

PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 42

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

14 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

o o o

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Could I just indicate to the
Minister of Career Development and
Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) that
it was my error yesterday? His
office had delivered a statement
to my office. I was not aware of
that when I spoke.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order the hon. the
member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, members will recall
that yesterday I adjourned the
debate on my own resolution at two
minutes before six to call for a
voice vote. As I took my place, I
heard that there was going to be a
standing vote. As is my duty as
party whip on this side, I
scurried to the Opposition Common
Room to see if any of my
colleagues were there. As I
returned to the House, the bar of
the House was down and the
Sergeant-at-Arms -

MR. PATTERSON:
You are a poor whip. You have not
got a whip over there.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:
I went to the Common Room for
about thirty seconds to see if any
of my colleagues were there to
come in for the standing vote and
when I came back to the House
members opposite were screaming
that I was not allowed in and the
Sergeant-at-Arms, as he is
supposed to do, of course,
motioned that I should leave the
House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my point of order
is this: When there is a standing
vote called there is a procedure,
and all hon. gentlemen know that
this procedure is to give party
whips time to round up members.
In most other jurisdictions there
is provision for this. Hon.
members saw me leave, and if they
know the rules of the House they
knew why I was leaving. Mr.
Speaker, the press reported, as
well, that I was not in the
House. I was in the House. I had
just adjourned the debate and I
came back for the vote. I want to
make that clear. But much more
important, Mr. Speaker, I believe
that when a vote is taken in the
future we must observe the rules
to give the party whips, or some
other designated persons, the
opportunity to go and round up
their colleagues. I was denied
that right yesterday and denied
the right to vote on my own
resolution, though I was here.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, to the point of
order, clearly it is not a point

of order, the hon. member has taken the opportunity to explain a circumstance in which he found himself inadvertently absent from a properly conducted vote. Because what happened, and what happens on many occasions, is that both sides agree to lay the bar across the House rather than wait the entire ten minutes that is required by the Standing Orders. That certainly was the situation yesterday. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition, himself, agreed to call for the bar. He may deny it now, but he certainly did. There is no question about it. In fact, if he had not, I am sure Your Honour would not have permitted the bar to go across. That is the circumstance. That is what happened. It is not a big deal. The hon. member has now taken the opportunity to explain the situation. But that is what occurred.

Mr. Speaker, on another point I might just point out that whether the hon. member was in the House or not, it is not even certain that he would have been recorded properly as voting, because one of the other of his colleagues, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), sat in the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island's (Mr. Barry) place and stood in the recorded vote and was not counted, obviously because he was not in his own place. So the same thing might have occurred. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of order, the member has taken the opportunity to explain the situation and that is fair ball.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have heard enough on this point and I am prepared to rule at this

stage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Surprise! Surprise!

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order. I would like to point out to the hon. member that it was asked if we would take the vote at the particular time and it was agreed to by that side.

MR. SIMMONS:
It was not. No, Sir!

AN HON. MEMBER:
It was. It was.

MR. SIMMONS:
No, Sir.

MR. TOBIN:
Yes. You agreed, boy.

MR. SIMMONS:
No, Sir. No, Sir!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
No, Sir! Now, tell the truth.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member will withdraw that now.

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, Sir!

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I have just been very badly misrepresented in this House by the Speaker of this Chamber. I have witnesses. I have the gentleman from Bellevue (Mr.

Callan) who will affirm that I gave no such agreement. I have the gentleman from Bellevue who will affirm that you would not let me make a point of order because a vote was proceeding, a vote that you rushed into without observing Standing Order 82 of this particular Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) will have no protection unless you give it to him - unless you give it to him.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Name him! Name him!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have already made a ruling on this matter. If the hon. member keeps on in this vein, I am afraid I will have to ask that he be expelled from the Chamber.

MR. SIMMONS:
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this Chamber, I submit, a vote was improperly taken. I tried, during the course of that vote to say that, and I was not permitted to make the point because Mr. Speaker said that we could not have a point of order during the course of a vote. I rose immediately after, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House forthwith, without hearing my point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the vote was

improperly taken. Be that as it may, the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) did vote in the Chamber, and then, because of a game that was played at least by people on that side, and I suspect some other people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:
- he was not allowed to have his vote recorded as provided for in Standing Order 82 (b) which says: 'A division bell shall ring for a period of not more than ten minutes.' There was no agreement to suspend that rule, Mr. Speaker. No agreement to suspend that rule. The vote was improperly taken. My friend, in the process, has been maligned and I think that is most unfair.

The vote was improperly taken. Now you decide whether it is a point of privilege or not, but it is an awful comment on the way this Chamber is being run.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, to the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of privilege, the hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
We will only be able to conduct business in this House if we all accept the authority and the ruling and the integrity of the Chair. Now, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the comments by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) has called that whole Institution into question and it just cannot stand. Because the House cannot operate if that sort of thing is not withdrawn totally and completely. I would suggest,

also, that a sincere apology should be offered to Your Honour because of the way those remarks were expressed.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that - this is a lesser point, nevertheless an important point - if the Leader of the Opposition felt that he had a point of privilege because a vote was improperly taken in this House, it was his duty to bring it to the notice of the House at the earliest possible moment, which clearly did not happen, Mr. Speaker, because a point of order, a much lesser event, a lesser breach of procedure in this House was allowed to be brought on the floor before the Leader of the Opposition rose to his feet on his alleged point of privilege. It is quite out of order on that smaller point, but in addition to that and of greater importance, the integrity and the respect for the Chair has been called into question and it must not be allowed to stand, it must be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, there is no prima facie case.

Statements by Ministers

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I have two statements that I would like to read. Both of these statements were ready for yesterday and, as a matter of fact, I gave copies of both

statements to both parties opposite. They are a little bit out of date, nevertheless I would like to read them.

The first one, Mr. Speaker, is to advise the hon. House of Assembly that yesterday I made an announcement of major importance concerning a beautification and community enhancement programme for the Eastern region, administered by the Department of Social Services in Harbour Grace.

The programme will cover eleven district offices of the department in the Eastern region. The offices are located in Harbour Grace, Heart's Content, Bay Roberts, St. Mary's, Whitbourne, Placentia, Arnold's Cove, Marystown, Grand Bank, Clarenville and Bonavista.

Mr. Speaker, this beautification project in the Eastern region will see the department spending over \$1 million during the fiscal year 1987/88, creating a total of 338 jobs.

The beautification and community enhancement programme will provide the opportunity of improving various communities physically as well as upgrading the work skills of those hired for the various projects.

The benefits of the programme should be to bring about a change of attitude towards ourselves, the land we live in, our communities, and our Province.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, the benefits of the programme are three-fold.

Firstly, it will reduce the social assistance caseload through self-satisfying, socially and

economically acceptable work; secondly, the beautification programme would preserve and enhance our Province for our children's natural heritage; and thirdly, the enhancement of the infrastructure for a future tourism industry, by providing clean, beautiful towns and a healthy living environment.

Some of the projects undertaken this year in the Eastern Region will focus special attention on road junctions, approaches to communities, attractive community welcome signs, mini parks or lay-bys, and removal of unsightly objects such as car wrecks and other discarded debris.

Mr. Speaker, the beautification and community enhancement programme will expand public funds on public property, to create employment for those in need of work through the department, to accomplish visible projects along the roads and through communities as a means of thanking citizens and communities who have maintained their properties well, and to remind all citizens that it is never too late to start doing so!

In addition, Mr. Speaker, a team of eleven enforcement agents, outside the Social Services caseload, will be employed to work with councils, development associations and the Department of Environment to enforce the Municipalities Act and the Salvage Dealers Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Beautification and Enhancement Programme will start next week, May 20, in nine of the eleven district offices while the remaining offices will start their projects as the labour force indicates.

Attached to the statement, Mr. Speaker, are the amounts that will be spent through each of the district offices and the number of jobs created. I will not read that, hon. members will be able to see it themselves.

The second statement, Mr. Speaker, is to inform the House of the Province's participation in the national long term strategy on impaired driving which was announced yesterday by the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare, the hon. Jake Epp.

Representatives of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, the nine other provinces, the territories and the Federal Department of Health and Welfare have been working to develop programmes aimed at changing the public's attitude towards impaired driving. We want to make it socially unacceptable for any person to drive any vehicle - whether it be a car, truck, boat, snowmobile or all-terrain vehicle - after they have been drinking alcohol or using other drugs.

We have tried to take a positive approach to the problem by encouraging people to take responsibility for their own actions and for the actions of others.

The national strategy announced yesterday will attempt to change attitudes and behaviour over the next twenty years. It consists of a number of initiatives. The first, which started yesterday, is a national media campaign aimed at our young people. Other parts of the strategy will stimulate community initiatives and provide training and resources to local groups to develop their own

impaired driving programmes. Additional federal/provincial committees will be working to develop driver education programmes.

The consultation which is occurring between the Provinces and the Federal Department of Health and Welfare also provides a unique forum in which ideas and resources are shared.

The commitment of time and resources by this Province, the other provinces and territories and the federal government, will help to ensure that this national strategy will be effective in making impaired driving socially unacceptable throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am also very pleased and proud to share with hon. members the significant initiatives which we have developed in this Province during the past six months. We are well on the way to developing an effective provincial approach to the problem of impaired driving.

Impaired driving not only has a tragic impact on those who are killed and injured, but it is a senseless crime which can have a devastating impact on the lives of people convicted and their families. We must stop this waste and we are developing programmes which will ensure that it will be stopped.

I am pleased to inform you that this is an area in which representatives from the provincial Departments of Social Service, Health, Transportation, Education, Justice, the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission, the two police forces, and the Newfoundland Teachers Association have been working productively to

develop programmes.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Challenge Committee, composed of representatives of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the ADDC and the Departments of Transportation and Justice have developed a number of initiatives which will challenge Newfoundlanders to stop driving while impaired.

The ADDC and the Challenge Committee are currently sponsoring a contest in the schools to develop a provincial logo and slogan for use by all impaired driving programmes in the Province.

They produced a Student Activity Manual to encourage students to develop impaired driving awareness programmes in their schools and communities.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, they recently submitted two proposals to the federal Departments of Justice and Health and Welfare respectively. They propose to develop a provincial media campaign and resource material which will help community groups to develop local programmes. Moreover, they are requesting funds for a provincial co-ordinator who will be responsible for fostering and assisting those community groups.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the staff of the ADDC, the Crime Prevention and School Safety Officers of the RNC and the RCMP who have been working actively in our schools and communities promoting the Newfoundland challenge.

In a related area, the ADDC and the Newfoundland Teachers

Association developed a SAFEGRAD programme which they are actively promoting in our high schools. This programme is supported by school boards, principals, and the Department of Education. This programme was stimulated by our concerns over the risk associated with high school graduation festivities when alcohol and other drugs are used. The promotion includes an instructional manual, poster and radio advertisements. We hope that the concept of alcohol and drug free graduation parties will be embraced by communities around the Province and become commonplace.

Our young people are our future and we must make it socially acceptable for them not to drive while impaired. We must encourage them to take responsibility for their actions and for the actions of their friends and parents. Our young people are already setting an example for their parents.

I was very proud to learn that students of Stephenville Integrated High School and the Grand Falls Academy Regional High School had won prizes in a national contest on impaired driving sponsored by the Reader's Digest. Their initiative is a challenge to us all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, impaired driving is a crime. It is also a social, health and cultural problem. As you can see, we are working actively to prevent it occurring.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank the minister for giving me copies of both his Ministerial Statements yesterday and giving me some time to read them over. I will deal with the second statement first, Mr. Speaker, in responding to what the minister just said. There are a couple of points I want to make but, first, we on this side of the House, like all people in the Province, agree with what the minister is doing in his promotion and his advertising campaign against drinking and driving and educating our young people on the social impact alcohol could have on their lives. A person driving a car, or any vehicle, while under the influence of alcohol is just as dangerous as and just as deadly as a person pointing a shotgun at someone and killing them. I do not think that is a lesser crime than driving while under the influence of alcohol.

But I find it very strange, Mr. Speaker, that a government which takes in multimillions of dollars from the sale of beer and alcohol - the same thing applies to cigarette smoking - puts such a small amount of money into a campaign against these social hazards.

This is one area, Mr. Speaker, where I think the ministers of all departments involved - the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) - are going to have to take a hard look at putting more money in a

campaign, because drugs and alcohol are having a very serious effect on our social life. We have to educate our students, our young people in our high schools as to what is facing them, and the devastating effect drugs and alcohol can have on their lives and on the lives of families who are affected by alcohol and drug problems, and about the loss of life in accidents caused by drivers who are under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

One area I have not heard addressed by the Department of Justice, and it should be looked into, is the sale of alcohol in the clubs. It is supposed to be against the law for a bartender or a club owner to sell beer or alcohol to a person who is drunk, yet it is not hard, when you walk into a club, to see somebody stagger to the bar and be sold liquor by the bartender or club owner, and then being allowed to walk out of the club to drive their vehicle home.

I think the Department of Justice and the campaign has to lean more toward prevention. I know there is a law against club owners selling alcohol to people who are obviously under the influence, but it is never enforced by any department or by any law enforcement officer. I think the minister and all other departments involved in this particular campaign should take under careful consideration not only preventing people from drinking and driving, but actually preventing them from getting drunk.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the first statement, this is what I find most amusing. In the budget that came down recently, the minister announced \$29 million for

community development programmes. He stands up in the House of Assembly today and reads a press release given yesterday out in Harbour Grace. And this is another example of where they show no respect for the House, they go to Harbour Grace and in a press conference make this announcement before they announce it in the people's House. They then, Mr. Speaker, announce the programme as if it were something totally separate from the monies that were already announced in the community development programme. But it is not, it is a part of that money.

