



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 41

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Friday

20 May 1988

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers, I would like to welcome to the galleries thirty Grade XI students and their teacher, Roy Goose, from Whitbourne High School.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Also, sixty students and six teachers from Newville Elementary School in New World Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BUTT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the hon. House that on May 20-29, 1988, over 7.5 million Canadians will be participating in a unique nine-day celebration known as "Canada's Fitweek".

Canada's Fitweek is a major promotional campaign designed to stimulate greater participation in physical activity and fitness. In keeping with the goals of the Department of Culture, Recreation

and Youth, Fitweek also aims to heighten the awareness of the benefits of an active lifestyle while strengthening the network of individual groups and organizations offering these programmes. In keeping with the first Fitweek launched in 1983, this year's campaign will again feature a number of nation-wide, mass-participation projects sponsored by twenty national and provincial health and fitness associations, twelve provincial and territorial governments and Fitness Canada. This year's theme is "Celebrate Good Times", with over 13,000 events being held all across Canada. These events range from swimming, cycling, racquet sports, to walking and numerous unique local activities.

In Newfoundland and Labrador last year, approximately 60,000 people were involved in numerous activities during Fitweek and this year we anticipate between 70,000 and 100,000 people involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:
Along with the participants, an enormous amount of volunteer work has also gone into this campaign with over 300,000 volunteers helping out all across the country.

The ultimate success of Canada's Fitweek can only be made possible by the dedicated work of these numerous volunteers and various associations and groups.

There are 25 towns in Newfoundland and Labrador hosting their own community Fitweek events during Canada's Fitweek, along with Provincial Health and Fitness Associations and over 300

individual communities that are also hosting their own unique events. From Nain to Labrador City and from St. Anthony to St. John's, hundreds of local and national events will be the order of the day, Mr. Speaker.

My department has been coordinating the national and provincial projects with these provincial associations and the above groups, ensuring that as many people as possible, get out and become active during Fitweek 1988.

A lot of provincial government departments have also taken the initiative and are participating in various projects throughout the week. A good example is the "Sneaker Day Project".

MR. MATTHEWS:

Put on your sneakers.

MR. BUTT:

Yes.

I must mention that today is "Sneaker Day" - May 20 - and to promote this unique event a great pink sneaker boot, Mr. Speaker, was launched just outside the Confederation Building yesterday. This pink sneaker is the official logo for Canada's Fitweek and will be used at various events around the city this week.

As minister responsible for "Fitness", I urge hon. members and all people of Newfoundland and Labrador to take part in as many events as possible during the week of May 20 - 29, this year.

MR. YOUNG:

Do us a favour. Do not wear your pink sneakers.

MR. BUTT:

As part of hon. members' commitment to Fitweek, I challenge all of you to join with me for today, May 20, and kick off Fitweek by wearing sneakers. Mine are on the way here, by the way, and I will put them on. They are coming over now.

Wherever hon. members may be during Canada's Fitweek, I urge you to contact your town office, your Recreation Department, or my office and get personally involved with this unique celebration. Consult your T.V. and radio guide and newspapers for schedules of events in your area.

As a famous Greek philosopher once said, "Fitness is not only a state of mind, but also a state of motion". So get up, get out and get active, and "celebrate good times". Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for his statement. My colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) could not be here this morning, so, on his behalf, I would like to respond to the statement.

It is with great pleasure that we rise on this side to celebrate Fitness Week and to see it welcomed into the Province. We have the Summer games coming up

this summer, and I think in Mount Pearl we are going to see a great number of performances by a lot of young people from all over the Province. They have been looking forward to it, and I am looking forward to seeing many people participate in that event this Summer. That is one of the highlights, Mr. Speaker.

The thing about Fitness Week is everybody, of all ages, should be involved and should be getting out. As the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) said to me this morning, he is getting ready to set his garden out in Fogo this weekend, and he invites all hon. members out there this weekend to help him out.

I have been looking at this Ministerial Statement which says we want to "celebrate good times", and it also challenges us "to wear sneakers," Mr. Speaker. Well, I think we, on this side, are going to be putting our sneakers on and giving you ladies and gentlemen the proverbial boot. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. LONG:
That was pretty funny. The member for Stephenville was very quick on that one, giving the government the boot today.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the more statements we receive from this minister, the more I think the name of the Minister's Department should be changed. Culture, Recreation and Youth is already a long name, but I do not

think it would be too much to add 'fun' to it. This is the minister for fun, clearly. He comes in with his statements and has great fun making his statements, and is constantly promoting, in an official way, that the people of this Province get out to our parks and have fun, get our sneakers on and have fun. I thought for sure the minister was going to come in with his sneakers on.

MR. BUTT:
I will have them here soon.

MR. LONG:
Okay. I would encourage the minister to take the lead in the 300 communities to try and set some goals for himself, to see how many of these communities are participating so that he might be able to run through and make an appearance.

And the other thing I might say is that, given that this is the eve of the long weekend, I would encourage the minister and all others members to take the lead on Fitweek, and recreation for the long weekend, by encouraging our staff and people in our offices to take the afternoon off and begin early today to participate in Fitweek and the long recreational weekend. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forestry (Mr. R.

Aylward), who will be aware that Kruger is about to spend \$400 million to expand its Three Rivers plant in Quebec, and in particular, would install a new paper machine with a capacity of 180,000 metric tons, the equivalent of the combined capacity of the No. 3 and No. 7 machine at Corner Brook? Can the minister confirm for the House, Mr. Speaker, that this expansion at Three Rivers is the real reason for Kruger's decision not to proceed with its earlier plan to modernize No. 3 machine at Corner Brook?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with the actual modernization of No. 3 machine in the Kruger mill at Corner Brook. Mr. Speaker, Kruger moved to part of our Province several years ago when we had a potentially disastrous situation on the West Coast in the second largest city in our Province, the only other city, although another one will be started up shortly. Kruger moved in there, Mr. Speaker, they signed an agreement with us to modernize the mill for about \$167 million, and about 20 per cent of that was a government contribution.

To date, Mr. Speaker, they are up in the \$253 million range of their modernization plan in Corner Brook, Mr. Speaker, and they are continuing to upgrade the plant. They are producing more paper there now than in the last few years Bowater was open, Mr. Speaker. They have a commitment to the Corner Brook area, and to the pulp and paper industry in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the figures several times from the Minister. We recognize that while Kruger does not have any legal obligation to modernize all five machines, that was certainly the spirit of the agreement, I think the minister will agree. My question, by way of supplementary to the minister -

MR. FENWICK:

They have an obligation on Nos. 2 and 3. I forgot to consult my legal experts on the philosophic left down there.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, was the government aware, I ask the minister, when it agreed to Kruger's revised plan, for the Corner Brook mill, i.e., to waive its plans for No. 3, that Kruger intended to make this massive investment at Three Rivers? And in particular, Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate to the House what he expects will be the impact on production levels at Corner Brook of this investment in Three Rivers?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, looking at the present world demand for newsprint, and in speaking with the officials of the Kruger operation, the expansion in the

Three River plant not only will not cut down production in the Corner Brook area but, Mr. Speaker, I see it as an opportunity maybe to be able to produce some pulpwood in the Wabush area of our Province and export it down on the trains coming out of Wabush and thus supply some of the raw material for that expanded mill in Three Rivers. That is the way I would look at it, Mr. Speaker. I will be having a talk to the Kruger officials to see if we cannot work out something. We have a company interested in the Western part of Labrador now, in producing some lumber and exporting some pulp, so I would hope that the expansion in the Three Rivers area might provide them with an opportunity to be able to increase their operation to the benefit of the Western Labrador portion of our Province.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Premier (Dr. Collins) concerning Capital Canada, which is the fiscal agent for the sale of Terra Nova Tel. I would like to put to the Deputy Premier, now that it is public knowledge that the president-owner, a one-man show, responsible for Capital Canada has been identified as being one of the chief bagmen for John Crosbie's leadership campaign and that -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech. I ask him to ask a

question.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, I am providing the background and I will get to the question.

Is the Deputy Premier concerned about the fact that the owner of this company, the one-man show running this company, was the chief bagman for the leadership campaign of Mr. Crosbie, who was then the Minister of Transport, is he concerned that this constitutes some kind of a conflict? If so, will the government not now ask the federal government to halt the sale process of Terra Nova Tel until there is an investigation?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I think the facts are that the provincial government has had no input into this process whatever. This is something that CN did, and they did it in a legitimate manner, I understand. They went for proposals and they received quite a number of proposals. They were familiar with those who had responded and, therefore, could assess them in light of the work they had done before. So it seems to me it was a straightforward proposal; and I do not see what part we should play in the process. I suppose it could be looked upon as an interference with a legitimate process. The evidence seems to show that CN are doing a good job and presumably if a good job is done the people of Gander and that part of the Province will benefit from a good job.

MR. BAKER:
There is a good job being done for somebody, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Is the minister concerned that Robert Foster of Capital Canada also has very close connections with Frank Moores, Craig Dobbin and Harry Steele, as pointed out in the public press, and that some of these individuals are connected to companies that are making bids on Terra Nova Tel? On those grounds will the minister, on behalf of the government, ask the federal government to halt the sale until there is a complete investigation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, clearly the question is absolutely politically loaded. My understanding is that the contract, or whatever it is, is to put a package together. I think the objective should be, 'Is it a good package; will it result in a more viable company; and will the the people in Central Newfoundland and those areas get better service out of it?' If the hon. member wants to orientate the thing totally to some sort of spurious political charge, well let him do it. But I think CN and everyone else is concerned with what will result from this in terms of telephone service and telecommunication services for a large proportion of the people of Newfoundland. That is what this government is concerned about and we have no reason to suspect that the present arrangement is going to do any harm to that concept.

MR. BAKER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

It is a political payoff and I suspect the fix is in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

Is this government concerned with the obvious conflict in this situation, and what are you going to do about it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I just have to reiterate that it is not a matter that is in our hands. If we saw evidence that there was something devious or underhanded or harmful to the people of Newfoundland, clearly we would do something about it. There is no evidence, that I am aware of, that the move made by CN is harmful to Newfoundland. It seems to be a straightforward, legitimate approach to a problem.

Now, the hon. member has a particular focus and one cannot object to that, but one has to recognize what that focus is. His focus is totally and utterly and simply Liberal. He can have that focus, but the hon. member's focus cannot spread across every activity that goes on in Newfoundland.

MR. BAKER:

It beats crookedness!

MR. BAIRD:

Why do you not say that outside the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question would normally have gone to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), but in his absence I shall direct it to the Deputy Premier, and maybe that is more fitting because I think the minister was Finance Minister when the subject matter which I am about to question him on was carried out. Mr. Speaker, in 1986 I think it was, prior to the reorganization of Fisheries Products International, a plant that cost the taxpayers of this Province I believe maybe as much as \$5 million was handed over to a Chinese lady from Toronto for, I believe, \$60,000, or in that order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Taiwanese.

MR. W. CARTER:

Taiwanese, yes, and now living in Toronto. We all know that that plant has now gone bankrupt, leaving a lot of misery in the community itself.

I wonder can the minister, Mr. Speaker, tell the House what investigations were conducted into this Taiwanese lady and on what basis was that plant sold to her company?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is looking for details, you know, documented details, one would have to take notice of that and see what we can bring forward. But in general terms it was well known, it was determined that the lady in question had very large financial resources. She had very large investments in Canada. She was behind a very large commitment to the plant. So I do not think there was any doubt of the lady's financial capabilities and her worth.

Now how that was determined I do not know at this point in time, but it can be looked into. But I think there was no doubt about it that she was a substantial financial force. And I think we have to remember that there were very few, I think she may be the only bidder interested in that particular plant.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that the gentleman, who was then the Minister of Finance, was not aware of the details of that transaction, because it is quite a transaction.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the minister: He talks about the substantial financial backing of that lady.

Well, is he aware that the day after that \$6 million plant was sold to her, for I believe \$60,000, that she immediately put a mortgage on it for \$700,000, and, subsequent to that, she contracted some very substantial debts with Swiss banks and other creditors?

DR. COLLINS:

No.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Is that a supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. W. CARTER:

The minister says it is not true.

All right, Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister, then: What steps does he and his government intend to take to bring that plant back on stream as quickly as possible? What steps are now in the mill to get the plant back operating for the people for whom it was intended in the first place?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

MR. Speaker, no one is gainsaying the fact that this is a difficult situation. Because it is a difficult situation, there has been a committee of Cabinet set up which will go into the thing in great detail. Perhaps I could ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor), who is on that committee, as is the Minister of Fisheries and other ministers, if he wishes to give any further details on how the committee is working.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I will try to deal with a couple of the questions

that came forward.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

First of all, that plant was sold by Fishery Products as a result of a proposal call. I understand it was the only proposal call that came in at the time. The lady had full financial ability to purchase the plant, to operate the plant, and requested no government assistance whatsoever. Government has no liability on that operation whatsoever, have no guarantees of loans or any other financial backing of that operation. So it is purely a private venture. What took place as a result of any mortgages that were entered into subsequent to the sale is not something that government was privy to. Neither were we privy to the fact that some time ago she, in fact, took out quite a large loan from a Swiss bank with some personal guarantees from herself. This is the situation we are dealing with now.

Again, it is not something that government was privy to. We had no financial input into the company. We had no monitoring of the company, as we do with all other fish plants in which we have any financial interest. As my hon. colleague points out, we have been meeting over the past number of days with Mrs. Ting and her financial and legal advisors. We have met with the councils of St. Lawrence and Lawn on several occasions. Government has established a Committee of Ministers, comprised of myself, my colleague, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Matthews), the Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), and our

colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), who represents a district that has interest in Mrs. Ting's companies.

We have also, of course, established a committee of officials to deal with the situation, as well, on a top priority basis. We will be doing anything possible to deal with the company, with any subsequent receivers, should any be appointed, or whatever the case may be, to ensure that all the plants involved in this particular transaction are operative if at all possible and just as quickly as possible.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, the minister can try as hard as he wants but he cannot wash his hands of some responsibility to the people of St. Lawrence. That plant was built there at a cost of \$6 million.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister, in light of what has happened, which puts into question, Mr. Speaker, the thoroughness of the investigation which was carried out into this lady by the government, which had a responsibility to

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

- will the minister undertake to

table in the House at the earliest possible date all relevant documents pertaining to the investigation before that plant was sold to that lady, and after it was sold?

