by side.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned yesterday another instance. I recalled for the House the announcement of the patronage appointments by Mr. Turner just before he called the federal election on July 10, 1984. He made the announcements, I believe, around June 29 or 30. I recalled for you the scorn with which Mr. Mulroney greeted that announcement and how he assured the country that things would be very different with him. Then, in what was supposed to be an unguarded, off the record moment on the airplane during the campaign, he said something to fifty or sixty reporters, in reference to the appointment of Mr. Bryce Mackasey as Ambassador to Portugal. I thought yesterday it was not parliamentary so I did not say what he said yesterday but I have checked Beauchesne and Beauchesne tells me it is quite parliamentary. So I will read into the record, to make a point later, what Mr. Mulroney said. He said two things.

The first thing he said was in relation to the Mackasey appointment, "There is no whore like a old whore," and you will remember that showed up in the

papers. Then his very next line was, "If I were in his position, I would have done the same thing." Both comments are on the public record. "There is no whore like a old whore," and, "If I were in his position I would have done the same thing," quoted, Mr. Speaker, word for word according to the press people who are there.

Mr. Speaker, that too is an instructive instance. If you want to understand the mind of Brian Mulroney, and more to the point, if you want to understand why we find ourselves in that absolutely diabolic situation, look at his complicity in dealing with Mr. Clark when he was leader, and then look at his complicity in dealing with the patronage issue when he was aspiring to be Prime Minister. The only thing that mattered was that he thought he was off the record. He never once said, 'I did not believe that or I did not mean that.' He said, 'I did not know you were going to report it.' That was his only concern. 'I did not know you were going to report it.'

Mr. Speaker, I say to my friends on the other side of the House, and this is why I was pursuing the question with the gentleman from Waterford-Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) earlier, I would take with several grains of salt any assurances I get from the present Prime Minister of Canada on any issue whatsoever. I would take them all with a big, big grain of salt.

You see, Mr. Speaker, a few of us who sat in Ottawa, and I was there a few months when the current Prime Minister sat across the floor having come in as the member for Central Nova, those of us who watched him closely - he is a man

who have to watch closely - knew a long time ago what kind of duplicitous individual we were dealing with. Our horror was that one day he might be in a position of power. Ever with partisan considerations aside, for many who knew him well it was almost a mission to protect the country from this particular person. We tried to tell the people of Canada, and we tried to tell the people of Newfoundland, but while we were doing that, there was a band on the other side of this House, including the leader of that party over there, the Premier, going around, hand in hand, cheek to cheek, etc., you know the rest, with another Brian, and together they were going to inflict prosperity on this Province. Everything was going to be hunky dory.

Mr. Speaker, I recall Mr. Mulroney's description of himself, not my description of him but in the Bryce Mackasey reference, I recall what Mr. Mulroney called himself. He first called Bryce Mackasey something and then he called himself the same thing. By inference, one who goes out to drum up business for that kind of person is known by various terms but one term, which is entirely parliamentary, is the term 'procurer'.

I say to you, Sir, that the Premier of this Province in the September '84 election sowed the seeds of what we are now reaping as a province by being the procurer for that man, by going out and aiding and abetting his illicit process, by going out and telling the people of Newfoundland that the debauchery this man was about to inflict on us would be all right, that the lack of consultation and that bargaining

Newfoundland fish for good Francophone relations was alright. The procurer inflicted that disease on us. It is a hazard of the trade. And who do we blame?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we support the resolution. We support the resolution in the same vein that if a resolution were brought here today saying, "Resolved that it is now daylight out there," we would support that because it happens to be the truth, and we will support this resolution because it happens to be the truth, that the Government of Canada needs to be condemned. But we will not stop there.

We will not stop by appearing to be in bed with the Tories on this one. We are in very different beds. It so happens that we happen to agree on what is a motherhood issue. But while riles us, Mr. Speaker, and what rankles us is that we have been brought to this position because the procurer was so busy procuring in September, 1984, that in the process, he compromised the integrity of this Province. Or to put it differently, if you are with me on the analogy, he forgot to ask the question as to whether Brian Mulroney would have respect for him in the morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
And therein lies the problem.

Today it is fish. Tomorrow, I predict, it will be free trade. I am not exactly wafted heavenward with all the fine nothings I hear from the gentleman for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the Premier about, 'Everything is

honky dory again, boy. We are satisfied.' Of course, they are satisfied, because they are a very easy crowd to satisfy.

Mr. Speaker, if they are so satisfied all of the sudden, how do I, in terms of the analogy I have set before you, explain all that waving and screaming and bawling and ranting and roaring that the Premier got on with there for a couple of weeks. Well, I have for that, Mr. Speaker, to go to Shakespeare. He explained it far more adequately than ever I could.

I have said to you that the procurer engaged in an activity which itself was illicit, which compromised the integrity of this Province, and which for him meant lost respect the next morning. Of course, eventually it dawns on the procurer, like it dawns on certain other people that Shakespeare had in mind, 'they do not love me anymore. He does not love me anymore.' What did Shakespeare have to say about that?

Well, with apologies to Shakespeare, he said something like this: "Hell has no fury like a procurer scorned."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
That, Mr. Speaker, explains the ranting and raving of the Premier back there early in February. But they have settled him down again, Mr. Speaker. They have kissed and made up. 'It is not going to happen again, we assure you. Free trade is no problem at all. We will route it all through Argentia if you want to. What else do you want us to say? Anything you want, as long as you come back as

our procurer. We need you. We need you.' I say to you, Sir, that they need him; the federal Tories need Brian, the procurer, about as much as anybody in the other business needs any procurer at any time. 'Dispensability', is the word, Mr. Speaker. The Premier found that out.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I said, while I talked Shakespeare and Alan Greg and Brian Mulroney, etc., is this, Mr. Speaker: 'fish, fish, fish.' Because the answer to this diabolical position we find ourselves in is not to be found in whining and bawling and calling a Premiers' Conference and wiring three foot long telegrams, and getting frustrated on television, etc., etc.

The answer to how we got into this in the first place cannot be pinned on John Crosbie, who forgot to make a phone call, etc., etc., etc. That is not the explanation. The ground work was laid before September, 1984 and since then. When this crowd over there got in bed with the person who was publicly known by his own, Alan Greg, the Tory pollster, who was publicly castigated by his own as being a man of considerable complicity, a man whom you could not trust any further than you could throw. Yet, being told that, they bulled straight ahead.

Now, I did not give you, because I cannot find it at this particular moment in time - but it is in there, I saw it last night - the most damning quote of all. The most damning quote of all comes from the Premier of the Province himself, when, if you remember the instance, if you were watching that Tory convention - and if nothing else it was great theatre - but before the final ballot, do

you remember what the Premier said to Clark's crowd? The essence of what he said was, 'You can either come with us, or have that you know what win. Anybody but Brian,' right. The quote is even more damning. I have not done a very good job of relating it to the House, because it is a very revealing quote.

Mr. Speaker, we support, with a heart and a half, the resolution and its two parts. We unanimously condemn and we take all necessary steps to get rid of this duplicitous, untrustworthy, diabolical crowd in Ottawa that calls itself a government.

In the same vein, Mr. Speaker, we do not intend, and I must admit to the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) or whoever drafted this that the WHEREASES are, by and large, well done, certainly cleverly worded, but we do not intend to become party to a lie. There is a lie in these WHEREASES and we will at the appropriate time attempt to strike the lie out so we can support the body of the resolution.

The lie implies that somehow the Premier did not know. How stupid! How stunned do they think we are! I submit, Mr. Speaker, he may not have known the precise time and date, but if he is doing his job, and as he has told this House and told the public, had information that fish might be on the table, and was asked his opinion of that idea, he only had to put two and two together. Whether the meeting was going to be held on a Tuesday or a Sunday or this week or next week was irrelevant. Why did he not then get on a plane and go to Ottawa and make the point? I submit to you, Sir, that in general terms he

knew, maybe not the day and hour, but he knew what was coming down. He sat idly by, deliberately so until the deed was done and then, like any procurer scorned, he went into a rage. A rage, Mr. Speaker, that has achieved nothing but to make the Premier the laughing stock across Canada that he has already become here in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, only so many times can you get up, as he did in 1982, and promise jobs, jobs, jobs and then go through this charade that the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) mentioned today, about how \$300,000 was a lot of money. Compared to what?

Compared maybe to the \$1 million a year that was put there when the Federal Liberals were in power, and when we had federal/provincial agreement called F.E.S.P., the forest stimulation programme. That \$300,000 is not a lot of money to an area with 80 per cent unemployment that up until now was getting \$1 million a year. So make no wonder he shouts loud, Mr. Speaker! But that is the kind of reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have in this Province an attitude towards the Premier that is, at kindest, one of laughter, but it is more deliberate than that. People of this Province are waiting their time. They have been led down the garden path by this procurer too many times.

