



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 44

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

20 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Before calling for Statements By Ministers, at this time I would like to respond to the point of order raised by the member for St. John's North, on Friday, May 15. I have heard the tapes of certain news reports of interviews and statements by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and from what I have heard I can find no imputation of disrespect to the Chair.

However, as Speaker I would like to refer all hon. members to read pages 38 and 39 of Beauchesne. 'The Speaker's ability to maintain order and decorum in this Chamber can only be effective if all hon. members, on both sides, decide that a certain level of civility must prevail.' I am not a master of this House, but only the servant of all hon. members. It is my duty to be impartial dispenser of order. I can assure all hon. members that I shall continue to carry out my duties in this manner and give all hon. members equal treatment during debate in this Chamber.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I wish today, Mr. Speaker, to inform hon. members of the House - I guess they have already heard it through the media - that First Ministers will meet on June 2, just a few weeks from now, to review a draft legislative text based on the Meech Lake agreement on the Constitution. I look forward to reviewing this text, which I am sure will reflect the spirit of the Meech Lake Accord. Today, I would like to affirm my support and that of this administration for this historic agreement, and I wish to address some of the specific concerns and criticisms that have been expressed about its basic terms.

As a result of this historic agreement, Quebec may now take its appropriate place as an equal and active partner in the Canadian Federation. Gone are the days of "Two Solitudes": We are experiencing the genesis of a new federalism, one in which all Canadians may actively and equally participate, and one in which all regions may contribute to the strengthening of Canada as a whole.

We have entered, I believe, a new era in which all Canadians will stand united, to quote from Prime Minister Mulroney's May 11 address to the House of Commons, "From a more united Canada we will achieve a more prosperous Canada."

Critics are claiming the Meech Lake accord undermines the powers of the federal government, gives too much power to the provinces and thereby weakens the federation. On the contrary, I believe the Meech Lake accord has strengthened our great nation by affirming that the Canadian State will be a balanced state: One in which the federal government and

all provinces will be true partners. Every province will benefit from this agreement. This is not a document which will weaken the Canadian State, rather it is the affirmation of a strong commitment to the Canadian Federation; one composed of a strong federal government and strong provinces.

As a result of the First Ministers' Accord, all provinces have been guaranteed the right to participate in the process of judicial selection, as it is applied to the Supreme Court of Canada. In the past, Court Justices were appointed by the federal Cabinet. Consultation with the provinces from which the appointments were to be made was not necessary. While some have argued that the involvement of provinces in the judicial selection process will undermine efforts to make the best possible selection to the court, it is important to recognize that the Supreme Court is a critical institution of Canadian government, and as a Court of Constitutional decision, its rulings must represent the spirit of Canadians in all regions of this great nation. A provincial role in the selection of Supreme Court judges particularly in this period of our country's development when the court is focusing so much of its efforts on the interpretation of the Constitution Act, 1982 and The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, serves to re-inforce and strengthen the federal nature of our country and ensures that the Court will reflect the underlying principle of federalism.

Similarly, the agreement for a provincial role in the appointments to the Senate is one

which will ensure that the federal system represents all Canadians. The Founding Fathers created the Senate to ensure some form of specific representation of regional and provincial interests at the national level and as a chamber of 'second sober thought', in which federal policies could be reviewed free from political constraints, and in a manner representative of all regions. Increasingly, however, the Senate has been criticized for not performing its role well. As a body whose purpose it is to protect and promote the interests of the regions, it is consistent and appropriate that provinces have a more direct say in the selection of those individuals who will be representing their interests.

Critics will say that the Meech Lake accord restricts our ability to pursue effective Senate reform. This is not true, in my view. On the contrary, as a result of the First Minister's agreement, we have ensured that Senate reform will become a priority on the national agenda. It is true unanimity of all governments will be required to effect Senate reform, but this is not foreign to the Canadian way of conducting intergovernmental relations. Several of the country's most important constitutional amendments have been achieved through unanimity - unemployment insurance in 1940 and old age pensions in 1951 are two examples. Major reform of a national institution should be the result of a reflective and collective agreement of all governments.

The Meech Lake agreement also affirms provincial involvement in matters of immigration. As hon.

members are aware, immigration is currently a matter of joint constitutional jurisdiction with federal paramountcy. Provinces have seldom, however, taken on their full responsibilities in immigration, despite the impact of immigration on provincial policies and programmes. As a result of the Meech Lake accord, all provinces have been assured a more direct say in immigration if they so desire, and a new spirit of federal/provincial co-operation will govern the co-ordination of federal immigration policy. It is also important to note that this spirit has not been achieved at the expense of federal standards or national objectives: the Government of Canada retains the important right to determine national immigrant selection criteria and quotas.

Another key element of the Meech Lake agreement relates to the spending power. This clause will not preclude the federal government from initiating new national programmes as some critics are suggesting. This clause will assure that new national programmes in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction will be the result of federal/provincial consensus, not federal/provincial conflict. We have not placed new constraints on the use of the federal spending power, rather we have ensured that all provinces will have a say in the creation of new programmes, and the right to administer these programmes by their own design, provided that national standards are maintained. As a result, new national programmes are assured to meet the needs of all regions and governments. This proposal will not affect existing federal/provincial programmes such as Medicare, or regional

development policies, which will be maintained in their current form.

As can be seen, the Meech Lake agreement is a doctrine of balanced federalism. It achieves this balance while at the same time reaffirming that the principle of juridical equality will remain a fundamental basis for future constitutional discussions. As a result, all provinces will be treated as equals, and all provinces have been accorded the same powers. We have secured that the Canadian system will be a strong system of government, consisting of strong provinces and a strong federal government.

Through the Meech Lake Agreement Canada has also been relieved of what some have called the 'Constitutional Strait Jacket' which limited our ability to pursue further constitutional discussions. As a result, we may now move on to consider constitutional issues of concern to other regions, such as fisheries jurisdiction and Senate reform, in a second round of constitutional negotiations.

The Meech Lake Accord is a declaration of Canadian unity: Through it, Quebec has been provided with an opportunity to join the Canadian Constitution with honour and enthusiasm. At the same time all provinces are guaranteed the right to become full, equal partners in the Canadian Federation. We have arrived at a new era in federal/provincial relations, one which can only be characterized as 'Balanced Federalism'. From this, all provinces, and all Canadians, will benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken note of, in the last week or so, comments by the former Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, who has now spoken out on public issues again in this nation, and most particularly upon the Meech Lake Accord. Of course I am happy to report that it is as a private citizen and not as Prime Minister of Canada when, through the efforts to patriate the Constitution, great conflict was caused in this country. Through the Meech Lake Accord, which would not be possible if that gentleman were still the Prime Minister, we are now in the process of unifying this country, not tearing it apart.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Spoken like a true leader, Brian.

MR. TULK:

The Canada/France cod agreement.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Premier believes what he has just said just as, I suppose, he believes that 1984, with the election of a Tory government in Ottawa, was a new era - remember how fast that new era came and went? - just as he believed that the offshore would start last Spring, and remember how that reality came and went. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that he believes what he has just said and I suppose that is one of the more frightful aspects of it, like he did two or three years ago, when the gentleman he condemns now stood

for what he believed in, and he said that he supported Rene Levesque's vision of Canada. That probably explains why he, the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador and, he, the former Premier of Quebec, Mr. Levesque, are on the same wave length on Meech Lake; they are both saying essentially the same things about it these days, using different semantics but the same end result. They are both jumping for joy: He, the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, because he has got to defend what he is party to, and he, the former Premier of Quebec, because he sees in it the out that he was looking for, the weapon he was looking for two or three years ago.

Mr. Speaker, three or four specifics: First of all, the matter of the distinct society. Let me be understood. I have never argued against the idea of Quebec being a distinct society, nor, Mr. Speaker, have I ever argued against Newfoundland and Labrador being a distinct society, so it brings one to the question of less distinct and more distinct. Can there be anything, Mr. Speaker, in North America more distinct than the particular culture that we have evolved here in splendid isolation for 500 years or more, the years of a way of life that was brought across the Atlantic and then nurtured, as I say, somewhat in isolation? Is somebody out there going to tell me that my culture is less distinct than another in this country?

I thought the whole purpose, Mr. Speaker, the whole emphasis of our multiculturalism in this country was to avoid the melting pot mentality of the United States and, instead, to foster the

diversity which is Canada, the distinctness which is Newfoundland and Labrador, the distinctness which is Quebec, the distinctness which is other parts of this country. Why we needed this particular pandering to Quebec is something that escapes me. I do not see the reason for it. But that is done. That is not one of the largest offences in this Accord.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again for the record, let me say on behalf of my colleagues and myself here in the official Opposition, that the achievement in bringing Quebec into the Constitution is a marvellous achievement. Nobody subtracts from that or wants to subtract from that at all. I think, and I have thought for some time, it was completely unthinkable that you would have one of the provinces of Canada not part of its Constitution. We now have achieved that, at least in principle.