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

MR. WINDSOR:
I will undertake to look into that, Mr. Speaker. The fact remains that at the time that this plant was sold by FPI this was the only game in town. It was fully supported by the people of St. Lawrence, by the way whom she met with.

MR. W. CARTER:
No, no!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Except the Mayor.

MR. WINDSOR:
Except the Mayor.

I recognize the hon. gentleman is speaking only for the mayor at the moment, not for the people of St. Lawrence or anybody else, or for the employees of the plant, or for the fishermen who sell fish to the plant. The company did have the full support of the people of St. Lawrence. They did provide employment for two years, at no expense to this government, without requesting any financial assistance from this government. Now we are dealing with a situation where the plant is in serious financial difficulties and we will do everything possible to try to elevate the situation for the people of St. Lawrence, the fishermen and the plant workers.

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development, and has to do with comments he made after the House sat yesterday that were reported on television. I want to ask was he accurately quoted? The gist of his comments seemed to be that the marketing practices of the Sprung Greenhouse operation, or Newfoundland Enviroponics, are designed to destroy the greenhouse industry in Nova Scotia that produces cucumbers, and then take their market. Would the minister confirm that that is the actual policy of this government?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting question. There was great concern in this House yesterday from the Leader of the Liberal Party trying to protect the greenhouse growers and the greenhouse industry in Nova Scotia. Now we get it from the NDPs as well.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it is not the government's intention, or Newfoundland Enviroponic's intention to deliberately put anybody out of business. It is not our deliberate intention to dump so that we can up prices afterwards. It is our deliberate intention to be very, very aggressive in the marketplace and to make sure that we are there in a price competitive situation. We are not going to be competitive in a quality situation because nobody can compete with us on

quality. There is nobody who produces a cucumber like we do, that is herbicide and pesticide free, packed fresh and gets to the market as quickly as ours can. On quality we have no concerns at all because we are going to be the best by far in the marketplace. When it comes to price, we are going to compete in any marketplace we choose to be in and we are going to do very, very well in those marketplaces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

The minister clearly seemed to be indicating that the intention was to knock them out of cucumber production. My supplementary question to the minister is this: There are approximately 100 acres of cucumber production in Leamington, Ontario, a massive industry even by our standards.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not asking a question.

MR. FENWICK:

My question to the minister is this: After you have destroyed the Nova Scotia industry and try to push your price back up, are you not then going to have to go and destroy the other industries that may compete in the Nova Scotia marketplace and keep on doing it ad nauseam in order to try and establish a market?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it really, really is funny. We have gone from protecting the Nova Scotia greenhouse industry to now protecting an industry in Ontario. As I said yesterday in my press statement, it is really, really sad, and I feel a tremendous amount of pity for the greenhouse growers in Nova Scotia, or the persons who are producing cucumbers in Ontario, because we in Newfoundland can do something better and more efficiently than they can. Now, all I can say for the greenhouse growers in Nova Scotia, or in Ontario, is they are in a marketplace and if they cannot compete then they had better get out of the greenhouse industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:

My final question is this: Since the Nova Scotia legislature is now debating the possibility of putting in place marketing controls on that kind of produce because of the predatory pricing, what will Newfoundland Enviroponics do if a marketing board is established in Nova Scotia that freezes out totally any of the produce from the Newfoundland Enviroponics operations?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, obviously the member for Menihek should know, if he does not know, that it is against the Constitution, against the laws of this country for one province to block trade with another province. It cannot be done under the marketing board systems that are in place in many parts of this country, including this Province, for protection of certain types of products. You may be able to regulate price, but you cannot prevent somebody else from coming in in competition.

Now, the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what happens in Nova Scotia, Nova Scotia citizens are going to want a very fresh product, they are going to want it at a very competitive price, and we in Newfoundland are going to be able to supply that market a lot better than anybody else. We are going to be there and the laws of the marketplace, will work so that our product is sold and sold first.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). The fact is that for four weeks now we have been waiting in this House for an answer from the Minister of Labour on the rental of Workers' Compensation Tribunal office space in the Central Trust Building. Will the minister now tell us why

the fifth highest tender was accepted for that space at \$14.85 square foot when there were tenders there at \$11.00 a square foot?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I already answered that question about two or three weeks ago for the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). I said that there were a number of considerations that we had to look at, primarily parking space for people, injured workers coming there, probably handicapped workers, but notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, I have stated that the matter is being examined, investigated. The person who is doing the investigation, Mr. Speaker, is presently on annual leave. I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, that there is any particular time limit on the production of the information, but it is being taken care of and will be presented.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

I suggest to the minister while one of his assistants may be on annual leave, according to this statement here there are a number of people in his office who could do it. I ask the minister very clearly, would the delay in the minister bringing this information forward to the House have anything to do with the fact that Terra Nova Enterprises, which owns the building, is part owned by a law partner of the Chairman of the

Tribunal, and another 25 per cent shareholder is the Deputy Premier of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with any delay in bringing the information forward.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

My final supplementary will go to the Premier of this Province. I refer him to Article No. 4, Article No. 7 and Article No. 8 in the Conflict of Interest Guidelines, and I ask the Premier of this Province, pertaining to those guidelines and the fact that his own Deputy Premier -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

is a 25 per cent shareholder and has a clear conflict of interest, would the Premier in fact have this matter investigated and immediately ask for the minister's resignation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is the first I have heard of it. The answer to the question, for brevity's sake, because of the ruling the Speaker made yesterday related to the minister, is, yes, I will have it

investigated.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. TULK:
I have a question for the Premier. The Premier is aware that there are news reports saying that a letter from French authorities to the Canadian Embassy was delivered in November, 1986, a year and a half ago, saying that French authorities would require the licensing of Canadian vessels and French vessels in the area where we have recently had the dispute. That was delivered to the Canadian Embassy.

I ask the Premier: Was he or the government aware of this memo and when did he become aware of it?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, at 6:07 yesterday evening, in my office, I had a call from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) who had then just become aware of it. However, there is more to the letter than the hon. member for Fogo just mentioned in his question. It mentioned that they were going to introduce regulations, and then it went on, either in that letter or a subsequent one a few weeks later, to defer implementation. But still we were not informed. So I think the bottom line on it is that we were not informed, but, then, when you see the rest of the information, they, in one, said, 'We are going to implement.' I just have to put in a

qualification; I do not know if it was all in one letter or if there were two - and then in either a subsequent paragraph in that letter or a subsequent letter, they deferred the implementation. I was made aware of it at 6:07 yesterday evening in my office by the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. WELLS:
That changes the impression given.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Exactly!

MR. TULK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, what the Premier has basically said is that the Government of Canada was aware of this, and in spite of the fact that the French deferred it, he should have been aware of it, in this deplorable situation.

MR. PECKFORD:
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
I want to ask the Premier will he now table all of that information? Whether it was a subsequent letter, whether it was in the same letter, would he table that information in the House, and would he, indeed, impress upon the Canadian Government that anything that has to do with this issue should be relayed to the Government of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier:

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question I have to say that the answers have now been shorter than the questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you very much. I appreciate your compliments on the way I am trying to conduct myself in the House.

But I would just make the point that I am not sure, I never said I was sure, whether, in fact, that is fair or not, an answer being shorter than the question. I am not sure.

I am not sure, in answer to the question, whether we have the information, have the letters. We are now aware that there were letters, and that we had not been informed about them at the time. Now I am getting too long, Mr. Speaker, but I must say that is the reason why, back over the last year or year and a half, I kept saying, in this House and outside of this House, because there were other meetings going on in Paris, and so on, over this whole negotiating process, that we did not feel comfortable with the whole process because we did not know whether we had all of the information at a given time on which to base any advice. And it was only advice in some kind of subcommittee before they went on to negotiate. Once again I have to say I am right.

MR. TULK:

Will you table it?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, sure.

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 Forest Resources. I asked the minister on Wednesday whether or not he had received a recommendation from the Pesticide Advisory Board to increase spraying of Bt by 50 per cent this year. The minister said, he did not have it on Wednesday. I would like to ask the minister now does he have the recommendation from the Pesticide Advisory Board to increase spraying of Bt by 50 per cent? And if he does have that recommendation has he acted on it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have not been in my office yet this morning. We had an early morning this morning and I have not been there. But as of last night at 10:30 when I left my office, I did not have the report of the Pesticide Advisory Board. They will not necessarily send it to me, they will probably send it to the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Russell).

MR. FUREY:

A short supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

The Minister of Environment and Lands at five to six in the House yesterday publicly stated that the Pesticide Advisory Board had, in fact, recommended an increase of Bt by 50 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
I would like to ask the minister now, in light of the fact that the minister did make that public yesterday, that his department increased the use of Bt by 50 per cent, will he now act upon that recommendation made public yesterday by the Minister of Environment and Lands?

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, every year with our spray programme to date, the Department of Forestry will go exactly by the guidelines of the licences to spray that are set down for us. We will take every precaution, Mr. Speaker, to do exactly what the Department of Environment tells us in the licences that are given out for our spray programme every year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
In light of the former Minister of Forestry's comments in the House yesterday that it is a clear case of economics, would the minister agree with his colleague, the former Minister of Forestry, that it is a question of dollars and cents, fenitrothion is cheaper, Bt is more expensive, and safety

comes in last?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Once again, the hon. member across the House, Mr. Speaker is trying to come out with irresponsible, alarmist statements about the spray programme in this Province. Mr. Speaker, the spray programme in this Province has been carried out for the past four years under the most strict environmental guidelines that are possible, Mr. Speaker.

We have the best environmental legislation in the country in this Province, and we go with the guidelines, Mr. Speaker, with all of our spray programmes. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that up to two weeks ago there was one registered substance that we could chose to fight the hemlock looper outbreak in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago Bt was registered, and already we have raised the area to be sprayed with Bt from about a 5,000 hectares programme, Mr. Speaker, to a 27,000 hectares programme this year.

Mr. Speaker, that is an improvement of over 500 per cent in one year, Mr. Speaker. If this year's commercial spray programme proves to be successful, this government, Mr. Speaker, and our department will be trying to increase the use of Bt in this Province. But hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we will break the cycle of insect infestation this year, Mr. Speaker, and we probably will

not have as much of a spray programme next year in this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like to deal now with a point of order that was raised yesterday towards the end of Question Time by the hon. the Premier. He drew my attention to Beauchesne, page 129, paragraph 357, "repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." In other words, that is not in order. The hon. the Premier was quite correct. The point is well taken.

For the benefit of hon. members I will read exactly what was in Hansard. The first question asked by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition - it is as in Hansard - "The question, Mr. Speaker, is how long will the government allow this to continue when the cost of producing these cucumbers is in excess of \$1.25 per cucumber?" The supplementary question was: "Now, I ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, how long will the government continue to allow these cucumbers to be produced at \$1.25 to \$1.50?"

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the hon. member for Port de Grave brought forward some figures in regard to bed closures. At the time, I said it was the first I had heard of them, but I would look into the matter and get back to him. So perhaps I could just read from Hansard two little parts of what the hon. member said.

He said, in part, "There are going to be sixty five beds closed at St. Clare's, seventy-two at the Grace General, and eighty-one at the Health Sciences Complex." A little further on, when I expressed some surprise at those figures, he said, "I have spoken to each one of the administrators in those hospitals, as late as twelve o'clock today, and these are correct figures."

Mr. Speaker, I was in touch with the administrator at the Health Sciences Complex and she told me the member had not been in touch with her. Secondly, she said that there has been no change in the proposed numbers of beds, which are forty-seven, not eighty-one. She said, "There has been absolutely no change in decisions made by the hospital over this." So, just to be sure that I get the point across, the hon. member said, in part, he was in touch with the administrator at the Health Sciences Complex and she denies totally that he was. Secondly, he said that she said the decision now was to close eighty-one beds, and she denies that. She says the decision stands, as was reported to us previously, at forty-seven beds.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do have to bring into some question the credibility of the member when he brings forward that sort of

information to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Resign! Resign!

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

AN HON. MEMBER:
We will have to get the hon. member a bed.

MR. EFFORD:
If I needed one, there is not one at the hospital for me.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
I have to rise in this House on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, because of the statements just made by the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Resign! Resign!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order!

Is the hon. member rising on a point of privilege?

MR. EFFORD:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that my privileges in this House have been severely damaged. Mr. Speaker, it is very clear the

minister is trying to play this down so I want to explain to the Speaker and this House exactly what is taking place.

I have spoken to the administrator and the administrative people in the Health Sciences Complex and very clearly they said there were forty-seven beds to close this year. I also had a letter, which I tabled in this House, which said there were thirty-three beds closed last year, which were not going to be reopened and have not been reopened this year, and forty-seven and thirty-three is eighty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Resign! Resign!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it is the exact truth I tabled in this House, as is what I said about St. Clare's Hospital and about the Grace Hospital. Mr. Speaker, to clarify the matter I will personally accompany the Minister of Health to each of the three hospitals and straighten out this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:
You wrote the letter yourself. You wrote the letter, and signed it.

MR. BAIRD:
He would be lowering himself to be seen with you.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, on the matter of privilege, it is obviously not a matter of privilege, it was an opportunity the member took, under the guise of a point of privilege, merely to try to defend the indefensible. I guess that is what has occurred. The pertinent point in the debate had to do with whether indeed the member, who said he had spoken to each one of those administrators in those hospitals as late as 12 o'clock that day, did in fact speak to each one of those three administrators as of 12 o'clock that day. This is the pertinent question.

All the Minister of Health said was that he had checked on those allegations made by the hon. member and in speaking with the administrators, the Administrator at the Health Sciences denied having spoken to the gentleman that day about that particular matter. So, there is clearly a difference of opinion as to fact, but there is certainly not a question of privilege here, and that is the point. It is not a question of privilege, the hon. member simply took the opportunity to try to explain -

MR. MATTHEWS:

He has to resign.

MR. YOUNG:

This is serious stuff. This is really, really serious stuff.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member for Fogo should take the advice he frequently gives me, 'Do not be too anxious.'