MR. HEARN:

How you wish you had.

MR. SIMMONS:

Let that one just sink in.

MR. FUREY:

What a Sunday philosopher.

MR. SIMMONS:

The hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) has surfaced. There is a Minister of Education!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of this House who have a concern for their future, political and personal, to get on the right side of this resolution. I know they will all vote and I believe they will all vote for the resolution. But I ask them not to be party to the lie that the Premier has buried in the resolution. I ask him not to be party to that. The Premier did know. Now let be clear in what I am saying. He probably did not know the hour and day, but he knew the event was taking place because he had been given notice. By his own admission, he knew they were going to put the fish on the table. Now, if they were going to put it on the table, there must be a table somewhere to put it on. There must be a meeting in which to have the table.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I represent a fishing district in Newfoundland, I welcome the opportunity to speak on this resolution and to say that we are speaking on it two months too late. We have heard members opposite try to justify what they have done. This resolution that was put forward on the first day the House opened, around the end of February, I do not think any Newfoundlander in his right mind could stand up here, whether he represented a fishing district or a logging district, and not say that he supports the resolution. The only thing I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that we in the Liberal Caucus have been urging that more immediate action be taken, than the posturing we have seen with this resolution, since the dastardly deed that the Premier talks about became known on January 23.

Now, this is the point where we have some doubts about what actually happened in this, because we have heard the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) admit that they knew that Northern cod was going to be discussed in the next meeting that was going to be held with the French to talk about the settlement of the boundary with St. Pierre and the fishing zones 3Ps, 3Pn. They knew that fish was going on the table as a part of this negotiation. The Premier admitted that he had said, "Yes, I am prepared to discuss Northern cod and put it on the table as a bargaining right in an effort to establish the boundaries around St. Pierre. He admitted first to 1,000 metric tons, then we heard the Minister of Fisheries come out and say that he was prepared to accept 2,000 metric tons, and then they became very righteous and indignant when they found, when

this famous meeting was over, that there were 3,000 metric tons on the table. This, to me, seems to be a bit hypocritical in view of the fact that the Premier admitted yes, he did agree to putting cod on the bargaining table, and then to come out with the hew and cry after the fact, when the meeting in France was over.

Now, as my colleague for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) just pointed out, and I guess most of my colleagues who spoke on this side of the House, we find it a little strange that the Premier would become so upset after the meeting and not be upset before the meeting. Now, you can say that he did not know, but we still contend, on this side of the House, that there had to be some knowledge over there that there was an impending meeting. Now, why were they not in contact with Ottawa? If the politicians were not talking to each other, surely they have civil servants in both the provincial and federal departments who did have some kind of communication open. If it had reached the stage where the Newfoundland Federal Minister was not talking to the Premier, surely someone in the Provincial Department of Fisheries should have said, 'Listen, we just received a phone call asking us if we would consider putting Northern cod on the bargaining table in the next negotiations with France', and someone in the Provincial Department of Fisheries should have then said to one of the bureaucrats, 'Would you please monitor this situation and keep us aware, make us aware when the next meeting is to be held?'

Now, we on this side are a little suspicious that maybe this was a plot on the part of the Premier to

let this meeting go ahead and then to come out and say Newfoundland has once again been done in by bad old Ottawa. Because those of us who watch politics and those of us who participate in politics, in Newfoundland, have seen a sort of plan evolving over the last six months in Newfoundland, and then the plot thickens, sort of thing, when we come to the fisheries thing.

Now, you all remember that back in the Fall, in November, we heard the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) say he could not get subsidiary agreements signed, we heard the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) say that he could not get a subsidiary agreement signed, and then we heard the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in his attempt to cover up the bungling and his planning in his department, say that he was unable to get an agreement signed and because of the federal cutbacks to Atlantic Canada, and Newfoundland in particular, and he was in trouble. But it was all put to the fact that he came out in December and said, Listen, we really have a serious problem. We just cannot seem to negotiate with Ottawa. We just cannot seem to get them to give us anything. Then, lo and behold, we saw this January situation evolve with the French/Canada negotiations that Newfoundland supposedly were not invited to. This, again, is where we have some doubts about what actually happened in those negotiations and why Newfoundland was not there. We feel, on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland was not there because it did not want to be there; it could not create a political situation if they were at that meeting. We contend that this is what the whole situation

was. As for the Premier, he knew. He had admitted that he was going to give away Northern cod, albeit it was only 1,000, 2,000, 3,000 metric tons, whatever it was. But there was going to be cod on the table. But he and his government wanted to create a political issue and say once again, Newfoundland had been wronged by Ottawa. So when the hue and cry broke out after that by now infamous meeting, we find that we are again going to be nationalist Newfoundlanders, we are going to fight. Brian the pussycat became Brian the fighter. The man who had, down through the last two years, said we have now established this great cooperation with Ottawa, we are now in the position, with the Government in Ottawa and the Government in Newfoundland wearing the same political shirt, where Newfoundland is going to take its rightful place in Canada and finally be brought into the twentieth century after all those years of wandering in the wilderness - brought in by those two great Brians. Now we find that our Brian came on and he had to admit that maybe things were not going as smoothly as he thought they would. He slavishly accepted any idea that came out of Ottawa last year. It was just a matter of a word from big Brian in Ottawa and our Brian jumped up and defended big Brian and said, It is going to be the best thing that every happened to Newfoundland. Here we are, big Brian says that the job strategy programme is good, and little Brian says it is great, it is going to create thousands of jobs in Newfoundland, hundreds of them down in Bay d'Espoir.

MR. DECKER:

And big Brian is going to give him

the offshore.

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, well, big Brian gave them the offshore. That is what he did. Now, we heard all about the offshore and how it was going to be the best agreement. The Atlantic Accord was going to be the thing that really was going to bring Newfoundlanders home from Calgary. The only fellow they brought from Calgary was Lougheed, at a cost of approximately \$400,000 a year. That was the employment we created and the fellows we brought home from Calgary; we brought home Lougheed and we brought him home, and he was doing a very good job for us, at \$400,000 a year.

MR. DECKER:

How much is that per hour?

MR. GILBERT:

That is \$192 an hour, if he works forty hours a week fifty-two weeks a year. I would say Cabot Martin must be upset to know that he was underpaid. I would say that the family of four who are living on social services at \$6,750 a year, \$3.26 an hour, would be a little upset too to think that the only Newfoundlander we could bring back from Calgary to put to work was a fellow who had been Premier of Alberta, and I do not think he is a Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:

They probably screeched him in.

MR. GILBERT:

Oh, they did, at that cocktail party they had over there at the Arts and Culture where they spent \$50,000 to welcome him. Oh, he was screeched in, so now he is a Newfoundlander.

MR. DECKER:

That is probably how they are getting around local preference now, they are screeching them in.

MR. GILBERT:

That is it. I am glad my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle mentioned that. I wondered how we could make a Newfoundlander out of him.

MR. DECKER:

Now we know.

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, by God! we know. He was screeched in at the Arts and Culture Centre at a cocktail party that the people of Newfoundland paid for to welcome this great Newfoundlander home.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, to go back to being more serious about that, we find that the Premier changed his mind in January of this year and said, 'Now, maybe we are not getting as good a deal now as we used to. There certainly seems to be some flaws in this great spirit of co-operation that has been there.' Because of that, he mentioned in one of his appearances in the media, when he was conducting the fish war through the media instead of here in the House of Assembly where it should have been done - we wanted it done immediately - that really our relationship with Ottawa, since we signed that great Atlantic Accord, was not very good.

MR. CALLAN:

Who said that?

MR. GILBERT:

This is what little Brian said. He said, No, it is not really as good. As a matter of fact, he was even quoted as saying, Mr. Speaker, that the relationship he had had with the former Liberal

Government under Trudeau, in the two years prior to the 1984 election, was better than he is having with Big Brian and those bullies up there in Ottawa who are trying to bully Newfoundland again.'

You know, the unfortunate part about it, Mr. Speaker, is that Little Brian has been saying through the last five administrations that Ottawa has been trying to bully him. He has broken off negotiations with everybody up there, and burned his bridges, and decided that there was nothing further to do but fight again for Newfoundland, and he decided that now is the time to fight. But it seems to me that the government, the Premier and members opposite, are not prepared to accept responsibility for anything.

Now I, and my colleagues here, are quite prepared to admit, yes, there are some problems in the negotiation process that is going on between the provincial government and Ottawa, but we also feel, Mr. Speaker, that this government, those members over there, were elected, and because they got the majority they were given the power to form the government, to govern Newfoundland, to respond to issues, to provide policy and set the course for development in Newfoundland.