The minister said in the announcement yesterday that he is ashamed to be recognized as a Newfoundlander because of the mess on the sides of the roads. Every year this is an ongoing thing with the various departments concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. EFFORD:
I had two statements, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would thank the minister for copies of both his statements yesterday, and I, also, will respond to them in the reverse order of which they were presented. We welcome the

statement on the long-term strategy to deal with impaired driving, although we would have some problems with it inasmuch as the statement did not put any dollar value on the activities and the programmes that the minister says they will be bringing in. It sounds like they are encouraging the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission, the Newfoundland Teachers Association and other agencies to do their own work, but it would be a sign of the minister's, and his department's, commitment if there was some money being put in to give these agencies actual financial support to extend these programmes.

We would also have a concern that it is necessary to address this problem at the source. The emphasis on reaching young people is very important, but we would have a concern that there is nothing in the statement about alcohol advertising. Right now, this season, with the NHL playoffs on, incredible numbers of young people and people of all ages, are being bombarded by lifestyle advertising, where you are not able to enjoy anything in this life unless you are drinking beer. There is a concern over whether or not the national programme might include an advertising programme to confront this. But more than that, we would make a suggestion that the minister look into dealing with private establishments, private clubs, and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. - making

it mandatory for club owners, in order to have their licences renewed, install breathalyzers in every private establishment, every club in the Province. And, further, that the minister consider, in making contact with the club owners, which is the source of the problem, the bars themselves, that there be a programme introduced in which drivers who are not drinking be allowed to be given free soft drinks. In other jurisdictions in the country this programme has been introduced with great success. It is an affirmative action programme to encourage people, when they go out in groups, to make sure that one person in the group is not drinking. A way to do that is to encourage private owners of clubs to allow people to drink soft drinks for free so that that will guarantee that any number of people in the establishment throughout the evening will be able to drive home without having had a drink. And there is more the minister could do to deal directly with the clubs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:

Could I have leave to respond to the second statement, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

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, as I understand it, the member has half the time of the official Opposition who have half the time -

MR. SIMMONS:

That is not true.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, I do not know what is wrong with him today. He is a little foisty or something.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Does he not have enough manners to let other people speak?

Mr. Speaker, the practice is the minister prepares a statement, and presents it. The Opposition gets half the time that the minister took, and the member of the NDP Party gets half -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

- the time the official Opposition took. It is clear the member's time is up, because he has used half as much time as the member of the Opposition used. Now, whether he thinks he got half the time, is another question. We are dealing with a point of order related to his request for leave and there is no leave granted on this side, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

And you get twice as much.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries eighteen Grade XI students from Stella Maris Central High in Trepassey with their teacher, Mr. Ted Winsor, from the district of St. Mary's-The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. FUREY:

Where is the Premier?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Premier. The Premier is coming back into the Chamber, and I have a question for him. His Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) has fumbled the ball for two and half years on ambulance service improvements. Now, judging by his statements in the press of the last few days, he insists on taking the ball and going home altogether.

Mr. Speaker, why in the name of ordinary, common decency does the Premier stand idly by and let that minister, the Minister of Health, jeopardize the safety, the health and the lives of so many people? Why?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that question really should be dignified with an answer. The Minister of Health is discharging his responsibilities as the Minister of Health. It is wrong for the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else to say that we are somehow ignoring the health concerns of the Province when in 1979, \$275 million was allocated to Health and this year \$624 million, over a 100 per cent increase. And in road ambulance services it is gone from \$1 million to \$2.9 million, just about a 200 per cent increase.

So what the road ambulance service has gotten is a higher percentage than did the whole Health budget.

MR. FLIGHT:

In eight years.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In eight years that is a big increase. And it is wrong to say that the Minister of Health is not trying to fight for what is justifiably due that department. This year there is a \$39 million increase in one year in the Department of Health - \$39 million in one year - and it went from \$275 million to \$624 million in eight years, with a 200 per cent increase in road ambulance services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we would like to do more. We would like to spend more money, but we have, of course, a responsibility to provide more money not only to road ambulance but to other forms of ambulance services, which gets the budget up to \$4 million just for ambulance services in total,

when you look at air ambulance. We have a responsibility to the hospitals, to the senior citizens, to the disabled, for abused children, for day care centres and the like, and we are trying to spread our resources as evenly as possible so that everybody is benefitting from some of the increase that has been going on every year in the Department of Health.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this is, unfortunately, not the time to rebut some of the incorrect statements the Premier has made. The business about the 200 per cent increase of course includes two or three components, including patient fees, and he knows who pays these, it is not the government, so he is misleading.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since 2:45 p.m. today we have had an incident at the Health Sciences Center where a driver arrived with a patient who happened to be a paraplegic and, because of orders to the staff of that institution and their wanting to protect themselves in terms of liability, they could not handle the patient, and the driver goes scurrying around the parking lot trying to find someone to help him unload that patient. Mr. Speaker, my question is while the innocent pawns of the government's monumental neglect on this issue are literally dying in the backs of ambulances - literally dying in the backs of ambulances - because of the lack of trained attendants, will the Premier, Mr. Speaker, now agree to what the minister now has stubbornly refused to, and will he agree to meet this afternoon or

tomorrow with the ambulance operators? They are here in the city, some of them have come all the way from Port aux Basques. Is he determined to precipitate a confrontation on this matter or will he become the conciliator that he likes sometimes to be? Mr. Speaker, if he could avoid that planned withdrawal of services tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I ask him would that alone, even though he feels he has done a great job in terms of funding, but just to avoid that withdrawal tomorrow would he not agree that that is sufficient reason to agree to a meeting between himself and the Ambulance Operators Association?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, we cannot run a government when we are being threatened. We cannot go running health services or Social Services or Education or anything else when we are under threat. There was another threat this morning from another group somewhere in the Province, which called into my office and would not meet with a particular minister and made another threat. Almost every day we are getting somebody who is going to threaten me or threaten the government if we do not do A, B and C, and you cannot run a civilized democratic society that way and I do not intend to run one that way, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon.

the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, that is an insult to those men and women who drive those ambulances, since it characterized what they are doing as a threat. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier does he want to rephrase that insulting characterization of people who have been brought to the brink of desperation by a minister who for two years has sat on a report? Mr. Speaker, I tell him that what he has heard is not a threat, I give him no threat. Will he, Mr. Speaker, if I give him the unqualified assurance that -

MR. TOBIN:
Your word is worth a lot.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
It was sufficient, and the Premier took it in a letter of contract when I hired him, and he stayed for six years, very happy years. He should have had eighteen like it.

MR. WARREN:
Yes, like Trudeau.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I know the guys over there do not care about health services, but will they shut up so I can get my question off to their leader?

MR. FUREY:
A bit of protection, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, how about a bit of protection.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, if I gave the Premier the assurance that there would be no withdrawal of service tomorrow if he would agree to a meeting today or tomorrow, or if his schedule is that busy in the next three or four days, with the Ambulance Operators Association? Would he agree if he had that assurance?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to negotiate with the Leader of the Opposition over health services in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
You are off the hook temporarily, Brian.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that the Premier would not get as many threats, and he possibly would not need his bodyguard if he was running his government right, and people were not driven into decisions that they were driven into. But I would like to ask the Premier to explain to the people of this Province, to the Ambulance Association and to the general

public, how it is, as the Minister of Health said in his statement, that he can only give the Ambulance Association a 4 per cent increase. But at the same time can spend \$300,000 in propoganda ads against the civil servant; \$15 million in renovations on the building; over \$800,000 in the last two years to his friend out in Alberta, Mr. Peter Lougheed, and now \$13.5 million for the Sprung Group?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
My question to the Premier started with, Mr. Speaker, would he explain how he can justify that to the Ambulance Association?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member should please keep quiet when I am up and speaking.

The hon. member asked a question and then he proceeded to make a speech. This is question time, so the hon. member should just confine himself to questions.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, is well accepted in this House that when Your Honour rises to his feet that all members are silent and listen Your Honour's statement. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you rose to your feet a little while ago to inform

the House on a matter that you considered important, at least to members over there kept interrupting you, pointing fingers at you. I think that that is totally out of order. I would encourage members to give the Chair the respect that is required for us to conduct public business.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the point is well taken.

MR. SIMMONS:

I could not agree more, Mr. Speaker. The point is well taken.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will put the question very simply: Will the Premier explain how it is that he cannot give any more than 4 per cent to the Ambulance Association when at the same time he spent \$300,000 in propaganda ads last year, \$15 million in renovations to the Confederation Building, and over \$800,000 went to his friend in Alberta, Mr. Peter Lougheed?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we increased the Health budget from last year to this year by \$39 million.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

What we need to know about, Mr. Speaker, is this: The people of this Province need a better ambulance service. The Premier has told them very clearly that government does not have the money. Will the Premier explain to those people, in his own words, why it is they have money to put \$2 million worth of computers into the Department of Social Services in the last two years and they cannot provide a decent ambulance service for this Province?

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

This is another trick.

MR. SIMMS:

This is not a trick, Mr. Speaker, this is trying to follow the practice and rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, may I quote for your edification from Beauchesne. Page 129, paragraph 357, says, "In putting a question...the question...must not multiply, even with slight variations, a similar question on the same point." That is section (c). Section (d) says it "must not repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." There are all kinds of other sections, Mr. Speaker, that I could refer you to.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the hon. members opposite cannot have much else to go on, because they are asking the very same question over and over, multiplying it with variations.

MR. FLIGHT:

The question is hurting the Premier and they will not answer it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if they are not getting answers, there is another method. If they are not satisfied with the answers, they can put it on the Late Show on Thursdays. There are all kinds of avenues, Mr. Speaker. But I suggest that the questions are totally out of order because they are just the same questions over and over, and they are certainly contrary to direct references in Beauchesne.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it is very difficult at times just to see the dividing line between one question and another. I would ask the hon. member to pose his question.

MR. EFFORD:

I asked my question. I am waiting for the Premier to answer the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, over the last eight years we have increased the budget in the Department of Health by \$349 million. That is a lot more than all the figures that the hon. member added up. In one year, this past year, we have increased it by \$39 million. That is the answer.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier a question. His own government commissioned a report two and a half years ago, and the recommendations are very clear, Mr. Speaker. They recommended more financing for ambulance services, a long-term plan, a drafting of legislation ensuring minimum standards are set and maintained, and a provision calling for a second trained attendant on all ambulances.

Now, those recommendations, Mr. Speaker, came from a committee commissioned by his government which made recommendations that they have had them for two and a half years. When will the Premier do what is morally right and act on these independent recommendations for the sake of all people's health in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think there are two parts to the hon. member's question. One has to do with the whole question of legislation. The Minister of Health has indicated that, in consultation with not only the private ambulance drivers but the community based ambulances, and the people from the hospitals, they will be moving ahead on that legislation as soon as possible. As it relates to funding, the road ambulance service has had its budget increased by over 200 per cent in the last eight years.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

The Premier has talked about putting a contingency plan in place, which we assume will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. I wonder if the Premier would tell us why he could not put that allocated money, as discussed by the Minister of Health, and apply that particular contingency money against and apply it to the recommendations from his own committee, from his own department and from his own government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

MR. PECKFORD:

I do not know how much the contingency plan is going to cost and therefore the whole premise of the hon. member's question could be false. The conclusion comes from a premise which could be quite false.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Premier if he would do what is right and convene a meeting as soon as possible with these ambulance operators while they are in the city and forget the nonsense about negotiating in public or negotiating with the Opposition. Just do what is fundamentally and morally right and convene a meeting as soon as possible to try to put this thing to rest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We do not govern under threats and we do not intend to.

MR. FLIGHT:

You do not govern, period.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier would he confirm that part of this problem arises because of lack of funding directed to Health, and indeed the same problem applies in Education, that there are transfers from the Government of Canada for both Health and Education but a portion of those funds are allocated to other areas? They are not tied. The minister and the Premier have never agreed to tie them. Maybe the Premier can answer this question: Does the Premier accept that he should tie funding that is received from the Government of Canada to the purposes for which it is given?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The point is, theoretically the hon. member might have a point, but in practical terms he does not because we spend more on Health and Education than we get in EPF payments on Health and Education. Equalization is where we get our biggest amount of money. We get \$300 million or \$400 million in EPF and we spent on Health alone \$624 million this year. So therefore it is just a theoretical consideration and not a practical one, because the EPF payments are

not as much as the Health budget itself let alone Career Development and Advanced Studies and the Department of Education, which together would come to about \$1 billion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Just to follow up on that, as I say it applies both to the problem of ambulance drivers, who are receiving the answer from government that there is not enough money to go around and meet their problems, and it applies to the students, who are meeting with I think most ministers, and I do not know if with all government MHAs but with all Opposition MHAs to express their concerns about lack of funding for Education. I ask the Premier if in fact even if there is more money spent on Education or on Health than is received from the Government of Canada, is there not in fact as much money spent for the programmes under which the funding is applied by the Government of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now the hon. member is getting, I think, to the point.