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not

think it is the type of privilege point that would be normally taking up a lot of time in debate, because it is clearly a difference of opinion as to the facts between two hon. gentlemen. That is clearly what it is. It certainly is not a question of privilege and should not require a lot more discussion and debate.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Port de Grave

MR. YOUNG:

You are not in your place.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is prowling around.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman for Port de Grave is exactly right in raising the point of privilege. Neither the Minister of Health nor anybody else, can stand in his place and do through the backdoor what he is not, again, to do through the front door. I am tempted to say, in no uncertain terms, that the hon. gentleman for Port de Grave has been told he has lied to this Legislature. He has certainly been told that he has deceived this legislature.

He has certainly been told that and his resignation demanded. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, while the hon. gentleman was speaking, from the other side of the House came the accusation that

he wrote the letter and signed it himself. Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of thing cannot be allowed.

MR. SIMMS:

Let him name names, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

It was not made by the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), it was made by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Peach).

Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of thing cannot be allowed to go on in this Legislature.

MR. SIMMS:

Nor should that kind of thing.

MR. TULK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We have had an incident where a gentleman from outside of this House accused the Premier of something, who is willing to come before the Bar of this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Let us bring the administrator right before the Bar of this House and let us see who is doing what?

MR. SPEAKER:

I am quite satisfied that there is no point of privilege here. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of privilege, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

I think it is very important, my

point of privilege, which is this: Can members of this House, Mr. Speaker, come into this House of Assembly any time, in debate or in Question Period, and bring mistruths, or untruths or not factual information? The question here today is did a member of the House bring untruths to the House or lie to the House, or is a civil servant or a semi-civil servant, a citizen outside, lying to the Minister of Health?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on.

MR. MORGAN:

That is the key question. The question then is, Mr. Speaker, when can we as members of this House believe or not believe our peers?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

I am on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not making a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN:

I am not?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not making a point of privilege. He is taking advantage, getting up on a point of privilege to speak on a matter

that is not privilege at all. He has not made a prime facie case of a breach of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a point of privilege, Sir, and I will keep rising from now until kingdom come when my rights are trodden on. Right now I have the right to stand in this House and question a matter of privilege, and the privilege is this, Sir:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member -

MR. MORGAN:

Give me a chance to, please, Sir, I beg of you, a chance to put my point of privilege forward to this House. My point is this: As members of this House, can we listen to the debates and believe what a member says at any time is always true?

I have sat in this House since 1972 believing that when we stood in debate, we always told the truth, or could we listen and debate the truth. Now the question of truth is before us all. Did a member of the House lie to the House, or is somebody outside lying to the Minister of Health? It is a very important point of privilege. It has to be addressed. If the member for Port de Grave lied to this House, he has to be dealt with by the House of Assembly. And if the Minister of Health lied to the House, he should be dealt with by the House, equally. Somebody is lying.

Mr. Speaker, my point is that a member of the House lied to all of us, which is a very, very serious breach of the privileges of this

House of Assembly and of me as a member, and it has to be dealt with, Mr. Speaker, by the Chair. It is a breach of privilege of all the House. Not just the member for Bonavista South, all of us. Can we in the future listen to debate and questions without a clear understanding that what is being said is the clear truth? Right now we cannot do that.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am quite prepared to deal with this matter now. There is no prima facie case of breach of privilege. The matter the hon. member for Bonavista South has raised, I have already dealt with, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. House Leader opposite rose he suggested that I did something improper by bringing this to the attention of the House, he sort of indicated that I, under some sort of pretext, was calling the hon. member for Port de Grave a liar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot let that stand without rising on a point of order to point out that the hon. member brought forward some facts of which I was unaware at the time. I told him I would look into the details of those facts, proposed facts, alleged facts, and that I would come back to the House with the results of my investigation. And that is exactly what I did. It was not, as the hon. House Leader suggests, an attempt on my part to in anyway

label by the backdoor the hon. member for Port de Grave as a liar. I merely did what I undertook to do, investigate some new information, or alleged new information that the hon. member had given. I found the information was incorrect and I did what I undertook to do, I reported that to the House.

So, I would say that the hon. member was out of order in making the unfounded allegation that I had some ulterior motive and, being the man he is, I would expect him to withdraw it.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
To that point of order, the hon. gentleman certainly used the words 'did not' in replying to Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given, no argument. If the hon. gentleman has now cleared up the situation, no problem on this side. We accept the apology.

MR. MORGAN:
It is not clear to us, though. The member lied. He lied to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. TULK:
The hon. the gentleman from Bonavista South has just said 'the member lied,' and he cannot do that in this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER:
I was listening to the hon. member for Fogo. If the hon. member said 'he lied,' I would ask him to withdraw it. I will certainly check it in Hansard.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, in my recollection of what occurred today in this House, somebody lied. And, Mr. Speaker, if they want, I will go on a point of privilege again.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

If the hon. member said the hon. member here lied, I am asking him now to withdraw that.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, I will repeat for the record what I said off the record, that the evidence put forward today by the Minister of Health shows that the member for Port de Grave lied in the House of Assembly. It is on the record now. The evidence is there.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

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

MR. FUREY:
No, it is a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, clearly you have ruled on that and said that it was a difference of opinion between two hon. members, much like it was a difference of opinion between the Premier and Mr. Dobbin, and this member should withdraw that statement.

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

The hon. member is now getting away completely from what we are discussing. The hon. the member for Fogo said that the hon. the member for Bonavista said in so many words that a lie was uttered. I said to the hon. member for Bonavista South, if that was so, would he withdraw it. Now, it has not been withdrawn as far as I am concerned, and I will look at Hansard and deal with it on Tuesday.

MR. FUREY:
He repeated it.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:
The evidence shows he lied. The evidence shows it.

MR. FUREY:
He is saying it again.

MR. MORGAN:
The man lied to the House.

MR. FUREY:
Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:
The evidence shows it. The evidence is clear. The man lied to the House.

MR. FUREY:
Now, Mr. Speaker, come on!

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

The hon. member clearly has said now that a member lied to the House. I ask him now to withdraw that.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, no, Sir. I did not say that. I said the evidence in

this House today, in debate, shows that the man lied to the House.

MR. FUREY:
Now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:
Somebody lied to the House.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, name him! Name him!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Name him! Name him!

MR. MORGAN:
Somebody lied to the House.

MR. FUREY:
Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:
I stand by that. Somebody lied to the House of Assembly today, somebody! I withdraw saying a member lied, but the evidence showed that somebody lied to the House and it is a very serious matter.

Petitions

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from 124 unemployed workers in the community of Milltown, head of the Bay, Bay d'Espoir, in the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. The petition is:

To the hon. House of Assembly in Parliament assembled.

We do hereby present petition on

behalf of the undersigned residents of Head Bay - Milltown, Bay d'Espoir, in the electoral district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

At the present time we are appalled by the number of people who are unemployed and are very unable to secure employment in the bay area. Immediate work is badly needed and immediate jobs have to be made available in order for the residents to improve the deplorable standard of living that now exists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, I cannot read this petition if the babbling still goes on over there. They are not interested in unemployment in Newfoundland, but those people are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:
We, the unemployed people of Bay d'Espoir, are very much frustrated and discontentment is rampant when we hear of outside contractors given contracts to plant trees in our areas and bringing in the unemployed people from elsewhere, when our local people go without jobs. We can plant trees as well as outsiders. This cannot be allowed this season.

Many forest sections need to be worked on in regards of reforestation and many jobs can be created, allowing for more people to gain employment if the government is trying to restore a fast dwindling natural resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, maybe the two members there, the member for Grand Bank and the member for Carbonear are not interested in unemployment.

MR. FUREY:
They think it is a joke.

MR. GILBERT:
They think it is a joke.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I ask the hon. member to continue with his petition.

MR. GILBERT:
The unemployed people, when UIC benefits have run out, are going - no other choice - to our Social Services to gain social welfare monies to keep their families. They are then put to work with private enterprises, only to be paid not by the private enterprises, but the Social Services Department. They have to work for very low wages and find it very discouraging and not sufficient finances to buy the household needs which are so costly at this time in our daily lives. Our people are forced to work for minimum wages.

We trust and do believe that the present PC administration can do better to improve the lives of the people in rural areas like our own. We want to live in our cherished home villages, we do not want to live our lives in urban areas. Please decentralize the jobs for our unemployed and not to centralize them where our people have to be removed from a traditional lifestyle to take upon themselves an urban way of life which they find hard to cope with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I find this not

so much a petition as a plea, and this plea is from 124 workers in Bay d'Espoir. For your benefit, Mr. Speaker, there is a total work force in Bay d'Espoir of 1,700, from Morrisville to St. Alban's, out of a total population of 4,100. Of a total work force of 1,700, Mr. Speaker, 200 have full time jobs. They are the ones who are employed with Newfoundland Hydro, the teachers, the government workers, the social workers and the few people who operate private businesses there. Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Ninety per cent are unemployed.

MR. GILBERT:

Ninety per cent are unemployed.

Right now, statistics will show, there are close to 600 people drawing unemployment. Those people are drawing unemployment because they worked on welfare projects last year to qualify for ten weeks' work and forty-two weeks of unemployment. There are over 300 people, Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Outreach office told me yesterday, who are discouraged workers in Bay d'Espoir, who do not come there any more.

The youth who never register as unemployed and cannot get a job are not considered as unemployed, Mr. Speaker, so they do not come into the statistics. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is this is a plea for people who are living in very desperate conditions. They are pointing out that they do not want to be forced onto social services before qualifying for a job.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services was so proud last week when he announced that there

were ten jobs created at the boat yard in Bay d'Espoir, social services jobs. The people down there have phoned me and said, 'Look, we do not want to be forced into the degradation of going on welfare before we qualify for a job. We deserve better.'

Mr. Speaker, as you know, employment in Bay d'Espoir is mainly in forestry and construction. There were 150 people who used to work with the Department of Forestry under the FESP Programme, the Forest Economic Stimulus Programme, which the previous Federal government and the provincial government shared 90/10. This programme was done away with. All those 150 workers have left this year is that fourteen of them are going to get jobs for four weeks.

The construction industry, which trained the people of Bay d'Espoir to take them away from the forestry industry some years ago, with the building of the Newfoundland hydro plant there -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. GILBERT:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, one of the workers said to me, 'Mr. Gilbert, we are concerned about the fact that the government can spend \$22 million on the Sprung project, powered by our hydro, when we cannot get any work in Bay d'Espoir.'

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, this is probably the

most significant petition presented in this House this session, and there is not one person on the government side paying any attention to the pleas from the thousands of people in this Province who are being deprived.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. The President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the leader of the Opposition can get up and pontificate all he wants, but to suggest there is nobody over here listening is totally inaccurate, unfair, and not true. So why say it? Why does the member not get on with what he has to say about the petition, never mind his nasty, political innuendo and attacks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I reiterate, people in government are not paying attention to the pleas of the thousands of Newfoundlanders who are without jobs, without the means of putting a reasonable level of food on their tables, and a reasonable amount of clothes on their children, and giving them an opportunity to go to school. The government sits and does not pay attention to it. They ignore the situation in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

Give back your salary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, would you stop that noise?

MR. PATTERSON:

Give back your salary to the blind and the deaf and the dumb.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, the most important petition presented in this House today has been largely ignored by the government, as the basic plight of our people has been ignored. They have sat by for years and devastated the economy of this Province and forced our people to leave to find food to feed their families.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

For three straight years in a row our population has declined. It is continuing now into the fourth year, Mr. Speaker, because there is not enough work for our people. They are driven out of this Province to find food. Our population in this Province today is less than it was in 1981. The only province in Canada that has had a decline in population, the only one in all those years, and we are going down.

When you add to that, Mr. Speaker, the 13,000 people natural increase by the excess of births over deaths and the actual reduction of another 5,600 in our population, that means that 18,000 people have been driven out of this Province by the failure of the government to properly provide an economic situation where they can find work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
They sit, as the member reads pleas from these people, and laugh and yack and pay no attention. That reflects what the government has been doing itself for the last eight or nine years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
In case people are not aware, Mr. Speaker, fifteen men, women, and children for every single day of the last three and one-quarter years, have been driven out of this Province by the performance of this government, fifteen for every day, Mr. Speaker. When is it going to stop? When are they going to call an election and put an end to it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
If you want another measure of what these people who signed that petition are talking about, look at what has happened to the proportion of our population living below the poverty level. In 1981, 17.4 per cent were below the poverty level. In New Brunswick, in the same year, 17.6 per cent were below the poverty level. That is first when this

government started.

What was it in 1986? Mr. Speaker, New Brunswick had gone down to 15.2 per cent and we went up to 21.2 per cent of our people below the poverty level.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. TULK:
It is shameful.

MR. WELLS:
And the government sits here -

MR. BAIRD:
Do not be so hypocritical.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:
The government sits here and month after month

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

I have been repeatedly calling for order and there are some hon. members who just continue to interrupt. I do not want to have to name them.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will sum up, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out what the government has said month after month about the great improvement in our unemployment rate. Let me just tell you what, in fact, has happened, Mr. Speaker. We are falling further behind the rest of the nation. That is a fact. In April 1987, our unemployment rate was 2.17 times the national

average. In April this year it was 2.27 times the national average. It is getting worse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

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

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, it is for clarification from the Chair. Are we now involved in the Throne Speech debate, the Budget debate, or are we speaking on a petition?

MR. TULK:
A petition, boy.

MR. MORGAN:
Because if we are speaking on a petition, surely the member is out of order.

MR. TULK:
No, he is not.

MR. MORGAN:
He is not relevant.

MR. CALLAN:
We are talking about Milltown.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

The hon. member has about thirty seconds left.

MR. WELLS:
I have finished what I want to say for now, Mr. Speaker. I am addressing the petition. The hon. the member for Bonavista South was out doing something else, paying

no attention to the pleas of thousands of Newfoundlanders who are without jobs. This is the subject of the plea of the petition, and that is what I was addressing. And it is largely the responsibility of this government, Mr. Speaker, and they out and play and cohort and laugh and joke as people plea for fairness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:
If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition had so much concern for Newfoundlanders, he would give back some of that exorbitant salary he has fleeced out of the contributors to the Liberal Party. He would not be in here today except that he was bought like a bullock. That is why you are here. Run against me in the next election and down you will go!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with respect to the petition, despite the fact that the Leader of the Opposition is playing to the galleries, I suspect - there is nobody else listening to him. It is right that certainly nobody on this side is listening to him. It is absolutely right. Nobody listens to him. I can tell him that there are members on his own side, who sit close to him and do not listen to him either. So he might want to keep his eyes open for that.