The theme of the last election was to create jobs. We know how well this has worked, how the policy has been. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) got up in this House this morning and very proudly announced that there were going to be \$326,000 spent in the great district of Burgeo - Bay d' Espoir to provide

employment in the Milltown - St. Alban's area. The only thing he neglected to say was that under his government, and he was still Minister of Forests Resources and Lands, an agreement expired that was providing up to \$1 million a year and providing 120 to 160 jobs in Bay d' Espoir. Now, this one he announced this morning, you know, is great. When you have an area that has 80 per cent unemployment, anything is a straw to a drowning man. But it is Band-Aid again and without planning. It took him a year to make the decision to put \$346,000 into Burgeo Bay d' Espoir. With a Special Warrant they agreed to pay Peter Lougheed, one man, \$440,000 a year, yet in Bay d' Espoir, where we have 90 per cent unemployment, after a year of my reminding the government every day they put \$326,000 down there. The problem is that it is just Band-Aid, no planning, no policy, and this is where the problem with government members opposite is. They are not prepared to govern. They were given the mandate but all they want to do is lay blame. The whole idea in their policy and in their approach to government is instead of us sitting down and doing the job we were put here to do, we must blame someone, and this will happen as long as they are there. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that that regime is finished after the next election, and there is a line in T.S. Elliott that describes how they will go, not with a bang but with a whimper. This is, I feel, how they will go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the district that I represent there is a very serious concern over the thing that this government is posturing on. The very lives of the people there are in jeopardy because of

the overfishing on the St. Pierre Banks, 3Pn and 3Ps. This is where there is a very serious problem. We saw the Newfoundland fish companies taking a cutback of 10,000 metric tons last year when we have a serious problem with supply for some of the plants along the South Coast.

The other thing we never hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) talking about, but it is a serious problem, is fish landing this year, the average size. Maybe the minister does not know about it, but last year it used to take thirty-nine fish to make 100 pounds but with the fish that have been landed this year, since the cod quotas came in, it takes forty-eight fish to make 100 pounds. Now, that means there is a very serious problem.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is that the South coast?

MR. GILBERT:

That is the South coast. That is a very serious problem, because that tells us what is happening in the area that we are most concerned about right here, the 3Ps+3Pn areas. Something, I think, our government should be pointing out to Ottawa is the real problem which is, as everybody knows, the serious overfishing in the area around St. Pierre. The political posturing that has gone on is not going to help that. It is not going to do anything to solve the problems that are there. The whole deal is it must be impressed upon the federal government that the French are overfishing in the St. Pierre Bank area. They were given a quota of 4,000 metric tons in that area last year, and they caught 27,000 metric tons. We are seeing a drop in the size of fish this year. If

this continues, Mr. Speaker, what we are going to see along the South Coast, where the whole economy of the South Coast is tied to the fact that fish have to be caught, is Newfoundlanders starving to death and more people going on unemployment. So something has to be done about the problem immediately.

We, my colleagues and I, have been trying to impress on that government over there that there is a serious problem. The serious problem is not negotiating with Northern cod - that, itself, should never have been on the table - the problem is with going to Ottawa and pointing out, Listen we have to settle if our lifestyle as we know it in Newfoundland, particularly along the South Coast, is not to be put in jeopardy. We must immediately start negotiations with France. We must go to arbitration or take whatever means is necessary, whatever course is there, use whatever political will there is in Ottawa, whatever way we can do it, even if it comes down to economic sanctions, otherwise, this Province of ours, the very lifestyle that we have enjoyed down through the hundreds of years that we have been here, is going to be destroyed because of the needless overfishing fishing on the St. Pierre Banks, the raping of that area.

Since the cod war broke out, we are always hearing that maybe the people of St. Pierre agree with us. I say, Mr. Speaker, we should use caution. I am a little bit afraid about the feeling that the people of St. Pierre are good guys. Because you must remember that they have licences for six wet fish trawlers there right now and they are trying to get up to

ten. And, believe me, each one of those wet fish draggers is capable of taking 5,000 metric tons of fish.

MR. LUSH:
Each one?

MR. GILBERT:

Each one. So if you have ten of them, that is 50,000 metric tons of fish that is going to be taken by them, and this is very serious. I mean, it is not bad Metropolitan France and good little St. Pierre. We heard the Premier, when he welcomed the fishermen from St. Pierre, say that he had a sort of an agreement. Again it is the little guy against the big guy. I somehow think that the people of St. Pierre are pulling a little bit of a scam. We are forgetting that they have a serious problem, and they are trying to continue raping the cod in that area around there.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to get Ottawa to accept the fact that it has a responsibility to protect our way of life in Newfoundland, and that the only way they are going to do that is by getting a boundary established in the St. Pierre Bank area to protect the South Coast fishery. I mean, one example, I have is in Francois, where a man cannot get a licence to fish 3Ps, even though he has fished it for years, and years; he is now changing from a 33 foot boat to a 42 or a 44 foot boat, Mr. Speaker. To me it is sort of ludicrous, you know, when we have this type of situation. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the thing the Newfoundland Government should be doing, pointing this out, instead of the posturing and arm waving and shouting and screaming that we

have had in the press. The reasonable approach is to point out that rural Newfoundland can be destroyed.

Again that brings me to another point, Mr. Speaker. I believe the government, members opposite, have forgotten about rural Newfoundland and our lifestyle. This is the thing that frightens me: When I asked the Minister of fisheries about his department building fish cages in St. John's to be trucked to Bay d'Espoir, when 90 per cent of the people in Bay d'Espoir are unemployed, he said he did not know about it, then he came back the next day and said it was being done as a tag-in programme. This is just a little example of the fact that the government and members opposite have forgotten about rural Newfoundland. This is the most serious part of this whole thing, they have forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, the plants along the South Coast - the two that I am most familiar with are the ones in Burgeo and Ramea. This year the plant in Burgeo is experiencing difficulties because of a shortage of fish and because of the size of the fish they are getting in there. The fish supply for that Burgeo plant is coming directly from 3Pn, 3Ps and the Gulf, 4R or 4S. That is where the supply is coming from for the Burgeo plant. Now, the Burgeo plant is very fortunate in that National Sea has taken it over and they get fish for other plants dropped off there from time to time because of the fact that the turn-around is quicker and they can get the boats back out to sea. Their supply is tied directly to that area that we are talking about where we must establish a boundary. If that is not done, you are going to see a reduction in the amount of fish

produced in the Burgeo plant.

We saw just this Winter, because of the fact that the Burgeo road has been closed most of the Winter, trawlers having to bypass Burgeo and go and land in Cape Breton and in Nova Scotia fish that should have been produced in Burgeo. Because the road was closed, they could not produce the type of fish that had to be sold on the Boston market there, so we have lost production time in Burgeo already this year.

I was talking to the President of the Union down there last week and he was telling me that right now there is a good possibility that this plant at Burgeo that worked two shifts from January until July last year, will possibly be down to one shift this week. That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is serious stuff, and it is something that government members opposite should bear in mind when they go to Ottawa.

The Ramea plant is a little more fortunate down there in that area, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that National Sea's fish, most of it is coming out of the Northern cod area and they have more druggers working in Newfoundland. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, the serious problem on the South Coast of Newfoundland lies with government's inability to stop its posturing and go to Ottawa and sit down and point out that it is a very serious problem.

We have no trouble with the fact that there is a breakdown. We know there is a breakdown in the ability of one government to talk to the other government. We feel that the federal minister certainly has to bear some of the responsibility for this. I think

the real crunch and the real problem comes from the fact that this government has not been prepared to identify the problem and do something about it. Here it is, March 13. This thing blew up on January 20. At that time, we asked the government, the Premier and members opposite, to call this House together, draft a resolution pointing out the serious threat to the economic way of life that we know in Newfoundland, get this to Ottawa immediately, and give Ottawa, the federal government, the message from the duly elected members of the House of Assembly that there is a serious problem in Newfoundland, one which they should be aware of and should be prepared to do something about. The fish stocks on the South Coast are being raped and pillaged by France, yet we have a government in Ottawa that sat and fiddled while Newfoundland burned or drowned.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Or starved.

MR. GILBERT:

Or starved if you want. This is the whole situation that we have, and the thing we have waited for for a month and a half. We saw this House open, and then we found that the debate was put on hold for a few days.

I feel that debating this now is sort of counterproductive. It should have been done back in January, Mr. Speaker. The federal government should have had a loud and clear message from the people of Newfoundland, through their representatives, that we are unhappy and our very lifestyle is being threatened because of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have a government that has lost its will

to govern. They wanted to fight a battle in the media, maybe something to use in an election: 'Once again poor little Newfoundland is attacked by Ottawa.'