I have some grave concerns about the price that we have paid for achieving it. I believe it could have been done without the price we have paid. It would have taken a little more time, maybe. I do not think that Prime Minister Mulroney's arm-twisting, labour-negotiating tactics, while quite successful in the labour arena in the interests of eeking out another cent or two in an overnight bargaining session, are exactly appropriate to constitutional change. In using that tactic, he has undermined the process considerably.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, in effect we are back to Mr. Joe Clark's community of communities or, as Mr. Trudeau characterized it at the time, collection of

supermarkets across the country, where we have become a group of pockets of trading partners without much in common constitutionally.

Mr. Speaker, it is the threat of this Accord to the less wealthy provinces that concerns me. In times of confrontation, in times when we cannot get agreement, the fair play aspect of the federal government could always be depended on. Whether Mr. Diefenbaker was the Prime Minister or Mr. Pearson or Mr. Trudeau or Mr. Clark, you could always appeal to the sense of fair play which is Canadian. That is gone now. We have to depend now on the negotiating power of the Premier of this Province, for example, versus the premier of any other province, and you can see why I do not sleep nights too easy in that particular situation. We have removed, Mr. Speaker, the trigger of fair play which has always protected the less wealthy provinces in a real showdown.

The Premier talks about Senate reform and there, Mr. Speaker, the Meech Lake accord really strikes at the whole basis of Confederation. The Premier slipped in a word that you will not find in the Constitution. He says, 'The Founding Fathers created the Senate to ensure some form of specific representation of regional and provincial interests.' Of course it does not say, and 'provincial' interests, it talks about regional interests. This suggestion that only a provincial government can protect regional interest was not part of the original intent by the original framers of the Constitution. Indeed, they saw the problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:
I will get a chance to say it later, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:
He spoke for fifteen minutes and you spoke for five.

MR. SIMMONS:
That is okay.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Just two very short comments in order to allow the other Ministerial Statement that is about to be made to be made so that we can respond to it.

One point I would like to point out is that we support the agreement and we look on it as a deal that was made in order get Quebec to co-operate in terms of being involved with the Constitution, and that there was a price to be paid but we do not really know what the price is at this point. However, at this moment it does look like a reasonable amount to be paid. Ten years from now we will really know for sure, we will know how it works. The kinds of things that would concern myself and my party, both federally and provincially, is whether or not it would hold back the introduction of new social welfare programmes, such as the universal child care system - we would certainly hope it would

not - and such as the establishment of a broader old age pension system than just the Canada Pension Plan and the old age supplement. Again, Mr. Speaker, it remains to be seen, I think, whether it will or not.

Finally, the only other comment is the question of fisheries jurisdiction. There is an appearance or a feeling that we have won something with the fisheries jurisdiction item, but I think if you look at it closely all you will see that we have won is the right to talk about it in the next particular go-arounds of the First Ministers' Conferences.

I would remind the House that when you put it on the agenda, when you put it on the table and you are discussing fisheries jurisdiction, there is us as a province, there is the federal government and there are four more provinces who have or will want a say in what the fisheries resource will be and who it will go to and, on that basis, Mr. Speaker, it will be a number of years before we find if we have actually gained anything. All we know is the door is open and negotiations will occur. At the end of that time period we will see whether we control our industry more than we have in the past.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries forty-five Grade VII students and three teachers from St. Peter's

Elementary School, in Catalina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the House that the Canadian Public Health Association Task Force Report on the Health Effects of flying activity in the Labrador area was released by the Association this morning in Goose Bay.

This study by the Canadian Public Health Association was undertaken at the request of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. When I announced the study by the Canadian Public Health Association in the House of Assembly in November, 1985, I indicated to the House that we were aware that people in Labrador had expressed concern about the potential health problems resulting from these low level flying exercises. As a government, we were sensitive to these concerns and wanted to take every reasonable measure to ensure that the health of the people of Labrador would not be adversely affected by this activity.

The Canadian Public Health Association noted in its interim report, which was released in July, 1986, that the initial request for the study was in a large part a response to concerns expressed by the Innu living in Sheshatshit. Their concerns were primarily related to the potential adverse health effects associated with the noise from low flying aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that on the basis of my initial review of the Canadian Public Health Association Study and its press release that the Task Force concluded that 'based on the frequency of low level flights neither the intensity nor the duration of exposure is sufficient to cause noise induced hearing loss.'

This concern was the initial stimulus for commencing this report by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. I am therefore pleased for the sake of the people living in the area to find that these initial concerns were not founded.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Public Health Association adopted a somewhat broader approach to health and considered, as well as physical health, such issues as mental health, stress, impact on lifestyle, and other factors relative to total health and social well-being. This led to a series of recommendations relating to this broad definition.

All of these recommendations will be studied and carefully considered by the government departments and agencies involved. It should be noted at this time that many of these concerns and recommendations are being addressed by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and by the Government of Canada through policies and programmes for the negotiation of Native Land Claims and the current Federal Environment Review Process into the proposed expansion of military training activities in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, further comments will be made by this government and, no doubt, by the Government of Canada

and other agencies involved after we have had an opportunity to fully examine and review the recommendations. At this point, I would stress that the initial health concern about the effect of low level flying activities on hearing in Labrador was thoroughly examined by the Canadian Public Health Association Task Force and I am satisfied with their finding that such activity was not having any detrimental effect on the hearing of the people in Labrador.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the key words are in the fourth paragraph where the association says, "based on the frequency of low level flights neither the intensity nor the duration of exposure is sufficient to cause noise induced hearing loss." I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that is good news to the Innu of Sheshashit who, I understand, were first to bring this to government's attention. We, on this side of the House, as our friends on the opposite side, are committed to NATO in Labrador. But if there is any suggestion whatsoever that there is a danger to the health and safety of the people, I am sure that both sides of the House would want to see that the cause would be stopped. We are pleased to see that there will be no hearing loss and there will be no health hazard.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister was kind enough to give me the full report. I have only read the first few pages, but it is not nearly as pro low level flying as this statement seems to indicate. I do not know exactly what the terms of reference were for this Committee, but, Mr. Speaker, they make some far-sweeping recommendations. The Task Force concluded that the primary issue is the struggle of the Aboriginal people of Labrador regarding their rights to self-determination. This is a political issue which cannot be resolved with a health study.

They also say on page 3 that the Task Force concluded that the clock must be stopped regarding the expansion of military flying activity. I think they are getting outside their terms of reference and I am not sure how this is going to be taken by the people of Labrador and by this government. At the same time, they are saying that every effort should be made to settle the land claims of the aboriginal people. The task force seriously considered recommending a total ban of low level flying' - which the minister's statement did not say but the report says - but they stopped on recommending a total ban because of the adverse economic, social and related health effects to the people of the Goose Bay area. Nevertheless, the task force does recommend that no further increase in activity be allowed until both the land claims have been settled and the FEARO process is complete.

I would like to hear a statement from the minister at some future date, when he has time to digest the report, just to see what some of their positions are going to be

on where this task force stepped totally outside its terms of reference and did raise some startling questions, Mr. Speaker, which, I would suggest, all of us members will read when the full report is presented.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is now three-thirty and being Wednesday it is time for Oral Questions, unless the hon. member has leave of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave.

MR. FENWICK:
I just want to get some comments in.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Does the hon. member have leave of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member is out of order. I will call Oral Questions.

Oral Questions

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt).

The government has purchased 50,000 litres of Bt from a U.S. lab to spray watersheds in sensitive areas in the Province this year. Last week this Bt was found by a McGill scientist, or a team of scientists, to be contaminated with at least two strains of streptococcus bacteria, amongst other things, and a complete halt has been called to the use of this spray by the governments in both Ontario and Quebec. Does the minister still intend to give his approval, as Minister of the Environment, to go ahead with these plans to spray our watershed areas this year?

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, I was made aware, just prior to coming to the House, by the Director of Environmental Assessment that there was a study done and there were large amounts of this streptococcus in the Bt that was analyzed, and in fact this streptococcus bacteria could be injurious to a person's health if in fact it got into an open wound, a cut or what have you. Now, I am not sure if the Bt solution that we have is from the same batch, but what we are undertaking right now to do immediately, in consultation with the Ministry of Health, is to do a series of testing on the solution that we have prior to it being sprayed. Of course, if the tests come out negative, then I would assume we will spray the sensitive areas with Bt, but if it proves otherwise then, of course, we will put it on hold the same as Ontario and Quebec have done.

MR. BAKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the minister that I have checked and the supply we have indeed comes from Abbott Labs in Chicago, which is the batch in question. Testing is now being done in other areas. I would like to inform the minister, first of all, that it is also known that the Bt used in Newfoundland last year contained the same kind of contamination of streptococcus bacteria. Would the minister who last year gave this contaminated spray his own personal stamp of approval, now set up some kind of a permanent mechanism to ensure that each batch is properly tested in the future and that the people of this Province are adequately protected by some kind of mechanism that the minister puts into play for any substance that is sprayed over our forests?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. gentleman that while I agree with this testing and being very cautious because of what unfolded in Ontario and Quebec, it was the hon. member and his colleague from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) who wanted me to spray the entire forest of Newfoundland last year with Bt. But we chose to spray with fenitrothion that has been registered with Agriculture Canada and has been studied to death. That is probably not a good expression to use, but it has gone through extensive study and it went through a long approval

process. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. member in answering the first question, we will forthwith analyze this batch of Bt that we have and if it is found to have sufficient quantities of this streptococcus to be injurious to people or animals, then of course we will do the responsible thing and not spray.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We on this side advise the use of bacillus thuringiensis and not streptococcus bacteria, I would like to remind the minister.