But all the Leader of the Opposition did, Mr. Speaker, for the last five minutes is practice and rehearse his next election campaign speech. That is all he was doing, for five minutes. We have heard it. We have heard it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

And since the Leader of the Opposition was given a considerable amount of leeway, I suggest, in presenting the petition - first of all, you are not even supposed to debate a petition. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not even know that yet. Of course, he is only a rookie here. It has been twenty years since he has been here.

Mr. Speaker, what we heard from the Leader of the Opposition for the last four or five minutes is precisely what he has been saying for the last four or five months around the Province, and the reaction he is getting around the Province to what he is saying is the same reaction he is going to get here in this House, the same reaction. He continues to twist the facts and totally ignores the

positive things. For example, I did not hear him mention that the unemployment rate in Newfoundland and Labrador is at the lowest it has been in over five years. He did not mention that, but that is a fact. He did not talk about the drop in unemployment in Newfoundland statistics, being the largest absolute decline of any province in Canada. He did not give any credit for that. Mr. Speaker, tell me about the people of Bay d'Espoir. I know as much about them as the hon member. I never sold cars to them, but I certainly know about them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

And I tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker -

MR. GILBERT:

I have represented them (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

You have what? You have what?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Whether the member represented them is a matter of opinion, and I have heard a lot of opinions from the people of Bay d'Espoir contrary to his position. The Leader of the Opposition neglected to mention the fact that employment in the construction industry has been up considerably, employment in the fishery, employment in the forestry has been up considerably. Employment in the mining industry, Mr. Speaker, was up 16-odd per cent

over what it was in 1986. The government brought in a private sector employment programme and his critic, I suppose it is his critic, the member over there for the Strait of Belle Isle, yesterday had the gall to get up in this House and tear it apart. He tore it apart, Mr. Speaker. He should be absolutely ashamed of himself. Everybody in the Province knows that it is a great programme. Everybody knows we would like to have more money to put into it, but I tell you, the next time applications come in from the Strait of Belle Isle, we will have to send them back a copy of your comments in Hansard and say, I am sorry, your own member is not even interested in supporting you on this programme.

That programme itself will create 3,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker. And if you do not believe any of those figures, listen to what the Conference Board of Canada has to say, an independent agency with no axe to grind and no politics to play like the member for Windsor - Buchans. Listen to what the Investment Dealers Association of Canada say, another independent group. Listen to what the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council say, Mr. Speaker. If you do not believe us, Mr. Speaker, and you are slanted towards maybe believing what the member for Windsor - Buchans said, listen to all those, because they have all said, and have all predicted, economic growth for Newfoundland and Labrador has been good in the last couple of years and it will continue to be good.

Mr. Speaker, we have all the intentions in the world of taking full credit for it and pointing out to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, when the time comes,

and I hope it comes soon, too, because then we will not have to listen to the hon. member get up there and pontificate in his pious way. That approach was tried by the member for Menihek and it did not work, and I tell you, it is not going to work for you either, Brother.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. SIMMS:

It has been agreed to carry on with motion 5, the Meech Lake Debate, last day adjourned by the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount has thirteen minutes left.

The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To continue on with the Meech Lake amendment, the amendment dealing with the uniqueness, the distinctness of Newfoundland, and to repeat what I said yesterday, we are in fact distinct, unique, different, and any evidence would show that Newfoundland as a Province is certainly the poorest one in the nation, with an economy that lags behind every other province dramatically on every point.

Not only are we distinct, Mr. Speaker, from an economic standpoint, but in many other ways as well. Yesterday we heard from the Premier how he has added the

Women's Policy Office to the Premier's Office, and the whole issue of women's rights and Native people's rights comes to mind; the fact that they have asked the Government of Canada to hold out for better provisions in the Constitution for their minorities, if I might use that word, and the distinctness of women and of the Native peoples, and the fact that they are not satisfied with the Constitution as it presently is.

Now, we are not just dealing with whether or not Meech Lake was a good Accord, but, in fact have we infringed upon the minorities in Canada, you might even say including ourselves as a minority, because we are very much a minority, given the power and clout of Quebec and Ontario?

We recently had an example of an attempt by a province, Saskatchewan, to enshrine the rights of the French minority in that province in their legislation, and that was not accepted. The attempt to have that government enshrine those rights was not acceptable to the Government of Saskatchewan, and that stand was backed up by Premier Bourassa of Quebec. He was quite happy - his own words - to see that the French minority in Saskatchewan were not given their proper rights in legislation.

So you would wonder, Mr. Speaker, about the future as far as Quebec is concerned in terms of the English minority receiving their rights in Quebec. It is very unlikely that his stand with the minority situation in Saskatchewan, and which could be a minority situation in many other provinces, needless to say, where French is a factor, much more so than in Newfoundland, but

certainly there are other provinces that could have their legislation tested in the same way, and you would wonder how Premier Bourassa is going to treat the English minority in the future, as Meech Lake and as the Constitution are challenged in any way.

I would doubt whether Bourassa is going to give equal treatment to the English minority. He made a campaign promise, as a matter of fact, that he would ensure that bilingual signs would be brought back in Quebec. If you were in Quebec city, Montreal, and even more so out in the countryside, all you would see would be French signs. He made a campaign promise that he would bring back bilingual signs. Now we hear he is backing off on that, backing off and saying that French should be the dominant language, should be dominant on all their signage, something that the business community is asking for, and he is denying it to the business community and denying it to the English minority, which is, indeed, bad news to the minority of the English people who live in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, just to make a deal we have been forced to settle for less than what we could have gotten. There is no question in most people's thinking across Canada that this deal was struck on Meech Lake by the premiers to obtain concessions for their provinces. I do not think there is any doubt about that. So, to bring Meech Lake about to get Quebec's final signature on the constitution, the premiers were offered a deal, or certainly insisted on a deal.

Time will tell what that was in

the case of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, it hardly seems right that we would settle for less than a Constitution that could have addressed women's rights in Canada, could have addressed Native people's, could have properly addressed the minorities, the other cultures we have throughout Canada, in particular the English minority in Quebec and the French minority in the rest of Canada.

We could have held out for a better Constitution, a better solution to the problem, rather than having a Meech Lake solution, which was a political one, I would suggest, where the premiers asked for concessions, or were offered concessions, and we, in this Province, will eventually see, no doubt, what those concessions were. But to get the signatures of the premiers, something had to be given up.

A lot was given up to see Meech Lake come about, and only time will tell what concessions were given. Mr. Speaker, we feel that a strong central government is the answer. More and more we are hearing cries of, Let us put power in the hands of the provinces. Well, that sounds wonderful in theory, Mr. Speaker, but it is not a great, wonderful deal for a Province like Newfoundland.

What we want is a fair share of the national pie. Now, we see Quebec and Ontario predominant in Canada, predominant in the numbers of seats federally, badly outnumbering us, possibly holding up any settlement of the Senate situation, and certainly dominant as far as the economy is concerned and dictating how rich or how poor Provinces such as Newfoundland can become.

We are a destination point for their products. And we find, no matter what we try to do in a Province like Newfoundland, an Island, isolated from the mainland, isolated from our markets, trying to develop secondary industry - Heaven knows we have tried. We are trying it again now with this ridiculous Sprung situation, but we are going to be attempting to market products on the mainland against similar companies which are closer to the market.

So we have tried, Mr. Speaker, to compete against the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, predominantly those two provinces, by way of developing secondary industry. The best we have ever been able to do is develop industry and business to support our own people and supply our own people. Maybe that is all we can ever attempt, except for developing our primary industries. To try to compete with the mainland is literally ridiculous, when you consider that the markets are right there in Ontario and Quebec and we are hoping to ship goods out of here and compete with them.

Mr. Speaker, we do need a strong central government to ensure that we are given our fair share, that equalization payments are continued and not reduced until we are brought up to the national average with the economy, and we are a long, long way from that now.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to say that we are, indeed, unique. I think the amendment is very much in order. It may sound as if it is out of order, that we should not be saying that Newfoundland is a distinct society. But we are not dealing with feelings in this

matter, we are dealing with the facts. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that no group is distinct in Canada in reality, not just us, or the opposite is, that we are all distinct. So we only have two choices: We either have to say that nobody is distinct or that we are all distinct.

As long as Quebec has been given a distinct status, which is unfair to the rest of Canada, then I think an amendment is in order to say that if one province is going to have distinct status, then all other provinces should have distinct status, and the start of that is the amendment which says, in fact, that we are a distinct society. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this hon. House it gives me great pleasure to be able to speak for a few minutes on the amendment put forth by my colleague for St. Barbe, 'the recognition that Newfoundland and Labrador constitute within Canada a distinct society.'

Mr. Speaker, if any province in Canada deserves to be recognized as a distinct society, Newfoundland and Labrador certainly stands out in that field, a way out, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, from any other province.

What position is Newfoundland in today? What are the advantages and what are the disadvantages? What is unique to Newfoundland that is not unique to any other province in Canada? All we have to do first, Mr. Speaker, is look at the fact that we are an Island. Newfoundland is an Island. It is separated from the mainland of Canada. Automatically, Mr. Speaker, that puts us at a disadvantage. The population of the Province of Newfoundland, outside of Labrador, are already at a disadvantage because they live on an Island. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

We heard the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development talking about Sprung this week, and the exporting of cucumbers to the Province of Nova Scotia. It has been pointed out very clearly that because we are an Island, freight costs are a great disadvantage in the exporting of goods. We have the problem of transporting goods by truck or carrier, which also has to be then transported across the gulf to North Sydney from Port aux Basques by boat. It is very expensive way, and that in itself is a problem.

What other ways, Mr. Speaker, are we distinct? Very clearly there are a number of areas where we are very distinct. This week I had the opportunity of reading a report from the National Welfare Council of Canada, a report on the people of this Province and the situation in which they are living. Twenty-three per cent of the families of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are living in poverty. Thirty-four per cent of the children of this Province are living in poverty. We have the highest percentage of

single people living in this Province of all the provinces of Canada living in poverty. If that does not make us distinct, Mr. Speaker, I ask you possibly what could make us distinct from any other province in Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:
That is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You said they were facts.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I would ask for protection of the Chair when I am speaking. We have a gentleman who seems to like to listen to himself. I suggest, if he wants to listen to himself, go look in a mirror and talk to yourself.

MR. DINN:
I would not break it anyway.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is distinct in many, many ways from any other Province of Canada.

One of the areas in which I am most familiar with and I have great deal of interest is the fisheries of this Province. I have, from time to time sat down in this House of Assembly, and listened to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and I have listened to the Premier of this Province and all the ministers on the other side get up and talk about the fishery in this Province. The Premier himself has tried to wrap himself in the flag and tell us that he is defending and he is supporting the fishermen of this Province.

But if you would go around any fishing village, any fishing community around the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador and ask any fisherman, do not ask them what their politics are, but ask any fisherman or anybody connected with the fishing families of this Province and ask them what they think, what their opinion is about the way they are being treated by the provincial government of this Province and the federal government in Canada when it comes to their rights of the fishermen and the protection that they deserve?

Mr. Speaker, there is not one fisherman that I have spoken to, not only in the community and the district that I represent, but in many, many other communities around this Province, not one fisherman in this Province would support the Premier in any way on the issues he has been trying to put forth because he is taking an attitude towards the fishermen of this Province that not even the Premier of Ontario, who has no connection, or the Premier of any Province in Canada, would take. It is not even close to the position the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has taken where they have taken a position and fell back.

Mr. Speaker, a very clear, prime example of the attitude and the protection the fishermen of this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are receiving from the government when we saw yesterday and all the last couple of weeks in this House of Assembly when it comes to the France - Canada issue.

The people on the Southwest Coast of this Province has been treated, not like Newfoundlanders, not like

Canadians, they are treated like beings who are non-existent, with no respect, with no concerns for their present, their past or their future, absolutely no concern whatsoever. We have a country, France. France is concerned - I am not going to attack France for what they are trying to do. They are trying to protect their own people. They are trying, whether it be right or wrong, to gain access to fishing grounds and more fish in this Province.

MR. DINN:

Your leader wants to give it to them.

MR. EFFORD:

They are fighting for the people of France. They are fighting for the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon, and they are willing to do it at all costs.

We have a Premier and a government where one day they make up their mind to cancel a project with France, and on the second day they decide not to cancel.

How can the people of this Province have any confidence whatsoever in a government who is not willing to stand up and say, 'We are going to fight for you. We are going to, at all costs, we are going to represent you, we are going to fight, we are going to negotiate, we are going to put forward our case and we are not going to back down.' When a government starts to back down, they start to weaken and when they show signs of weakening at a negotiating table or over a dispute, the other country then, automatically gains an advantage that they did not have on the previous day.

There is nobody on this side of

the House who even suggests that we can cancel the contracts that the federal government has put out to France but, we can ask them, as we did in the resolution put forth by all members of this House, we can ask them to cancel the contract. We can put pressure on and we can suggest to them, but how can we do it when this House cancelled the contract, told the people they were going to cancel the contract, and the very next day went back on their word and said, 'No, we are not going to cancel the contract.' How can we then ask the federal Government of Canada, or demand the federal Government of Canada when we take the flip-flop position that we take here in this Province?

We are going to have absolutely no credibility with the people of this Province and we are certainly not going to have any credibility with the federal Government of Canada or the Opposition parties in Canada. How can we have any credibility when they cannot even depend on our word? We cannot even stand up and fight for the people of this Province.

I do not think anybody connected with those contractors in this Province would be satisfied to gain a mere \$700,000 contract, the few dollars profit they are going to gain from that, when they can recognize the vast hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars that the fishermen of this Province are going to lose.

Do not tell me that we, as Newfoundlanders, because we are not in the fishing industry or because we are in the work force, do not tell me that we are not united together for the one cause, the best thing for all people of this Province.

The fishermen of this Province will stand up for the working class and the working class and the business people will stand up for the fishermen, because we all gain from the one thing, we all gain a profit. I am sure business people, professional people, laborers, carpenters, tradesmen, fishermen, everybody in this Province are still shocked at the announcement by the Minister of Development, the Minister of Fisheries, and the Premier of this Province when they rescinded on the resolution that they put forth after a unanimous decision by all members of this House.