One of the problems nationwide, and what some of the students are saying in their representations to the provincial governments and to the federal government, is that over the last number of years both the former Liberal administration in Ottawa and the present Progressive Conservative administration in Ottawa have been reducing the amount of funds under the EPF programmes, and that has

put the burden on the provinces and made it more difficult. But even under that reduction that is coming in the rate of increase that we thought we could anticipate from the federal government, even with that reduction we are still increasing the budgets of the Department of Education, the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, and the Department of Health. This year we are increasing the Department of Health's budget by \$39 million, even though we are getting less from the federal government than we did years ago, but it does put an added burden on us. We perhaps could still find that \$39 million, but if we did not have the reduction from the federal government then we would have perhaps a \$45 million or \$50 million increase rather than a \$39 million increase this year. So the inherent information contained in the hon. member's question is valid. I have argued this point, and I know the hon. member for Mount Scio-Bell Island agrees with me, not only as it relates to Education and Health per se, and I have been saying this in the House for the last week or so, but in the whole area of research and development Canada is falling behind. And that is all tied up with education and training and so on and it is a very serious national issue and has a big impact for us.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

One of the ideas put forward by students, which was in fact a recommendation from the Provincial

Liberal Party accepted by the Federal Liberal Convention, is that there be some better national co-ordination of programmes in education.

Ambulance drivers are pointing out that in other provinces we see a second person in the ambulance, I believe I am told in every other province, except Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

This is a final supplementary.

MR. BARRY:
I will cut it brief. But briefly I would like to ask the Premier does he believe in the need for getting more consistency in national standards, both in education and in health as in ambulance services, and does he accept the concept of a national council of post-secondary education, and possibly a national council on health care measures?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I think I could agree with the basic thrust of what the hon. member is putting forward. There is no question there has to be some better standards. And as it relates to health care and the road ambulance service, there is nothing we would like better to do than to provide more money than we are providing this year in road ambulance. But when you have demands coming from the Department of Social Services, or Career Development, where we have launched a new programme for reorganizing post-secondary education in the Province, and demands for roads and all the other things, you have to try to

be fair to everybody.

The big thing here to remember is that if you take all the sectors in the government that we have to fund, the road ambulance service over the last eight years has perhaps done better than anybody else, and got a 200 per cent increase. I do not know of anywhere else in government where that kind of increase has been given over the last eight years. So we have recognized it as a high priority and will as soon as possible move to even improve it more along the lines that the private ambulance operators want, Mr. Speaker. The policy is not in question. We agree the issue is a good issue, but where do you get the money when you have just gone from a \$42 million current account deficit to a \$172 million current account deficit?

Before I sit down, on EPF this year we got \$224.5 million, and Health and Career Development and Advanced Studies is \$860 million. So we are getting from the federal government \$229 million and we are spending \$860 million.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to come back to the Premier on the ambulance drivers again. They have been attempting for a number of weeks to meet with the minister and your administration to discuss the problems. They have come to the point where they are very frustrated and would like to see

the situation addressed. I would like to ask you again if you would try to defuse the situation by meeting the representatives of the ambulance drivers of the Province to see if a compromise can be worked out. These people do not want to take any action such as they have discussed. They do not really want to, they are trying their best not to, they have been making attempts not to. Will you undertake to try to meet with them and try to work out a compromise?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question about three times.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I will keep asking the question because we are not getting an answer. As far as I know, under the rules of order -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member will be out of order if he keeps repeating that question.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
The report has been in the hands of government for eighteen months. Why has the government not acted upon the recommendations? Why does the Premier have to wait until another group in this Province has to come in and demonstrate at the building here to get his attention so that

he will respond to their concerns?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland society today there are many, many groups which legitimately are requesting additional funds. We have brought down our budget and we must keep within the budgetary limits that we are now debating in the House. We have gone from a \$42 million deficit to \$172 million deficit in one year, and a lot of that was because we had to, because we felt that Health and Education were so important, and that Health needed \$39 million more this year, that we could not pare it down and reduce it from where it was last year. There are a lot of groups out there who have legitimate health and safety concerns, one of them are the private road ambulance operators, no question. But there are many others and we must deal with them all fairly and squarely. We have budgeted a certain amount this year and we intend to keep to that budgetary amount.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I would like for the Premier to explain why his government has ignored the report and its recommendations, because there was no action taken on the recommendations.

First off, why has his government ignored the recommendations? Why have he and his officials refused to at least see and discuss with

these people their problems, since they have tried to be very reasonable with the government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, we intend to move on it. As the Minister of Health has said on several occasions this week, we intend to move on it and bring in the new legislation. But we have to consult not only the private ambulance operators, but also the community based ambulance operators and the people on the hospital boards which have ambulances at their hospitals. We have to do all of that so that when we bring in a piece of legislation it will reflect the concerns of all those people who are working in this field.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
My question is for the Minister of Health. It concerns the same issue, and has to do with the statement that the minister read in the House yesterday, in which he suggests that statements made that deaths have occurred in ambulances as a result of no attendants being there are not supported by fact.

MR. DINN:
That is not what he said.

MR. LONG:
I am reading from the minister's statement.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. LONG:
I ask the minister would he withdraw that statement and confirm that there have been proven incidents in which people have died because of a lack of attendants in ambulances? Would the minister explain where he gets his figure that 75 per cent of ambulances in the Province have attendants.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I do not have facts, neither does the Department of Health have facts, that people have died in the back of ambulances because there was not some first aid or some medical support present at that time.

Where did I get my figures as regard to 75 per cent?

MR. LONG:
Yes.

DR. TWOMEY:
I have asked the people in the Department of Health to examine the records and they have done so. I have checked it not once, but twice. These are the figures they have given me. I have given them already twice in the House. I reaffirm it here this evening.

MR. LONG:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, to the minister that several statements in the minister's statement yesterday are absolutely false and that it should be withdrawn. I would leave it to the media to check on that.

My question, Mr. Speaker, for the minister is: At the close of his statement yesterday he made reference to the contingency plan in the event of a withdrawal of services. There is an estimate that at least \$500,000 will be spent on this contingency plan this weekend. Would the minister consider taking the money that is being allocated for this contingency plan, and offering it to the private ambulance operators as a gesture of good faith, as the first stage of an implementation programme for the operators?

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to recollect what the hon. member just said in the preface to his question. I think, if I am correct, that he clearly said, and perhaps he can nod and indicate whether he did say that the statements the hon. minister made to this House yesterday in his Ministerial Statement were false statements? Because if the hon. member said that, Mr. Speaker, then he must withdraw those remarks immediately. He cannot say things indirectly which obviously impugn the motives of the Minister of Health or make

comments of that nature. I do not have a reference right at my hand, but I am sure Your Honour is well aware of it. And if he did say that, then he should be instructed to withdraw before he does anything else. That is totally unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member said that statements were false, and I would ask him to withdraw that.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying the minister was misleading the House. I will withdraw the unparliamentary language. But it stays that the statement the minister made yesterday was slanderous, disrespectful and presenting misinformation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member can slither all he wants to try to get away from what he said, which was clearly unparliamentary. I submit to you, Your Honour, that what he has now said is even more unparliamentary, and even members opposite, I think, would agree with me. That kind of language cannot be tolerated in the parliament of Newfoundland or in any other parliament in this country. The hon. member should be forced, Your Honour, to withdraw those statements. If he is not prepared

to be a man and stand up and withdraw unparliamentary remarks, then he should be named.

MR. LONG:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to use unparliamentary language and if I have I would unequivocally withdraw it. The minister has been maligning, and that is the point I have been making in my statement. And in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, there is a question that I have put to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is now stating that hon. minister is maligning, and that again is unparliamentary. I ask him to withdraw it without comment.

MR. LONG:

I would not only withdraw, I would apologize and ask that the minister do the same to the people that he was speaking of yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I am going to call on the hon. member to withdraw that without qualification.

MR. LONG:

I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, the statement I made yesterday was not consciously and I hope not unconsciously misleading this House. I did it with sincerity and honesty. As a member of the department I have to be factual, honest and truthful. I have done that to the very best of my ability. I have not tried in any way to mislead or to confuse any of the hon. members in this House. That is my statement and I stand by it.

Someone can vilify my character, vilify my motives, misconstrue them, that is the privilege of this House, but I stand here and affirm to all my colleagues, on both sides, that to my knowledge I did not mislead; I was conscientious and I wanted to give information to all sides of this House.

As regards to the other statement made by the hon. member, money, money, money. I can assure this House I have checked on this too, Sir, and we do not expect anything to cost as much as has been published in the press. Nothing, Sir. You must remember that we have helicopters stationed in Deer Lake, we have helicopters stationed in Gander, we have helicopters stationed in Torbay, we have helicopters stationed in Bay d'Espoir, and these have been there all the time to provide emergency services. They are under contract to the department and to other departments and can be used. There is one helicopter we have asked to stand by and we have put that in Clarendville. We pay the usual rates for that and there might be a standby fee.

In transferring the ambulances, there will be a slight cost. We do not think it is going to be

high. Otherwise the running of the ambulances will be the same as it has been previously.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. It relates to the ambulance issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. PEACH:

Time is up.

MR. FUREY:

Privilege, he said.

MR. SIMMONS:

I know that. As I said a minute ago, I rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is fine.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is the first time I heard it.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, on a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the reason, I submit, Sir, that you cannot hear what is

going on is because your clowns - and I am glad they are yours, not mine - will not give you a chance to hear what is going on. I very distinctly said, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member has a point of privilege, I would ask him to state it.

MR. SIMMONS:

I was stating it, but how would you know that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I need some order, if you can achieve it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

If the hon. member has a point of privilege, please state it now.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to state the point of privilege, but I want the protection of the Chair in having some order while I state the point of privilege because it is a very serious matter.

It arises out of statements by the Minister of Health. I hear the minister and I am duly impressed by his sincerity. I have never questioned his sincerity. But, I say to him, you can be sincerely wrong.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this Chamber he told this House - he told the press as well, but the point of privilege relates to the House - that he had not had a

request to meet with the Ambulance Operators Association. I say to him and to this House, that is incorrect information. He misled the House. I tell him, to verify what I am saying all he needs to do is talk to his Director of Emergency Services, Mr. Dick Conrad, and he will affirm that there was a request from the Ambulance Operators Association, from Mr. Steve McKenzie, the President, who talked with Mr. Conrad. Mr. Conrad reported to the minister, the minister tried to dictate the terms of the agenda and, having failed to do that, refused to have the meeting.

Now, I put it to him and I put it to this House, that the minister yesterday, Mr. Speaker, did mislead this House by telling the Chamber that he and his department had not had a request from the Association to meet with that Association.

In parliamentary terms, Mr. Speaker, that is unconscionable. It might be sincere, but sincerely wrong, I say to the minister, and sincerely wrong is not good enough when you are dealing with the lives and the health and the safety of people. This was an incorrect statement. I submit that the easy way is to say, as has been said before, I do not have a prima facie case. The courageous thing is to investigate this. If I am wrong on that, I will sincerely apologize to the minister.

My information is that there were repeated requests about three weeks ago for the meeting, contrary to the minister's statement to this House that there was no such request. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the minister has misled the House. And if you find

that I have established a prima facie case, I am prepared to put down the appropriate motion.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance to that point of privilege.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we cherish the right to bring up points of privilege in this House, because points of privilege take precedence over everything else; all other activity in the House of the people comes to a dead halt and you have to consider only the point of privilege. Now, that is a very great privilege for every member and it has to be treated and regarded as something very precious.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has gotten up - and I am quite sure he is aware of this - and he has a difference of opinion as to facts with the hon. the Minister of Health. That is clearly not a point of privilege. It is an abuse of the House to get up on something which is clearly not a point of privilege and hold up all other activities in this House.

Beauchesne states quite clearly that a difference of opinion as to facts does not constitute privilege. The whole case is facetious and it is really an insult to the rest of us.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, there is no prima facie case.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Government Services Committee I would like to report that the Committee has considered the matters to it referred and has passed without amendment items of expenditure under the following headings: Public Works and Services; Transportation; Municipal Affairs; Consumer Affairs and Communications; Finance; and Labour.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
I believe my colleague, the member St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), also has a report he wishes to table.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, in spite of the negative comments about the Estimates Committee system by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons), and I might add carried on critically in today's Evening Telegram, the Social Services Committee have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the spending estimates of

the following departments: Social Services; Justice; Health; Education; Environment; Culture, Recreation and Youth; and Career Development and Advanced Studies.

Notices of Motion

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Corporations Act." (Bill No. 38).

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development Act." (Bill No. 37).

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act And The Uniformed Services

Pensions Act." (Bill No. 40).

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, a few first readings.

Motion 9.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 27).

On motion, Bill No. 27 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 11.

Motion, the the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University (Pensions) Act," carried. (Bill No. 39).

On motion, Bill No. 39 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

DR. COLLINS:

Order 3, Concurrence debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Twillingate who has just about a minute or so left to finish.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the fifteen minutes -

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave!

MR. W. CARTER:

-allocated in this debate has been pretty well used up, but I did indicate during my few remarks -

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, he has got ten minutes now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted.

MR. W. CARTER:

- that I wanted to have a few words to say about the resource-short plant problem in our Province.

I have a fish plant in my district, in fact I have three fish plants in my district where there is a shortage of resource. I can refer the hon. gentlemen opposite to the plant in Twillingate, which is a very substantial plant now operating at probably less than 40 per cent of its actual operating capability. I can talk about plants in other parts of Newfoundland where similar situations exist.

The point I wanted to make, I would like to address to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). We cannot afford the luxury, Mr. Speaker, of giving quotas to foreign countries, whether that quota is in the areas commonly known as 2J+3KL or in the Northern area known as 2G and 2GH. I have said this before in the House and I am going to keep repeating it until we get some assurance from the minister that never again will there be a quota of ground fish given to a foreign power within our 200 mile limit as long as we have fish plants that are operating far below their actual operating capability.