My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Health, who is involved in this. The Federal Department of Health is currently testing this mixture to confirm for streptococcus as well as several other suspected dangerous substances. Has the minister received any information from his federal counterparts regarding this testing? If not, will he immediately investigate to determine any possible health hazard to the people of this Province, especially in light of the fact that this Province is the only province in Canada that uses this substance exclusively in watershed and water supply areas?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

No, we have not received, to my

knowledge, any advance notice from the Federal Department of Health about streptococcus contamination in Bt. I heard about it this afternoon, and I can assure you and all members of this House that my department will investigate to its fullest detail.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. It concerns statements made by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), a member of the government's own backbench, who has now joined the massive voice of public questioning of the hydroponic project in Mount Pearl. The member for Terra Nova says he could not understand the rationale of the government for putting this hydroponic complex in Mount Pearl rather than a rural part of the Province. My question to the Premier is this: If the member for Terra Nova, a highly placed official in this Legislature, could not rationalize this decision, how does the Premier expect the people of this Province to rationalize it? Or does he want to keep it secret, in the same way as he did when he passed over Come By Chance and the right to our birthright, Hibernia oil, to that secret Bermudian company called Newfoundland Energy Limited?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
What a lot of propaganda, those people over there talking about Come By Chance and Hibernia oil, the party that caused the white

elephant out in Come By Chance with Shaheen, while we are still paying back \$30 million. I think the total is \$48 million that the taxpayers of Newfoundland and Labrador are paying back for the Liberal mistake of Shaheen in Come By Chance - \$48 million! The hon. member over there is a member of the party that perpetrated that disaster on the taxpayers of Newfoundland and Labrador. Then he has the audacity, the unmitigated gall, Mr. Speaker, to stand in his place, proudly proclaiming his Liberalism, and asking us about Come By Chance and about trying to do other things in the Province to create jobs.

I did not hear the hon. member for Terra Nova's comment. If the hon. member for Terra Nova cannot rationalize it, the hon. member for Terra Nova will have to substantiate why he cannot rationalize it. He is not a member of government. He is a supporter of the administration and he has made his views known. I have not seen what he said -

MR. TULK:
'Seen what he said.' That was good!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Well, fine. Let it be good. I have not heard what he said. I mean, the hon. member for Terra Nova is allowed to say what he wants to say, I guess. I do not understand. If he said that he cannot rationalize or he does not understand it, I guess he will have to demonstrate to his constituents and the people of Newfoundland what logic and rationality he brings to it for his position. That is all I can say. The hon. member made a statement. If he made a statement, I guess he will have to

stand by it and defend it in the same way as the hon. the member for Fogo, over the years has tried to defend and rationally explain what he said, although I do not think he has done a very good job on it over the last number of years. But that is the story.

If the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and other people in Newfoundland are opposed to a new high technology coming to the Province to create 150 jobs, let them be opposed to it. They were opposed to Newfoundland Energy in Come By Chance and there are over 500 Newfoundlanders working there now.

Now, when we get this new biotechnology center going and we create another 150 jobs and start producing things we never produced before, when the next election is called, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland will judge how they stand on the issues of the day and they will judge us on how we stand on the issues of the day, and we will see who will win, Mr. Speaker. No problem! That is all I have to say about it. It is a free society. Anybody is allowed to say what they like, I suppose.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Liberal Party in 1967, the same time, as a matter of fact, the Premier was President of the Green Bay district Liberal Association. I did not leave it because the Premier of the day would not let me run in a certain district:

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. I was never President.

MR. TULK:
You never made President. You were Secretary.

Let me ask the Premier another question.

MR. SIMMONS:
I was his campaign manager.

MR. TULK:
Shame on you!

The member for Terra Nova has also expressed the opposition of his constituents over the location of the proposed \$18 million tomato and cucumber farm in Mount Pearl. Will the Premier now agree, in view of the opposition from his own backbenches, to put this project on hold until all studies have been tabled and there has been a public debate in this Legislature? Or does he again want to operate in the same manner of secrecy as he did with Come By Chance and give it away to somebody else from outside of the Province?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The answer is absolutely no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask will the Premier inform the House if it is his intention to meet with the people of Terra Nova as has been requested by the member for Terra Nova, or will he give them a public commitment now that indeed he will or will not meet with them to discuss their concerns over this project going into Mount Pearl? Will he do that or will he not?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do what I feel is right, Mr. Speaker, in due course.

MR. GREENING:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

The request for the Premier to meet in Terra Nova was made by the Port Blandford/Winter Brook Rural Development Association. That is my point of order, Mr. Speaker. Clarification.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for

the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), a man who is a very busy minister these days. I want to raise a question relating to the salmon hatchery in Bay d'Espoir or, more to the point, his questionable involvement in that particular operation. Would the minister indicate to the House why the minister is deliberately putting at risk the salmon hatchery and the salmon farming operation in Bay d'Espoir, why the minister is insisting that the government must have a commanding voice on the Board of Directors before it, the government, will assist what is after all a local small scale rural Newfoundland enterprise? Why?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development is not putting the aquaculture industry in Bay d'Espoir at risk, to correct one statement the hon. member made. What this minister is requesting, and I do not think it is unreasonable to request it, is that the Development Association in Bay d'Espoir live up to an agreement that I had with them in 1985. That is not an unreasonable request. That is what I am doing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Brian, when are you going to open up your government?

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the same minister is responsible to government for another enterprise, hydroponics, the \$13 million pickle the Premier got himself into.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
I thought you would love that one.

MR. TULK:
Pickles and catsup.

MR. GILBERT:
The cucumber kid.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the minister will be as familiar as the gentleman for Terra Nova, at least, with the hydroponics proposal, one in which the government has committed the taxpayers to \$13.5 million in equity, loan guarantees and so on. Now, Mr. Speaker, why the double role? Why is it that an enterprise in which we are going to sink \$13.5 million does not require an override by government, yet this enterprise down in Bay d'Espoir, where we have a bunch of local entrepreneurs who, through frustration and high unemployment, have been driven to seek something productive to do and have found it does? Why is it now that the government wants to play interference on this? Why is the government applying one set of rules there, saying my way or no way and yet is letting Sprung and his crowd have free rein on millions of government taxpayers?

How can he rationalize the different treatment of those two enterprises? Is the difference that one is from Calgary and the other is from Bay d'Espoir? Is that the difference?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in the Sprung proposal, or Sprung deal, we have put in cash of \$2.5 million and land worth \$1 million and Sprung has put in cash of \$3.5 million. For our small investment for a scientific part of this Sprung facility, we own 50 per cent of it. We put in half of the money, we own 50 per cent of it. In Bay d'Espoir, Mr. Speaker, we put in all of the money and we are asking for 51 per cent of the management. We do now want to own it, they own 100 per cent of it. We want 51 per cent of the management until the hatchery is a viable industry, then we are gone. Simple, Mr. Speaker. Easy to rationalize.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
The people of Bay d'Espoir, I say to the minister, who are involved in this project, submitted to him a management plan last October.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

(Inaudible) development plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There price went up by \$100,000.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I like to let them talk because they get so little chance to in their own caucus. Let it all hang out.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

A plan was submitted to the minister last October and a meeting was requested. The minister refused -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand here unless I get some order to put my questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Last Fall a plan was submitted to the minister and a meeting was requested of the minister. He stalled until last week. The Premier says they do not have the expertise. Let them hire the expertise. We are not talking about who will have control. The issue is why has the minister jiggered those people around all those months? Why does he not trust

them to do their own thing in Bay d'Espoir? Why is it he wants to have the final bit of say on this important local enterprise which would have a chance of succeeding if he would stop interfering and give them the same lease on life as he has given to an out-of-province firm called Sprung? Why the two different kinds of treatment? Does he not trust the people of rural Newfoundland? Is he rejecting outright the underlying theme of the House report? Why is it he will not trust the people of rural Newfoundland to develop their own economies? Why?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member obviously does not have very many questions to ask today if it takes three or four minutes to ask a simple question.

MR. SIMMONS:

You do not think it is important, do you?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the Bay d'Espoir Salmon Growers Co-op has actually nothing to do with the hatchery. The co-op is a group of farmers who want to grow salmon. That is separate than the hatchery. One of the reasons for the hatchery deal we made in 1985 was that the estimates on the construction of the hatchery were 100 per cent in error. I had to go get an extra \$1 million over and above what we had budgeted and what they suggested the hatchery would cost, and then we asked for some management control, Mr. Speaker,

and we still ask for that management control until the hatchery is a viable business. Mr. Speaker, we have to put probably as much money as that again in there, 100 per cent of our money has to go in there again, Mr. Speaker. So we would like to have some management control while we are putting in 100 per cent of the money and, when it is a viable business, Mr. Speaker, we are gone.