This is not so, Mr. Speaker. We are a member of this great country which extends from coast to coast. The only thing is that our government has lost the ability - they never had it under the present administration - to sit down and negotiate a deal. Now the deal that we want, and the message that we wanted to get out of this was not a political one. This goes beyond politics, Mr. Speaker. What we wanted to do was protect the lifestyle of Newfoundland and it was not done. We have waited for six weeks, now we are going to pass this resolution, all of us are going to vote for it.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. GILBERT:
It is too little and too late.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on this resolution. One of the reasons I want to speak on the resolution is because several members opposite have gotten up and contended that the government knew about the meeting in Paris. Mr. Speaker, that has been not only refuted by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.

Rideout). Not only did he not know, not only did none of his officials know about the meeting in Paris, but the federal minister himself, the hon. John Crosbie, who is the Newfoundland representative in the Federal Cabinet, indicated in his speech in the House of Commons that he did not know; and not only did he not know but he said it was contemptuous. He thought it was a terrible thing to have happened and asked the federal government to apologize, which they did, and they apologized for that single reason, that nobody knew about the meeting in Paris.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is high time that we started taking the word of what hon. members say in this House, because if we start questioning the truth or validity of what people say there is nothing sacred. I have heard the hon. former minister in the Federal Cabinet get up this morning and talk about the integrity of the Prime Minister. I do not think that does anything for what I believe to be a very worthwhile profession, the profession of politics.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Would the minister agree, then, that if the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage attacking the Prime Minister, as he did this morning, does not do much for the profession of politics, would he also agree then that the Premier's public statements from coast to coast in Canada attacking the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr.

Siddon) as a liar does very little for the profession as well? Would you agree with that?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I want just a few words to say to this resolution because I think it is a very important one. Even though there are not many fishermen in the district of Pleasantville, there are several fishermen in the district.

MR. CALLAN:

Are you going to respond to that?

MR. DINN:

I am not going to respond to that because it is not a point of order.

MR. FUREY:

It is the truth.

MR. DINN:

The hon. member who actually did question the integrity of any other politician in this world in my opinion had no right to do it.

MR. CALLAN:

He was very specific.

MR. DINN:

Yes, I know he was, and the hon. member should know what he was. So, Mr. Speaker, of all hon. members to speak about integrity, or call on the integrity of another person in this House, the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage in my opinion does not have that right.

MR. FUREY:

You are engaging in the same thing.

MR. DINN:

I am not engaging in the same thing. I would like to leave it there. The only reason I mentioned it is because the hon. member stood up on a frivolous point of order which he generally does, breaking the rules of the House by not allowing hon. members on this side of the House to have their say in a very important debate.

Now, the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) brought in an amendment, and the amendment was basically based on the fact that we did not know. He moved an amendment to the resolution presented by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Ottenheimer) that the words 'or knowledge of' contained in the third WHEREAS be deleted. Now, Mr. Speaker, that indicates the hon. the former Minister of Fisheries, the hon. the member for Twillingate, really does not believe that we knew and kept silent about the meeting in Paris. I am sure that he agrees that no hon. member on this side of the House knew about that meeting in Paris and acquiesced or allowed it to happen without saying something.

MR. CALLAN:

Not until just before it started.

MR. DINN:

The hon. member for the Come By Chance area, Bellevue (Mr. Callan), really should not be interrupting either because he continually does that and I do not think it really does anything for what I consider to be a very hon. profession to be in, politics. It is not good and it does not do anything for anyone in this House, and it does not do anything for the House of Assembly itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the fisheries, basically in 1972 the fish offshore was given away by the treaty that was signed with France in 1972. That is when it started, in 1972. I think that was a very unwise treaty. I do not think Newfoundland was considered when that treaty was signed in 1972, and it basically gave away the resource that many of the people in this Province depend on for a livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, what can we do now? Well, the Premier, when he found out about the meeting in Paris and the deal that was struck, did what he thought was right. The hon. the member for Twillingate has something there in his hand that he keeps pointing to which is supposed to mean something to me, but I did not see it and I do not know what is contained in it. But the Premier did the only thing he could do under the circumstances, and that was to protest as loudly and as clearly as he possibly could, to the point of getting all the Premier's in Canada - there were two who did not make it - to a meeting to discuss the issue and they basically agreed that what the federal government had done in this instance was reprehensible, was something that should never have happened and should never happen again. And if it does happen, we shall protest as loudly and as clearly as the hon. the Premier did in this instance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what else did the Premier do? Mr. Speaker, he sent a letter to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) saying we would like to open the House for a couple of days to discuss this. The hon. the member for Bellevue is laughing, but this is important. It was very timely to do it right then, to do it quickly

and to make sure that everyone in this House of Assembly was on record as being against what happened at that meeting in Paris. So he asked the Leader of the Opposition and he asked the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick) to come to the House, debate it for two days and get it off to Ottawa. Now, why did he say two days? Simply because if you dragged it out there would be a perception out there that somebody in this House did not agree that what happened at the meeting in Paris was reprehensible, was unconscionable and should never have happened. What actually happened when we did get to the House of Assembly? The debate has gone on now for some six days. There is no resolution to it. Mr. Speaker, we lost an opportunity that we should have taken when the Premier recommended it to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, by implication the minister is suggesting that the fault for the delay in passing this resolution rests with this side of the House. I think that is the point he is trying to make. Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister has made a number of inaccuracies in his few comments, certainly one wherein he has attributed motives to me in making the amendment that I made to the resolution. I have allowed that to pass. Maybe sometime I will get a chance to refute that. But I cannot sit here and allow him to suggest that we are responsible for the delay in passing this resolution. In

fact, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, the letter that the minister alludes to was written by the Premier on February 13. If the hon. minister can recall, the official Opposition, in a letter to the Premier dated January 27, requested that the House be convened.

MR. DINN:

That is not a point of order.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Twillingate is abusing my privileges in this House by not allowing me to speak. He had his full time to speak on this resolution. He obviously does not have a point of order, and he is abusing my privileges by interrupting me while I am speaking in this House, which I have every right to do.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I think you would have to agree that an hon. member in this House certainly has the right, when a minister is misleading the House - I am not saying deliberately, but the minister has misled the House in what he is saying - to set the

record straight. And that is what I am doing, setting the record straight. The Minister of Mines and Housing has misled the House - I repeat, I am not saying deliberately, I will omit that word - when he talked about members on this side being responsible for the time it has taken to debate and to pass this resolution. The minister is misleading the House, because I am sure he knows differently.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what I actually said was that the hon. member for Twillingate proposed an amendment that calls into question the resolution itself. It says, 'Or knowledge of,' which indicates that we had knowledge of the meeting in Paris and did nothing about it. Mr. Speaker, that is not true. The hon. member knows that is not true. The Minister of Fisheries said it was not true. There was a contention that officials in the provincial government knew and they have all sworn affidavits that it was not true. So the hon. member should take that. I mean, he is a noted parliamentarian.

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order again, Mr. Speaker, and I have a right to do this.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DINN:

You do not really have a right to interrupt. You had your twenty minutes. You are interrupting. There is no point of order.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a right to rise on a point of order again when the minister is misleading the House. There is a telegram that was sent to the Premier of this Province signed by John C. Crosbie, a member of the Privy Council, a Cabinet minister, who states quite clearly in the second paragraph of that letter that the Government of Newfoundland was informed of an impending meeting, at which time Northern cod would be on the bargaining table. In this telex, Mr. Speaker - I am prepared to table it, I think copies have been made available to the press - the minister goes on to even name the people who were contacted in the provincial government and the people who contacted them in Ottawa. That, Mr. Speaker, is on record. It is a telegram by a Privy Councillor of this country, the Minister of Transport, the member for St. John's West, clearly stating - I might add, Mr. Speaker, that in conversation -

MR. TOBIN:

That is not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, can I have silence?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence, please?

MR. SIMMS:

What is his point of order?