It just does not make sense that we should be trading off ground fish from within our 200 mile limit to other countries, for whatever reason, while we have people in this Province underemployed and unemployed, fish plants that are underutilized, operating at considerable expense at only a fraction of their actual operating capabilities.

We all remember last December when the minister and the government opposite, in collusion with the national governments, gave the Government of France a quota of 2000 metric tons that subsequently increased to 3000 metric tons of ground fish in the area known as 2GH. I said the other day, there is only an imaginary pencil line, a pencil mark, separating those two areas. It is alarming when you think, Mr. Speaker, that these foreign countries, given the right to fish in that area, can quite easily slip over that imaginary boundary South into the area that is traditionally fished by our vessels, take their load of fish, sneak back over the, again, imaginary boundary, into the 2GH area and not be caught. The fact, I suppose, that it is such a wide area makes it almost impossible to properly police.

In the Estimates Committee, Mr. Speaker, these matters were brought to the minister's attention, as were a number of other matters pertaining to the fishery and to the resource sector of our economy. I think yesterday we had an example and I think I stated in this House, where there appears to be a lack of competence, maybe that is not the right word, but certainly there is a lot to be desired, for example, in the operations of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board.

I realize it is a difficult task that has been assigned to the Chairman and the members of that board. I believe it is a very useful board and I believe that they should be given the necessary wearwithal in order to be able to fill their role as they are supposed to. We heard the minister talk yesterday about the price of lobster. I think it is no secret that there has been a slipping up there somewhere and, because of that, our lobster fishermen did not get the price that they were suppose to get, the Boston blue sheet price. Because the Industry Advisory Board maybe lacked the confidence to provide the proper kind of intelligence, the information required to the minister, or did not have the proper mechanism in place where that kind of intelligence would be forthcoming, the fishermen of our Province have been short-changed on the price of lobsters.

It is all very well for the minister to say that he hopes that maybe the buyers will compensate the fishermen for monies forfeited by virtue of that fact, but I am afraid he has probably more faith in a lot of our fish merchants than I have because I suspect it will take almost a direct order from this House or from some other supreme being before the fish merchants who purchase those lobsters will voluntarily compensate the fishermen for monies lost because of that price.

I think certainly one of the problems, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, stems back to the Industry Advisory Board. Their job is to keep on top of things and have the proper intelligence in place and agents to be able to advise the minister, the

department and the union, and through the union, the fishermen, of what is going on in the marketplace. Obviously, in the case of lobsters, that was not so.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the few comments that I have to make. As I said when I adjourned the debate, I indicated to the House I wanted to have these few words on the resource-short plant problems. I think we have to address that problem. I would strongly suggest to the minister that he maybe go back over his files and dig out some of the reports that were submitted or prepared ten, fifteen, eight, ten years ago, wherein that problem was addressed and very well addressed.

We all know that there is a problem in Newfoundland with respect to the seasonality of fish plants. For example, we know that on the Northeast Coast the inshore fishery, the source from which most of these so-called resource-short plants draw their source of supply, there is a problem with the continuity of supplies certainly after a certain period in the year. That is why we have to find ways and means of providing the raw material, hold it in storage until the time comes in the Fall of the year for the plants to draw upon that source.

At one point in time there was a plan ready to go into effect, and it has been alluded to in the budget this year, where holding facilities would be built around the Province in designated areas. I believe there was one planned for the Northwest Coast and one for the Northeast Coast. Several of these cold storage holding facilities were being planned whereby fish could be taken there,

gutted head on fish, ready for processing during the glut period, or during other periods when surplus material was available, or maybe fish would be procured by draggers that would fish in the Northern areas, including 2GH, trucked to these holding areas for use by these resource-short plants at a time of the year when other sources of raw material were not available.

I would strongly suggest, and it is in the budget, I give the government credit for at least putting it in the budget, for what good that is going to do, I would strongly suggest that they take a hard look at that policy and that plan and give some thought to implementing it as soon as possible.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to respond again to the concerns raised by the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) on the matters he referred to today. As he correctly indicated in his remarks, I have responded to them before and I will respond to them again.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it, none of us - I mean, it is not a matter of political philosophy or political differences between us in this House. There are none of us as Newfoundlanders impressed when any amount of fish resource off our Province, whether it is in 2GH or whether it is a certain species or a species in 2J+3KL or in any other NAFO division around our

Province, none of us are impressed as leaders of the community, as politicians, when we are told that we are not harvesting all of that resource that is available to us.

All of us would accept as motherhood the statement that there should be nothing out there that is surplus to the needs of Newfoundland and Labrador or that is surplus to the needs, secondly, after having said that, to Atlantic Canada.

But the fact that we cannot dispute, Mr. Speaker, not that I like it that way, I know the member does not like it that way, none of us like it that way, the fact that we cannot dispute is that there are certain species in certain NAFO divisions adjacent to our shores that have, since there is a 200 mile limit, for one reason or another, it can be argued maybe not a good reason, but for one reason or another that have been surplus to our needs or surplus to our capacity to catch or surplus to our desire to catch or surplus to our economic ability to catch or surplus to something that makes it possible for us to harvest that particular species or that particular resource.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that in 2GH there is a Canadian allocation that the Government of Canada allocates for Canadian harvesting that has never been harvested. It has not been harvested by Canadians in Atlantic Canada. It has not been harvested by Canadians in Newfoundland and Labrador. And, in fact, there has been a special allocation as part of the overall quota of 1,000 tons that has been allocated to the resource-short plant programme that have never been harvested in 2GH.

Now, you can argue that that is wrong. You can argue that there should be financial incentives to allow our companies to participate in that harvest. These are being looked at and they have been looked at in the past. You can argue that they should be forced to go up there.

But all of the arguments are on the other side too, Mr. Speaker. Because of economic reasons; because of climatic conditions; because of bottom difficulties; because of harvesting difficulties; it is not economic, whatever that means, to harvest that particular resource.

Mr. Speaker, whether you like it or not, whether you are in favour of it or not, and most of us are not, but when that happens and there is an amount of resource that is surplus to the needs and to the harvesting capability at the time of the coastal state then, Mr. Speaker, under international law the coastal state has no recourse but to divide and allocate that surplus to foreign countries at the request of foreign countries. That is the law of the sea. That is the international constitutional basis for our 200 mile limit. We might not like it, we might lump it, we might screech and complain and everything else about it, but the fact of the matter is we have the right to harvest the 20,000 tons allocation in 2GH and we are not harvesting it. Therefore, other countries have a right to expect access to that.

Once you accept that or do not accept it, just put yourself forward for a few moments and you are in an international negotiation trying to settle

another very serious fisheries problem for Newfoundland and Labrador. That problem, of course, I am referring to is the French overfishing in a disputed area. There is no doubt about that. That is not a case of mistaken fact or mistaken identity. There is a vast disputed area between the sovereign state of Canada and the sovereign state of France in the area known as 3Ps. You are trying to negotiate a settlement to that disputed zone so that you can get the boundary to arbitration, so that you can get some compromise on an acceptable quota in that area, and in other to achieve that, you obviously, in any set of negotiations, have to give something.

Now if you have to give something, Mr. Speaker, and this is the question that we are getting thrown back at us. If you have to give something, and that has been the position of this Province, you can argue that you do not have to give nothing, that might be defensible, it might not. But in negotiations it is usual that both sides have to give something. So if you accept the principle that you have to give something, do you give what is surplus to your ability to catch and that you are not catching, or do you give what is non-surplus? Mr. Speaker, it is as simple as that.

If there is a surplus allocation of - whether there should be or not is another thing - but if there is a surplus allocation a species in 2GH, or if there is a surplus allocation of another species, and it is certainly not cod, in some other zone, do you work with that surplus to try to achieve your needs and your ambitions and your desires to

control the stock, get a boundary set in another zone, or do you not? Do you say, 'Stuff it', and walk away from the table? Now, Mr. Speaker, it is as simple as that.

We choose, not with any great degree of enthusiasm, I might add, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of a quid pro quo in 3Ps to agree to 1,000 ton allocation in 2GH. When the secret deal was done, it was up to 3,000 or 3,500. But we did agree on the principle of offering some surplus stock in 2GH to get arbitration on the boundary, and a compromise on overfishing in 3Ps.

Of course, the federal negotiators in their stupidity - I have said this before and I will say it again without any need to apologize - in their stupidity they gave away, they acceded to the principle of giving something that was surplus to your needs at the present time - it might be argued that we can use it, but at the present time we are not - but they acceded to the principle of letting access into that surplus stock without getting the guarantee of the quid pro quo on the other side, on 3Ps, and the overfishing and the boundary. Of course that was the essence of stupidity, and the essence of stupid negotiations. I do not care how that is interpreted by the people who made that colossal blunder. So that is where we have been and where we are, Mr. Speaker, on that particular issue of access to 2GH cod.

Let me make this point as well. The hon. gentleman says - and up until this year he was quite right. By the way, the foreigners have been fishing that fish, whether it is the West Germans or whatever, since 1977 on quotas

given to them by Canada. But, the hon. gentleman makes the point that it is very easy to just slip over the line. You know you are fishing and then suddenly South in the Northern regions of 2J. That is true. That was true up until this government - whatever we can say about the present government in Ottawa, good, bad, or indifferent, it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the government of today in Ottawa and this government were able to bring in a new policy of surveillance on foreign vessels so that today every foreign-registered vessel that fishes inside the 200 mile limit of Canada has 100 per cent observer coverage, as does every domestic vessel.

Now, under the Liberal policy, when the previous government was in power in Ottawa, there was an average of 40 per cent coverage. Under those conditions, the hon. gentleman's observation was correct. There was no way you would know whether they slipped down South of 2J or whatever they did. There was no way to have control over their fishing. There was no way to know whether they stuck to their quotas or not. But under the present policy, 100 per cent enforceable and paid for by the owners of the foreign vessels, the foreign governments and the foreign companies, there is now 100 per cent coverage on every foreign vessel and 100 per cent coverage on every domestic vessel that fishes inside the 200 mile limit, so that they cannot slip over a border.

If they do, it is done with the collaboration and the concurrence of Canadian nationals. Obviously, we are not expecting that to happen. So there is 100 per cent coverage.

This dippy-doodle, rob me, rape me another bit kind of approach that the hon. gentleman referred to cannot happen under this new progressive, innovative policy that was brought in by the Government of Canada. So where they are right, I give them full marks, and where they are wrong, I condemn them.

Mr. Speaker, on the Fishing Industry Advisory Board -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, no! I am saying good things about him.

Mr. Speaker, on the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, I have to take exception to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman about the incompetence of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. It is not a function of the incompetence of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board that it is difficult to have a handle on what happens to lobster prices in the Boston market. The Fishing Industry Advisory Board is on top of that on a daily basis.

What is difficult, and it seems that it is almost impossible to get people to understand this because it is not a new phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, it is not something that just happened this year, the fact of the matter is that the lobster bought in Twillingate today, May 14, 1987, will not be in the Boston market until about seven days from now. That is the difficulty. It is a week time lag. They are a week behind before the date that the lobster is purchased in Newfoundland. It could be sent to Nova Scotia and held in pounds. It

might be held down in Lou Everly's outfit down in Comfort Cove. It could be held somewhere else, and then be a longer time getting in. But the average time, from the time the lobster is purchased in Ming's Bight in Newfoundland until it gets to Boston, and the price is reflected in the Boston Blue Sheet, is seven days.

Now, how you compute the 70 per cent of that price this day, 9:15 this morning, at 70 per cent and tell the fishermen that that is what he is entitled to, is a difficult situation. We do not know what 70 per cent of that will be until a week down the road. So that is not a function of the incompetence of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. I think it is a credit that they are able to advise fishermen and advise the union and advise the minister and advise buyers on a daily basis what those prices are fetching in the market place.

So I have to take exception to that, and say this as well, Mr. Speaker, in terms of a defence of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, which in many respects, does not need a lot of defence. The hon. gentleman for Twillingate last year -

MR. BARRY:
Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Sure.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:
It says that 70 per cent of the Boston price will be paid. The lobster bought on a particular day

are seasoned then for three or four days. Then they are trucked off. By the time they get to Boston, the price may have gone up or may have gone down. Now, what is meant by that condition in the license? What price is supposed to be paid? Is it 70 per cent of the price on the day the lobster are bought or on the day the lobster are sold?

MR. RIDEOUT:
That is what I just finished referring to. I am sure the member did not hear me.

MR. BARRY:
I picked up part of it, but I did not get it all.

MR. RIDEOUT:
The question is a good one. The way the regulation is structured is that - understand now that there is a week delay on the average before the lobsters get from Newfoundland to Boston. So the lobsters bought this week may get down there next week, and you are right, it could be up, it could be down. The way we are enforcing and interpreting the regulation is 70 per cent of the weekly average price. So that we monitor every day in Boston this week, from Monday to Friday. At the end of the week, we will have a 70 per cent average of the weekly price. As of last Friday, for example, that weekly average, 70 per cent, was \$3.28 a pound Canadian. So that lobster buyers in Newfoundland should have been paying a minimum of \$3.28. So that is how it is done.

MR. BARRY:
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:
Yes. It is done every day and then it is averaged at the end of

the week and you take 70 per cent of it. This week, it so happens, that practically every buyer in the Province is paying significantly in excess of 70 per cent of the Boston price. Because normally the market takes a big dip following the Mother's Day weekend, and it took that dip this week. So, while they were two or three weeks paying significantly less, they are now into a period where they are paying significantly higher. That has to average itself out too.