MR. TULK:
Who is 'we'?

MR. R. AYLWARD:
The 'we' is the same people who are involved with 50 per cent ownership of Sprung.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is initially to the Minister of Health. It has to do with the recently released Canadian Public Health Association Task Force Report. The question I would like to ask the Minister of Health is in his statement the impression was given that there was no health problems pointed out in the particular report itself. I would refer the minister to recommendations number 10, which says that there should be monitoring of noise levels in the Goose Bay area, including schools and work places, and preventative measures taken if possible, and number 12, which says that the FEARO process must assess the issue of aircraft emissions, especially with regard to the food chain, and the other

recommendations that talk about the effects on Happy Valley - Goose Bay. My question to the minister is this: Is he dismissing these as legitimate concerns for the Canadian Public Health Association and is he only concentrating on damage to the ears?

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

DR. TWOMEY:
In making a Ministerial Statement on the report, I covered for the Department of Health the statement and the report as it relates health.

I think there are other questions and other recommendations that will have to be passed on to the Department of the Environment. One thing that I have mentioned, and I think it is about the fourth paragraph in my Ministerial Statement, is that it is possible that there will be some mental or psychological problems, there might be tension, there might be anxiety, and I speak about the startled reflex. They speak about intervention and counselling. They have also spoken about the potential of noise in the school that is in immediate proximity to the runway. These are the things they have mentioned. But overall, as regards to physical health, to my knowledge there is no implication. As regards to stress and anxiety there is a potential, but my answer to that would be in all normal, human activities there is a degree of stress, for us as if run to seek election, or if we invest, even if we get married. There are also other problems. There is stress when we get in our car every morning if we anticipate that there is going to be a problem or when we drive on the

highway. All these can cause a degree of stress. I think that is inherent in all developments in this world.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

As the minister indicated, there are other ministries that are involved with this. My question is for the Premier, who is also the minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs. There are two specific recommendations in this Canadian Public Health Association Report which was commissioned by the government, two specific recommendations that they put forward. The first one is that there be -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please ask his question?

MR. FENWICK:

Well, I am asking whether or not the government agrees with the two recommendations of the Canadian Public Health Association Report, one of which is to freeze the frequency of flying at this present Summer's level until such time as the FEARO panel study is complete and the Innu land claims are settled, and the second one is to ban night flying, which according to the report causes much greater psychological damage to people underneath it than does the day flying? What is the position of Intergovernmental Affairs with regard to these two recommendations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think the report was released this morning. We got it this morning. We are a pretty efficient administration here, Mr. Speaker, and we pride ourselves on responding as quickly as we can, but I do not think it would be very wise or prudent of me, Mr. Speaker, to respond this afternoon. I have not had a chance to read the report myself. I am sure over the next week or so the Intergovernmental Affairs people, with other departments, will be reviewing it and making a recommendation to me and to Cabinet and then we will debate it and come up with a position.

I appreciate the hon. member's question and the concerns that he has on these two very important areas of the report and I can assure him that we will immediately study it, analyze it and take a position on it as quickly as we can.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My final supplementary is again to the Premier. I accept his argument that he needs time to study the recommendations. But the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Panel back in January -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is a final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:

My question to the Premier is this: In January the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Panel also recommended that there be a freeze on the frequency of low level flights in Labrador until such time as the FEARO panel completed its study. Since it has been several months since that FEARO agency has released its report, what is the government's position with regard to that request for a freeze?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is getting awfully convoluted and ambiguous. I do not know what the hon. member is asking now. There was an earlier recommendation -

MR. FENWICK:

(Inaudible) the recommendations of the FEARO panel.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. Well, we waited until the report came out, and now we are going to take all of the recommendations of the report and go through them and take a position on them. Like we did with the House report recommendations, which we are implementing a whole lot of them.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have question for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). The minister will know that the federal Minister of Health, the hon. Jake Epp, granted an increase of \$152 per month in

January of this year to Canada Pension Plan disability pensioners. The minister will also know that many of these disability pensioners were receiving social services because the pension plan was so low.

Can the minister explain to the House why many of these recipients, who were receiving social assistance, had some or all of that extra \$152 deducted from their welfare cheques, depending on the level of assistance each recipient was receiving?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member I think is well aware of the fact that any income from the federal government is considered as non-allowable income and therefore must be deducted from social assistance.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister is aware that the hon. Mr. Epp has again been advised by his legal people of a way around this regulation that the minister is talking about? He has received a letter. So I wonder if the minister can indicate whether he supports Mr. Epp's position, who believes that these recipients should receive all of the increase of \$152 a month?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social

Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of what Mr. Epp's position is on that and I can only repeat to the hon. member that additional federal income is considered non-allowable income and therefore we have to deduct it. Now, if somebody has given Mr. Epp some legal advice as to some way around it, I have not seen that.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I will table in the House the press release here which states Mr. Epp's position. I again ask the minister whether he agreed with the federal minister that these recipients, in view of the tremendous financial need they are in, in view of the fact that these people are not likely to work again, in view of the fact that they receive no other income, whether he supports the federal minister that these disability pensioners should receive all of that increase?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

It is quite easy, I guess, to stand up over there and say that the people on social assistance need the money. Mr. Speaker, nobody in the world would like anymore than myself to see the amounts that these people are getting doubled. But again, Mr. Speaker, this year, as I have said on many occasions, we are going to spend \$172 million in this

Province in the Department of Social Services and there is a limit to what the Province can do. As much as we would like to see an increase in rates, Mr. Speaker, it just cannot be done.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn). We learned over the weekend that twenty more workers at the St. Lawrence operation would be laid off effective next weekend. This latest cutback will bring the total layoffs down there to fifty workers. Now, since St. Lawrence is one of those projects that the Premier touts as a major success story, I would like to ask the Minister of Mines how the work force can be cut from eighty to thirty people, a loss of fifty full-time jobs in a five month period?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I outlined in this House only about three weeks ago, and of course in the estimates committee as well, that there were problems down at St. Lawrence. One of the problems was the fact that we had a severe run-off this Spring and as a result of that they had a problem with mining. They had to curtail their mining operations down there and had a lay off at that point in time. That was number one. Number two, the first ore that went through the mill, the

processing machine, was too fine for the customer it was being produced for, ICI, and as a result of that some of the mill people had to be laid off because they had to readjust the machine. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other problems that are developing down there that we are not 100 per cent happy with but we have the Chief Executive Officer of Minworth coming here later on this week or early next week, and we tentatively have a meeting scheduled for Friday. We had one previously scheduled for June 4 but because of the seriousness of the situation in St. Lawrence, and wanting to get a complete update of the situation down there, the President and Chief Executive Officer of Minworth will be here on Friday. We intend to discuss all these matters with him at that point in time and hopefully have a report for the House early next week.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is just four o'clock now and it is time to call Private Members' Day, unless by leave.

MR. FUREY:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No Leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

No leave.

Order, please!

I now call on the hon. the member for Placentia - Private Member's motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce this Private Member's resolution. It is a resolution that I am sure the Opposition over there will be delighted to support. I know they have gone through a very trying period in knifing their leader, but having accomplished that and have cleansed the blood from their hands and their garments, I say he is a very compassionate leader to sit there with them. I certainly would not sit in the front rows over there, I would sit in the back.

Mr. Speaker, we have to very gratefully and we have to thank this government for their perseverance in fighting for the Atlantic Accord. Members opposite sat there, they stood there and they supported Lalonde and Trudeau and Chretien: they supported their proposal to take from Newfoundlanders that which was rightfully their's. You did that and history will record the shameful way you acted, one and all. Mr. Speaker, I know they are going to scatter out of the House now, because they do not want to be here to support this.

MR. SIMMS:

They cannot take the heat.

MR. PATTERSON:

They cannot take the heat, and there is the head man leaving now.

I think it was Rudyard Kipling who said 'When thieves and rouges fall out and fight, there's full arrears to pay.' I guess you fellows are feeling that way over there now because it was actual thievery to take from that man

that which was rightfully his, that which was given him at a convention four months ago. You ganged upon him and then you were not happy with that, you had to gang up on one of your own members who was running there. And there are such thieves (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

So, I can see now, Mr. Speaker, they do not have too much time for this resolution. They are not at all happy that this resolution is on the table here today, because they were not given the opportunity to give away that resource. Had this government not stood firm for Newfoundland and had the Trudeau regime remained in Ottawa, we would not have the Atlantic Accord which guarantees we have full coverage in it for Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) the resettlement programme.

MR. PATTERSON:

You should be resettled. I can assure you if you have any aspirations to being resettled, run against me in Placentia district. If you want to be resettled, run against me in Placentia district.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

You raised it.

MR. PATTERSON:

I have every intention of getting out in the next election, but if

something like you came on the scene, it would be very, very tempting.