To go back and say, 'No, we cannot now do that,' everybody becomes confused because when that decision was made in Cabinet, it was quite clear to everybody that when they made the decision to cancel the contract, they knew the amount of dollars. They had to know the amount of dollars that were involved with the companies. They had to know the number of companies that were involved in this contract. It is no good to say we have to give them back the contract because it is affecting Newfoundlanders.

When they made the original decision, they had to have known. A Cabinet cannot make a decision without knowing the amount of money that is involved, without knowing the people who are involved. It is a clear cut case of the Cabinet not knowing what they are doing, or intentionally misrepresenting the people of this Province and misleading the government of Canada about their credibility after they were serious about cancelling the contract. At the same time, they demanded the Minister of External Affairs cancel all contracts,

AirBus, the submarines and all major contracts and trade relations with the country of France.

It is beyond me how a Cabinet, or how a Premier, or how a Minister of this government could expect anybody else to trust us in the future. We are for the people of this Province, we are for the fishermen of this Province, or we are not for anything! And we have shown a sign of weakness that is going to come back to haunt us in the future. There is no question about it. The day is going to come when there is another dispute with the Government of Newfoundland, the Government of Canada, and countries such as France. It could be any other country that is fishing on the Grand Banks. If we have rescinded on that unanimous resolution that was put forth by the people of this House, now we have to show that we are not willing to stand by the vote that we took in the House of Assembly just a short time ago. How can we expect anybody in this country to trust us in the future?

Let us look at the people up in Fortune, the people up on the South Coast who depend so strongly on the fishing industry for a livelihood. All people who are on the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador are affected, but just think about the way in which those people are affected.

Those people have fished side by side with the people from St. Pierre and Miquelon for hundreds of years, a very, very clear picture of two groups of people, not from the same province, but two groups of people working together with absolutely no problems, traditionally fishing

side by side, one person communicating with the other on a daily basis, making a livelihood without absolutely no problem.

What is situation we have now? We have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where they talked about everyone going to get a licence to fish. What is taking place for the fishermen to go out there and fish, they have to get a permit.

Can you imagine the people of this Province, who have the traditional right to fish, and who have fished for so long in that area now having to have to get a permit, and every two weeks they have to go and get that permit renewed? What an incredible position to put the fishermen of this Province into! What rights do we have in this Province any more? We are not allowed to even hold as licence, or hold a right, not a licence but a right to fish around the Coast of our Province.

Why is this taken place? This is taken place, Mr. Speaker, very clearly because government of this Province have showed another weakness, and when any administration shows a weakness, there is no other government in this world that is going to give an inch.

The weakness was shown even further than that last year when the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries of this Province walked away from the negotiating table. We have a problem out there that certainly has to be resolved, and has to be resolved for the best interest of this Province. Number one is the best interest of all the people of this Province. That is number one on the list, not forgetting that the people of France, by the right of treaty,

have had the right to fish in the 3PS zone for hundreds of years. We have to recognize that right. But when the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries get to the position where they cannot sit down and argue their point across the table, and when they walk away, that shows, Mr. Speaker, a very clear sign of weakness in this Province.

How can you have your rights, how can you get your message through, how can you know that somebody else is going to put up every argument possible to gain the best interests of this Province, when the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries walk away from the negotiating table? That is a very clear picture, Mr. Speaker, that this government is weak, that this government is not putting forth the concerns and not holding up to its responsibilities to protect the interests of this Province.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a letter written to the hon. the Premier by one Wing Commander of the RCAF. I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to read a very clear picture that this gentleman was putting forth to the Premier of this Province. It shows very clearly how concerned, not only the people of Newfoundland are, but how concerned people in the Province of Ontario are over the Meech Lake Accord. It points to a number of issues that the people of this Province have been saying, and that the Leader of the Liberal Opposition Party of Newfoundland has been saying very clearly. It substantiates very clearly how correct we are when we say that the Meech Lake Accord is not good for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and it is not good for the country of Canada. There certainly have to be major, major

changes put forth.

How can we have a province distinct from any other province? How is that bringing the Constitution of this country together, saying that all people in the country are equal and should be treated on an equal and fair basis? We defeat that purpose very clearly, Mr. Speaker, when we say that the people of Quebec are a distinct society, or the people of any province are a distinct society. We have to have it very clearly that all people should be treated on an equal and fair basis. If we want this country to succeed, we must all agree on that. There is no way we should have to give in, Mr. Speaker, to pressures from other provinces to try to gain their own advantages out of the Meech Lake Accord, and for somebody else to take a lesser position.

Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, is begging, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are begging, the Minister of Fisheries and, especially, the Premier of this Province to stop fabricating, to stop fantasizing, to stop the illusions that they are creating around the Province that they are working for the best interests of the fishery. There is absolutely no way that is happening. Nobody in this Province can understand the route that the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) and the Minister Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and all Cabinet ministers, they all had to agree on it, nobody can understand the route that they have taken in the past couple of weeks. Where can it be, Mr. Speaker, - excuse me for laughing, Mr. Speaker, but the pink sneakers -

MR. BUTT:

They were sent from Ottawa.

MR. EFFORD:

Where can we be, Mr. Speaker, when we can see a display such as that? Where could it possibly be in this Province where you would travel around the Northeast Coast or any fishing community or anybody in this Province where you could see any ray of hope among the fishermen of this Province for the future, not only the inshore.

The inshore fishery is gone. The inshore fishery is a thing of the past. The Minister of Fisheries proved that several weeks ago when he brought forth the restructuring programme. He had absolutely no knowledge of what the problems are with the inshore fishery. If he had had any knowledge he would not have brought forth a programme such as he did.

All he was concerned was his act as a banker. Here was a group of people who owed certain dollars to the bank or to a company, and he was concerned about trying to reduce their loan. The only thing he did was reduce the amount of interest owed. The fact that the fishermen still owe that same amount of money, the same principal, what is that going to do to correct the problems in the inshore fishery?

The problem with the inshore fishery, number one, is there is no fish coming inshore. Number two, the size of the boats that the fishermen are using are too small to go offshore to catch fish where the fish are swimming. So if the problem is related to the boat size of this Province and the licencing structure that is in place, then the Minister of Fisheries does not even know or they could not even recognize what

the problems are to correct the problems with the inshore fishery. Obviously you cannot direct the fish to swim in the bays.

But you can direct the fishermen to go outside of the bay and catch the fish. So the Minister of Fisheries has to work with the federal people and set up some kind of a joint management board to look at the overall picture with the inshore fishing industry.

The inshore fishing industry needs changes, number one, in the licensing. You cannot expect the fishermen to hold several licences to catch fish within Conception Bay or any bay in this Province if there is no fish there. The licences are useless.

The size of the boats that the inshore fishermen are now using are thirty-four feet eleven inches. They are not allowed to build a boat one inch larger. So the rules have to be changed, so that those fishermen who have proven all down through the hundreds of years that they have the capability, they have the knowledge, they have the desire to go offshore and catch the fish, change their regulations so that they can go out.

They do not want to beg for government handouts. They do not need government backing all the time financially if they had the chance to catch the fish. They have proven that.

Several years ago in Port de Grave, and I will use that as a clear example, the crab fishery failed. They had tens of thousands of dollars worth of crab pots, all of a sudden they went out. In 1982, I think it was,

1981 there was no crab. They did not lie down. They did not lie down and say we needed government dollars, we need government backing to survive through the Winter.

All they asked for was for the government of this Province and the Government of Canada to give them the licence, give them the permit to go out farther afield and catch fish. That is all they needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
What happened? I attended a meeting with the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier of this Province subsequently, after I met with the fishermen. The Premier of this Province told those people who were in those sixty-five foot and sixty-four foot, eleven-and-a-half inch boats that, 'You are not capable of going on the Grand Banks and making a profit. There is no way you can do it.'

What happened? The people of Port de Grave said to the Premier, and they pointed at the Premier, 'We can do it, we will do it, and we will do it without your confidence and we will do it without your co operation.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
The people of Port de Grave took their boats and they went out on the Grand Banks. Did they successfully fish? At the same time they told the Premier they could not do it, he decided, with the Minister of Fisheries, they were going to bring in the middle

distance fleet. A sixty four foot, eleven-and-a-half inch boat can be occupied by five people and can be built at a cost of \$500,000. Keep that figure in mind.

A used middle distance boat costs the taxpayers of this Province \$1.5 million. It has to be operated with a crew of no less than thirteen. Last year, four boats from Port de Grave, four sixty-four foot, eleven-and-a-half inch boats from Port de Grave caught the same amount of fish and landed the same amount of fish as did four middle distance boats with half the crew.

George Petten, Captain of the **Carl Venture** of Port de Grave, caught 1.6 million pounds of fish last year.

MR. MORGAN:
He must be an exceptionally good fisherman.

MR. EFFORD:
They are exceptionally good fishermen, Mr. Speaker, as are all fishermen of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, that is the point I want to make. Any fishermen in this Province, given the opportunity, given the recognition that they deserve, can do exactly the same thing as the fishermen of that community did, but they are being held back by this government. They are being held back by the Government of Ottawa.

The point is not getting across. They do not need more dollars! They do not need work programmes. They do not need LIP programmes.

They do not need Social Services programmes. They are sick of that.

What they need is the opportunity to get the size of boat and the license they require and they can catch fish, they can make a profit. Now, what happens?

MR. FUREY:
Morgan said that your fishermen are exceptional. What were the middle distance fishermen?

MR. EFFORD:
What happens when the people of this Province catch fish? I have been accused sometimes in my own district by people of talking too much about fish. But when I explain to the people who really do not see what I am talking about that when the people of this Province catch fish, they make a profit, as also do the plant owners, and, most importantly, also do the people who work in the fish plants.

If the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, were working six months out of the year, instead of the two months that they are working now, what kind of an economy would we have in this Province? We would have an economy in this Province where the 18,000 people who have had to leave this Province would have been able to stay home. That is one thing we would have had, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
We should have a situation where the students coming out of high school and university with training this year would have a job. They would not have to go to

Ontario. They would not have to go to other parts of Canada or to other parts of the United States. They would have a job in this Province, where they would want to stay. That is what is happening in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

The government of this Province has shown a sign of weakness. They have shown another example of where the people of this Province can no longer depend on them. The confidence of the people of this Province in the government is gone.

Mr. Speaker, many times I hear the Deputy Premier, the President of the Council and the Premier himself make accusations across the Province that we are a lost opposition party.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will say to them, drop the writ and see who is lost, see how many people will be sitting from that side over here, Mr. Speaker. There will be one or two over here from that side of the House and this side will be over there.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am not sure I know why we are debating this resolution because I think it is pretty obvious on the basis of press reports that I have been reading, and in light of the

election recently in Manitoba, that the Meech Lake Accord and the resolution dealing with it is as dead as last week's newspaper. I am not sure that we should be wasting the time of the House making great speeches on this when there are other things, in my view, certainly more important matters that we could be debating.

For example, the Leader of the Opposition, a moment ago, in speaking to the petition made reference to the shocking rate of unemployment in this Province and the outward migration of our people. He said fifteen people every day of the year for the past three and a half years have been forced, in order to survive, they have been forced to pack it in.

Mr. Speaker, let us get one thing straight from the beginning. I am not going to stand up here and try and compete with the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who appears to take delight in sitting in his seat and making snide, caustic little remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

If the hon. gentleman wants to speak, Mr. Speaker, he has a right to do it as I have, but I am not going to stand and allow him to get on with that kind of nonsense. We are seeing too much of that here.

Today I had sixty students in that gallery from my district and, Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly ashamed of this institution, thoroughly ashamed of what went on here this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

I am thoroughly ashamed of what happened. I have served here now for quite a few years and I have never in my lifetime seen such goings on as we have seen here in the past few weeks. Ministers of the Cabinet, Ministers of the Crown, members of the Cabinet rather, the Queen's Ministers, acting like hooligans without any regard whatever, Mr. Speaker, for the rights of members to get up and ask questions.

We sit here and we listen to their answers, some of them are too long, but, Mr. Speaker, surely as a member, and I intended this morning to rise on a point of personal privilege because I believe that my privileges as a member of this House are being infringed upon by members opposite. The time has arrived -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

The member can laugh - yes. Mr. Speaker, we have now arrived at a point in this House where it is not safe to stand up and ask a civilized question, a sensible question, without running the danger of being maligned by members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the frustration of some of the backbenchers because they never get a chance to speak and they never get a chance to make a decision. I can understand their frustration and how they want to vent their nastiness once in awhile. But there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot accept and that is when I see a Minister of the Crown, a man who should

demand certain respect in this Province from people, from school children, when I see them act like I have seen certain members opposite and certain ministers, and some of them are here now, and the Minister of Mines is not without fault when it comes to his behaviour in the House, when I see the way they act, Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed of this institution.

MR. DINN:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the hon. member in his opening remark is breaking the rules of the House by referring to members of the House as hooligans. This is not permitted in this House of Assembly. It might be permitted in Houses of Assembly where the hon. member has served before, but it is not permitted here. You refer to members as members of the House for a particular district, or you refer to them as ministers, but you do not refer to them as hooligans. That is breaking the rules of the House and the hon. member, who is a long standing parliamentarian, should know better than that.

MR. FUREY:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines has been a member of this House a lot longer than I have, and he would know, Mr. Speaker, that if he consulted Beauchesne, as Your

Honour is know doing, hooligans is perfectly acceptable where applicable.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, referring to members of the House as hooligans may be acceptable for the member of St. Barbe, or the member for Twillingate, but it certainly is not acceptable as far as we are concerned.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

This is the final submission.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman for Twillingate did not call anybody a hooligan, he said, and this is very important: 'They are behaving like hooligans,' and there is a far difference. In any case, the word itself is not unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. I will take it under advisement. I am not really sure if the hon. member said 'acting like hooligans' or he did call them hooligans. If it was the latter, then I ask him to withdraw it, but if it was the former, then it is just an expression and a difference of opinion, but I will take it under advisement.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, let me say this, Sir, I will save you the trouble.

If my reference and if my likening of certain members opposite to acting like hooligans, Mr. Speaker, if it offends their sensitive ears, then I will retract.

I should remind Your Honour that hooligan, by the way, is not unparliamentary. I do not think there is any reference to it whatever in Beauchesne.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my point. Again, I reiterate what I said a moment ago that we have now reached a point in this House certainly from where I sit, I am almost embarrassed to encourage people from my constituency to visit the galleries. I mean that sincerely! I am almost embarrassed to suggest to my constituents that they visit the gallery.