I made the point in the statement yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it. I think it is an anomaly really and I am not sure how it developed that the Department of Fisheries in the Government of Newfoundland is into this exercise. Lobster is the only species of any commercial significance that I am aware of for which the price is not collectively bargained by the representatives of the fishermen, by the Fishermen's Union. I think there is a lot to be said for that to happen because I think there is protection in it for the fishermen. I mean, all fish prices are bargained as minimum prices and that is the minimum that the buyer, who is a member or a signatory to the agreement can pay. I do not think you would have those wild fluctuations then at the beginning of the season or two or three or four weeks in the season, you would have a stable price situation.

So I think there are advantages in that for the fishermen and, like I said, in my opinion, I think it is an anomaly that we are in this position and I intend, through the process of consultation and discussion, to try to see if we cannot reach an agreement with the

Fishermen's Union where, come next year, they would bargain lobster prices as they bargained cod prices or as they bargained caplin prices, or as they bargained crab prices, or as they bargained a whole number of other things.

The other thing I wanted to say before I sit down -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed, unless we have leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Leave.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Okay, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:
You may continue.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Only just a point or two on the Fishing Industry Advisory Board before I was asked a question by the hon. gentleman for Mount Scio-Bell Island.

The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) last year in committee, and I believe, if I am not mistaken, in Question Period, asked on a number of occasions whether maybe the time had come for us to rethink or even abandon the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, or change its mandate, or a whole bunch of things of that nature.

I, in good faith, said to the hon. gentleman that nothing is carved in stone and neither should it be, and I would undertake to give some thought to that, to consult on that and to see the mandate and the board was living up to its mandate and whether the industry

and the union for whom it was basically set up to advise, and to give independent advice to the minister, whether those roles are being fulfilled. And I did.

The Fishermen's Union, Mr. Speaker, is adamant that the Fishing Industry Advisory Board is performing a vital, aggressive, innovative, up-to-date, spur of the moment, advice to them on practically any question that they want independent advice on.

The industry, as members will appreciate, use the Fishing Industry Advisory Board to find out independent market advice and so on but there are some in the industry who would be just as happy if the board was not there.

But from the Fishermen's Union perspective the board plays, in their opinion, and in the opinion of the leadership of that union, plays a very, very vital role, and the consultation around whether the mandate needs to be examined, whether it needs to be expanded, whether it needs to be tightened up, the unanimous solid advice from the Fishermen's Union is that, "If it is not broke, do not fix it. This board is working very, very well. We are very, very supportive of it. We do not want you to tamper with it, just leave it alone. It is doing a fine job, thank you very much." That was the principle reason by the way, as I was not in the House at the time but I know the background to the legislation, the principle reason that we have a Fishing Industry Advisory Board today came out of the union/employee disputes of the early seventies when it was felt that there was a need for an independent, arms length professional organization to give

independent market advice and assessments to both sides, and the union is adamant that they still are playing a very vital role in that regard and that it should not be changed. Now, that is not to say the world is perfect, and if any member, or a member of society, for that matter, has some suggestion to make with regard to improving the functions of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, then, as always, Mr. Speaker, this minister is open to those kinds of suggestions.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
I just want to set the record straight in a couple of instances. I know it is difficult sometimes to go back over twelve months and to be able to quote a person verbatim as to what was said, but I can tell the minister now, and I can tell this House - I stand to be corrected if it is on record, but I know it is not - that I at no time suggested that the Fishing Industry Advisory Board be abolished. I was Minister of Fisheries at the time that board was restructured and beefed up, and it was done for a very good reason. I still think the board has a very, very important role to play in the whole scheme of things. Last year, Mr. Speaker - and I do not think the minister is trying to create the wrong impressions - I expressed some concerns about the board because of a situation that developed in my riding and similar situations that were developing in other parts of Newfoundland, and it had to do with the mackerel

fishery. In my district last year some fishermen were dumping hundreds of thousands of pounds of mackerel because they could not get a market or an adequate price for that fish. I contacted the Advisory Board at that time and requested that there be some kind of an explanation as to why fishermen in Newfoundland had to dump huge quantities of mackerel. At that time, I was not satisfied with the response I got from the Chairman of that Board and in Committee I expressed the concerns that I had and I suggested that maybe in light of the importance of the Board, in light of the need for such a Board, the necessity for it, that maybe the Board should be reviewed with a view to beefing it up, to improving the intelligence unit that the Board is supposed to have whereby they can, in fact, reach out into the marketplace and provide the mechanism whereby prices can be ascertained and proper liaison be in place between the primary producer and the merchant. I realize, too, that the fishermen's union is very big on the Advisory Board. I think any Minister of Fisheries or any government that would dare abolish that Board would do so at their own peril. I think the fishermen in our Province would take a very dim view of anybody who dared tamper with that Board because it can, Mr. Speaker, fill a very useful function.

In fact, I have always said that if that Board was able to function the way it was intended to function there need not be any long-standing or costly disputes between the fishermen and the fish buyers. That Board was established in order to have in place certain intelligence capability that would enable it to

advise the Fishermen's Union, the processors, the fish buyers, exactly what the situation was or is with respect to the marketplace.

Now, getting back to the statement I made earlier today about Newfoundlanders should never again witness the giveaway of any fish stocks within our 200 mile limit, I am well aware of that section of the Law of the Sea unified text which states that 'in cases where there is a surplus, then we have an obligation to make sure that that surplus is made available to other coastal states.' That is one of the fundamental principles of the 200 mile limit regime and it makes sense. Canada could not possibly hope to win the goodwill of the other countries, the 130-odd countries that were part of that negotiating effort, if they adopted a dog-in-the-manager attitude, if they adopted the attitude we have at our disposal a certain quantity of fish that the scientists say can be safely harvested but whether we can take it or not, it will die of old age before we will allow other countries to harvest that resource. That would not stand up. Canada would be laughed at, it would be frowned upon and rightly so.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that only that which is surplus to the actual needs of the coastal State should be given or shall be given to other countries. The point I want to make - I made it earlier and I want to do so again - is that in light of what we are experiencing in this Province with 60,000 or 70,000 people unemployed, a large number of whom live in coastal communities where we have seasonal fish plants operating very much below their actual operating

capability, I see no reason why there should be any fish at all within our 200 mile limit declared as surplus. Now, I know the minister will say that is not economic maybe to harvest that resource. But I would suggest to him that if it is that difficult to harvest and that expensive, why, then, would the French want it? Why are the French people prepared to use that fish stock as a bargaining chip in trying to negotiate other agreements?

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that one of the reasons why that fish is not being harvested is because the harvesting companies find it cheaper, more expedient to fish on the Funk Island Banks, for example, on the Northern Grand Banks, and in the area of 2J+3KL. I know this year there has been agreement that the large companies will disperse their harvesting efforts three ways, one-third on the 2J area, the Northern part of 2J+3KL, another one-third on the Funk Island Banks, and the final third on the Northern Grand Banks, and that is a move in the right direction. Some of us at the time thought maybe there should be even less effort allowed on the Funk Island Banks and on the Northern Grand Banks in light of the impact it is having on the inshore fishery on the Northeast Coast. But be that as it may, it is an improvement over previous years. Because last year, for example, we all know that 99 per cent of the total harvest took place on the Funk Island Banks and the Northern Grand Banks; one per cent of the total offshore harvest for that year and the year before took place North of the Funk Island Banks, and that, of course, is an unacceptable situation. We all know what happened last year

to the inshore fishery on the Northeast Coast. It was a dismal failure because the fish just did not turn up. I suppose there is probably no real hard scientific data that would prove beyond doubt that that is the reason why the fish did not turn up. The old Newfoundland fishermen who continue to say that you cannot catch a cod fish twice, I think their argument would stand up and the reason why the fish did not come ashore on the Northeast Coast was because it had already been caught on the Funk Island Banks and on the Northern Grand Banks. So that is a move in the right direction. Hopefully, next year they will further disperse the effort and, maybe, have less pressure on the stocks on the Funk Island Banks and on the Northern Grand Banks.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to repeat that there is no need why there should be any fish within our 200 mile regime declared as being surplus. If the big companies can prove beyond doubt that it is absolutely uneconomic to fish the stocks in 2GH, then maybe there should be some kind of incentive provided. I am referring now to Fisheries Products International, which is the biggest, the largest in the world, I suppose. Maybe there should be an incentive whereby for every thousand tons of cod they harvest in the 2GH area and make available to our plants, especially our resource-short plants, they should be given extra or special concessions in the more accessible areas. Maybe that is the way to do it. Maybe the large companies involved in the offshore sector should be given that kind of an incentive. If they are prepared to spend a little extra money and effort to prosecute the

fishery in the Northern reaches of the 200 mile limit, then maybe they should be given preferential treatment when it comes to the allocation of quotas in the more accessible areas. But certainly there must be some way in which that fish can be harvested. It just does not make sense, when you realize that we have plants crying for additional raw material, to have fish literally dying of old age in the Northern reaches of the 200 mile limit.

Getting back to the Advisory Board, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat, because as a politician and as a representative for Twillingate district, as one who has a lot of respect and admiration for the Fishermen's Union and its leadership, I have never in my political career openly, publicly criticized the union. I have had some misgivings at times about, maybe, some of their policies or their philosophies, but I have never openly, willingly and knowingly said anything to jeopardize that union. Because while it is not perfect, I have very vivid memories of life in this Province, Mr. Speaker, before the advent of the Fishermen's Union. I have very, very vivid memories.

MR. RIDEOUT:

We have come a long way.

MR. W. CARTER:

We have come a long way, the minister says, and I agree with him. I can recall very vividly, although I was not actively involved in it but my people were, they were very much involved in the fishery before we had a union, and I tell you now I would not want to see the primary producers in this Province subjected to the kind of treatment that was

accorded people in my father's generation, for example, who were left to their own resources, left to the mercy, the benevolence and the fairness of the fish merchants. I suggest to you that these were virtues, Mr. Speaker, that were not very prevalent. Benevolence, charity and fairness were virtues that were not to prevalent in the fish merchants of yesterday.

If I could take a half minute I want to emphasize again that I am not against the Advisory Board. I think it should be beefed up, if necessary, and given the tools to do the job. And if that is so, then, I think they will play an even greater role in keeping peace in the fishing industry and ensuring that our fishermen are given a fair return for their labours.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to have another few comments on the items raised by my friend from Twillingate. Again, there is not much disagreement between us and between both sides of the House on the comments that my friend just made. I certainly, in questioning his questions on the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, did not mean to unduly indicate that the gentleman may have been against the Board. That was not my intention at all. All I wanted to say was that I knew there had been some questioning of the Board last year. I believe - my memory is a little bit better right now - it was actually the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, in the estimates

discussions, that the hon. gentleman might have suggested we get rid of, or certainly do dramatic surgery on it, but there were questions on the Advisory Board as well.

I would like to make a comment or two, Mr. Speaker, on the Fishing Industry Advisory Board as related to mackerel, in particular, last year. I know the hon. gentleman was not satisfied, nor was I, nor, I suspect, were a lot of members and a lot of fishermen, in particular, with the situation regarding mackerel last year. The thing we have to remember, and I am going to say this perhaps at the risk of incurring some criticism or a smack in the gob from certain people in the industry, but the fact of the matter with mackerel last year, and it may have been the fact other years, I do not know, but it certainly was a pronounced factor last year, was that our own people, particularly a consortia or two of our own people, were our own worst enemies in mackerel last year. They went and they did deals, particularly with the Soviet Union, and signed and agreed to prices and our producers, and I am sure the hon. gentleman knows this, could not even afford to pay the fishermen last year - under those signed contracts - what they were paid the year before, which was crazy.

Our processors could not afford to process mackerel last year under those contract prices and even get a very small, insignificant contribution to their overheads, which was crazy. The best market we had, unfortunately, for mackerel last year was the bait market, which is a very, very sad commentary on what we are doing with a species - any fish species

- like mackerel which is of such good food value, and you have to put it into bait. That was a function of the negotiating process under which there were Newfoundlanders and non-Newfoundlanders in this consortia - two consortia actually - who did those deals principally with the Soviet Union and negotiated prices under which nobody, fishermen or plant owners, could produce that mackerel for that price. Now Barrys did their own deal and were much better negotiators, were smarter negotiators and got a heck of a better price than the other two did, and they were able to buy significant amounts of mackerel and make a dollar on it. But the others did not do that. We tried to assist the situation last year, as members will recall, by introducing a special \$1 million mackerel assistance programme to help in food aid, in buying mackerel to send to Third World Countries. It was probably a bit late when we got into it and the industry did not have their homework done, nor did the union and, consequently, there was not a lot of mackerel purchased under that particular programme. But I hope that the small steps we made in that particular programme last year might bear larger fruits this year. Because it is criminal, whether there is a good fishing season or not, that we are not, for whatever reason, harvesting mackerel, and this year, hopefully, there will be a lot of herring to harvest, and squid as well, but harvesting those species when they are available to us so that our fishermen and our plant workers can get the economic gain from our so doing. It certainly hurts me and hurts every Newfoundlander that we are not in a position to do that as well as

we should.