Mr. Speaker, "WHEREAS the Atlantic Accord provided for a joint offshore management, offshore revenue sharing and a preparatory Offshore Development Fund;" - we have that fund - "and"

"WHEREAS the Provincial Government has been requesting timely approval of projects under the Offshore Development Fund; and

"WHEREAS the establishment of an offshore fiscal regime is critical to Hibernia development;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House go on record as encouraging the Federal Government to consider these issues on a more urgent and sensitive basis to facilitate the start-up of the Hibernia project without further delay."

Now, I heard the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) say, 'Yes, you have.' Well, I can tell him yes, we have, and the money is being spent from that Accord: Millions of dollars have gone into the trade school system.

MR. TOBIN:

\$10.5 million.

MR. PATTERSON:

\$10.5 million have gone there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

\$11.5 million.

MR. PATTERSON:

\$11.5 million. To date a total of \$103.6 million has been approved under the fund, and the projects approved for funding are designed to give long-term economic benefits to the Province by

establishing basic facilities and programmes in support of education, training, industrial infrastructure, and research and development related to the offshore.

Twenty-five million dollars for a center for earth resources at Memorial University. This project is scheduled for completion in the Fall of 1989.

MR. SIMMS:

A world-class facility.

MR. PATTERSON:

A world-class facility. Three million dollars for a modest number of skills training projects. These projects are proceeding as planned and will be fully activated with the release of the Hibernia project - \$1 million for a computer-aided engineering design center; and \$5 million for an offshore survival center. I think we should kick in a few dollars for the survival of the Liberal Party, because I think they will be wiped out in the next election which hopefully will be on my birthday, which is September 20.

Three million for a Career Development Awards programme designed to provide the scholarships and other forms of financial assistance.

MR. SIMMS:

Rex is running in Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

No, no! He will never do that again.

Two point seven million, contribution to the center for offshore remote medicine at Memorial University; \$17.4 million, research and development

programme designed to establish a stronger petroleum related research.

One of the things we have to be very, very careful of, and which the Mobil Oil people have done a good job on, is dealing with the possibilities of pollution out there. They have done an excellent job on that. But that does not mean we will not have a blowout out there. Blowouts have been occurring all over the world, wherever they have oil wells, and tankers have been colliding, but built into the Atlantic Accord -

MR. TULK:

There is a plug to stop it.

MR. PATTERSON:

There is not a plug to stop it. If we wanted a plug to stop anything that is running, we would use your head.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, there would be no great outflow of brains. Because if that hon. gentleman's brains were dynamite, he would not have enough to blow his nose. Your leader over there knew it when he demoted you. He was the first to detect it, and he is a Placentia Bay man. When it comes to detecting political weaknesses in people, you cannot go beyond a Placentia Bay man to get it. Leo Barry knew that and he demoted you.

MR. CALLAN:

Are there any lobsters in Placentia Bay?

MR. PATTERSON:

If you want to talk about lobsters, you will be as red as a

lobster when the votes are counted after the next election.

Mr. Speaker, written into the Atlantic Accord -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Ask for protection. They are harassing the hon. member.

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, would you protect me from the hon. mugwumps opposite?

MR. SPEAKER:

May we have order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

The legislation implementing the Accord will establish an oil pollution compensation regime with respect to absolute liability.

Now, what did you people have up in Come By Chance? What did you have to protect the fishermen of Placentia Bay when the Bay was flooded and polluted? What did you have there when the big tankers went out without pilots? They did not come under compulsory piloting. What did you have up there then? It was shameful the way the people were treated. When we had the spill up at ERCO there was no pollution protection. But now we have a good Minister of Environment here and he has good legislation and guidelines to go by. So you should be the last group to talk about environmental concerns.

MR. TOBIN:

There is pollution over there, Bill.

MR. PATTERSON:

There is one man over there I cannot say very much about, and

what I have to say about him is good. He is the only true Liberal over there. He is a man who has a social conscience, and that is the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). The rest are tools of the Capitalists, because they had their leader bought like a bullock, hoof and hide. They do not know who paid for him. They went out and they could not get a leader so finally they had to go down to Mr. Wells and offer him \$200,000 a year. Who is paying the \$200,000 a year?

MR. TULK:

Frank Ryan and Craig Dobbin.

MR. PATTERSON:

No, Sir! You bought your leader. Where will you lay the ransom for him? You are not going to give it, you will lay that in a canvas bag out in a cemetery someplace where the kidnapers can come and pick it up and deliver him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

I know what you are like. I have observed and studied you people over there. If you were a bit smart, what you would do is wait - the Liberal Party always made that mistake - your turn is coming. Time is against us on this side of the House.

MR. TULK:

But you hope it is a long time.

MR. PATTERSON:

No, seventeen years is a long time. Your time is coming if you would not be too anxious. Now, the only chance you ever had to get over here you had, but you assassinated your leader, a man who took you from five seats to fifteen seats. Had the election

lasted another six or seven days -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is this relevant?

MR. SIMMS:

It is very relevant.

MR. PATTERSON:

This is very relevant. - had the election lasted another five or six days he would have had more votes. Why did you do it? you must ask yourselves.

MR. TOBIN:

Who is paying Clyde Wells?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have some order? All members of the House will have equal opportunity to speak.

MR. PATTERSON:

Not only did we achieve one Atlantic Accord last year, we achieved the Argentinia Accord. Here was a piece of property that I went to Ottawa and negotiated with the Liberals on and we could not get to first base with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

When?

MR. PATTERSON:

Here we had a piece of property that was in the hands of a foreign government and we could not get access to that property. Finally Trudeau shrugged his shoulder and gave us the finger, like he always did, and I said, 'That is enough, buddy, we are going to straighten this out.' But we straightened

out the deal and we straightened it out on May 5. Here is a picture of Patterson and the Consul General and the Premier and John Crosbie signing that, a very historic document. Because the Americans were under no obligation to us to sign this agreement, because this agreement was signed in 1941 for 100 years.

Now, I must say for my friend, when Walter Carter was in Ottawa -

MR. TULK:

The member for Twillingate.

MR. PATTERSON:

Yes, the member for Twillingate. When he was in Ottawa he worked on this with me because he and I were very close friends.

MR. FLIGHT:

Did you support him for the leadership?

MR. PATTERSON:

I did. I supported Walter Carter in two leaderships, and I am not ashamed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Now I know why you are not in the Cabinet.

MR. PATTERSON:

In case you people do not know what the Argentinia Accord means, it means that we have access to 500 acres of Argentinia, 500 acres, and that is going to be developed as the site for topside construction. A lot of the construction will be done in my hon. friend's district, and the topsides will be put together in Argentinia.

MR. CALLAN:

What about Come By Chance?

MR. PATTERSON:

Yes, that is a very good point. There will be a lot of activity up there in Adams Head, there is no doubt about it.

MR. SIMMS:

What about (inaudible) Head, will there be much activity there?

MR. PATTERSON:

No, none in that. Forget it. At Adams Head there will be a lot of activity, because that is where the gravity base concrete structures are going to be built, and there are going to be 3,000 people involved in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

What about those letters they are continuously writing every day? That is not true, is it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Those letters they are writing every day to the editor, they are not true, are they?

MR. PATTERSON:

No, no, that is not true at all. A few dirt-bags up there, a few Liberals, probably they are known to you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

Someone of your calibre, I guess, who can neither read nor write. You would feel very much at home

in that company.

MR. FLIGHT:

They are complimentary letters.

MR. PATTERSON:

Yes, in that company you would feel very much at home. But now we have the Atlantic Accord and we have the Argentinia Accord. And then we had the Liberals who left behind them orders to destroy the VTS Station in Argentinia, they wanted that burned as a scorched-earth policy. They said, 'We do not want that any more, get rid of it.' Who put the screws to it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON:

This man over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PATTERSON:

Well, some of his money. I will have to give him a bit of credit for it. Nevertheless, we went to Ottawa, we built a good case and as a result of that Come By Chance will be onstream \$7 million cheaper than had that been destroyed.

MR. TULK:

What a man for the Cabinet.

MR. FLIGHT:

He should be in the Cabinet.

MR. SIMMS:

Do not pay any attention to them.

MR. PATTERSON:

No, I am not concerned about them at all. Had that facility been

destroyed, it would have cost \$7 million to put it back there. And Placentia Bay has to come under compulsory pilotage, and this station up there will monitor who is going in and out of Argentia.

This was our last chance. We were on the bottom rung of the ladder since Confederation. That is where we were and we were forever looking up. We never would have moved but for the Tories taking over in Ottawa. We would have been serfs and tools for Ottawa. All we would have gotten out of the offshore was the milk. The cream would be whipped away to Ottawa, and they would send us back the crumbs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

That is true. That was under the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) when he was up there and would not let the oil rigs come into Placentia Bay.

MR. PATTERSON:

That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I have just about wound up my remarks on the resolution and I look forward to hearing -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PATTERSON:

No. I am a person. I want to be enlightened. I know there are a lot of brains over there and I know you are anxious to get moving

on it. I certainly would like for you fellows to get into a kind of jovial mood to get away from the treacherous act that you have committed with your leader. That must be troubling you.

MR. TOBIN:

Is the blood dry on your hands?

MR. PATTERSON:

I can you assure you, had my colleague from Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) stayed in the leadership race he would have won. Because all you have to do is look at history. Turner came back. Where did he go?