MR. W. CARTER:

I do not do this very often. I think when I do it I deserve to be heard. If what I am saying is hurting the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West, then, Mr. Speaker, so be it. The fact of that matter is that there is a telex in which it is clearly stated by a privy councillor of this country, a minister of the federal Cabinet, that the Government of Newfoundland was made aware of the forthcoming meeting - the names, the places and everything else connected with it. If the Minister of Mines can refute that, then I would like to hear him do it.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has already indicated that he does not do this very often, yet the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) started speaking about eight or ten minutes ago and already the member for Twillingate has gotten up twice on what are obviously spurious points of order to simply disagree and dispute comments that are made - I do not care what he is waving over there. He can wave that wherever he wants to wave it. All the documents are available and all that stuff, but, Mr. Speaker, the point is the member for Twillingate is a former Cabinet minister himself, a veteran of this House. As a matter of fact, the hon. member is a veteran of all kinds of houses, as I recall, federally,

municipally and provincially. He is a veteran parliamentarian and he should know full well that what he raises here today is not a legitimate point of order. A point of order has to do with parliamentary practices. That is what a point of order is. The hon. member should study Beauchesne. There is clearly no point of order. The member for Twillingate is being burned by what the Minister of Mines and Housing is saying and simply wants to use whatever tactic he can to take away from the hon. minister's time. He had his thirty minutes to speak. Give the hon. the minister the same courtesy.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I hope the people who are sitting within the confines of this House realize what has happened here this morning. I got up as a member representing a district in this Province and the hon. the member for Twillingate, who is supposed to be a noted parliamentarian, continues to interrupt with spurious points of order and has obviously been out of order each time he stood up. Now, he is breaking parliamentary practice again by interrupting in the House of Assembly. He should know that one of the primary rules of the House is that when a member speaks in debate all other hon. members should sit and listen in silence. He is breaking the rules again, Mr. Speaker, he cannot take the heat. Now, Mr. Speaker, when this fuss started initially, the federal minister he just quoted said that five or six individuals,

people in the provincial government, people in the bureaucracy had been called and told about the meeting in Paris. Each of those individuals - the hon. member is showing it again - have sworn affidavits saying that they did not get a call. Now, we have to then consider, do we believe the one individual who said they did get a call or the five or six individuals who have sworn affidavits saying that they did not get a call? Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that those five or six individuals - I know some of them personally - were not only telling the truth, but they swore affidavits that they did not and were not informed by anyone federally that that meeting was going on in Paris. Now, that may not be good enough for the hon. member, but it certainly is good enough for me.

Now, what about the federal minister? In my discussions with him I said, 'John, did you know about this meeting in Paris?' 'Well,' he said, 'I heard that there was the possibility of a meeting in Paris and', he said, 'I enquired around.' He asked, 'Is there a meeting going on in Paris?' 'Well,' he said, 'first I was told there was no meeting, the meeting was not going on. Then', he said, 'a little later on, when I was alerted, I found out that there was a meeting going on but they had no authority to do anything, so it really did not matter to me.'

MR. W. CARTER:

Will he verify that?

MR. DINN:

Oh, yes, he will verify that. Now, I do not care what he wrote in that telegram, nor when it was written, but I can tell this hon.

House that that was said to me, and I happen to believe the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Crosbie), federally. He informed the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), as well, of the same situation, that the hon. the Minister of Transportation, representing Newfoundland in the federal Cabinet, really did not know at first that there was a meeting and then, when he found out, he was told that they had no authority to do or sign anything at that meeting. He was absolutely astounded and shocked when he found out that they not only signed but had the authority to sign on behalf of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is reprehensible that it was done. I believe that it is reprehensible that the Province was not informed, which they were not, and I believe that it is reprehensible that the federal minister, the minister responsible, the minister who represents Newfoundland in the Federal Cabinet really did not know what was going on at the Paris meeting, when it was going on.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear, because hon. members opposite may have, unwittingly or otherwise, clouded the issue with respect to what went on and how the meeting in Paris came about. I believe what happened was the French sabre rattled and the Canadian Government wilted, they just did not stand up for the rights of Newfoundlanders; they were scared the French might send over a little gunboat. Mr. Speaker, if that is how this country is going to be run, then I say things have to change in this country. I am disgusted with what happened. I do not believe there is a Newfoundlander living who has

not been shocked by what happened at that Paris meeting. Mr. Speaker, I believe it clouds the issue when we bring in amendments, as the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has done, talking about a WHEREAS which says; "AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada deliberately" - it was deliberate - "excluded the Province of Newfoundland from participation in" - that is a fact - "or knowledge of the Paris meeting contrary to established practice." That that is 100 per cent accurate.

Now, to bring in a frivolous amendment, and I believe it to be frivolous, to remove 'or knowledge of' just clouds the issue. I believe that every member of this House when the vote comes should stand. Forget about that amendment which has no bearing on the situation at all and which is inaccurate, to say the least. Every member in this House should vote for this resolution. This resolution should have gone forward two days after the thirteenth, when the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was asked to agree to the opening of the House for two days. At that point in time, when the issue was clear in the minds of all Canadians, this House should have been opened on that one issue, it should have been debated and, Mr. Speaker, a unanimous decision of this House should have gone forward to the federal government denouncing what happened at that meeting in Paris.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take

interruptions from the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) right now. He can just sit down and listen, and I will take the amount of time that I need to explain what I believe should have happened and should happen now.

This vote should come as quickly as possible. It is late, but it is not too late. I want to see how members in this House stand on this issue. I think it is very important that everybody stand and support this resolution in its entirety and that it go forward to the federal government indicating that this House, Liberal, P.C. and NDP, is 100 per cent in support of this resolution, and, Mr. Speaker, saying that the House of Assembly records its unanimous condemnation of this infamous agreement made in callous disregard for the livelihood of Canadians dependent on this fish resource, and the deliberate denial of the legitimate participation of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House urge the Government of Canada to take all necessary measures to have the boundary issue resolved without compromising the vital interests of the Province of Newfoundland."

I think we should vote on that as quickly as possible and get it off to those concerned in Ottawa so that they know what the people's House in this Province thinks of what they did with respect to the Canada/France fish deal.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, in commenting on this resolution I want to commence by saying that I will be voting for it because we know what happens when we vote against resolutions. No matter how clear cut and how obvious the reasons are, the Premier and his colleagues will go outside and twist it and turn it and present a totally different picture.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for what I would classify, Mr. Speaker, as a charade. That is all it is. It is a red herring. That is all this is, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you what kind of charade it is, Mr. Speaker, and I will compare it to what happened in Corner Brook a couple of years ago.

The Premier Mr. Speaker, is a master at manipulation and trickery. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Premier were in a hockey game he would spend 95 per cent of his time in the penalty box. That is the kind of a player the Premier is, a trickster, and as I said a few days ago in the Legislature here, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has three jobs -

MR. BRETT:
He is captain of the winning team.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, he may be captain of a winning team but it is the spectators who are losing, the spectators out there around the Province of Newfoundland and

Labrador who have no employment and who are living on welfare.

Mr. Speaker, almost with every thing that this government does and says, it contradicts itself. In the Speech from the Throne a few days ago, the government said they were going to get rid of the ten week syndrome. What do we have, Mr. Speaker? We had the latest example this morning. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is sitting in his seat and he should be listening to me. What he announced this morning was \$1.3 million in ten week syndromes. That is what it is. It is make work programmes which will last ten weeks.

In the same Speech from the Throne where the government talked about getting rid of the ten week syndrome, we had reference made to the Minister of Social Service's Department where they will be elaborating and extending the ten week syndrome, where they take people off welfare, put them to work for ten weeks so they are not being paid by the taxpayers of this Province directly, 50 per cent of course, because 50 per cent comes from Ottawa anyway, but after they get their ten weeks, they go on UIC. Why do they not let them work for fifteen or twenty or thirty? Once they get their ten weeks, the Department of Social Services lays them off and then they are on the Ottawa Treasury getting UIC. And the ten week syndrome, rather than being done away with, is going to be extended according to the Speech from the Throne.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you agree (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN:

I am talking about the contradictions that come out of the mouths of people like the Premier, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands and practically every minister over there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is a charade. This resolution is about a charade and I want to make a comparison and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands and the two members for Corner Brook, whom I am sure are within the confines of this Legislature, will remember well the charade that took place in Corner Brook a couple of years ago. We have an almost identical situation here, Mr. Speaker, almost identical. What happened?

The people in Corner Brook did not want Kruger but the Premier was trying to force it down their throats and so the Premier was in trouble because of that and, of course, Kruger was in trouble as well. So what did Kruger do? They packed their bags in the middle of the night. They left Corner Brook and went back to Montreal. It was a plot actually. The Premier told them what to do you see, Mr. Speaker, he said, 'You pack your bags and go away. I am in trouble and you are in trouble. You pack your bags and leave and I will go up and try to convince you to come back. That will make me a hero, number one, because I convinced you to come back, and the people in Corner Brook will be thankful that you came back and so they will have a different attitude towards you as well.' That is what happened, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier, in the last election and on many occasions in the Legislature and outside, did not say it is in these words, but he

wondered what is wrong with the people in Corner Brook. 'I saved their mill for them, I saved their city, and they still voted against me.' They almost defeated the incumbent for Humber East (Ms Verge) and nearly defeated the incumbent for Humber West (Mr. Baird). The member who ran for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Blanchard) won by fourteen or sixteen votes.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to use up the hon. member's time but, with all due respect now, the hon. member has been speaking for six or seven minutes and he has talked about everything under the sun except the fisheries resolution. With all due respect, I think the hon. member should be a little more relevant to the resolution and tell us what he thinks about the fisheries resolution and the deal between Canada and France.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am drawing a comparison. I am talking about a charade here and I am talking about the dozens of charades that we have seen conducted by the Premier and his administration over the last eight years or so. Mr. Speaker, if I can just mention one particular item in passing. Some people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, are wondering why is it that the Premier did not deliver

on the jobs that he asked for a mandate to create in 1985, two years ago. He has not delivered on that. Why not?