I want to say, too, to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, in terms of surplus species, particularly cod in 2GH, we embarked on a programme last year - it was begun the Summer before last, but we went more widely with it last year - to encourage the development of a cod fishery, once again, North of Nain. As the hon. gentleman knows, years ago there was, in many years, a very viable cod fishery well North of Nain, but over the last number of years that cod fishery has totally, for all practical purposes, disappeared; you have a char fishery and a salmon fishery and that is about it. We have embarked on a financial incentive programme over the last year or so to try to encourage Northern Labrador fishermen and Island fishermen to go further North of Nain, up around Hebron and Okak, which we did last year, up in that region, and it appears as if it is working. So we will continue with that this year. We also need to, I agree with the hon. gentleman, get our own larger offshore fleets to do the same thing, but with our first priority as a Province being to try and help the inshore fishermen, particularly the inshore fishermen in Northern Labrador, we are using the meager financial fiscal capacity available to us to encourage the development of that fishery by the inshore fishermen North of Nain. I am pleased to say that it appears to be working and we will continue with that this year with the support of my colleague from Torngat Mountains.

One other thing I want to say. The gentleman asked a rhetorical question, and it is good question, Why will foreigners fish in 2GH when our own offshore vessels will

not unless they are forced to? Well, The answer is very simple, Mr. Speaker. Foreigners, particularly the EEC countries like West Germany, France and the Soviet Union, do not have access to adequate stocks of fish to service their own fleets, to keep them fishing, so, therefore, they are forced to fish, whether it is in 2GH which is very expensive, or whether it is by allocation off the Falkland Islands. I mean, they are doing that as well. They are forced to go further and further afield, to less economic advantageous fishing regions because there is nothing else left for their fleets to do. Our fleet has some flexibility in that regard, but, yet, I agree with the principle espoused by the hon. gentleman, that we should be forcing them to go as far North as is practical, and financial incentives should be available if we can do that.

I am pleased, too, Mr. Speaker, to be able to say that while it may not have been enough, and while we will have a good look at it again when we implement the 1988 management plan, the very fact that the companies howled and screamed and said that it will be economically disastrous and it cannot be done, the fact of the matter is that the mandatory sharing of the harvesting effort of one-third and one-third and one-third in 2J+3KL has worked. FPI have caught their one-third quota available to them in 2J already, and they were screaming like blue murder last year, 'You are going to bankrupt us.' But we stuck to our guns, and the Government of Canada stuck to its guns and said, You have to harvest one-third of your allocations in 2J and in 3K and in 3L. Whether or not, as my colleague said, we

can scientifically make the connection or not, it is fundamentally wrong that 99 per cent of the 256,000 tons that was allocated to the offshore effort be caught in one small geographic NAFO zone when 2J is not being harvested and some other area has been overharvested. It is not good management to allow that to happen. And despite the screams and despite the reservations, we went with that mandatory distribution and it has worked, and I hope we will see the results of that this year and next year and following years in the inshore fishery. I think we will have to continue to expand on that kind of management programme in the years to come.

MR. W. CARTER:

May I ask a question of the minister.

MR. SPEAKER (Mitchell):
Order, please!

I have to announce the questions for the Late Show. The hon. member may pose his question afterward.

We have three questions for the Late Show today. One from the hon. the member for Fogo to the Premier concerning the hydroponic complex. The second one from the hon. the member for Port de Grave to the Premier concerning investment to the Sprung Group. And the third question is from the hon. member for Bellevue, and it is to the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development concerning rural Newfoundland investment by his department.

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order.

MR. FUREY:

With respect, the hon. the member for Fogo could not be here today and I was supposed to ask the Chair at the beginning of the House today if it would be okay if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) replaced him in this particular question?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

The government really does not care what happens, but that is a matter that the hon. member should deal with the Speaker on and not the House. That is a matter that the Speaker deals with. Perhaps he can go in and see the Speaker. It would be the Speaker who would make that decision.

MR. FUREY:

By leave of the House?

MR. SIMMS:

Go in and have a chat to the Speaker, that is the best thing to do.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Late Show will take place at 5:30, so I am sure there is time for that to be resolved.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, with respect, I think most members said they have no problem with that, that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would replace the House Leader. I am sure you can rule on that. That is no problem.

MR. SIMMS:

You will still have to get the Speaker's agreement.

MR. FUREY:

Not by leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the Chair will consult with the Speaker of the House and a ruling will be made shortly.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, that is the appropriate course and I commend you, because it is not for a member to shuttle back and forth between people who happen to be in the Chair at a given time. The Speaker is an institution. Now, we have just put to the Speaker who happens to be in the Chair right now, the Speaker, a proposal. The Speaker has responded as he should have and we thank him.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the normal ten minute period, I know others want to have a few words. I think the minister made an interesting observation during his rebuttal to some of the comments I made concerning the management plan and how it was this year, divided three ways. I commend the government for doing that.

He also alluded to the problems with respect to harvesting the quotas in the 2GH area. Now, not wishing to give the impression that I have an obsession with respect to the 2GH, and I know there are problems up there in trying to harvest that resource.

I do have an obsession, I suppose, in one way. I want to see our inshore plants operating as close to full capacity as possible. Until we can do that, I do not think we will ever have a truly prosperous or successful inshore fishery or an inshore processing operation. But, would the minister give some thought to what I am going to suggest to him? Maybe when he is consulted on this he should insist, if that is the right word to use, that the powers that be in Ottawa think about it to.

Why would this government not, in next year's management plan, when they allocate quotas and when they start divvying up the quotas, dispersing it over, say, three years, include the 2GH area and maybe insist that 25 per cent of the total quota be harvested in 2GH, 25 per cent in the 2J area, 25 per cent in the Funk Island Bank area, and, of course, the remaining 25 per cent on the Northern Grand Banks? I believe that if that were done that our fishing effort in the 2GH area would be vastly increased and maybe we would not have a surplus up there.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will give serious thought to that serious, I am sure, and sincere recommendation from my friend from Twillingate. I think it has a lot of merit and we will give thought to it. I am sure the hon. gentleman is aware that the stocks, even through they are probably distant cousins

biologically, are managed as two separate stocks, and 2J+3KL is set at 246,000 tons now, with the 10,000 ton reduction, and 2GH is set at 20,000 tons. Certainly that is a worthwhile recommendation and one that we will give serious consideration to.

Just one other point before I finish responding to the hon. gentleman. We dispatched - I do not know if force is the right word - but we made it part of our fishing plan last year for our middle distance vessels that they had to do some trips to 2GH. I must say, Mr. Speaker, even using gill nets, because we thought that it would not be very practical in terms of long lines, the effort was very, very discouraging from an economic perspective.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a couple of things that I want to in the Resource Estimates concerning the fisheries. I am sure the minister will listen while he is out in the corridor. My particular area and my district concentrates mainly on the inshore fishery. The inshore fishery has been greatly affected over the past number of years by what has been taking place offshore. It is a major problem, and I guess it is due to the overfishing and the quotas and the dragging and everything else, although some of the scientists seem to blame it on the temperature of waters and a number of scientific problems. But the fact still remains that

the inshore fishery is not what it used to be in the local areas around Newfoundland, especially out in my area. The trap fishery has been almost a complete failure. So it has been really affected by what is taking place offshore by the foreign fishery and by our own Canadian draggers.

We have problems with regulations and with licenses. The system has been changed back and forth a number of times and it is now being looked at in a different way because of the major problems in the inshore fishery and because of what is taking place.

One of the most serious things that is taking place now, and probably the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) can answer me and enlighten me when he gets the opportunity, is in the caplin fishery. The only way to survive for most of the inshore fishermen now is with caplin. If the caplin fails, of course, it is back to hunger strikes as we saw a couple of years ago when people were having to go on television and get down on their hands and knees and beg for food. It is not necessarily the lack of caplin, but I think it is the market more than anything else. What is taking place is because of the fishery in Denmark, the Winter fishery, or Norway, wherever it has been, I am not quite sure other than Denmark, the Japanese can get their quotas if the fishery is good in that particular area in the Wintertime which leaves the Newfoundland fishery short in the marketplace.

What has to take place is there has to be at least some sort of a guarantee from year to year, if it can be worked out with the Japanese through trade relations

or whatever so that, yes, the quota last year was 30,000 metric tons and in order for the Newfoundland fishery to survive and the Newfoundland fishermen to make at least a decent income with the caplin fishery, knowing there is nothing else to fall back on, there has to be some way in which the government and the unions possibly together, can make a deal with the Japanese people to protect the quota from year to year.

Already right now the talk is around about the pricing and about the amount of caplin that is going to be purchased in 1987. If it comes to a point where you are going to get a substantial drop of 25 per cent or 30 per cent in the markets from 1986 to 1987, that then follows right down through the line and you are going to get a 30 per cent or 40 per cent drop in the amount of money which a particular fisherman is going to make for that season. The problem then is the fact that your season is only three to four weeks long seining and trapping. This means it cuts back the amount of money that can be lengthened out over a period time in order for them to receive unemployment insurance. So, not only do you get the fact that they are going to make a substantial amount of money less for the season, you are also going to eliminate a lot of people from obtaining unemployment insurance for the coming Winter.

If other species of fish was available, hopefully this year and I heard the minister refer to it earlier that squid - and it looks good - squid will possibly be in in some quantity, according to the researchers from the Department of Fisheries in the Fall of 1987, but we cannot go on the guarantee or

the expectations of what is going to happen in the Fall. We have to try to make the most and the best of what is going to take place in the Spring when the caplin fishery comes in.

Now everybody was encouraged last Fall, in the Fall of 1986 when it was reported that there was going to be a market for male caplin in 1987, but whether the fishermen were going to get any advantage out of taking a good price for the male caplin is another question. Because when the processors buy caplin, they buy a quantity of caplin, as they have been doing in the past, and they pay for the male and female, whether it is seven or eight cents a pound or whatever the set price is, depending on the quantity and quality, the male caplin is taken and thrown away so there has been no cost or no loss to the fishermen. What we are saying is possibly what is going to happen in - I would say not possibly I would say it is going to happen - if any purchase is done or any sale is done to the male caplin, the fishermen are not going to get any price because they have been bringing them in and the processors are going to say, "Well we bought them from you last year and we threw them away." So we cannot see that as any additive or supplement to their income for this year, unless it is negotiated. To date, I have not heard about any negotiations as far as the price of male caplin is concerned. So the serious threat of the drop in the market because the Japanese bought from another country, Denmark or Norway this Winter, is going to seriously depreciate the amount of caplin that is going to be purchased in 1987.

The question I am really asking of the minister is: Is there going to be some way in which the market can be protected, at least some sort of a market set from year to year that you can depend on, instead of right now where it is a guess?

If the Japanese do not get what they want, they will buy from Newfoundland. If they get 75 per cent of their quota somewhere else, they will buy 25 per cent from Newfoundlanders. It is possible, from the way it is looking now, that the amount of caplin bought last year and the amount that was caught this Winter, that in 1987 and it could go into 1988, the market could drop another 25 or 30 per cent, which would mean in the following year we could only be selling to the Japanese market about 30 or 40 per cent of what we sold in 1986 and 1987.

Therefore, we have a complete failure and a crisis on our hands in the inshore fishery, where already the cod stocks are gone. In the district of Port de Grave I would say right now it has been about fifteen years since any fisherman made any substantial income from the cod fishery. Before that, the cod fishery in the district of Port de Grave, and especially in the community of Port de Grave, was a major, major industry. There are about seventy fishermen in the community who have at least four to five cod traps and all different kinds of seines and they would get anywhere from 1,000 to 2,000 quintals of fish in any given Summer. Now the whole seventy fishermen do not get 1,000 quintals in any given year, which means that income has been completely wiped out.

So those are really the main things that I wanted the minister to respond to, with regard to markets and the protection of markets and what steps can be taken to ensure that the markets will be there, at least substantially, from year to year.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to respond to some of the concerns raised by the hon. gentleman for Port de Grave. They are legitimate concerns, particularly as it relates to the caplin fishery for 1987. As the hon. gentleman so correctly states, the caplin fishery has become a very vital part of the income for our inshore fishermen. In fact, over the last number of years, particularly last year, without the caplin fishery, there would have been an unmitigated disaster all along the East and Northeast Coast of Newfoundland in terms of fishermen's incomes.

Now, it is a very delicate piece of business that the hon. gentleman refers to. I am sure he understands that. The fact of the matter is that Newfoundland does have some significant and major competitors in the caplin business, particularly Norway and Iceland. Those two countries, in particular, have fairly healthy, fairly significant stocks of caplin and, of course, the Japanese are as good, and, I suppose, many would argue, probably better businessmen than most of us. If they can access a

source of supply in Norway or source of supply in Iceland which reduces their dependency on the Newfoundland caplin fishery, then the Japanese, as astute international traders, are going to do that, and there is not much we can do about it.

The suggestion that we try, on a bilateral level, to negotiate some guarantees of tonages and prices between Canada and Japan is an excellent suggestion and one that we have been giving a lot of serious consideration to as we get into further bilateral discussions between our two countries. As a matter of fact, the bilats are ongoing this week. There are representatives from the industry in Newfoundland already in Japan. I think we have to try to use, not necessarily fish for market access, because I have great difficulty with that - that got us in trouble with the long term agreement with the EEC.

I think we have to use all the levers of international trade that is available to us as a country because we can do something for the Japanese caplin market that the other two countries cannot necessarily do. We can guarantee, as much as anything can be guaranteed, a fairly stable, significant tonnage to them.

As the House knows, Mr. Speaker, our total allowable catch for caplin is based on market ability and it is not based on the biological data of the stock because where we are harvesting 70,000 tons biologically, we could be harvesting perhaps in excess of 200,000. The stock, the scientists say, I would not like to see it that high, but the scientists say the stock is that healthy. We also have two

distinct caplin stocks in waters adjacent to Newfoundland that Norway and Iceland does not have. The Icelandic caplin stock is an offshore stock that never comes to shore, never. The caplin do not land on the beaches of Iceland or the beaches of Norway, as they do in Newfoundland. So we have an offshore stock and we have another separate stock that comes inshore. I think we have some significant negotiating levers that we can use with the Japanese.