When I was telephoned two weeks ago and told by a teacher of the Newville Elementary School that she would be bringing sixty students in to visit the House of Assembly, naturally, I welcomed the news.

I told her that I would make arrangements for the students to be met at the entrance to the building, that I would, upon being advised of their arrival in the building, go to the foyer of the building and speak to them and make their visit as enjoyable as possible. But I did have some reservations, because I thought to myself that Friday morning is not a good morning. I do not know why. It seems on Friday morning members opposite appear to misbehave more than any other morning in the week.

I know this morning they had reason to because we know that

their fortunes are sinking fast, rapidly sinking, and we can see it.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, and I have been in parliament and I have been here for quite a while, but you can always tell when they are beaten, because they will - I have seen it happen so often - the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) will get up and he will score a very important point. Somebody else will get up and they will score a very important point. The members opposite start to try and react with their shouting, ballyragging and maligning the members over here.

But then they will get up and they run for the curtains and just as they are going out through the curtains, they look back and they will make some snide remark and then make a run for the corridor. I have seen that.

In fact, I saw the House Leader (Mr. Simms) do it, I believe on Wednesday.

MR. SIMMS:

Talk about ways (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, this is all relevant. I am as relevant in my comments as the House Leader was in his rebuttal to the petition presented by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) an hour ago.

MR. DINN:

You are certainly as relevant as the member for Port de Grave, anytime he speaks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

So I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, to do me the courtesy of allowing me to speak in quiet. I do not need advice from the House Leader. I am quite capable of speaking for myself and that is what I intend to do, Mr. Speaker, without any prompting from the House Leader.

He might not be able to get and say what he believes or the way he feels, but on this side of the House we can and we can do it very well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:

I thought you had to go to Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Humber West, I have reconciled myself to one very important fact, is not a bad fellow and I have decided I am going to put up with him and tolerate the way he is getting on because he is not going to be here much longer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

For the next six months or whatever time it take, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. DINN:

At least he will (inaudible.)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:

I will not sulk away. I will not

run away.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, may I have silence?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. W. CARTER:

The Speaker has had to warn members opposite on three occasions in the past week, he has warned ministers opposite on three occasions, if they refuse to abide by the rules and to listen to hon. members in silence, he would have to name them and have them removed from the House. I believe the hon. member for Humber West was one of the trio that he served notice on. I know the Minister of Housing (Mr. Peach), I know the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin).

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

I know the my good friend for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) is not without sin.

MR. DINN:

I never was named. That is a lie.

MR. W. CARTER:

My good friend for Pleasantville is not without sin. He was one of the people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

I had the guts to run in Pleasantville all the time.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped

that this morning the members opposite would maybe listen and learn something.

MR. DINN:

You cannot from the hon. member, only about dollar votes.

MR. W. CARTER:

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, in the process they might learn to be better behaved, and instead of acting like a bunch of spoiled children, they would sit back like gentlemen, as they should be -

MR. DINN:

You should be able to talk!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Mines is at it again. He sits there and he barks and he yaps and he yaps.

MR. DINN:

I also find you out of order this morning.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker -

MR. DINN:

Do not get nervous now.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, we will wait. There will be a comment as he goes through the curtains. No, he did not do it.

At least, Mr. Speaker, I have accomplished something this morning. The hon. the House Leader went through the curtains and did not turn back and make some snide remark and then rush for the back room.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of this debate we have witnessed what I believe to be a great deal of inconsistency on the part of members opposite.

MR. DINN:
(Inaudible) the next election.

MR. TULK:
Another one gone.

MR. W. CARTER:
Another one going, yes.

We have seen the Premier, of course, stand in his place and, in typical fashion, in the style that Newfoundlanders have become accustomed to in recent years.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
You would not say it when he is here.

MR. W. CARTER:
We have heard him loudly and clearly, proclaim defence for the Newfoundland fishermen. Of course, he is hanging his hat on the fact that in the agenda for the next First Ministers' Conference, that fisheries, its roles and responsibilities, and Senate reform, and a number of other items, will be discussed, mind you, discussed.

Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing fisheries in this Province, I suppose, since John Cabot threw the first basket overboard off Cape Spear or wherever it was.

MR. DECKER:
Cape Spear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Cape Race.

It is probably the most discussed subject ever in this Province and in Newfoundland even before we became a province of Canada. It has been talked about. There have been reports written on it, and all we seem to do is talk about the fishery.

MR. J. CARTER:
Who said, 'Who burned the boats?'

MR. W. CARTER:
The member for St. John's North, again sitting where he is sitting and saying very little, except from his seat, says, "Who said, 'burn your boats'." Well, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I question very much if the gentleman who has been credited with having made that statement ever made it, -

MR. DINN:
That is not what you said when you were over here.

MR. W. CARTER:
- certainly not in the context in which it has been reported. I know that gentleman -

MR. J. CARTER:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Parsons):
A point of order, the hon. the gentleman from St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
I thank the member for yielding. What was actually said was - and I am quoting - "Burn your boats, there will be two jobs for every man." Now, I, unfortunately, cannot supply the date and place, but the former, former, former Premier, Premier Smallwood of Newfoundland did say, "Burn your boats. There will be two jobs for every man." Now, he said it in a period of excitement -

MR. DINN:
Two or three times, and once in Bonavista North.

MR. J. CARTER:
- but he did say it and he never hesitated to affirm that he did say it at the time.

He thought that industrialization would be the saviour of Newfoundland, and that we could all get out of the fishery, but he did say it, and I think he should be credited with it.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order?

MR. W. CARTER:
I am not going to engage the hon. member now in an argument as to what was said and when it was said. I am repeating what I said a moment ago that, knowing that gentleman as I do.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
That is for the Chair to decide. From what I hear, I am not sure what was said by anyone years ago. It is just a difference of opinion over what was said.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
That is an excellent ruling, Your Honour.

Again, I am not going to engage in a long debate as to what was said forty years ago. I am not going to waste my time discussing it, except to say, and I repeat what I said a moment ago, that I shall never be convinced that that statement was made by the former Premier in the context in which it is being reported.

We all know that, and if the hon. member will think back, he will have to understand that prior to Confederation, the fishing industry of Newfoundland was one of the most poverty stricken industries. I suppose, on this continent. Unfortunately, and my forefathers and my father are in the category to which I am now going to relate, people who were engaged in the fishery in that period, prior to the advent of the frozen fish market, people who were involved in the salt fish industry had very little to be proud of, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the industry itself.

It was a starvation industry. Today we have people who are in their graves who died because of malnutrition, beriberi and other illness that was brought on by the lack of proper food.

So, if the former Premier did, in fact, make that statement, I laud him for it. I do not apologize for it, because how anybody back in the mid-forties could have too much good to say about the fishing industry does not really surprise me, Mr. Speaker.

It was difficult in those days to find anything good to say about the salt fish industry. It was a starvation industry, and those in it, Mr. Speaker, were on the brink of starvation three parts of their time.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is hanging his hat on the reference in the Meech Lake Accord to an undertaking that the roles and responsibilities of the fisheries be on the agenda for the next First Minister's Conference and succeeding First Minister's Conferences. No promise that any action will be taken, no promise

whatever. They have promised that the Premier will be permitted to introduce it, and it will be debated. Nothing more than that. Now, on that, we are hanging on our hat.

The Premier last week said something that was rather significant. When the Leader of the Opposition, I think it was, was talking about the need for a Triple "E" Senate and the reform of the Senate, and how that too was an item that might be discussed at future First Ministers Conferences, the Premier said, "Well, what is the use of discussing that? We will never get an elected Senate anyway".

Now I realize that the amending formula is slightly different in that to amend the act relating to the Senate would require the unanimous approval of all of the provinces. I realize too that to amend the Constitution to give Newfoundland certain, as the Premier calls it, legislative jurisdiction over the fisheries, would invoke an other type of a formula, of the amending formula, that is that seven of the ten provinces, with at least 50 percent Canadian people agree to that amendment.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, about that aspect of it. What we have seen unfold in the past couple of days just might have some bearing on our chances of getting approval for legislative jurisdiction over the fishery.

I am inconvenienced in my mind that Canadians, that the other provinces will not support any such move or any such attempt to give Newfoundland that kind of legislative jurisdiction.

We have been seeing what has been happening in recent days with respect to the Sprung Greenhouse and the cucumbers, and the fact that we are now trying to break into the Nova Scotia market. That fact, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, will cause a lot of problems, and a lot of ill feelings towards this Province and the Province of Nova Scotia. So if anybody here thinks that the Nova Scotians will indeed support any attempt on the part of the federal government to give Newfoundland legislative jurisdiction over the fisheries, we have already seen a very strong indication from New Brunswick, for example, that that province will certainly have nothing to do with it. So I think for the Premier to even suggest that Newfoundland will one day have legislative jurisdiction over the fishery is nothing more, Mr. Speaker, than a pipe dream, as desirable as it might be. It is being very practical, Mr. Speaker, and thank goodness the Minister of Health is not Premier the way he has mangled the health care in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is that we do not disagree with the need for Newfoundlander's to have more say in the management and control of the fishery. Of course, we want it. I have said it, I suppose a 1,000 times. Yes, and I will fight for it.

But I am not anxious, Mr. Speaker, as it is only a fool who will fight for a cause that he knows he has not got a snowball's chance of winning. That is exactly what the government is doing.

They are using that as an example to ingratiate themselves and to win support in this Province. But I can tell you now, that Newfoundlander's are not being

fooled by it, because we have seen all too often the capers being cut by our Premier in his so called determination to fight for the rights of Newfoundlanders. In each case, Mr. Speaker, he has, I think, lost all of his fights.

To suggest that we are going to get control of the fishery under the Meech Lake Accord is, I think, Mr. Speaker, misleading and we are only kidding ourselves.

What we are suggesting is that the matter be dealt with similar to the Petroleum Board, the action taken by both governments when the Petroleum Board was established. That is the kind of a board that we believe would come close to fitting the bill as far as Newfoundland is concerned, our need for greater say in the management of our fishery. That, Mr. Speaker, is the method that we would see being adopted and we do not see too many problems with that kind of an approach.

That would almost achieve, Mr. Speaker, the same thing the Premier is talking about when he says legislative jurisdiction. In fact, he has never fully spelled out yet what he means by legislative jurisdiction. We have heard members opposite, and I have heard the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) get up one day and in point form outline what they expect to achieve in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
I have yet to hear the Premier, but I suppose there must be something on record, but I have not heard the Premier spell out clearly and concisely what he

means by legislative jurisdiction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
If it means policing the 200 mile limits, of course, we all know the futility of that kind of a suggestion because it would take at last twice as much money as the Department of Fisheries has been voted this year to administer that aspect of fisheries jurisdiction.

I am told that the annual cost of manning the vessels and the aircrafts that patrol the 200 mile limit is in the order of \$30 million a year. I am told that the capital cost of providing the hardware that is necessary, the ships and the aircraft, would be another \$50 or \$60 million.

Surely the Premier cannot be suggesting Newfoundland assume legislative jurisdiction over the fisheries, if it means that we are going to be responsible for finding the necessary wherewithal, the necessary money to finance the cost of even that aspect alone.

Mr. Speaker, another thing I have not been able to reconcile is that if the Premier and the government is so determined to get their hands on, as he calls it, legislative jurisdiction over the fishery, or more say in the management of that resource, then why would that not have been a condition of his approval for the Meech Lake Accord?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
I recall very well the day the Premier came back. I respect him for it, and he handled it very

well, I thought. He also went into great length as to how long they were closeted in some office debating the Meech Lake Accord. I believe he said nineteen and a half hours were used up in that exercise. It was well into the wee hours of the morning, I think, before it was agreed by the First Ministers to approve the Meech Lake Accord.

Now, it seems to me that if I were the Premier and if I meant what I said in terms of Newfoundland getting greater say in the management of that resource that that would have been one of the conditions that I would have attached to my support of the Meech Lake Accord. 'Allowing himself to be pacified, as it were, by saying, 'Now Brian, do not worry, do not rock the boat. If you agree to the Meech Lake Accord, we will make a concession. We will agree to have the roles and responsibilities of the fisheries become an item on the next agenda and on succeeding agendas of First Ministers' Conferences.' No guarantee that there will be anything done about it, but 'we will at least discuss the matter.'

Now, obviously the Premier fell for that suggestion on the part of the Prime Minister and others. Of course, I believe that Newfoundland will continue to pay for it. I repeat, if the Premier was as sincere as he purports to be in terms of Newfoundland having greater say in fisheries jurisdiction, if I were him I would have held out and would have made my support of that document conditional on Newfoundland getting certainly more than just a mere promise that it would be on future agendas.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) any say at all.

MR. W. CARTER:
Yes, of course, Mr. Speaker, of course. I was out calling for more jurisdiction in the fisheries before the member even thought of coming into this House, long before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
I am on record, and I make no bones about it. I spoke in the hon. member's district when I went over in 1979 and helped the hon. member get elected. I recall speaking for him in Catalina.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, in my view is unique, as leaders go. He is honest! He is completely honest in what he says!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
He is completely honest! He is not a showman. He can get up and he can strip to the waist and get on with his puffery and nonsense -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:
Of course he can. Give the man credit for being honest. He is saying what is correct, and the honest thing to say. He is not just getting up and speaking for the sake of speaking and making - I will give you an example.

Two weeks ago today we had a debate in this House on a resolution condemning France for its actions in arresting or

detaining and escorting to the harbour of St. Pierre a Newfoundland fishing vessel. We saw the Premier get up and say, 'Oh, we will never compromise,' and it is on record, it is in Hansard. 'There will be no compromise.' We saw the Minister of Fisheries get up and almost like a man who was obsessed, 'Oh, we will fight them! This is an all-out war and, if necessary, we will cut off the air ambulance,' and we will do this and we will do that! Then, upon our insistence they agreed to include in that resolution a small paragraph having to do with the Newfoundland Government doing what they are asking the federal government to do, and that is to sever any economic connections or business they have with that country. Of course, they agreed to it.

Then we saw the Minister of Development get up, the great hero, 'Oh, yes, I am going to recommend to my colleagues in Cabinet tonight that we discontinue that contract, we suspend that contract.' The Premier, I believe, in his letter to Joe Clark, made reference to it.