MR. TOBIN:

Nowhere.

MR. PATTERSON:

Yes. Where did the late Don Jamieson go? He came back? He did not make it.

MR. TULK:

Ah, now!

MR. PATTERSON:

I am not speaking disrespectfully. He did not make it. So if I were in my friend's shoes who is running for the leadership over there, I would go into that meeting and I would tell them, Look, if you vote for the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) he will be in the House of Assembly on Monday morning. If you vote for my friend here, he may never be in the House of Assembly. I am quite sure he will never be in there, because I checked my ouija board on that fellow and I will tell you that he will never sit in the House of Assembly.

MR. TOBIN:

In two year's time he will not even be elected.

MR. PATTERSON:

No. No. I would say that you men over there are treating that gentleman in a shameful manner. Here is his opponent guaranteed \$200,000 or \$300,000 -

MR. FLIGHT:

Read your own speeches of last year.

MR. PATTERSON:

Guaranteed \$300,000 -

MR. TULK:

What did your ouija board say?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

He said (inaudible) of what the people were saying.

MR. FLIGHT:

Read your own speeches from last year.

MR. PATTERSON:

No, I do not have to read any speeches. I was around in the days of Confederation, I worked for Confederation and I am not a bit ashamed to say that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

I made speeches then, my son. Look here, you would have had to hold onto your hat because you would have been a Whig or a Tory, or whatever they called them in those days. You would have been a member of the Water Street gang that fought against Confederation.

MR. TULK:

Who?

MR. PATTERSON:

All of you. The whole lot of you.

Anyway, I think that wraps it up.

MR. TOBIN:

How much is Clyde Wells getting?

MR. PATTERSON:

I would say a couple of hundred thousand dollars a year.

MR. TOBIN:

But who is paying him?

MR. PATTERSON:

Well, there are a few people here in St. John's. It certainly is not fair to the member for Gander. He is in a very unfair position. He has to take up that seat over there if he is elected and he has to go on his MHA pay. That is it! They have not offered him -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. PATTERSON:

No, my son, you have not offered one penny to the member for Gander. It is shameful what you did.

MR. TULK:

Who said that?

MR. TOBIN:

Norm Whalen said it and Clyde Wells said it.

MR. PATTERSON:

That is right. And you did not give it to Leo. You did not. I think you should do it. I think you should cleanse your souls now and say, Look, whatever is guaranteed to one we will guarantee to the other. You fellows will always hear it ringing in your ears that you bought your leader, bought like a bullock hoof and hide. You bought your leader, he is not elected.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ask the question, Mr. Speaker.

Carried.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, before we carry this magnificent resolution prepared and put down - well, at least put down by and I have no doubt prepared by one of the great gentleman of this Chamber, a man who, as he says, Mr. Speaker, did indeed participate in Confederation, which goes a long way to explaining why he is not in the Cabinet. There is no place in the Cabinet for any pro-confederates, that is a sin. If there is one thing he should understand, that is a sin. If there is one thing the Premier is it is an elephant. The Premier is an elephant for memory, I can tell him that, and the Premier remembers well by extension. He remembers vicariously that the gentleman from Placentia did indeed support Confederation. But if that were not enough of a sin to have on his shoulders, his considerable shoulders, his very able shoulders, the Premier remembers something else, too, more recent, he remembers that the gentleman from Placentia had the wisdom to support, in the 1979 Tory leadership, the man who was clearly the best choice for leader of the Tory Party at that time. Indeed, that candidate's one

weakness, his Achilles' heel, and perhaps the reason he did not win the leadership at that time, despite the support of the gentleman from Placentia East, is that he was not a Tory. He was a Liberal, like so many in that party, offering himself to lead the so-called Tory Party. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I refer to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter). He had the honour on that occasion to have the support of the mover of this resolution, this resolution which says, in effect, that the House get after the federal government to treat the offshore matter more urgently.

That, Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Long), is, uncoded, what this resolution says. Despite all the pontifications leading up to the September, 1984 election, despite all the beating of breasts after the 1984 election, and particularly in February, 1985 when they came to the Hotel Newfoundland to sign the Atlantic Accord, despite all the protestations of interest in our welfare down here, despite the threats to inflict prosperity on us, despite all that, what do we have now? One of the few remaining pro-Confederate Tories, what a rare bird in Newfoundland to be a pro-Confederate Tory, and on to that, to be competent.

Mr. Speaker, it makes the Canada goose look plentiful, a competent, pro-Confederate Tory. That is what they call in math almost a null set, a set in which there are no people, there are no individuals. This individual has one set, so it is some kind of unique set, a competent, pro-Confederate Tory. That gentleman has brought to such

frustration by what he has seen - Mr. Speaker, let us be clear, this gentleman knows the offshore like nobody on that side of the House.

I had the great privilege last year to journey to Norway with him, the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the gentleman from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) and the gentleman from Humber West (Mr. Baird). I had the privilege of journeying with those men to Norway, but the privilege was nowhere greater than insofar as it applied to the gentleman from Placentia East. Because I found, Mr. Speaker, in conversations with him, and I had several and I am grateful to him for that, he knows the offshore issue inside out.

MR. FUREY:

As do all those guys.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, no! I do not say that tongue in cheek. The gentleman from Placentia East knows this issue very well. He has not only been around a long time, he has been alert all that time. That, in itself, is a compliment. How anybody can stay alert in that caucus is either a great comment on his ability to stay awake or on his devotion to duty. I guess, as the Whip, it is his devotion to duty. Whatever the reason, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, he has followed this one with intimacy. That is important to what I want to say about this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

He, to a greater degree than any other member in the government caucus, is frustrated by what he has seen happen since the Tory Administration took office in Ottawa. He is so frustrated, Mr.

Speaker, that he has been compelled to put it in writing; so alarmed, Mr. Speaker, that he has allowed his writings to become public and here they are.

He says, "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House go on record as encouraging the Federal Government to consider these issues on a more urgent and sensitive basis to facilitate the start-up of the Hibernia project without further delay."

Mr. Speaker, being the diplomat he is, and we saw something of that a few moments ago, he has couched his plea in kind terms. Let us uncode what he has said. Let us decode, I guess is the word, what he has said. The "House go on record as encouraging the federal government." Encouraging, of course, is a nice word for asking someone to get on with it.

Then he says, "to consider these issues on a more urgent and sensitive basis." What is his charge then, Mr. Speaker? What is the charge of the gentleman for Placentia East? His charge is twofold. First, that the Government of Canada is not treating the offshore urgently enough and we agree with him on that. The Government of Canada is not treating the issue urgently enough. It does not place any urgency on the matter whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, his other charge is even more telling. He also charges that the treatment by the federal government of the Hibernia project has been insensitive, it has lacked sensitivity; and hence his plea that they treat it on a more sensitive basis. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a supporter of the administration that told us in September, 1985 that there was

going to be a new era. When the two governments of the same stripe were both in office, then we would have this era of prosperity and Hibernia would go ahead.

Indeed, their only fear at that time, as you remember, Mr. Speaker, was that they might overheat the economy. We might have more prosperity going that we could deal with. We might have too many jobs and too much money changing hands. Do you remember that fear, Mr. Speaker, about over heating the economy?

Now, two years later we have come to this, where a government backbencher says, 'Get on with it and do not be so insensitive. Get on with Hibernia and do not be so insensitive.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have no difficulty with this resolution. I suspect though, Mr. Speaker, that the government has some great difficulty with it and I would alert my good friend for Placentia to be careful that his own so-called colleagues do not try and amend his motion because for the government to vote for this resolution is to admit failure. It is to admit that despite all the fine words that we have heard, this provincial administration has been conned, has been outsmarted by the fast talking lawyer from Baie Commeau, from Manicouagan, Quebec.

The Prime Minister strikes again! The gentleman from Quebec, the gentleman who prides himself in running an American branch plant operation - the Governor of America's fifty-first state, if Mulroney has his way - has done it again. He has succeeded in baffling our Brian. What was once an urgent matter, the offshore,

once a matter to be treated sensitivity, is now, in the able characterization of the gentleman for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), become a matter lacking urgency and lacking sensitivity.

Mr. Speaker, does it occur to you that Hibernia may be like Utopia, that it may be something we talk about but never see? Does it occur to you that Hibernia may be like Atlantis, down there we are sure, but it may never surface? Does it occur to the gentleman for Placentia that in putting down this resolution he may be permitting this House to give voice one last time to a dying project?

I believe with his knowledge of offshore he will realize that events outside of this Province are very quickly threatening to make Hibernia completely irrelevant. I refer, in particular, to the announcement of a development of two or three weeks ago in the Beaufort Sea. In a moment I will have for hon. members the details of that. I saw it among papers a few minutes ago. On May 8th, I believe, the company concerned gave notice that it was going to proceed with a development in the Beaufort. Gulf Oil decided to go ahead with its Beaufort oilfield development. It said that the oilfield in the Beaufort is attractive for three reasons: First of all, the size of the reserves in that field, the cost of extraction, and thirdly, the proximity to existing pipelines.