It is not going to be easy. It is not going to happen overnight. We may have to tie in car quotas, we may have to tie in a whole number of things, but at the bilateral trade negotiation level between the two countries, it is an avenue that we are exploring. I do not know if it will be successful or not, but I do think and agree with the hon. gentleman that it is worthy of every ounce of effort that we have.

In terms of price, again, the Japanese are good, solid, sound, international business negotiators. If the hon. gentleman had wanted to buy something and he could access that from two, three or four different sources, I am sure he would use his competitive advantage and his competitive business nature to get the best price that he can. The Japanese are similar. They are using us to play us off against the other two primary large producers that they have and they, no doubt, in good times will get the price down.

I think there will be a reduction in price this year but I do not think it will be that significant when it is compared to where we came from last year.

Of course, in the down-times we have the advantage that we can sock it to them a little bit like we did on price last year. So that will be the give and take of international trade.

But I like his suggestion, I like his argument, that as best we can, given the variances and the difficulties of international negotiations, as best we can, we should try to guarantee some floors, some floors on tonnage and some floors on price. We have put that forth and I know that discussions have taken place and are in fact taking place again this week as the bilats continue.

We also have to, I think, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the caplin industry in this Province, it has been a pet peeve of mine in the two years that I have been a minister that some how or other we have to find a way to be able to utilize the gravy that we are throwing away. The gravy that we are throwing away, of course, is the 35,000 ton of male caplin that we had to destroy last year in order to market 35,000 ton of females. That is fundamentally wrong. There is nothing you can do about it if you do not have a place to sell them, but there is a lot of potential. While we might get criticized from time to time for leading trade delegations or whatever, then I am going to say now that I do not care. I am going to keep it up because I believe that in a protein-starved world, it is a cancer on this society that we cannot find a way to be able to sell for economic gain the 35,000 tons or the 30,000 tons, whatever it might be in any given year, of male caplin that has been harvested in this Province.

We have made significant process with the Soviets who are interested in male caplin in this Province. They will be here this year to have a look at the caplin fishery. Their acting Minister of Fisheries and a delegation will be here this year.

We have made significant progress with the Mainland Chinese, who had people in this Province last year and who put up, on an experimental basis out in Charleston, I believe, a number of products.

There is a food aid mission in Nigeria at the present moment, not a political mission but a non-political, charitable mission in Nigeria at the present moment which is exploring potential in that area.

Every pound of male caplin, whether you only get five cents a pound for it or ten cents a pound for it, whatever you get for it, it is something you did not have last year because you threw it away.

The other significant potential, Mr. Speaker, for the utilization of male caplin is, of course, the aquaculture food industry. The Norwegians are running into difficulty in feeding their aquaculture industry. The Scottish are running into difficulty in feeding their aquaculture industry. We have taken money, financial assistance and incentives and directly put it into development of an aquaculture fish/food industry based on using male caplin as a base. It takes time. It takes experimentation. It takes dedication and it takes hard work. But I am optimistic that out of all of those initiatives, we will be able to, hopefully in the not too distant

future, be able to see a firm utilization of that precious resource that we are throwing away today.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, in some respect that answers the hon. gentleman's question.

DR. COLLINS:

You have given a very good answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was glad to speak to the Committee on Resource Estimates. It has clued up its committee hearings. I want to bring to the attention of the House again, Mr. Speaker, the issue of defense spending or the lack of it that goes on within this Province.

I bring it up because the Department of Development are partially responsible for the negotiations for the Sea Cadet facility for the Province, and have been attempting to acquire that facility. I was reading through the Budget of 1987 for this government, Mr. Speaker, and it gives a list of the Department of National Defence expenditures by province. The ranking leaves us, out of the ten, at the bottom of the totem pole. What I did not look at first and I notice now is that the top three provinces that received defence dollars in the country from the federal government are Nova Scotia, Prince

Edward Island, and New Brunswick. The three other Atlantic Provinces are the top three in the country in receiving defence monies from the federal government. These three other provinces are receiving federal monies to help with their economic infrastructure, which helps the economy, which helps the entire province that is affected by it. Here we are on the bottom of that totem pole fighting to get up there and fighting for our fair share of the defence monies, of the social spending that goes on in this country. We find ourselves at the bottom.

I think it is a shame, Mr. Speaker. I think the federal government has not realized or has not awakened to the need for this type of money, this type of spending in this Province. I rise

-

MR. WARREN:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, today the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) got up on a point of privilege. I just got a copy of Hansard. I would like to quote to you, Sir: He said, "Yesterday in this Chamber he," referring to the Minister of Health, "told this House - he told the press as well, that the point of privilege relates to the House - that he had not had a request to meet with the Ambulance Operators Association."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of

Hansard here. I may not have digested it all, but I read the Minister of Health's statement to this House yesterday and at no time is there recorded in Hansard that the Minister of Health made those remarks. So, Mr. Speaker, it was not the Minister of Health that misled the House yesterday, it was the Leader of the Opposition today who misled this House by making those accusations against the Minister of Health. I would think the Leader of the Opposition, although sometimes, Mr. Speaker, he has indicated he does not agree with your ruling, but I would suggest, Sir, a copy of Hansard from yesterday and a copy of Hansard for today will show that this House is not being misled by the Minister of Health, but has been misled by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, to that point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:
To the member's alleged point of privilege, I am delighted that the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is beginning to earn his pay.

Mr. Speaker, what I said in the House, of course, is that the gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) has given undertakings quite publicly to the effect that he had not been asked to meet with the Ambulance Operators Association. I submit in the light of the consistency with which the Chair must always operate and in view of the fact that the merits of who is right or wrong here are totally alien to

the substance of a point of privilege, I submit that the only reasonable course for the Speaker to follow right now is the very one he followed when I raised the original point today, because if today's events were a difference of opinion between two members, surely the matter now between me and the member for Torngat Mountains is equally a difference between two hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of privilege, I must rule there is no prima facie case.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, while I have a minute left, the text of my remarks concern the amount of monies that we have received and the efforts by this government to achieve the proper amount of money for this Province.

As the cadet facility we are hoping to have in Stephenville, as that proposal is now on the table in Ottawa, I want to express to the government the concern that I feel the government should be very active at the present time meeting with the Federal Minister of Defence in Ottawa to see if the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador can start to get recognition and its fair share of what is rightfully its amount of money, and recognition of its place in this Confederation, recognition of its place with the other Atlantic Provinces when it comes to defence spending in the country.

I think it is time we got recognized for that, and it is time that our economy was looked upon as needing a lot of help. On

that point, Mr. Speaker, since it is now five-thirty, I adjourn the debate.

Late Show

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the floor and it is to be debated. The first debate is by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who is not satisfied with the answer given to him by the Premier concerning the Sprung hydroponic complex.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
In your absence, Mr. Speaker, we had indicated to the Chair, the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) was then in the Chair, that we would want to substitute me for the gentleman for Fogo on the precedent that often when a minister is not available for a Late Show another minister is substituted to respond.

MR. J. CARTER:
No leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
No, Mr. Speaker, I will not put myself in the situation where I need the leave of the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) for anything. I will do it on the basis that I am following an honoured precedent. If Mr. Speaker finds otherwise, I will be obliged to take my seat.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, there is no precedent at all.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
There is no precedent at all for this extraordinary breach of parliamentary tradition. The Leader of the Opposition may very well by leave represent the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), but I assure this House that he does not have leave from this quarter.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, I do not think there is a point of order. I am not aware that this matter has come up before. If there were four questions I would automatically take one other one, but we have only three. I know that in the past other ministers have spoken on behalf of a minister a question was actually referred to, so in the circumstances I think it reasonable that the hon. Leader of the Opposition be permitted to speak.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, if the gentleman from St. John's North wants to question the very good ruling of the Speaker, he knows how to do it. He has given me this advice very often and he knows how to do it.

Mr. Speaker, yes, I want, in the absence of my colleague from Fogo, who is in his district on important business today, to raise the issue with which he and I and

every sane-thinking person in Newfoundland and Labrador is dissatisfied with and that is the kinds of answers we are getting from this government, particularly from the Premier, on this issue of hydroponics. The big question, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I was asked in the cafeteria over in the new building today and on the phone many times in the past few days is why this business? Why did they get into this deal at all, in the first place? The second question is, and this one I was asked last night at a function down at the hotel where several well-known Tory fund raisers were present, and one was going around the room within the hearing of everybody saying, the Premier, on this hydroponics thing, is he really serious, fellows? Is he really serious? Whoever advised him on this one? That is one of your Tory fund raisers, less than twenty-four hours ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well accepted, well recognized truth, whether it be a leader of a government, a leader in industry or any person in a leadership position, that when that person's electorate or constituency begins not only questioning, not only doubting but laughing at, when it gets to the point where people begin laughing at a situation, then, Mr. Speaker, it is time, I say to the Premier, to sit up and take stock. I have heard, Mr. Speaker, more jokes - this one has caught the imagination of the Newfoundland people - and more ridicule on this issue in the past few days than I have heard on any other issue, because Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are treating this for what it is, and they treat it, to put it kindly, as something less than a serious matter. The Premier will

be aware, of course, because he received some correspondence in which people point out that Mr. Sprung, who has been making great claims about this - it is interesting, by the way, that none of Mr. Sprung's claims, and on this the jury is still out - I am not pooh-poohing his technology, because I am not in that field and I do not even pretend to begin to understand the technology. I suggest the Premier does not understand it either, and that is not to his discredit, you can only get your head around so many issues; you cannot be a chemist and a physicist and everything else in this business, you cannot be a jack-of-all-trades. So I make no particular apologies for not knowing the technology. But, Mr. Speaker, there are people out there who could adjudicate the worth of this technology if they were given the information, but the interesting thing is that we have to take Mr. Sprung's word it is good because he says so, because he says it is good. I could get into the rhetoric here but I want to, in this particular period, enter one or two of the arguments and I would hope the Premier might think fit to respond in kind, if that is his inclination this evening. It is not a matter of pooh-poohing or turning thumbs down on the technology, and I am talking about that particular issue now - there are many other issues as well - it is a matter that people do not have the information on which to judge whether it is a good thing or a bad thing. Because we are told that Mr. Sprung says it is good, therefore, it is good.

I read to you a statement from somebody else in the industry: "On a recent Land And Sea T.V. programme, he, Mr. Sprung,

admitted the growing system was the nutrient film technique, the same we have been using for the past ten years in our greenhouses." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is from the Greenhouse Growers Association of Nova Scotia who wrote the Premier a letter, and I am reading from a copy of the letter to the Premier, dated May 11.

The point is that we cannot really adjudicate the worth of this technology. We cannot ask experts to do it, because experts, in a number of institutions, have said that they do not have access to the technology. Here is a company that says it does.

Much was made a couple of days ago, I think by the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, that he dismissed all the critics as having a conflict of interest. I put it to him, in terms of sweet reason, will he not allow, and I will finish on this sentence, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Sprung may have a conflict of interest as well, in that he is giving information which is in his interest to give? Does he have any licence on the lack of a conflict of interest?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate where the hon. Leader of the Opposition is coming from, and some others, on this matter. I found it remarkable, in that the letter that the Leader of the Opposition just referred to, to think that the people in Nova Scotia - I just read it this morning, I think it was, or last

night - to just reverse the argument for a second, the Maritime Greenhouse Growers, the people I got the letter from, whatever their organizational name is, are saying, number one, we question the technology. Mr. Sprung has given some information on the technology. He cannot give it all. It is a secret. It is his secret. It is a secret of his company.

Now, if you want to get into asking people, the best people you can go to are the scientists, because a lot of the scientists were involved with the Sprungs in spending \$35 million. Sprung, themselves, spent \$35 million. There the other day the Opposition unintelligently talked about this gentleman, Snellen, or whatever his name is, who we have since talked to and who did not say what the members of the Opposition said he said, talking as if he had the technology. He does not have the Sprung technology. He has been involved in hydroponics, but not in the hydroponic technology that Sprung has. There are many people into hydroponics, and are into various aspects of hydroponics. Nobody is into the area of hydroponics in the level of technology that the Sprung Group have been able to develop with scientists.

The National Research Council is where members go if they really are still skeptical about this. That is where you should go, or call up this gentleman down in the States who did the Epscot Center in Disney World. Call up the Dean of Science here at Memorial. You do not have to go down to the Epscot Center, call the Dean of Science who is a leader in biotechnology research, Dr. Wisner, and ask him, who was

involved in all of this stuff years ago. So there is no question it is a technology, and they were producing thousands and thousands of cucumbers and tomatoes. It was not just in the lab.

I do not understand why the Maritime Greenhouse Growers and all the rest of them are so concerned. In their letter they talk about price, they talk about markets, and they talk about production. If it is as bad as the Greenhouse Growers Association are saying, why are they worried about it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They are not doing it for Newfoundland's benefit. The Nova Scotians? Some chance! The Nova Scotians are not now suddenly interested in rational, economic development in Newfoundland, 'We are going to protect Newfoundlanders against this technology because it is going to destroy Newfoundland, or destroy Brian Peckford or the Government of Newfoundland.' What are they writing me for? If the production is as bad as they say it is, if the price is as bad as they say it is, if the markets are as unavailable as they say they are and if they are still skeptical about the technology, what are they concerned about? What are they doing all the writing for? Why did they go to Ottawa and kick up a fuss to the Maritime caucus?