MR. TULK:

And to the Prime Minister.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, to the Prime Minister as well. And, lo and behold, two days ago the minister -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying I have never seen such hypocrisy before.

MR. DINN:

The Speaker brought you to order. Do not break the rules of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Their brazen, two-facedness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

If they do not like it, they can lump it.

MR. DINN:

You have been called to order by the Chair.

MR. W. CARTER:

But that is the essence of hypocrisy. The essence of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. That minister, to get in his place last week -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave!

MR. W. CARTER:

Do I have leave, to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Not by leave, no.

MR. W. CARTER:

I can understand that.

MR. DINN:

He is making a fool of himself. He broke the rules all morning. All he knows about is the dollar vote.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, order!

Before recognizing the hon. member for Stephenville, I would like to welcome to the gallery Mr. Laurie Tulk the instructor with four students from the Bell Island Campus, Avalon Community College.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today and speak on this debate and talk to the amendment put forward by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), my good and honourable colleague, who works very hard.

It is appropriate to, Mr. Speaker, to rise in this debate with the situation concerning Newfoundland in the Confederation we see now and what is happening with the dispute in the fishery, and what this government has undertaken to do about resolving that dispute.

We see this Province saying one thing to the federal government about economic sanctions and then we see them doing another thing, Mr. Speaker. That is a simple explanation of what is going on.

No matter what anybody else says, the reality of it is that we have the words of this House of

Assembly asking that every economic sanction that we can put forward be put forward to France, and we also have put forward the recommendation that the Province do the same. For us to do any other thing and put forward any other idea would be contrary to that resolution that was put forward giving the Province's position unanimously from everybody in this House.

When we are talking about this, Mr. Speaker, we have had actions in this House that we should follow. This House of Assembly and the members on this side of the House would like to see that followed but obviously the government has decided upon another action. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because it cast doubt, I think, on the whole seriousness of the matter and also the intentions of the government in resolving the matter.

We are discussing the Meech Lake Accord and our amendment is on the distinct society clause, Mr. Speaker. I could not believe it the other day when I saw the Premier get up and say that Quebec was more distinct than Newfoundland in the Confederation of Canada. I cannot believe that I heard that and I cannot believe that he said it and I cannot believe that he would not go along with the amendment that we are putting forward.

They could have said a lot of other things, Mr. Speaker, in the Meech Lake Accord that would have given Quebec its characteristics that are special within this Confederation. There are other words that could have been put into the Meech Lake Accord and they were offered and they were put forward by a number of groups

across Canada that could have resolved that and could have shown in the Meech Lake Accord that this existed.

But what did they do, Mr. Speaker? They decide to make Quebec a distinct society within a society. Those are the words that are entrenched in the Meech Lake Constitution. When you do that, you create something different. You create something that was not there. You have created a separate entity that now has to be governed by the Province of Quebec, and now has to make laws that will promote this distinct society. They are not promoting a French characteristic or a French character. They are promoting a distinct society. Those words are completely different.

They mean a different thing altogether, and, therefore, we put forward the amendment to the resolution which states that Newfoundland and Labrador is also a distinct society, as is every other province in this Confederation, because they have special characteristics also.

If they are going to entrench one in the Constitution and then allow a provincial government to then carry out that mandate, as a distinct society, then there is an inequality, Mr. Speaker, that has to be addressed. In order for that inequality to be addressed, we have to do something about it, and I am very pleased to rise and support this amendment to the resolution.

Canada is a country where there are many differences and many characteristics from one end to the other. But for us to be here today and to look at Quebec as a distinct society that is separate

from everything else in Canada and to promote it as such, I think we have to look again, very carefully, at where that lies and where is it going, Mr. Speaker. Because, the Meech Lake Accord is not changing very much in the sense that the power bases are still there. There is no change in that.

We see that Quebec and Ontario are still going to have the same number of members in the House of Commons, the great numbers they have, and the power base. That is not changing. The Meech Lake Accord recognizes it. It goes further though, to recognize Quebec in its role.

I have nothing against Quebec, as do other members on this side of the House. We are all for recognizing a special characteristic of Quebec within the Confederation. But to recognize another province as a distinct society goes too far and it should be looked at, Mr. Speaker, and reopened and maybe other wording can be put in there, because these are just words, as we say, but these words will be interpreted from here on. The careful interpretation and the legal interpretation of this wording is going to have a great impact on the people of Quebec and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and the rest of the people of Canada, especially when it comes to looking at distinct society and what that really means. How do you push it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, we feel that Newfoundland and Labrador has a great dependency on the fishery of this Province. It is a rural Province. Communities live and die by the fishery and also the

other industries. But the fisheries has been the historical key in the economy of the Province in keeping rural Newfoundland alive. When we see the things that are going on, Mr. Speaker, with Ottawa and the representation that is being made in trying to resolve the long-standing dispute, it worries us. We are concerned. We want to see something done with it, Mr. Speaker.

I have to talk about the recent economic sanctions, the proposal we put forward, because it shows part of our role in Confederation and the way we are being taken. If we are to say to Ottawa, 'Ottawa, please stop everything you are doing with France and we will do the same,' then that is one way for us to exert some pressure and to help resolve this Canadian dispute, not only in Newfoundland and Labrador but the Canadian international dispute off our coastal waters. That has to be done. We have to provide these economic sanctions and so on.

I have one question. Last week as we saw the government deciding that they were going to cancel the contract, then they come in and say they are not going to cancel the contract, the other question entered my mind, Mr. Speaker, was how did we get that far? How did we get that far? They must have had ongoing negotiations with some company in France to get this going. This must be going on for months, as far as I know.

Also, we were told that there may be other contracts that were in the works. And yet, this dispute has been going on for months and here we are saying, 'Ottawa beat them over the head,' and what are we doing? 'Come on in by, no sweat.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I would like to know why, behind the scenes, we were negotiating with French companies based in France, government monies, contracts, some benefits, or whatever. We are negotiating with them, Mr. Speaker.

Yet, we decide we are going to cancel that then. Then we decide we are not going to cancel. I mean, if that is not a flip-flop, I do not know what is, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We did not want to see the flip-flop, Mr. Speaker. We were the ones that suggested to them that we put in in this resolution, that we would say 'No, nothing for the French. If they are going to treat us like they have been treating us, okay, let us send them a message.' That is what we said to them.

We suggested that in the resolution and we put it forward, good constructive Opposition work, representing the interests of the fishermen of the Province and everybody else. We put forward that amendment to the resolution. It was accepted wholeheartedly by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

But what happens, Mr. Speaker? It is accepted and then it is a flip-flop. They said, 'Yes, we are going to do it, but not right now. We will do it later.' It is a double standard and it takes away from the position of this Province. It takes away from the

pushing to the federal government to get them to do something about it. That is what has happened.

For any other explanation to be put forward, it is just not right and is not giving a clear picture of the situation. The fact that we were negotiating with some French company, and government money was involved behind the scenes, just says to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is shocking, that we would come in here and beat our chests and say: 'Okay, Ottawa, you play hard ball with France, but we will get around to it later.' We have got to do the same thing that we ask our federal counterparts to do, Mr. Speaker. One of these days we will maybe see that done, but I am not sure with this present government.

So, when I hear all the pounding of the chest, Mr. Speaker, and the salt of the earth Newfoundlanders talking about, 'We are doing this and the Liberal Opposition is against that,' that was a good example of us making good concrete suggestions for the interests of Newfoundland and Labrador, and then not being acted upon. It was not acted upon, and it appears that it is not going to be acted upon. It is unfortunate.

It makes, as I said, Mr. Speaker, our resolution weaker in Ottawa as they try to resolve this dispute. We have asked the government to consider their decision. Whether or not the provincial government will do that is another thing, Mr. Speaker. It is just unfortunate that we see it happen, because it shows again the need, Mr. Speaker, for a strong representation from this Province on the fishery and it shows also the need of a good Opposition that is getting ready to form the government, Mr.

Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the homework is getting done. Let me tell you, because that flip-flop told everybody in this Province where they are coming from over there. They got caught with their trousers down, Mr. Speaker, and they did not know what to do. That is exactly what happened and they know it.

They then had to come in all red-faced and say, 'We were going to do that but we then decided, no, we cannot do that right now. We saw the information but we did not really read it, but then we read it so we are going to do that.'

Maybe that will happen again, Mr. Speaker, and maybe it will happen with other things they are negotiating right now. I would not understand it. I know I am only simple minded, Mr. Speaker, and I am just too honest and everything else. I just do not know the difference.

What is happening with the other deals they are negotiating? Are there any French companies involved with the Hibernia deal, or whatever? Maybe there are all kinds of things going on that we do not know about. If you say a policy is stated, let us go for it. We have to get this Province rolling, Mr. Speaker.

When I see the Premier of this Province get up and say that Newfoundland is not a distinct society and that Quebec is more distinct than Newfoundland, then I have a problem, Mr. Speaker, and

so does every other Newfoundlander, as far as I am concerned.

Those are the words entrenched in the Constitution and for us not to be able, in this Province, to promote our distinct society as well as Quebecs, makes us unequal. That is a logical argument, I think, Mr. Speaker, it is very logical. The wording has been put there, not by us, but by the other premiers of Canada.

Looking at the distinct society clause, recently David Peterson, the premier of Ontario, has now had second thoughts. He had some thoughts on this and he is willing, and it looks like he may be interested, in having a look at the distinct society clause and its effects on the future of Canada, Quebec and the other provinces.

So, there are some people in Canada who are looking again and saying, 'Maybe there is a problem there, maybe we acted too hastily, maybe we put in wording that maybe should be looked at again so that the realism of what we have can be put forward,' instead, Mr. Speaker, of putting things on paper that could have a very dramatic impact on the future of Canada. There are indications in other parts of Canada that eyes are being opened, ears are being opened and that people who say that the Meech Lake Accord is not exactly the greatest historical document put forward in Canada and that maybe it should be reviewed and looked at. That is all we are saying. We are saying it should be reviewed and looked at, and some amendments made to clarify some of the things that have been put forward.

We are not condemning the people who signed it, Mr. Speaker. They signed it but they should also have the wisdom to see that when they signed something with some errors in it, they should correct them. If we can put forward those suggestions, I do not see what the problem is. I think the Premiers of Canada and the Prime Minister, that great Canadian, Brian Mulroney, that believes in Atlantic Canada and believes in promoting regional disparity, I believe that they should look seriously at the Meech Lake Accord and where its future lies and what impact it will have. These are things, I think, that have to be reviewed, so when I see the very good amendment put forward by my colleague, I am very pleased to support it.

Mr. Speaker, look at the Meech Lake Accord and here is what they could have left in. "The recognition that the existence of French-speaking Canadians, centred in Quebec but also present elsewhere in Canada, and English speaking Canadians concentrated outside Quebec, but also present in Quebec, constitute a fundamental characteristic of Canada."

Mr. Speaker, that is nice wording. They constitute a fundamental characteristic in Canada. What else did they put in? "The recognition that Quebec constitutes within Canada a distinct society." They did not have to do that, Mr. Speaker. We have here, 'they are a fundamental characteristic of Canada.' That is exactly what they are. They are a special fundamental characteristic in Canada. It does not say they are a separate body, or a distinct society. It does not say that. It just says it

recognized that they are a characteristic, not a separate, but a characteristic as part of the whole. As part of what we have in Canada, they are as a special characteristic and that is a complete difference, Mr. Speaker.

It is saying you are a distinct society, a separate body, within a Confederation. You are a separate body promoting yourself separately. It can only be, Mr. Speaker, I think, at the harm of Canada that that is allowed to progress because it is going to be put into the courts, Mr. Speaker, the law is going to be brought in. What happens if we get another separatist government in Quebec? What happens then? They have got entrenched now, we are going to have it in the Meech Lake Accord, that 'We are a distinct society.' They are allowed to make their own rules, they are going to make their own rules and so on, as they are. It is going to be entrenched there that they promote it. They promote it and they bring it forward.

If the late former Premier of Quebec, Mr. Levesque, had had this in his hands, he might have been more successful, Mr. Speaker, when it came to separating from Canada. That was a threat then and then that was resolved. But, Mr. Speaker, by putting this in, I have to question whether or not, if you get a government that feels that they do not want to be part any more and you are saying to them, "You are a separate body; You are a distinct society within that Confederation," then I think they are going to have more ammunition than they had the last time. That is a reality that we have to deal with.

They could have left it out, Mr. Speaker, but they decided to put it in. Brian Mulroney says, 'If you reopen, it it will shag everything up.' It is not going to shag everything up at all. You are going to try and correct things. You want to fix things right before they get out of hand and there becomes a threat.

It is unfortunate that they all sat around, Mr. Speaker, that night and they decided, 'You give me this or whatever and I will give you that and we will have a Meech Lake Accord.' The ramifications for that in the future are very important. Like I said, they had enough in there, Mr. Speaker, that looked at Quebec and minorities in Canada saying that it is a special characteristic. But a distinct society means a completely different thing. And it is something that we have to address.

Getting back to the distinct society, it was some funny in here the other day watching the Premier try to get out of it by saying, 'Well, a distinct society, they are only words. I mean Newfoundland is not a distinct society. Only Quebec is distinct. But Newfoundland is not. We are over here just doing this because, you see, we want to make points. That is all we are doing it for. I mean, we do not want to try to correct the problem.'

MR. FUREY:

He made a career out of that.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, he made a career out of that.