In writing about this, the editor of Oilweek magazine in Calgary, while he stopped short of saying that Mobil will not go ahead with Hibernia, he did say that it is not very encouraging for

Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:

Who is this from?

MR. SIMMONS:

The editor of Oilweek magazine in Calgary.

Mr. Speaker, I introduce that note not because I wish it will become the reality, but because I wish to flag an issue.

Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, what I shall call the confrontation period that we went through on Hibernia and on the offshore generally? If you go back to mid-1983, the last year of the former Federal Liberal Government, everything was high pitched. Every moment you awoke and you turned on your radio in the morning, you were told what to think that day. It was either Mr. Marshall or Mr. Peckford or somebody else hyping people up.

Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, how shockingly dangerous and callous it was to have oil rigs out there in the Winter when the Liberal Government was in Ottawa? Do you not notice how different it is now that there is a Tory Government in Ottawa? It is not at all dangerous to have oil rigs out there now in the Winter. It is quite all right now. In those days people's emotions were played with day in and day out. It was shocking! It was callous! It was insensitive to have oil rigs out there!

Do you remember how terrible it was to have non-Newfoundlanders working on those rigs? It is not so anymore. Remember how terrible it was to have non-Newfoundlanders working anywhere. Not so anymore in Hopebrook or in Come By Chance

or anywhere else. Remember that general period of confrontation, Mr. Speaker, where your every waking moment was occupied with Hibernia! Hibernia! Counting your dollars and trying to withstand the onslaught of unprecedented prosperity. Remember that, Mr. Speaker, those heady days of 1983, when all would be solved as soon as the Tory Government came to office.

One of my points is this: During that period the matter was cranked up, cranked up by the Premier and by his entourage. Day in, day out, we were told, Hibernia, Hibernia, offshore, prosperity. Every day - I used to be in Ottawa in those days - you did not get a three foot telegram from the Premier, it was a slow day, a three foot telegram telling you what was wrong with those big, bad feds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of the sudden, where is it? Weeks go by and there is no finalization of the federal government agreement with Mobil, yet not a word from the government. The tactic now is if they remain silent enough, perhaps the problem will go away. Nobody being psyched up these days, Mr. Speaker. Oh, no! Because our other Brian is in charge in Ottawa. The Brian who manipulated our Brian into that infamous Meech Lake deal last week, the Brian, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa who has this Brian eating out of his hand.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I would just like to know how long the hon. member has. He has been on the go now for nearly half an hour. It seems highly irregular.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about three and a half minutes left.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is another example, Mr. Speaker, of how the gentlemen on that side continue to question your authority, Sir. You send me a note in good faith telling me how much time I have. I am governed by that. Always within the rules of the House I am. The gentleman from St. John's North, it is too cold to cultivate savoury, so he comes in here and cultivates mischief.

Now, I have noted, Mr. Speaker, that the number of points of order that he raises goes down graphically as the temperature goes up, because then he can be out at his -

MR. J. CARTER:

In inverse proportion.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is the general idea.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not hear much about Hibernia now, because that saviour of the Tory government is no longer there. These days it is pickles. Everybody eats pickles! Thirteen million dollar pickles, that is the latest saviour of the economy. So that there would not be a counterthreat from those people down in Bay d'Espoir who might turn out a few salmon, squash the salmon. All pickles these days! All cucumbers and tomatoes! If you do not like cucumbers and tomatoes, rough.

Another word came to mind, but it is not the place to say it.

So it goes, Mr. Speaker. Today it is cucumbers. Yesterday it was Hibernia. The gentleman from Placentia does us a great favour in bringing this issue before the House, because he allows us to vote for getting on with the job. The one thing I doubt is whether he can get his colleagues to fall in line without making amendments to the resolution.

While I have a minute, Mr. Speaker, I thought I ought to get the attention of the gentleman from Placentia. He is engaged with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, which is would admit is a fairly engaging exercise. If he can get anything through to that minister, it is going to take all his time and effort. But if he will just take a holiday for the moment.

I noticed with some amusement his comments about matters pertaining to this party. I am noticing, Mr. Speaker, that he is taking an undue interest in this party. The one fear we have over here is one of the few Tories on that side will want to come to this side. We will be hard pressed with such a gentleman, and a gentleman he is. We would have to refuse him on philosophical grounds. We could not do it on grounds of not being a gentleman. He is the ultimate gentleman, but he is not a Liberal.

I suppose we could test his credentials. We could bring him the caucus and ask him a few litmus test questions. I can tell you thing, if the reasons that hold that crowd together were our reasons for existence over here, we could take them in, because

their reasons for existing are a hatred of everything on this side. I think by his earlier comments in other places, we could be led to believe that he hates most things on that side.

I want to disspell the rumour about the gentleman from Placentia, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, with this I will finish. I want to dispel the rumour about the gentleman that it is not true that the Premier found him out near Whitbourne last week with an axe looking for a Cabinet post. That is not true.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I would like to have a few brief comments as it relates to the resolution so ably put forth by my colleague from Placentia (Mr. Patterson). The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) said he would give serious consideration to the member for Placentia joining the Liberal Party. All I would say there, Mr. Speaker, is that the mentality and the level of intelligence on the other side would certainly increase significantly.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons),

who talks about pickles and the Sprung operation, seems to me and sounds to me from his debate in this Legislature like somebody who was probably weened on a cucumber.

Mr. Speaker, let us get to the basis of this resolution that was put forth by my colleague for Placentia. After listening to the exercise and statements made by the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), one would almost believe that he is not the same person who sat in the House of Commons, he is not the same person who was the member for Burin-St. George's when the Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, would not provide Newfoundland with the opportunity to have control or ownership of its resources.

When he stood by, Mr. Speaker, and supported Mr. Chrétien, supported Mr. Lalonde, supported Mr. Trudeau, and would not give Newfoundland any chance, any say, any decision in his offshore resources; when he stood by, Mr. Speaker, and supported the Federal Liberal Government, when they refused to let the oil rigs come into Mortier Bay; he stood by, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Chrétien sent out a Telex and said the reason why the oil rigs could not go into Mortier Bay was because it was blocked with ice. What an insult, Mr. Speaker, to the best port on the Eastern seaboard! What an insult to the people! What an insult to the best trained marine workforce anywhere in the world! That is, Mr. Speaker, exactly where the member for Fortune-Hermitage stood, and that is exactly why the member for Fortune-Hermitage was delivered the royal order of a typical hypocritical politician in 1984 during the federal election.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution put forward by my colleague for Placentia clearly states what we have all known, Mr. Speaker, and what we all want to see happening. "WHEREAS the Atlantic Accord provided for a joint offshore management, offshore revenue sharing and a preparatory Offshore Development Fund."

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the Atlantic Accord. Where did the Atlantic Accord come from? Did the Atlantic Accord come, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Liberal regime that was in Ottawa? You bet your life it did not, Mr. Speaker. Did the Atlantic Accord come, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the little lambs that sat in this House in the last session on the other side and supported lock, stock and barrel every effort, every attempt? Everytime, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Liberals in Ottawa tried to put the hammer, tried to stamp, tried to trot Newfoundlanders into the ground, where was the member for Fogo and the other members opposite? They were there standing in their place, totally supportive of the federal government.

The second whereas, Mr. Speaker, is, "WHEREAS the Provincial Government has been requesting timely approval of projects under the Offshore Development Fund."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that we have been doing a very good job in the delivery of that. We were set, Mr. Speaker, with a development fund during the last election campaign and, Mr. Speaker, we did not spend one cent of that for political purposes. We did not spend one red penny of that for political gain. We destroyed, Mr. Speaker, the

philosophy of governments in the past where they throw money at voters and try to obtain votes without any substance.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the WHEREAS where the Provincial Government wants approval of the projects under the Offshore Development Fund, I can look at my own district of Burin - Placentia West, like my colleague did in Placentia East, and we have seen in the past little while an announcement, Mr. Speaker, whereby there will be a \$20 million expansion of the Marystown Shipyard. I believe that is very significant, an announcement of \$20 million expansion of the Marystown Shipyard, an announcement, Mr. Speaker, for various studies to be carried out throughout the Province and further announcements as it relates to the educational aspect of Memorial University and to the marine activities of our Province.

"WHEREAS the establishment of an offshore fiscal regime is critical to Hibernia development."

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there was anyone would ever argue that, but let us look at what was offered to us in the past. Let us look at the what the federal Liberals were prepared to give Newfoundland in terms, Mr. Speaker, of our offshore development. The Liberal Party, with ministers such as Chrétien, and such as Lalonde, were prepared to give nothing to Newfoundlanders as it related to the offshore except the royal order of the shaft.

Mr. Speaker, it is just coincidental I see the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) coming in here. There is a prime

example, Mr. Speaker, of a man who sat on the Liberal benches prior to 1982, stood and supported the Liberal Government of Canada every time they put the shaft to Newfoundlanders. He stood and supported the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, and yes, when the people of Windsor - Buchans got the opportunity, the first opportunity available to the people of Windsor - Buchans, it was to put the member, Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible) was also a member of that caucus that fought for Newfoundland's right to have refining done in Newfoundland under the Atlantic Accord and this member there is part of the biggest sell-out, and it will be seen as the biggest sell-out or giveaway that was ever given way. It will make Churchill Falls look like a Sunday school picnic.