I do not understand why they are so concerned because, they believe they are right on production; they believe they are right on markets; they believe they are right on price; they believe they are right

on the technology; so they do not have anything to worry about. They should be singing to the skys! 'Thanks a million Peckford for ensuring our markets and our productions up here because this thing is a disaster.' That is the way they should be saying it, but they are not. They are frightened to death. They are frightened out of their wits.

Why are they frightened out of their wits when they gave me four reasons why it is not going to work? I do not understand it. I do not understand that kind of rationale. It is crazy.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, which I kept emphasizing all week, and will continue to emphasize, is the reason why the Government of Newfoundland is embarking on this project is in the same way as House says in his Royal Commission. We see an opportunity here and not only in the first instance. We talked about this a lot in caucus. There are two prongs to the project. One is a business venture on cucumbers and tomatoes and the other is research and development, high technology. That is the primary reason why we are into this project.

Read **Time** magazine, the last one, the superconductivity stuff, just read about it. If we do not capture an niche somewhere, as New England has done and revolutionize their small economy which is now the most buoyant in the United States, and it was the most depressed nine years ago - I have the numbers - ten years ago it was the most depressed part of the United States outside of the state of Mississippi, which is now coming back by the way in cat fish farming and is not as depressed as it used to be, in aquaculture,

mainly cat fish farming, in the state of Mississippi. If we do not find our niches as we start travelling down the road, as our resource industries take up less and less of our GNP, and now it is down to 25 or 30 per cent, if we do not start finding niches for ourselves and are enlightened enough and progressive enough to go and grab something when we have an opportunity, then we might as well fold up our tents and silently steal away back to the 1700s and 1800s here in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Joey's (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no, not in Joey's way. That was not high technology he was talking about. He was talking about chocolate bar factories to compete with Ontario. This is not a chocolate bar factory that is going to compete with Ontario. It is high tech. Open your minds. It is like I told CBC Radio's Morning Show the other day, stop demeaning the human mind, stop degrading the human mind, stop degrading science, Mr. Speaker. It is incredible. Now we are going to get our niche in a few places, Mr. Speaker.

Go to the National Research Council and to the scientists who know about this. Do not go to somebody who only knows half the information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The third question for the Late Show has been withdrawn so we are coming to the second and final one. This is by the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) who is not satisfied with the government's share of investment in the Sprung Group and would like to debate it.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the protection of the Chair because I have five minutes in which I have a few things I want to state to the Premier and I would like the protection of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt what the Premier's intentions are in this development. I have no doubt that the Premier, as he has proven this afternoon, is an exceptional politician and can stand to his feet. I have no doubt or argument.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

His past record in the teaching profession is probably equally as excellent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

But let me say, Mr. Speaker, very clearly that his record in managing this present government over the last seven or eight years

MR. SIMMS:

Is excellent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
- his record does not show, Mr. Speaker, the same record that he did as a politician in his speaking ability and as a teacher. In fact, it goes far, far down the line.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh!

MR. EFFORD:
My question, Mr. Speaker, is very clear. I asked the Premier the other day in the House of Assembly would he report to the House on why such an amount of money was put in by the Newfoundland government and the government guaranteed loan of \$7 million is compared to \$500,000 by this Sprung Group. The Premier came back and said it is not his place, and we do not have any right or should not ask the question and he should not report to the members any about what the government is doing or his governing of the Province.

I say to the Premier that I am a taxpayer of this Province and anytime, as a taxpayer and as a member of the House of Assembly, we can ask a question in any way and we expect an answer for the taxpayers of this Province.

The Premier just pointed out very clearly a few minutes ago, when he said that Nova Scotia greenhouse growers should be jumping with joy if they believe what they are saying is correct, that this is going to fail.

MR. WARREN:
Where did you buy your tie?

AN HON. MEMBER:

A lot of (inaudible) around.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
Let me ask the Premier in the same instance, and this is getting to my question, if he believes so strongly in what he is doing and if he believes so strongly in the credibility of the Sprung Group, why will he not -

MR. SIMMS:
Yes.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, could you ask the clown there, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) to be quiet while I am talking? The court jester.

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

MR. EFFORD:
What I am asking the Premier is, if he has the confidence in this group of businessmen and this investment, why is it, number one, that we cannot get a copy of the market survey? Why is it we cannot get a copy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:
We are going to go twenty-four hour (inaudible) in six hours.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
You would not like to walk across there and grab that up would you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the confidence that the Premier has displayed in this group of companies and the \$13.5 million that is going to be put up by the provincial government is all from the taxpayers of this Province. What we want to see before the deal is signed, before there can be no turning back, at least the Opposition and the taxpayers of this Province should have the right to see the surveys. The Premier has already stated very clearly that the market surveys have been done, the costs of production has been done and the Premier and his administration is quite pleased and has no doubt about the success and about the accuracy of the market surveys. That is the main point, Mr. Speaker, with those questions. With the credibility that has been put forth by the Premier and his government in this company, why is it then that we cannot get, and he will not table a copy of the surveys until after the deal is signed. He knows full well once the deal is signed no matter how good or how bad those surveys are, there is nothing that can be done about it.

MR. SIMMS:

A good question, nothing wrong with it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let us get the financing thing straightened away first. The Opposition keep talking about the \$10 or \$13

million or whatever.

The Sprungs are putting in \$3.5 million in equity cash. We are putting in \$2.5 million cash. The other \$1 million is the land and the development of the land. There is a \$7 million loan guarantee. In other words, the joint venture will go out and borrow \$7 million. In order to ensure that we can get the \$7 million, the Government of Newfoundland has put its name behind it. Not one copper has to go out, not one cent has to go out, from the government on that \$7 million. It is security. The name of the Government of Newfoundland is backing it. Now, if the whole joint venture fails, then the government could be on the hook for the \$7 million, and we have all kinds of security to cover that \$7 million. We will come first in any disposal of assets if it goes up, so we will get our money back. We will get our money back if it succeeds and we will get our money back if it fails. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the story.

On the retail sales tax, which we do for a lot of companies around the Province and will continue to do, we have even been harder on the Sprungs than we are on other companies that have gotten an exemption, because we would not just give them an exemption. In return for that, we had to get more shares in the company. So we have shares in the company to the same value as the amount of retail sales tax exemption. So we are covered there.

On the electrical part of it, on the operational side, there are no subsidies. They have to pay the going rate for just the normal operation of the facility. For

the extra lights, the high intensity lights, we have told the Sprungs, and the agreement will show this when we get the legal agreement worked out in the next couple of weeks, that they have to purchase the lights and install them and do all that kind of stuff, that \$3 million. That is our safety net, because obviously given, not the sunshine in Newfoundland, the amount of light - it is not a question of sunshine, it is a question of light - that we will then have that extra safety net to ensure that production levels stay at a high level to allow the export and the markets to be met.

We are still talking to the Sprungs. The lawyers for the Sprung Group of companies and the lawyers for the government are still talking. In the same way as we have a deal on Meech Lake, the heads of an agreement or an agreement in principle is there and now the lawyers are working away at it and we will get back to look at the legal language to see if we will sign the final legal documents on June 2. That is the same way as we are working with the Sprungs. We have the heads of an agreement or agreement in principle. Now we are working to negotiate the legal wording with lawyers for both sides. That is why we cannot go giving out all of this information. We have not signed a deal yet. We have got to try to get the best deal we can.

As I indicated to hon. members opposite, we will be making the agreement public and all the rest of it, as we should do when we are using the taxpayers' money, as we are obligated to do, and we will do. So that is where that is.

The other point is, which I know

is just partisan politics and so on, but this is just for the record. The Opposition are really not going to make any hay on this because there are just too many people around who know the difference. Number one, this is not a megaproject. Talk about megaprojects and we are talking about Churchill Falls and Hibernia and all those things, and we are not doing anything for rural Newfoundland and all of that. Look at the three statements that were made by the ministers for job creation this year. From the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands: Bay of Islands; Fox Marsh; Cobbles Ridge in St. Barbe district; Bay St. George in St. George's district; Shipbuilders Pond in Lewisporte; Lewisporte South Side; Goose Bay in Naskaupi district; Gambo Hill, Bonavista North; Coles Pond, Strait of Belle Isle; Ocean Pond, Terra Nova district; Bloomfield in Terra Nova; all of these are all in rural Newfoundland.

In agriculture, 'we are only doing something for the Sprungs, hey.' The Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern (Mr. R. Aylward) just a little while ago announced, I forget how much money was here, over \$1 million and there is more to come for land clearing.

Here is land clearing: Goulds; Musgrave Town; Wooddale; Cormack; Bay Bulls; St. John's; St. Shotts; St. Mary's Bay; Bell Island; Salmon Cove - this is all land clearing for farmers - Swansea Pasture; Carbonear Horse Pasture; Point Crewe Pasture; Lewisporte; Port Albert Pasture; Comfort Cove Pasture; Jackson's Cove Pasture, Green Bay; Parsons Pond Pasture on the Great Northern Peninsula in the hon. member's district; Cormack; Robinsons; O'Regan's;

Centreville; Roaches Line;
Makinsons; Colliers; Adam's Cove;
Gushues Pond.

Where are all of these places?
They are all in rural Newfoundland
and what are they there for, what
is the money being spent for?

Burning and fencing for
blueberries, burning and fencing:
Victoria; Harbour Grace; Broad
Cove; Roaches Line; Ochre Pit
Cove; Harbour Grace Halls Town;
Old Track Road.

On fur animal cages for the fur
industry for the fox farm
industry, we are giving them money
to build the fur cages. Fox
farming: Little Barachois,
Placentia - fox farming is
agriculture too. Is that down
town St. John's? Is that on
Duckworth Street? - Little
Barachois in Placentia; Bishop
Falls; Potato Seed. Pinware in
the Eagle River district, guided
boat tours, \$10,000 from Tourism.
Scallop processing!

I find it really strange, Mr.
Speaker, that they attack me on
the Sprung thing because I am only
suppose to have oil on my brain
anyway. What are we doing giving
Pinware a guided boat tours
\$10,000; scallop processing;
firewood marketing; fish plant
extension; firewood harvesting;
craft development; Charlottetown
and Square Islands on the Labrador
Coast, expansion of fish plants;
Rigolet craft development; gear
mending programme Makkovik; craft
development Makkovik; firewood
harvesting; fish smoking Davis
Inlet.

Davis Inlet, for the Naskaupi
Montagnais people, the people who
do not even recognize this
government as being a government.

They have got to go to the United
Nations and Joe Clark, External
Affairs Minister for Canada
because we only came over here in
the last 400 or 500 years. Here
they are getting \$25,000 of our
money.

Small engine repairs; soapstone
carving; root crop farm expansion;
curing and selling dried caplin;
salmon enhancement; aquaculture
experiment Holyrood Pond; Miners
Museum Craft Shop.

Holy Moses! Mr. Speaker, this is
the government that is not
interested in rural Newfoundland.
You can go on through the other
projects in the Minister of
Fisheries statement that he made.
As Dr. House said, it has got to
be a balanced approach.

Use all the opportunities you can
get your hands on, if it makes
sense, use all the opportunities.
That is what fox farming and
smoking and all the rest of it
means, using all the opportunities
that you have at your disposal.
That is what we are doing, and if
we can grab a niche in a high tech
area so that Japan, South Korea
and parts of the United States do
not have it all wrapped up in
their back pocket, and do
something to create jobs at the
same time in an area of research
and development, it has got to
take public funds. Everybody
understands that, research and
development should be done. That
is why Japan is so far ahead
because they put public funds into
research and development, and
married with the private sector to
put their money into it. We are
marrying with the private sector
right now as it relates to this
high technology, this
biotechnology, this hydroponic
technology. Mr. Speaker, so we

will get a niche in technology, not just not NORDCO and C-Core, all of that too and more in the same way as Iceland has done it, all across their economy. That is what we are going to do. We are not going to be stopped by parochial narrow-minded people - Right? -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Right on.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
- who really do not want us to go ahead. Every time we do something now, Mr. Speaker, it is suppose to be a disaster. On the restructuring agreement, I was attacked; the Atlantic Accord I was attacked; Newfoundland Energy I was attacked; Kruger I was attacked, and they are all successes, Mr. Speaker. And I bet you any money,

MR. DECKER:
If you say so.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, not because I say so, go talk to the scientists, the people who know. Do not talk to somebody with half the information. That is no good. There are two things really a curse on humanity. One is dogmatism and the other one is ignorance.

MR. WARREN:
And he has both.

MR. SIMMS:
And you possess both.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Dogmatism and ignorance, and sometimes I am not sure on the opposite side how much of it is ignorance and how much of it is dogmatism, because they will not allow themselves to open up and stand up and say - 'You know, Mr.

Speaker, this could be the very, very good development for Newfoundland. We have some questions to ask the Premier about it and the minister and we will continue to ask them,' but they come four foursquare against it.

MR. SIMMS:
Right on.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is not true.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is so true. Coming in with false information, or not false information, inaccurate information in the House about this gentleman down in the Battery the other day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
There is no question, it was just shocking. That kind of tactic is not going to get you anywhere. You will either get re-elected for your district and sit over there, or get defeated, but you will not be over here as long as you people keep on that tact.

There is wisdom in the crowd. Get with it! Do not be so foolish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn. All those in favour 'Aye', those against 'Nay', carried.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 15, 1987, at 10:00 a.m.