We are saying, why cannot we say it if they are going to say it for Quebec? Why cannot we say it? We

are the newest province in this Confederation and we are a distinct society.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I was looking back, Mr. Speaker, through some old Throne Speeches that this government brought in the last number of years, since 1979. In those Throne Speeches Newfoundland is considered a distinct society, Mr. Speaker. It is right in the wording.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We are a distinct society. So when they are around the table up there, why did not the hon. Premier say, 'Well, okay, Mr. Bourassa, you want a distinct society. Well, that is fine, but we are a distinct too and why do you not put us down as such so we can promote our future and our good characteristics that we have.' Mr. Speaker, we have enough problems in this country trying to govern it. They have enough problems trying to govern it. But now you have given one province the right to do a lot of other things and promote a lot of things, Mr. Speaker, that if the government decides that they want to go a way that is hazardous to this Canada, they can do it. We have given them the ammunition to do it; we have given them the power to do it. We have decided that we want to jeopardize this country. One of these days that reality will wake the people up, Mr. Speaker, in the good country of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I knew I was reading it over. I did not have it on me,

but now it has been put in my hands. July 12, 1979, the Thirty-Eighth General Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland Speech from the Throne: "Mr. Speaker and members of the hon. House of Assembly." The hon. the Premier himself, 1979. "My Government feels -

MR. FUREY:

Which government? Premier Peckford?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The hon. Premier, Brian Peckford, yes. "My Government feels that we must go through a final, but necessary, stage of our process of reconstruction. Our people are, I am sure, ready - yes - even anxious to complete the task of securing to themselves the means by which they, as a people, can assure their future as a distinct society."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Where is the hon. Premier today, I wonder? Where is he today?

MR. FUREY:

He is cancelling those contracts.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The other day he gets up and says -

MR. TULK:

He is cancelling his comments.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We are cancelling those comments too.

It is amazing, and this is in a couple of other Throne Speeches. He talks about here in the Throne Speech all kinds of attitudes and our role within Confederation, and says, we are a distinct society.

'Our people are and are even anxious to complete that task of securing our future,' Mr. Speaker.

We are willing to do that. We are willing to read it here in the Throne Speeches. When it comes to our own promotion, Mr. Speaker, and where we lie within this Confederation, then we have to be looking at the ramifications of such a deal.

Oh my gosh! February 28, 1980, Thursday, same government. They were in government then at the time. The Throne Speech again: "In addition to such measures, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we maintain our collective sense as a distinctive society."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Who said that?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The hon. the Premier again. He said it within Confederation, and that we promote a lively debate upon our past, present and future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

And Mulroney made him cancel those comments.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The thing is, you see, we are distinct but we are not willing to fight for our distinctiveness as much as Quebec. That is where it lies, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to read a couple of other words here. It says, "We are a distinctive society within Confederation and that we promote a lively debate upon our past,

present, and future." Now, I am going to go to the Meech Lake Accord. It says here, "Promote your distinct society." Let me read you something, and it is good too, I must say, really good. I can see why they do not want to get up and talk about it, Mr. Speaker.

Here is number three: "The role of the legislature and Government of Quebec to preserve and promote the distinct identity of Quebec." So, what we were saying eight or nine years ago in all of our Throne Speeches about what we are was, 'We are distinct and we are going to fight for that distinctiveness. We are going to fight for that.' So they got up around the table up there, and what did they do?

They gave Mr. Bourassa everything he wanted and we got a discussion of fisheries. We are going to get a chance now to talk about the roles and responsibilities in the fishery, as if you never had the chance before, Mr. Speaker.

If he was fighting for jurisdiction, why did he not have in the Meech Lake Accord now, not the discussion though, or the roles and responsibilities of, why did he not say that we are going to discuss the jurisdiction of the fishery issue, Mr. Speaker? He did not put it in there, because you could not get it. He is not going to get it either.

The hon. Tom Siddon, Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, what did he say when he was asking the House of Commons, 'What does it mean about fisheries jurisdiction in the Meech Lake Accord? Does that mean that Newfoundland will get more jurisdiction?' They asked him that hon. question concerning

the Newfoundland people. They asked him that question, and he said, 'No,' Mr. Speaker, 'that is not what it means.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
He said: 'What it means is we will look at the roles and responsibilities,' Mr. Speaker, 'but we have no intention of giving away jurisdiction. We have no intention, whatsoever.' He said he was going to talk about it. They said, no problem, they were going to talk about it. I am all for the talk, Mr. Speaker, I am all for that too, but why would this provincial government decide that they are going to call it one thing, and the 'Ottawa;' who are the givers, by the way, they are the ones that we have to get this from. We are not the ones who have it. We have to go get it from them and negotiate. There are the ones that are going to give to us and they are saying, not a chance, not a snowball, whatever, you are not going to get it. Okay, you are going to forget it. Okay?

We have got the Premier down here saying, 'Yes, we are going to get it. We have it there now.' But then we have 'Ottawa,' this great Tory government in Ottawa, this great government that was going to inflict prosperity in 1984 like we have never seen before, and here we have the population, Mr. Speaker, in the last three years going down in population, that is a good infliction of prosperity, Mr. Speaker! What an infliction that is!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
It is more like an infection.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
They should call it infection. The hon. member for Fogo got it right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
So all of this infliction of wonderful prosperity on this good Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has not come through. We are still waiting for that and we are hoping to see it, but we feel in this Province, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador feels that we are a distinct society, and not only that, the Province of Newfoundland, this government of Newfoundland, supposedly believes the same thing. Yet, I wonder if they are going to vote for that amendment.

It is going to be interesting to see how they get out of it when they vote against it. It is going to be interesting to see because, like they can churn out the paper and send it all over this Province, I, as a member am going to churn out some paper too. I am going to send out some copies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I am going to send out some copies, and I am not going to accuse them, -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) liner board mill.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank God for the federal Liberal government on that one too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to them explaining to the rest of the Province that we are not a distinct society, but Quebec is. It is going to be awful interesting to find out how they are going to get out of that one. I wonder if they are going to try the same thing they are doing on the contract with the French. Maybe they are going to try to do the same thing.

'Yes, we said that, but we have got to have a Cabinet meeting on it.' I am not going to say to them over there that there are not salt-of-the-earth Newfoundlanders, because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that everybody in this hon. House is a salt-of-the-earth Newfoundlander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

I am not going to accuse them of this, that, and everything else about personalities and things like that, but they are the government, they are supposed to be promoting our distinct society, Mr. Speaker, and unless they decide they are going to do it, then we, the Liberal Opposition, are getting ready to do it, and we are looking forward to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
It is going to be interesting --

AN HON. MEMBER:
Time is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
I still have a couple of minutes

left, Mr. Speaker. I am just getting wound up here now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
We have one secretary for two MHAs, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
We have lots of volunteers, though.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
We had a few volunteers, but we have a lot more these days. We are going to start indicating to the people of the Province what their words are and what their real interests are, Mr. Speaker, in trying to promote Newfoundland as a distinct society, and promoting the fishery of Newfoundland and all the other things that are inherent.

Mr. Speaker, they can cajole and threaten me all they want about my political future, and if I get defeated the next time, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, if I do not get elected again, if I never come back into this House, let me say that I said to them what I thought. And we are going to hold them accountable. Because as long as we get a new Liberal Government the next time --

MR. SIMMONS:
Have not will be no more.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
That is right, have not will be no more. Not only that, for those who are in Alberta wondering when they can come home, maybe they will be able to come home in a few years time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SIMMONS:

He adjourned the debate.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I adjourned the debate. It is one o'clock.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You did not.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I did so. I just said it over the mike. You can check Hansard.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Go ahead. I said, 'I adjourn the debate.'

MR. SIMMS:

To a point of order. There is no urgency to do it today if Your Honour wishes to check Hansard to see if the hon. member adjourned the debate. If he did, then he has thirty seconds remaining, and that is fair ball. We have no real problem with it. However, if he just said thank you very much and sat down -

MR. REID:

That is what he said.

MR. SIMMS:

Just let me finish, please. If he obviously indicated he was finished to Your Honour's point of view and there was no other speaker, the vote was put and we were in the middle of calling the vote, then obviously we would have

to proceed with the vote on the amendment. We can leave it until next day and let His Honour review it.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

To the point of order, I just heard the Minister of Career Development tell the Government House Leader that we clearly heard him adjourn the debate.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in what the Minister of Career Development is going to tell me. It is Your Honour who has to make the ruling, not me. That is a suggestion anyway, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is a good point of order. I understood that the hon. member had finished, but I will certainly check the matter.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

I am going to check Hansard and we will leave it at that. My understanding was that the hon. member had finished. I agree, I may be wrong. I will check the matter.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the information of hon. members, next week's House Business. Monday, of course, is a holiday. On Tuesday and Thursday of next week we will be doing legislation from the Order Paper, beginning with Order 4, which is the closing of The Internal Economy Commission Act. Then we will be moving on from there and going down through the Order Paper - Tuesday and Thursday. Wednesday is Private Member's Day.

I wish to inform hon. members that the House will not sit next Friday, in order to allow our members to attend a Provincial Executive Council meeting in Lewisporte and, as well, to allow the members of the New Democratic Party to attend their very tiny little provincial convention they are going to have in Corner Brook, I believe it is, next weekend. I would like to thank hon. members opposite, in particular, for their co-operation in that regard; it is a bit of a practice and a tradition.

I wish everybody, particularly on that side of the House, a fine weekend. As usual, Mr. Speaker, we, on this side, will be working as hard as always.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, at 3:00 p.m., and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24 at 3:00 p.m.

[CONTINUED]

Premier Peckford.....PC.....Green Bay
Mr. Power.....PC.....Ferryland
Mr. Reid.....PC.....Trinity-Bay de Verde
Mr. Rideout.....PC.....Baie Verte-White Bay
Mr. Russell.....PC.....Lewisporte
Hon. Mr. Simmons.....Lib.....Fortune-Hermitage
Mr. Simms.....PC.....Grand Falls
Mr. Tobin.....PC.....Burin-Placentia West
Mr. Tulk.....Lib.....Fogo
Dr. Twomey.....PC.....Exploits
Ms. Verge.....PC.....Humber East
Mr. Warren.....PC.....Torngat Mountains
Mr. Wells.....Lib.....Windsor-Buchans
Mr. Windsor.....PC.....Mount Pearl
Mr. Woodford.....PC.....Humber Valley
Mr. Young.....PC.....Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY:

Premier A. Brian Peckford.....Energy
Mr. R. Alyward.....Forest Resources
Mr. Barrett.....Development and Tourism
Mr. Blanchard.....Labour
Mr. Brett.....Municipal Affairs
Mr. Butt.....Culture, Recreation and Youth
Dr. Collins.....Health and Deputy Premier
Mr. Dawe.....Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Dinn.....Mines
Mr. Doyle.....Transportation
Mr. Matthews.....Career Development and Advanced Studies
Mr. Peach.....Minister Responsible for Housing
Mr. Power.....Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Mr. Rideout.....Fisheries
Mr. Russell.....Environment and Lands
Mr. Simms.....President of the Executive Council
President of Treasury Board
Government House Leader
Mr. Tobin.....Social Services
Dr. Twomey.....Public Works and Services
Ms. Verge.....Justice
Mr. Warren.....Minister Responsible for Northern Development
Mr. Windsor.....Finance
Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro
Mr. Young.....Consumer Affairs and Communications

CONTENTS

FRIDAY, 20 MAY, 1988.

Statements by Ministers

Canada's Fitweek Declared:

Mr. Butt.....	2175
Mr. K. Aylward.....	2176
Mr. Long.....	2177

Oral Questions

Kruger Expansion in Quebec:

Does the decision to expand in Quebec explain Kruger's decision not to modernize No. 3 machine at Corner Brook. Mr. Simmons,	
Mr. R. Aylward.....	2177

When government waived plan to rebuild No. 3 was it aware of Kruger's plans for Three Rivers. What will the impact be on production at Corner Brook. Mr. Simmons,	
Mr. R. Aylward.....	2178

Terra Nova Tel:

Concern that the president-owner of Capital Canada, fiscal agent for Terra Nova Tel sale, was a bagman for John Crosbie's P.C. leadership bid might be a conflict of interest. Mr. Baker,	
Dr. Collins.....	2179

Suggests halting the sale and holding an investigation. Mr. Baker, Dr. Collins.....	2180
---	------

Is government concerned with the conflict of interest, and what will it do about it.	
Mr. Baker, Dr. Collins.....	2180

Mrs. Ting's Fishery Operations:

What investigations were conducted and on what basis was the plant sold to her.

Mr. W. Carter, Dr. Collins.....2181

Was plant immediately mortgaged. What steps to get the plant back in operation. Mr. W. Carter, Dr. Collins, Mr. Windsor.....2181

Requests all relevant documents be tabled.

Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Windsor.....2183

Sprung Project:

Is the aim of Newfoundland Enviroponics the destruction of the Nova Scotia greenhouse industry. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Power.....2184

Suggests every produce industry in Canada would have to be destroyed. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Power.....2184

What if Nova Scotia establishes a marketing board and freezes out produce from Newfoundland Enviroponics. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Power.....2185

Workers' Compensation Tribunal:

Why was the fifth highest tender accepted for the Tribunal's office space, and why haven't reasons for the decision been explained.

Mr. Efford, Mr. Blanchard.....2185

Would the lack of explanation be related to the Chairman's law partner and the Deputy Premier holding shares in the company which owns the building. Mr. Efford, Mr. Blanchard.....2186

Seeks an investigation and the resignation of the Minister of Health. Mr. Efford, Premier Peckford.....2186

Canada-France Boundary Dispute:

When was the Premier aware that France advised Canada in 1986 that French and Canadian vessels fishing in the disputed zone required licenses. Mr. Tulk, Premier Peckford.....2187

Requests all information be tabled. Asks the Premier to impress on Canada that Newfoundland be informed of all development. Mr. Tulk, Premier Peckford.....2187

Forest Spraying Programme:

Recommendation of the Pesticide Advisory Board to increase spraying of Bt by 50 percent. Mr. Furey, Mr. R. Aylward.....2188

Since the Environment Minister disclosed the recommendation had been made, will the minister act on the recommendation. Mr. Furey, Mr. R. Aylward.....2188

Suggests safety comes first. Mr. Furey, Mr. R. Aylward.....2189

**Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given**

Hospital bed closure figures:
Dr. Collins.....2190

Point of Privilege, Mr. Efford, Mr. Simms,
Mr. Tulk.....2191

Mr. Speaker, No prima facie case established.....2193

Point of Privilege, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Speaker,
Dr. Collins, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Furey.....2193

Mr. Speaker, Reserves ruling.....2196

Petitions

Unemployed requesting employment:
Mr. Gilbert.....2196
Mr. Wells.....2198
Mr. Simms.....2201

Orders of the Day

Motion 5, Meech Lake Accord:

[Amendment, Mr. Furey]

Mr. Gullage, resumes debate.....	2203
Mr. Eppard.....	2206
Mr. W. Carter.....	2214
Mr. K. Aylward, adjourns debate.....	2225
Adjournment Motion.....	2236