Newfoundlanders realize that the oil in Hibernia or anywhere else offshore will be shipped off to Montreal, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for refining and all we will have is the profit from the sale and a few paltry jobs on the rigs, not the refining capacity that we are entitled to. That is what the member stood for when he supported the Accord and that is what he is going to have to live with.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Windsor - Buchans can squirm all he likes in this House, Mr. Speaker, he can squirm all he likes and try defend his actions. He is, Mr. Speaker, one Newfoundlander who stood here, and by the way, Mr. Speaker, there is another Newfoundlander who plays a very significant role in what happened as it relates to Hibernia and one of the reasons why Hibernia is not going today, and that is the fellow that they just bought lock, stock and barrel with a few business people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, Clyde Wells.

I tell you something right now, some of the lines will be forthcoming when he went to court against Newfoundland and denied, Mr. Speaker - a Newfoundlander today who wants to be a leader of a Liberal Party, who wants to be leader of a political party in this Province, who denied Newfoundlanders the right to their offshore, who denied Newfoundlanders the right to a fiscal regime, who denied Newfoundlanders the right to work in Newfoundland, that is the man now, Mr. Speaker, that they are all out buying, like my colleague from Placentia said, on the hoof. That is the man that has been penetrating the purses of the business community in this Province. As the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) said, he who pays the piper, calls the tune. And the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has the gall to stand in this House and talk about Come By Chance! The member for Windsor - Buchans talked about Come By Chance when he stood in this House not too long ago, and was opposed to what was happening, Mr.

Speaker. The only reason why they were not too critical about what was happening in Come By Chance was because the owner of Marco, the main contractor on the job, the man who refused to hire union people, Mr. Speaker, was the bagman for the Liberal Party. That is where they are coming from, Mr. Speaker.

If they want to talk about Come By Chance and if they want to talk about Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders having control over their resources, let them tell us, Mr. Speaker, who is paying Clyde Wells and much is he receiving! Then talk about the offshore oil and then we will talk, Mr. Speaker, about Clyde Wells and the role that he played in denying Newfoundlanders!

I see Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, walking around this Province praying for Hibernia to come. Mr. Speaker, there are two reasons why Hibernia is not started right now, forgetting the oil prices, it could have been started before that if, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government in Ottawa had been prepared to give us control over our resources, had been prepared to give us the Atlantic Accord, and if, Mr. Speaker, this Province had not had people like Clyde Wells, who just sold himself to the Liberal Party, and not too long ago he was selling himself to the federal Liberal Government at the expense of Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker. That is what the Liberal Party are putting forth as a leader! That is the best they could have, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is that is the man, Mr. Speaker, who betrayed Newfoundlanders, betrayed Newfoundland, went to court and

said that Newfoundland should not have control and that Newfoundland should not have jurisdiction over its offshore. That is the best that the Liberal Party can attract! I would say, Mr. Speaker, that as long as they continue to attract the upper echelon, the elite society, Mr. Speaker, the St. John's lawyers, they will always be in Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, they can talk about their St. John's lawyers! They had, Mr. Speaker, Ed Roberts, a very well-renowned, highly respected, St. John's lawyer. Where is he, Mr. Speaker, as a leader? What happened to him? Then came another messiah, a fellow by the name of Bill Rowe, another great St. John's lawyer. Out the window, Mr. Speaker, and the Liberal Party had not learned a lesson then. Away they go and who do they come back with? Mr. Barry, another well-renowned, St. John's lawyer.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province, the people in rural Newfoundland, the people in the fishing boats, Mr. Speaker, are not prepared to stand by and see a fellow that you have to buy for hundreds of thousands of dollars. They are not prepared to stand by and see that. In particular, Mr. Speaker, a fellow who went to court and denied - in my own district today, Mr. Speaker, there would be 500 or 600 people working if it had not been for Mr. Wells.

MR. FLIGHT:

Good bye, Glenn, with that one.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, 'good bye, Glen'! I tell him, either one of them, including the hundreds of thousands of dollars paid leader, come to Burin - Placentia West and

we will see who will come back,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
(Inaudible) \$500,000 trust fund.

MR. TOBIN:
They can scurry their dirt and their untruths. The fact of the matter is that they had to go on the street, buy a St. John's lawyer for hundreds of thousands of dollars who is now in the pockets of a few rich business people of this Province.

Go down to Petit Forte or South East Bight, go down to Paradise or somewhere, Mr. Speaker, and tell the fishermen, 'At \$75,000, my family cannot live in dignity.' That is, Mr. Speaker, what they have put forth and that is what will put the jinx and hinx to the Liberal Party in this Province.

I hate to say it, Mr. Speaker, but I say it sincerely, as a result of the leader of the Liberal Party being a St. John's lawyer in the pocket, Mr. Speaker, of a half a dozen or so business people in this Province, I am fairly scared that the socialists will take over second place in the Province.

MR. FLIGHT:
'Has Been' Glenn.

MR. TOBIN:
Down in my district, Mr. Speaker, they do not call me 'Has Been Glenn.' I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, if the polls show that he was a safe in his district as I was in mine -

MR. FLIGHT:
Close to it.

MR. TOBIN:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, and probably he should look at the poll and see

who are the worst two sitting members in this House. Mr. Speaker, the worst two sitting members in this House, Mr. Speaker, one is from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and the other is for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. FLIGHT:
'Has Been' Glenn.

MR. TOBIN:
- that is what they elected for a leader. Now, Mr. Speaker, after they have the knives down, the blood on their hands, not dry, Mr. Speaker, they come out with the member for Fortune - Hermitage, the former member for Burin - St. George's, a man, Mr. Speaker, who in 1984 on the South Coast, we just put him out to pasture as a politician. We had enough, Mr. Speaker, there is no way we could stand more of these representations. I can tell you something right now, Burin - Placentia West, Mr. Speaker, did the job.

Mr. Speaker, I have the floor to speak in this House, and I do not have to ask any of these people there for the right to speak, when I should speak, when I cannot speak or anything else. They all feel, Mr. Speaker, that they are chairing these meetings, but they are not. Mr. Speaker, the truth hurts.

The fact of the matter is, this resolution put forth today asks the federal government to move ahead at a faster pace in developing Hibernia. It has significant benefit to my colleague who introduced it. We have, Mr. Speaker, a resolution before the House as a result of the interest of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). As a

result, my own district, Mr. Speaker, will have significant gains. Mr. Speaker, the member for Bellevue will have significant gains.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a good resolution. It is a resolution that I am extremely interested in as it relates to the district of Burin - Placentia West, as it relates to what we call The Golden Triangle in Placentia Bay, Mr. Speaker, and as it relates to the best interest of all Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, I say that in all sincerity. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will do everything we can to ensure that Hibernia moves ahead at a faster pace and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite will support the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Placentia. If the hon. member speaks he will close debate.

MR. PATTERSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons), and the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) for their comments on this very important resolution. We have the Atlantic Accord, which is more or less a magna carta of rules and guidelines to govern us in the operation of this Hibernia development, and we have the Argentinia Accord which deals with on land, but the whole thing is froth with danger. There is no question at all about that, the movement of oil on the oceans is

something that we have to be very, very conscious of. All we have to do is look at history and see what has happened in several cases where you had huge oil spills, you had the Tory Canyon off the Coast of France, that tanker cracked up and it polluted miles and miles of beaches. In Chetabucto Bay we had the Arrow, another ship and that ship grounded there and polluted the Coast of Nova Scotia. Much of that pollution came into Placentia Bay and into St. Mary's Bay. So no matter how careful we are and no matter how many controls we have with the movement of oil on the oceans we are bound to have oil spills. But nevertheless every precaution is taken to see that they will be dealt with.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if we had control of the offshore fishery we would curse the day we ever heard of oil, because twenty years down the road we can have twenty, thirty or forty or fifty dry holes out there so far as business is concerned, but oozing oil in among the fish stocks. And 90 per cent of the world's ocean are biologically dead, they cannot support life, only 10 per cent, and we have about 8 per cent of that because of the upwelling warm waters coming from the Gulf stream bringing nutrients with it. And that is something we have to be very careful with.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question?

All those in favour "aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against "nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The resolution is defeated.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Falls.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, since it is five o'clock, Private Members' Day it would, under normal circumstances you would proceed since we have finished the debate on this particular resolution a bit early with the following resolution.

The following resolution is moved by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) who unfortunately is not in his seat, and I guess the idea probably would be that if we can get an agreement that we would not call that resolution now. It would be rather unfair, that it would obviously be the next one for next Wednesday, if the Opposition agrees.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Given what is going on we have no problem at all with agreeing. Obviously we want to be fair to the member for Menihek and he has not had any notice, when he is in his seat then we will call the resolution, next Wednesday.

MR. SIMMS:

Do you agree to call it six o'clock?

MR. TULK:

Yes, we agree to call it six o'clock.

MR. SIMMS:

We agree to call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.