The answer is simple to me, Mr. Speaker. When the Premier went into that election in 1985 asking for a mandate to create jobs, he went into it with 61 per cent of the people behind him from the previous election. When the election results came in on the night of April 2, 1985, the Premier did not get his mandate because his percentage of popular vote, Mr. Speaker, dropped from 61 per cent down to 49 per cent. The majority of Newfoundlanders, 51 per cent of them, voted against the Premier. In the Premier's mind that was reason enough for him not to have to deliver on his promise because he did not get the mandate that he asked for.

MR. PEACH:

Do you ever do math in school?

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, I did.

MR. PEACH:

You must have been a poor learner.

MR. CALLAN:

If the non-minister, Mr. Speaker, from Carbonear (Mr. Peach) does not realize that when the Premier dropped from 61 per cent of the popular vote in 1982 down to 49 per cent in 1985 -

MR. PEACH:

And won the election.

MR. CALLAN:

He won the election but 51 per cent of the people, the majority of the people voted against the Premier, so he did not get the mandate that he asked for, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on this cod deal, what a charade, what a bluff has been perpetrated on the people of this Province. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, spent three weeks, news conference after news conference here in the Province and then away to Ottawa and foolishly conned the other Premiers into meeting with them up in Ottawa or Toronto or wherever it was. The reason for it, of course, was obvious. The Chairman of the Premiers' caucus was the Tory from Alberta. So this, Mr. Speaker, is a charade. That is all it is, a charade. What happened, Mr. Speaker?

Why is it that the Premier and his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) offered at least 1,000 tons of Northern cod to the French in December? Why was it that they were so upset, Mr. Speaker, when the negotiators went over to Paris on the 23rd and 24th of January and talked about Northern cod and put Northern cod on the table. The simple answer, Mr. Speaker, is because the Premier and his Minister of Fisheries had put Northern cod on the table at least a month before, in December of 1986. It is true. I saw the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, on The View from the Hill on NTV admit that they offered 1,000 tons of Northern cod and I saw the hon. John Crosbie in the media as well, down at the Newfoundland Hotel in the speech that he made, talking about the fact that 1,000 tons of Northern cod, he called it the Momas and the Papas of the Northern cod, it was Northern Northern cod, but the same cod that the Premier talks about in other documents.

You see the Premier just simply forgets for the sake of convenience one document when he is talking about a certain

episode, but on another occasion, of course, he brings another document forward. Mr. Speaker, the Premier is so inconsistent in how he handled this thing that you could drive a punt through the holes in the arguments that he put forward.

MR. TOBIN:

What about Northern cod at Arnold's Cove? How much of that is landed at Arnold's Cove?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I know all about the National Sea plant and the Northern cod that comes to Arnold's Cove. As a matter of fact, it was only less than two weeks ago that I was down and went in and brought some beautiful fillets at the Arnold's Cove fish plant, as I do whenever I go down that way. I know all about the Northern cod.

I am talking, Mr. Speaker, about the Northern cod that the Premier and his Minister of Fisheries gave away in December in negotiations. Mr. Speaker, this whole episode is a charade. The Premier was so anxious to get the House open to debate this on a mere technicality, most of it fabricated in his own mind. The Leader of the Opposition's letter responds to the Premier.

In responding to opening the House for a special two day session to debate this issue, the Leader of the Opposition in the very first paragraph made it abundantly clear, 'Yes, we agree.' But then, after he had made it abundantly clear, in a second and third paragraph he said, 'I would like to have the House open to debate other issues as well.' It was not a condition. The Leader of the Opposition did not say, 'Unless

you open the Legislature for these other reasons, and unless you invite the cameras in, we will not debate the Northern cod.'

Mr. Speaker, the Premier used that little technicality and then went to the media and said, 'Oh, the Liberals do not want the House of Assembly open. They put their party before the Province. Me, I put my Province before the party.' To see the Premier going abroad the elevator with his two overpaid henchmen - he has got two bodyguards now. It was bad enough, draining the taxpayers of this Province, having one all along. He is the most expensive Premier in all of Canada and the least productive. Every day that I sit in my seat now, Mr. Speaker, I see another bodyguard who stands in the doorway there hour on end gazing down. What for? Not to protect the Premier. The Premier is hardly ever here. He comes in for a half hour for Question Period and then he is gone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

The Premier was here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member on my left to please give the hon. member silence.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from

Placentia (Mr. Patterson), and the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) should neither be seen nor heard. Neither one of these two gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, should be seen nor heard over their abdication of responsibility and duty to the people who live in their district, who, for fifty years, have been travelling and trusting to the Come By Chance hospital for medical services, and the member for Placentia and the member for Burin - Placentia West have played no role in trying to get at least a sixteen hour clinic at Come By Chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, they will get into the record, and they will be put on the record. They will be brought into this debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I agree with what you just said, to call us to order, but I think, at the same time, maybe you should consider asking the member if he would deal with the matter that is before the floor, which is the fisheries resolution. It has nothing whatsoever to do with medical care in this Province. It is totally irrelevant!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to use up my thirty minutes that I have at my disposal. There is no need to. I know all about the fish and the fishermen and the fish plants in the Province.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible.)

MR. CALLAN:

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that comment was heard and was recorded upstairs on the electronic recording system, the comment just made by the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West when he turned to his colleague from Grand Bank, the minister who accepts credit for keeping the cottage hospitals open on the Burin Peninsula, because he made good representation, he says. He is in a good position, Mr. Speaker, to make good representation. He is in the Cabinet. Is the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth suggesting that the member and the people in the general Come By Chance area did not make good representation? He already admitted it. I saw him on television when he said, 'We heard about it 1,000 times.'

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is now getting away from the motion that we are discussing.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin

- Placentia West dragged me away from the topic. He turned to his colleague and he said, 'We have our hospitals open.' That is what he said. In other words, to hell with Come By Chance and the people who trusted that health care service. That is what -

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is going to get up in the House and start making accusations and imputing motives, he should be careful. The fact of the matter is what he is saying was never said. What I said and I will say anywhere, and I will say for the public record when he said about me not being responsible for the hospital, I said, I have a hospital. I have, Mr. Speaker, a brand new one that is going to be ready to open this year in the district of Burin - Placentia West. It cost \$20-odd million, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to have been able to work on behalf of my constituents and deliver that facility.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we saw a month pass by. It was on February 13, and today is Friday, March 13, it was a month ago that

the Premier suggested that he was going to have the House open. But, of course, that was two weeks after he had travelled the Province and travelled to Ottawa and milked it for everything that it was worth. But, Mr. Speaker, at the end of that, he discovered, when he conducted his poll, that there is not enough in this to call an election on and he dropped it. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it has taken us a month to arrive at today. The resolution is now going to go to Ottawa, even though, the Premier went to Ottawa earlier in the week and he could have bought the all-party resolution from this legislation up to Ottawa with him and hand delivered it.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, there is at least one thing I notice. When my colleagues were speaking earlier today and yesterday afternoon in this debate on this particular topic, there was hardly anybody on the government benches. I am glad at least that I have the ability to draw them in from the Common Room.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, not only when my colleagues were speaking on this very important resolution, so say the members opposite, but just now when the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) was speaking, there was not one person, there was not one of his colleagues listening to him. I was tempted to call for a quorum

call, but I did not. Mr. Speaker, it will also be noted the number of persons and who they were from the government benches who got up and spoke in defence of this very, very important resolution, so says the Premier.

MR. BAIRD:
Do you support it? You have not said yet.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, if the member for Corner Brook had been here when I stood, I said, I am supporting and I will vote for this charade, because that is what it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:
This resolution going to Ottawa at this late stage, Mr. Speaker, will do nothing for the fishermen who fish in Trinity Bay, and Placentia Bay, in my district. It will do nothing for them, Mr. Speaker, because we know that this is a charade. As it happened -

MR. PATTERSON:
Why vote for it?

MR. CALLAN:
Because, Mr. Speaker, too often before we had voted in conscience against something that was brought forward by the Premier, and it was, Mr. Speaker, a charade again, but we voted against it because we knew it was. But the Premier went out, because he can use the taxpayers dollars, Mr. Speaker, and print up 10,000 of these, at taxpayers' expense, and put them in the liquor stores and he can go and buy the full page ads.

MR. YOUNG:
That is what he should have done with your money instead of going -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
He could buy the full page ads in the newspapers with taxpayers dollars because he happens to be in the seat of power.

But, Mr. Speaker, the people in this Province are very quickly starting to see the transparency that this Premier exemplifies every time that he gets up on a phony issue, because that is what it is. We saw the popular vote drop in 1985 from 61 per cent down to 49 per cent. We will see it go much, much further the next time, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier has tried the same trick, Mr. Speaker, far too often. Now, when he tries the same trick over again, he gets caught.

The majority of people around the Province, Mr. Speaker, even though, for the first couple of days, they were caught up in this cod war with France. When the facts started to come out, it will be clear then. The people will realize, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier was onto another kick where he was trying to get publicity for his party, not for the government and not to help the people of this Province. He is on his own personal kick. He is trying to get some credit and get something to add to his ego, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, on the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER:
We are on the amendment to the motion.

MR. BARRY:
Oh, I thought you had carried it.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those in favour of the motion as amended please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:
Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:
I declare the amendment defeated.

All those in favour of the main motion -

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I am not going to debate for a long time, I have spoken on the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
No, Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken on the main motion yet. I am entitled to speak on the main motion. We have debated and spoken on the amendment.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

I would not, Mr. Speaker, be holding up the vote if I had not spoken just for too short a time on this matter last Thursday, prior to my leaving to go to the Boston Sea Food Show, where incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I saw the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), a number of members of the Department of Development and the Department of Fisheries. The Province was quite noticeable in its presentation. It had probably the most outstanding, most noticeable booth at the conference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Wait. Wait. Wait. The irony, and I say this, Mr. Speaker, it was a good job done in putting together a booth and I think there were seven or eight exhibitors, companies around that booth. However, members opposite should not be so quick to applaud, nor members on this side for that matter, because the irony, Mr. Speaker, is that the more experience and the more knowledgeable Newfoundland fish companies have become aware of the completely unjustified but very real prejudice of the buyers in the United States against anything that smacks of government involvement. I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) smiling. He must be aware of this.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Oh, I thought it was at the remarks. That was the irony, Mr. Speaker, at a time when they make

a good presentation, have an excellent booth, an excellent exhibit, a high profile appearance by the minister, Mr. Speaker, is in all probability, regrettably, doing more harm than good as far as the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

I know it is unfortunate, it should not be the case, and I hope that in the free trade negotiations the Prime Minister is going to hang tough on our right here in this country to establish our own policies with respect to supporting the fishing industry so that we do not have to put up with that sort of guff from our friendly neighbours to the South.

But the reality, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a militant free enterprise mentality, as the former Minister of Fisheries can probably attest to, who I see has come over on this side. There is a militant free enterprise mentality that actually causes companies in the United States to refrain from buying from companies in Canada which they see as receiving government assistance.

I spoke with a number of Newfoundland companies who had previously had exhibits who have decided that they would not participate in the Newfoundland Government exhibit. By the way, an interesting point is that Fishery Products International, the Crown Corporation of which this Province is a major shareholder, it did not participate in the government pavilion. It had its own booth. It tried to stay as far away from any -

MR. TOBIN:

That is not true. That is not the reason. Now come on now, be fair.

MR. BARRY:

I have heard Mr. Young myself use that reason as one of the arguments in favour of privatization. I am sorry but Mr. Young has made a statement that one of the reasons for privatization is to move FPI away from this notion of a Crown Corporation with government involvement, with financing coming from the Government of Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that Fishery Products International did not have their booth as part of what was an excellent, highly visible - and I say this in all sincerity, good job done by the people putting together the exhibit. It is unfortunate that a little more thought had not been put into the consequences from this militant free enterprise mentality of having such a large scale government involvement, but it puts the devil in me I have to say. I state it as a matter of fact. I do not condone, I do not support this approach by buyers in the United States or by the US government. It puts the devil in me that they would take it upon themselves to tell us how we should run business in our country, but the reality is that it is there. FPI stayed as far away from, as a matter of fact, the Newfoundland pavilion was up in that end and the FPI was down in the other end, as far away, as far removed in the last part of the row as they could get.

MR. MORGAN:

That is the same way it was in Los Angeles.

MR. BARRY:

I suspect the former minister would agree that there is that militant free enterprise spirit in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to spend a lot of time on this but I will make a few remarks. It ties in with what we should be talking about, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the fishing industry. Instead of this useless resolution, made useless by the fact that it is too late and too little too late. It is watered down. I do not know if this has been mentioned before. It is watered down from the original wording that was put before the House, seriously watered down, with a preamble in there that is incorrect when it comes to knowledge of the Paris meeting. That is incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, the things that we should be talking about in terms of the fishing industry are matters such as, Do members opposite know? I suspect the former Minister of Fisheries does. I do not know if the present - well he is not here so it is not fair for me to say - but do members opposite know the threat and the extent of the threat to the Newfoundland fishing industry and to fish prices from substitution?

MR. MORGAN:

New Zealand products and South American products.

MR. BARRY:

South American, Argentine, for example - large scale substitution where buyers in these major large scale restaurants are saving themselves thirty-five to forty cents a pound when they buy their product and studies indicate the consumer cannot tell the

difference. Now are they going to buy the more expensive cod in that situation? It is cause for serious concern.

I also learned, by the way, Mr. Speaker, and this is something else we should be talking about instead of this resolution, in terms of doing something for the Newfoundland fishery that the Salfish Corporation is engaging in some questionable practices in terms of the way it does one deal with one company and a different deal with another company in terms of what they permit them to sell, make their own arrangements, get their own prices. Is the former Minister of Fisheries aware of that?

It is a very serious matter where we have different companies in this Province being treated in one fashion and others not treated as well, not as equitably because special agreements are entered into that the Salfish Corporation does to remove itself from the monopoly which it has by legislation. It does not, Mr. Speaker, enforce that monopoly for all companies. There are some serious challenges coming to the Salfish Corporation from certain Newfoundland companies.

MR. MORGAN:

It is long overdue.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, it is long overdue and I was informed about that during the discussions I had, Mr. Speaker.

Do you know the extent of the difference in price in terms of what the Salfish Corporation is buying salt fish for and what individuals tell me they can go out in the market and sell it for? You are not talking cents,

you are talking dollars in the difference. And is that money going back to the Newfoundland fishermen? You bet your life it is not. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of issue that this House should be debating and should be dealing with. How should we approach that as an issue instead of this useless motion we now have before the House?

We will vote for it, Mr. Speaker, just to get it off the Order Paper and get on with the real business. We will be watching then to see what happens after it goes out of this House.

MR. TULK:

What about the NATO resolution?

MR. BARRY:

Like we saw the follow-up on the NATO resolution, we will be watching to see if there is the same follow-up on this one. We will be asking for the results. Are the results going to be the same as those fabled results of the China trade expedition?

MR. PEACH:

Lush would never make a comment like that.

MR. BARRY:

The hundreds of jobs that were going to be brought back from China.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible.)

MR. BARRY:

Well, we have managed to have a few over here to, as the minister knows, but they were Hong Kong and I suspect the minister's are Hong Kong as well. The investors that in some cases are coming in are investors that could not meet with the Premier. I cannot remember if

the minister was on that expedition or not, but they are companies and we have been dealing with companies here, Mr. Speaker, who tried to meet with the minister and the Premier in China and they were to busy on their social engagements on the cocktail circuit.

MR. TOBIN:

That is not fair now.

MR. BARRY:

But, it is true. Whether it is fair or not it is true.

MR. TOBIN:

You know it is not true.

MR. BARRY:

I know it is true. I know that we had companies here, Mr. Speaker, that came, after not being able to get a meeting in China, came here and could not get a meeting with government here until after they had gone out and started up a plant. They were not able to get the attention of government here. You talk about a government who is interested in developing the fishery or in developing jobs. They had to come to the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. I will not get to specific in terms of which member because I do not want to identify and embarrass the businessmen who have since, since they showed they were able to go out and start a company without any help from government, start up an operation, have now, finally, been able to get to first base and get doors open as far as government is concerned.

MR. TOBIN:

Have you ever been over in China?

MR. BARRY:

No, but I am looking forward to it before to long. I have had some

invitations and I might even bring a few members from the other side of the House with me just to show the different species that exist in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PEACH:

You will have lots of time to travel.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in addition to these issues that I mentioned with respect to substitution, with respect to the Saltfish Corporation, there is a very serious concern as to where prices are going.

Prices in the industry should continue to be good this year but there is a serious concern, Mr. Speaker, and there were some interesting seminars, speakers and information provided on future pricing in the fishing industry at this show.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to the resolution itself I have to really wonder why we have the Premier getting up in this House attempting to wrap himself in the flag again. The irony being that while he is doing that he is saying that it is he who puts the Province before the party.

When, Mr. Speaker, anybody dares to criticize on this side of the House, or, I would suspect, on the other side as well, he or she is labelled as a traitor to the Province if he or she does not agree with the Premier.

MR. BAIRD:

How many over there do not agree with you?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel. It is when the Premier is at his most desperate and when members opposite are at their most desperate that they stand up and condemn members on this side of the House for being traitors because they dare to question. Why was it that the Premier was not speaking with the Newfoundland representative in the federal Cabinet? Why was it he had not spoken with him for months prior to the Paris meeting which entered into that Canada - France fisheries agreement? Why was it, Mr. Speaker, that he did not speak with the Newfoundland Cabinet Minister for several weeks after the Canada - France agreement and the Paris meeting? Are we traitors for wondering whether this serious riff in federal - provincial communication might have had something to do with the fact that the Department of External Affairs, or, I suspect, more likely, the Prime Minister's office was able to slip this agreement into place before John Crosbie knew about it? If the Premier of this Province had been communicating with John Crosbie, as he should have been, that would not have happened, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, how is it, if the Premier of this Province is so interested in putting the Province before his party, he would engage in this theatrical demonstration instead of calling the House into session immediately, seeking the all-party resolution which we offered, bringing up, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
Good job, Mr. Speaker. How is it that the House of Assembly was not called into session immediately to seek an all-party resolution, to appoint an all-party delegation, and to go up and fight the battle where it should be fought, in Ottawa?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
We have another straw man being set up and knocked down here in Newfoundland for the benefit of the media here in this Province. Theatrics, Mr. Speaker, because, I regret to say, the Premier of this Province put the party, put his standing in the polls and his party's standing in the polls, ahead of how to get results for the Newfoundland fishing industry. Now, those are the facts.

MR. PEACH:
You did not even show in the polls.

MR. BARRY:
Oh, I will be glad to have a chat with the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) on the polls. He, Mr. Speaker, is one of the ones who is the most shaky, as he well knows, along with another sixteen or seventeen, I believe it was, at the last count, of members opposite.

MR. PEACH:
You guys are dreaming.

MR. BARRY:
Yes, I know. We all see Shannie taking your place in Cabinet. Of course, the member for Carbonear is not really complaining about

that, because obviously that would just delay it a bit longer if Shannie had made it. It is another couple of years, Mr. Speaker, and he may move up from the backbenches.

Mr. Speaker, the facts, I think, in this situation speak for themselves, as to who was playing politics with the issue, and who was trying to get results. The reality that we saw was that this party, not only supported the government, worked for and fought for the Province, we even received a letter of thanks from the Premier for doing that, Mr. Speaker. But then that was before we started to question whether the way in which he was acting was designed to get results or designed purely for political purposes. The regret is that, despite what the Premier may say, if he walks like a duck and quacks like a duck and moves like a duck -

MR. BAIRD:

He has a lot of people behind him.

MR. YOUNG:

There are no lame ducks over here.

MR. BARRY:

- he is not fighting for the fishing industry, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the bottom line. We have spent several weeks in this House now and this urgent resolution took second place to the Throne Speech. Where is the urgency? Why is it that the Premier of this Province would come forth with a

resolution, which is so watered down, we can support, is so motherhoodish, but why would he come into this House with a resolution and put it down as a government, not a private member's resolution, as a government resolution and then leave it hanging high and dry on the Order Paper for days while we get into the general Throne Speech debate? That, Mr. Speaker, is not a sign of urgency in terms of dealing with a matter critical to the Newfoundland fishing industry. That is, Mr. Speaker, politics at its rawest, lowest and basest because it is putting the political position of members opposite ahead of how to get results in terms of protecting the fish stocks of this country.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the reason they did not want it debated was because they knew we would have to raise the question, why did they trade away Northern cod? It was explained in terms of 'Oh, but that was surplus.' What has that to do with the principle of do you give bribes to highjackers, to pirates, to people who say we are going to go in and break their laws? Is that the way you enforce the fisheries laws of Canada, by giving countries that break your laws more fish? Saying, here please, here take all of this fish up off Labrador, as though that were worth nothing. As though that were not important to the people, not just of Labrador, but who go up to Smokey and other places along the Coast of Labrador in the Summertime.

And we know all about, Mr. Speaker, there is a different stock than 2J + 3KL. And we say, so what? Is the fish less important because it is off Labrador? Many of our

forefathers, many of us here in this House, Mr. Speaker, had bread on the table, and money in our pockets because of the fishery off Labrador. It disturbs me greatly when I see this discriminatory approach to protecting the fishery, when I see members opposite being prepared to trade off Labrador cod, because it is only cod off Labrador, Mr. Speaker. Now, that is regrettable.

No, they do it in another fashion. The minister says, nothing said that. No, what they do, Mr. Speaker, is they agree to it being labelled surplus. It is Northern cod. There is no question it is Northern cod on the Premier's own definition. Maybe he got caught out by putting out one too many glossy brochures at the taxpayers expense. But there is no question that it was labelled Northern cod in his glossy brochure. There is no question that it was Northern cod which he swore he would protect.

So where is this great protector of Northern cod? How is it that he could espouse this principle of protecting Northern cod when he and his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) had, as early as December, over a month before the Paris agreement was signed, traded off the Northern cod off Labrador. Now, that is regrettable and that is something, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite will have to explain.

Make no wonder that the Premiers across Canada issued a wishy-washy communique which, as we see, got absolutely no results. The agreement is still there. Nothing is changed. The French are still out there taking the cod off Labrador, taking the cod in 3Ps,

when incidentally, Mr. Speaker, our own fishermen are being blocked. There will be more said about that later. They are being blocked from fishing in 3Ps. We have the French with free access to plunder and pilage that resource.

Where are the results of the actions taken by the Premier? Regrettably results are not something that members opposite are known for, Mr. Speaker.

They are known for ranting and roaring, but not results. That is the trademark, that is the hallmark, Mr. Speaker, of the performance of members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the day is coming when members will have to explain how they can stand up in this House and delay a resolution which they say is supposedly urgent. How can they delay that for at least an extra week? It could probably have been done, Mr. Speaker, if they had said it was urgent, in the first day or two days of the House being open.

Mr. Speaker, such urgency was not the intention of government. They were not seeking results. They were trying to flog this issue because they thought they might lift their political stature and lift their political standing. Regretably, it did not take long before the Premier realized that it was not selling, Mr. Speaker. It did not take long before members opposite started to get the message from their party workers that they did not accept this fed bashing, they did not accept this turning upon their own members in Ottawa.

I am sorry the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is not here because

he put back a pretty witty response to Mr. Crosbie when Mr. Crosbie referred to the Province as being 'greedy, inconsiderate, and ungrateful.' He gave definitions. But I noticed one definition he did not supply was the definition of scapegoat. I think that that is one clear message that has come through, Mr. Speaker. John Crosbie said that the Premier and his Cabinet were attempting to make the Government of Canada the scapegoat for their lack of performance in the fishing industry and in the economy of the Province generally. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that statement was correct. I looked forward to the statement of the Minister of Finance defining scapegoat, and explaining why they have not been trying to make the Government of Canada the scapegoat for their inaction.

Mr. Speaker, we have agreed that the resolution shall pass this morning. There are many more things that I could say with respect to this, but that is the essence of it. A breakdown in communications between the Premier and our Cabinet representative led, Mr. Speaker, to this agreement going through. An earlier trading off of Northern cod led the Government of Canada to expect that they would be able to ram it down the Premier's throat after the fact, as they did with the factory freezer trawler agreement when they tore up an earlier agreement with this Province by so doing. And, Mr. Speaker, for purely partisan political purposes the Premier of this Province put the urgency of this resolution to the back burner. It was not urgent. He wanted to play with it, toy with it, to the detriment of the fishing industry of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Before putting this resolution to a vote I would like to give a rather belated welcome to a delegation from the Town of Mount Pearl: Councillor, Derm Connolly; Councillor, Fred Bannister; Town manager, Brian McArthur; and work superintendent, Jim Oxford.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

On motion, resolution adopted.

MR. TULK:
Division.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

All those in favour of the resolution please stand:

The hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge); the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the President of the Council and Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms); the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews); the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn); the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt); the hon. the Minister of

Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle); the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard); Mr. Baird; Mr. Greening; Mr. Patterson; Mr. Reid; Mr. Tobin; Mr. Peach; Mr. Parsons; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Morgan; Mr. Woodford; the hon. the Leader of the Opposition; Mr. Flight; Mr. Tulk; Mr. Kelland; the hon. Mr. Simmons; Mr. Lush; Mr. W. Carter; Mr. Gilbert; Mr. K. Aylward; Mr. Efford; Mr. Furey; and Mr. Decker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I declare this resolution carried unanimously.

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